

U.S. Congress

Appendix

Federal Insurance on Bank Deposits Did Not Lead to Federal Control of Banking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, those who would timorously prevent the Government from marching into the future close their eyes to the fact that the doom criers of a quarter of a century ago lived to see the downfall of their dismal prophecies that the United States was plunging headlong into socialism.

Many of us remember the outcry that accompanied the proposal that the Federal Government guarantee the safety of bank deposits. But the threatened taking over of the banks by the Government never materialized, as was pointed out recently in a forthright editorial in the *Rome (N.Y.) Daily Sentinel*. "They were wrong on bank insurance," says the *Sentinel*, and proves it.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY WERE WRONG ON BANK INSURANCE

They said—25 years ago—that if the Federal Government undertook to guarantee deposits in the Nation's banks, the inevitable result would be complete Government control of banking.

They said that to insure deposits the Government would have to assume an unconscionable degree of control over banking loans and investments, having the effectual result of underwriting those banking functions too.

These fears and alarms are only faint echoes of the past as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation celebrates its 25th anniversary this month. In retrospect its creation now appears a major banking reform. In the 2 years prior to its authorization by the 1933 Banking Act 3,643 banks in the United States had failed. Estimates of losses to depositors—some eventually to be recouped—ranged from three-quarters of a billion dollars to as much as a billion and a quarter.

The original plan provided insurance for the first \$2,500 for each depositor. The limit was raised to \$5,000 in 1934; on September 21, 1950, it was increased to \$10,000 per depositor. Inasmuch as about 98 percent of all deposit accounts have balances of less than \$10,000, substantially all of such deposits are now insured. Of the Nation's 14,095 commercial and mutual savings banks, 13,333 now qualify for the Federal insurance.

The original amount of FDIC paid-in capital was \$239 million. Federal Reserve Banks provided \$139 million; the U.S. Treasury, \$150

million. Congress has never made an appropriation to the Corporation.

The original capital has been repaid with interest from surplus accumulated from FDIC's assessments on insured banks at the annual rate of one-twelfth of 1 percent of their total deposits, less authorized deductions, and income from investments. Since 1950, FDIC has been returning to insured banks 60 percent of their annual payments.

Some 1½ million depositors in 438 sick banks have received payments from FDIC insurance in the Corporation's 25-year lifetime. More than \$343 million has been paid out. The rate of bank failures now has dwindled almost to a standstill. In 1957 the FDIC had to shell out to depositors of only one bank.

Meantime, over the years, the banking business has prospered, though consolidations have reduced the total number of banks. But this trend is being offset by the mushrooming of branches. And the fear that Federal insurance for deposits would encourage recklessness on the part of bankers was replaced long ago by a feeling of confidence in the banking system almost inconceivable in those shaky days of the great depression.

A new play based on the Lincoln-Douglas debates will be welcome emphasis of the fact that not all differences in that era were settled with six-shooters.

Address of Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia, Before Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address which I delivered on Thursday, January 29, 1959, at the annual dinner of the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York held at Hotel Plaza in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman Leslie, President Bell, distinguished guests and members of the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York, thank you for affording me the privilege of sharing with you this significant occasion in your association's history. It is an honor for which I am deeply and humbly grateful.

This is a group with which I feel at home not only because of our common interest in the textile industry and its future but also because of the close ties which many of you and your firms have with my State of Georgia.

We in Georgia know how to appreciate the great industry which you represent.

Our State is the Nation's fifth largest producer of cotton textiles.

One out of every three Georgians employed in industry realizes his livelihood from a textile plant.

More than 85,000 Georgia cotton farmers look to the cotton textile industry as the principal market for the fiber they produce.

And, considering the wide dispersal of the industry and the hundreds of allied industries and businesses which it sustains, it is no exaggeration to say there is hardly a Georgia family whose welfare is not to some degree influenced by the cotton textile industry.

Therefore, I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to express to you and your industry the heartfelt gratitude of all Georgians for the many contributions which the textile industry has made and is making toward the continuing economic progress of our State.

Georgians are looking with confidence toward a future of growth and prosperity limited only by the extent of our energy and imagination and it is a source of pride and inspiration to us to know that the textile industry shares our faith in a greater tomorrow and has cast its lot with us in laboring toward its realization.

The economic and social bonds between your industry and my State make it inevitable that what affects one affects the other.

When the textile industry prospers, Georgia prospers; when the textile economy is threatened, Georgia's economy is endangered, too.

That is why Georgians are sorely disturbed about what is happening to the cotton textile industry as the result of the asinine and unrealistic government policies and programs which have placed the industry and jobs of its employees in grave jeopardy.

Of all the Nation's major industries none is more deserving of favorable consideration in the formulation of governmental policy than the textile industry.

That is true not only because the Armed Forces rank textiles immediately behind steel in the order of priority of materials needed for national defense but, even more important, because no other industry so nearly epitomizes the American concept of free enterprise and competitive economy.

Since Samuel Slater built this country's first textile mill at Pawtucket, R.I., in 1790 and thus set in motion the American industrial revolution which transformed the United States from a frontier nation into a world power, the term "monopoly" has never been associated with the textile industry.

While the heavy industries were concentrating themselves in vast industrial complexes, the textile industry dispersed itself throughout the country in community-type enterprises of which no single company controls as much as 5 percent.

While the monopolies were seeking to control their wealth by channeling it through interlocking subsidiaries, the textile industry went into the open market to buy its needs and thus contributed to the establishment and expansion of independent allied industries in the best American tradition.

The result has been the development of a responsible and highly competitive industry which turns out superior products at minimum prices through efficiency, imagination and mass production—an industry so closely attuned to the general business cycle that it is a recognized bellwether of economic

trends—an industry which, so long as it was protected from unfair competition, prospered and contributed to the prosperity of all associated with it.

What has happened to the textile industry through no fault of its own is a shameful chapter in the industrial history of the United States. It is a sad commentary upon our national values and a ringing indictment of the poor judgment and callous indifference of our national policymakers.

The situation in which our Federal Government has placed the American textile industry is incredible to the point of disbelief to one not familiar with the facts.

But the record is as incontrovertible as it is shocking.

The United States has spent American tax dollars to help rebuild and equip the war-ravaged textile industries of our allies and former enemies and to establish new textile industries in undeveloped countries where wage scales are minute fractions of those in this country.

The United States has furnished the operators of those plants with complete information about even the most advanced management and production techniques developed by the American industry.

The United States has sold surplus American cotton to those countries at prices as much as 20 percent under those which the American industry must pay on the domestic market and, in many instances, has loaned the money with which the purchases were made and then bought the finished products for foreign aid distribution in other countries.

The United States has offered to finance the relocation of American textile plants to other countries and to insure them against loss or expropriation.

The United States has lowered American tariffs to the point and set import quotas so low that foreign textiles turned out with cheap labor and cheap cotton in new, modern plants built with American capital are glutting and destroying the markets for American textiles right here at home.

Those are the things which have been done to the American textile industry in the name of global goodness and under the guise of protecting the free world against communism.

In other words, it is the actual, if not officially expressed, policy of the Government of the United States that the American textile industry is expendable and should be forced to help finance its own liquidation.

What other conclusion can be drawn from policies and programs which require an industry and its employees to pay taxes to build, equip, and supply the plants of the competitors which are threatening to put it out of business?

It is a situation which prompts the question: Just how stupid can we get?

To my knowledge no other industry in the history of the world ever has been forced to compete for its existence under handicaps like those unilaterally imposed by American trade and foreign aid policies on the textile industry of the United States.

Because this country has taken the position of favoring foreign textile industries over its own, the list of advantages enjoyed by textile manufacturers in other countries over their American counterparts is staggering.

They can get their capital from the U.S. Treasury.

They can buy American cotton 20 percent cheaper and use borrowed American dollars to pay for it.

They can sell their finished products back to the American Government through so-called three-way deals under the foreign aid program.

They can pay wage scales which are one-tenth or less of the American legal minimum.

They can impose working conditions which would be illegal in the United States.

They can learn American trade secrets and production know-how merely by asking.

They can undersell comparable American products on the American market.

It is small wonder in the light of those facts that the American textile industry has lost markets equivalent to 10 percent of the national production and that, since 1947, 717 textile mills have closed their doors and 345,000 textile jobs have been discontinued.

It is a great tribute to the vitality and resiliency of the industry that it has been able to contain its losses within those bounds and that, even in the face of the almost insurmountable odds against which it must compete, it is now in the midst of a strong comeback.

Your distinguished president, Mr. Bell, very ably and graphically summarized the situation and position of the textile industry last month in his report on "Ten Years of Cotton Textiles—1948 to 1958" in which he stated:

"Unlike other sections of the American economy which have been favored with direct Government subsidies, financial and tax benefits or which have enjoyed large scale Government buying of their products, textiles have been made the ugly ducklings of the national barnyard. In consequence, textile people have become leading critics of a foreign trade policy which fundamentally discriminates unfairly against the American producer of textiles and apparel while at the same time it grants special privileges here to his foreign competitors and bounties abroad."

It is to your everlasting credit that you have refused to be either discouraged by your plight or daunted by your high-placed adversaries.

Your persistent and consistent stand in defense of your rights has served to open the eyes of many heretofore complacent individuals. And I am encouraged to believe that the pressures being generated by your articulate and irrefutable criticism of the untenable policies of our Federal Government will assure their eventual modification to afford the textile industry the legislative relief and protection to which it is entitled and which it must have if it is to survive.

Without in any way minimizing the gravity of the problem or the effort necessary to bring about its solution, I am confident that—just as surely as was the case in the fable to which Mr. Bell referred in his well-phrased analogy—your days as the "ugly ducklings" of the American economy are numbered.

Although you have been rebuffed time and again when you have sought to present the merits of your case before the executive and legislative branches, you have the satisfaction of knowing that you have forced both to recognize the justice of your cause—the executive in negotiating the import agreement with Japan and the legislative in the action of the Senate in ordering a full-dress study of the problems of the industry.

As a temporary expedient, the executive agreement with Japan gave the industry some relief, but a limited unilateral arrangement which leaves the American textile industry at the mercy of a foreign government is no solution. Furthermore, the problem of low-cost foreign goods is not limited to Japan as is evidenced by snowballing apparel imports from the sweatshops of Hong Kong where the world's lowest wage scales prevail.

It is my resolute conviction that all American industry has a right not only to expect but also to demand that its national government by policy and statute give it unequivocal protection from indiscriminate foreign imports. That can be accomplished only through an effective system of tariffs and

quotas sufficiently high to protect the investment of our industry and the jobs and living standards of its workers and to assure that all products of equivalent quality regardless of origin go into the American market place on a basis of competitive parity.

Let no one confuse the issue with the specious contention that America's position of world leadership in the struggle against international communism requires this country to divide up its domestic markets among the uncommitted nations of the world. The point at issue is not a question of foreign policy but rather a question of maintaining the vitality of our domestic economy. Trade is a matter of business and cannot be made a matter of international politics without disastrous results to business.

To any individual willing to take the time to think it through it obviously is far more important to the future of the free world that the United States sustain its solvency than it is to hand the remainder of the world readymade markets in this country at the expense of American industry. In dealing with the issue we must never lose sight of the fundamental fact that the only hope for the survival of all the free world is an economically invincible America and that the only sure course to American economic invincibility is through maintaining and strengthening—not betraying and destroying—our free enterprise, industrial economy here at home.

If the American textile industry were seeking special favors or preferential treatment, this might be a different story. But, as was so aptly stated by President Halbert M. Jones of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute in testimony before the special Senate subcommittee studying textile problems last July, all the industry is seeking is "a recognition of the vital and important place which this industry and its employees occupy in our national economy and, as a result of this recognition, an assurance of fair and just consideration of our industry and our textile jobs in all of our relations with the Government and its policies."

I interpret that to mean that the textile industry wants nothing more—and nothing less—than to be treated like any other corporate taxpayer. Surely no fair-minded and realistic individual could object to that and I am hopeful that the Senate study of your industry's problems will prove to be the beginning of action which will culminate in remedial legislation during the 86th Congress.

While I would not presume to predict what form any such enactments might take, I do have some definite ideas about the points I think they ought to include if the textile industry and its employees are to receive the protection to which they are entitled. They are:

1. Amendment of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to make it beyond doubt that its restrictions on imports apply to finished, as well as raw, agricultural products.

2. Strengthening of patent laws to prevent foreign pirating of American processes and techniques and to prohibit the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration from disclosing details about them under the foreign aid program.

3. Amendment of Public Law 480 to prohibit the importation into the United States of goods manufactured with commodities sold abroad under its subsidization.

4. Amendment of the Mutual Security Act to require that the International Cooperation Administration purchase in this country all textile products distributed under its terms.

5. Enactment of a new national farm program under which the farmer would be guaranteed his proportionate share of the

national income through compensatory payments and the textile and other agricultural-processing industries would be permitted to buy agricultural commodities at free market prices.

While I shall give my wholehearted support to all of those measures, as well as to any other reasonable and practical proposals which may be made for dealing with textile problems, I expect to concentrate my efforts in this area during the 86th Congress on seeking a new farm bill. My interest in so doing is not only to put the farmer back on his feet on a free-enterprise basis but also to help the textile industry and all other industries utilizing agricultural commodities regain their competitive position at home and abroad.

The present farm program has been a miserable failure by any yardstick. From the farmer's standpoint, it has reduced his income below the subsistence level and all but put him out of business. From the taxpayer's standpoint, it has increased his tax burden and the prices he has to pay for agricultural products. From the textile industry's standpoint, it has forced it to buy cotton at artificially high prices and thus priced its goods out of the world market and many areas of the domestic market.

My study of the problem has brought me to the conclusion that the only effective and permanent solution lies in freeing the farmer to plant and sell as he pleases and allowing commodity prices to seek their own levels under the law of supply and demand. It is my view that the most efficient and economical way under such an arrangement to make up the difference between the farmer's income and the minimum wage and collective bargaining advantages enjoyed by labor would be to pay him a compensatory payment on basic commodities consumed in this country equal to the difference between the market price and 100 percent of parity.

The beauty of such an arrangement is that it would cost the taxpayers \$2 to \$3 billion a year less and would put perhaps as much as \$1 billion a year more in the pockets of the farmers. As paradoxical as that may seem, it would be the case because the high costs of administering the present bureaucratic program and of handling, transporting, storing and disposing of surplus commodities—the latter figure now running to more than \$1 million a day—would be eliminated and every farm program dollar would go directly to the farmer.

I have embodied my ideas in a bill which I introduced in the Senate earlier this month. The overwhelmingly favorable response which I have received from farmers and consumers alike since I first set forth my plan last year encourages me to believe that it has widespread appeal and has the best chance of any proposal yet put forth of becoming a basis for agreement among the various farm groups in writing a new national farm law.

It is my hope that it will have the approval and support of the textile industry. I honestly think it could do more to help the industry than any other measure yet proposed because it would let you buy your cotton at the prevailing world price and would put an end to the utterly ridiculous present situation under which your foreign competitors are buying American cotton at subsidized prices of \$35 to \$40 a bale below its cost of production.

It is the only way of which I know by which our domestic farm economy can be restored and American textiles put back on the world market at competitive prices at the same time.

Certainly it is worth a try because, as I think you will agree, anything would be an improvement over the present patchwork of discredited and abortive farm laws.

The plights in which the textile industry and the farmer find themselves are perfect examples of what happens in nations which,

to use the words of Thomas Jefferson, "have more machinery of government than is necessary."

With the exception of the external menace of communism, all of the ills and problems of the United States can be summarized in the one phrase—too much government.

The American economy is suffering from too much government.

We have 48-cent dollars and face the prospect of 10-cent dollars as the result of ever-broadening governmental policies and programs which are bankrupting our Nation and mortgaging our future.

American prestige abroad is suffering from too much government.

We have undertaken through various bureaucratic and paternalistic programs of spending and instruction to try to make the world over in our own image and as a result find ourselves despised and distrusted throughout most of the world and with less friends and dependable allies than before we started.

The American people are suffering from too much government.

The ever-encroaching arm of Federal governmental authority is embracing more and more affairs traditionally and constitutionally regarded as local matters and as a result the individual citizen finds himself with less and less voice in the conduct of his local government and its institutions.

I cannot bring myself to believe that the majority of American people approve of the philosophy that central governments must be all things to all men and do all things for all men.

To the contrary the mail which I receive from all sections of the Nation indicates to me that the rank and file of the populace are gravely concerned about the present course of our Nation and the consequences of pursuing it to its ultimate conclusion.

I believe the people of this country want to see the Federal budget balanced and the Nation's economy stabilized.

I believe the people of this country want the United States to cease doing for people in other countries what it either is unable or unwilling to do for our own citizens here at home.

I believe the people of this country want the Federal Government to confine its activities to those areas reserved to it by the Constitution and leave the management of all other affairs to local people on the local level.

I believe with Thomas Jefferson that: "The people may be misled or deceived for a time, but where the avenues of truth are open there men will learn to reject what is false and harmful. Where the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government; whenever things get so far wrong as to attract public notice they may be relied upon to set them to rights."

Throughout the Nation there is a growing awakening to the dangers inherent in our country's present policies and a swelling voice for a recognition of the lessons of the past through a return to the fundamentals of constitutional, republican government.

I feel with all my being that the American people already would have expressed themselves in favor of such a return to fundamentals had they had a clear-cut choice at the polls.

I have faith in the desire and willingness of the American people to demand that their house be set in order and I believe that that desire and willingness is not far from making itself felt.

In a constitutional republic such as ours, the masses may not be immediately articulate; but once given leaders and leadership they are swift in making their wishes felt and known.

It is out of that abiding faith in the reason, good judgment, and commonsense of

the great American public that I, in concluding, wish to address myself through you and this occasion to it about a matter which should be a source of grave concern to all persons who are interested in the education of all the children of this Nation regardless of their color or place of residence.

I speak of the chain of events which has resulted in the closing of public schools in various localities of the South and which, if allowed to run their full course, surely will result in the destruction of public education in the South.

Such an eventuality would be a tragic catastrophe which this Nation cannot afford under any circumstances to permit to happen at this critical juncture in our national life. Engaged as we are in a life-or-death struggle with the forces of world communism, this is no time to permit a constitutional controversy to rob the Nation of the minds and talents of a great segment of its youth by locking the doors of the public schools in their faces.

My friends, unless it is the wish of this Nation that we tear our country apart and destroy the schools of the South, action must be taken soon in the Congress of the United States to resolve the issue on a realistic, constitutional basis.

And I cannot believe there is any reasonably intelligent person who would contend that the use of Federal bayonets or the rearing of a generation in ignorance are either realistic or constitutional—and certainly not humane—solutions to the problem.

I have given long and serious study to this question and, recognizing that there are feelings as strong on the other side of the subject as mine are on my side, I have come to the conclusion that there is only one solution compatible with constitutional concepts to which all persons of all shades of opinion can subscribe.

That is the solution which I stood before the Senate on last Monday and outlined with all the sincerity of my being—that is, to amend the Constitution of the United States to give the people on the State and local level the right to determine for themselves the manner in which the issue will be solved in their localities.

This proposed amendment reads as follows: "Administrative control of any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by any State or by any political or other subdivision thereof, shall be vested exclusively in such State and subdivision and nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny to the residents thereof the right to determine for themselves the manner in which any such school, institution or system is administered by such State and subdivision."

Let me emphasize the language "the right to determine for themselves."

Such a provision in our Constitution would leave the citizens of each State and locality free to make their own decisions in accordance with local conditions and prevailing attitudes as to how and when their schools would comply with the Supreme Court's school decision.

Such a provision in our Constitution would prevent destruction of the public schools of the South and would end for all time any threat from any quarter of Federal control of education.

Such a provision in our Constitution would assure uninterrupted instruction for all the children of this country regardless of their color or place of residence.

Such a provision in our Constitution would permit either retention of the status quo or orderly change as dictated by the requirements of public opinion and make certain that whatever change might take place would be by the constructive process of evolution rather than the destructive process of revolution.

Such a provision in our Constitution would create a basis for unity throughout the Nation at a time when it is vitally important that we present a united front before our enemies.

I do not believe there is any parent in this country who could sincerely say that he or she does not believe in the fundamental fact that public schools are local institutions and, if they are to fulfill their role, must be operated on the local level by the parents of the children who attend them.

Nether do I believe that there is any parent in this country who is genuinely concerned about the future of our Nation and the education of our children who could not support such an amendment as I have proposed with a clear conscience and in complete consistency with his principles.

I presented my amendment in good faith. As a staunch adherent of the principle of local self-government and local self-determination, I have no qualms about submitting that or any other issue to the people of the United States or their elected representatives to be resolved by the democratic process.

The very basis of our form of government is, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, that it derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed." And it is to invoke that heritage to resolve the question of control of our public schools that I have proposed my amendment.

I appeal to all the citizens of America—particularly to the parents of school-age children—to let their views about what I have proposed be known to their Senators and Congressmen.

I am convinced that, if they will, the 86th Congress will vote to give the people of America the opportunity to amend our Constitution to assure for all time to come that they retain the fundamental right to run their schools on the local level in accordance with the wishes of the local citizenry.

The future of the United States rests in the hands and hearts of the American people.

Although we sometimes may be justified in feeling frustrated about the course and policies of our Government, we must never sell our people short nor discount their loyalty, courage, honesty, ability and sincerity of purpose.

They have demonstrated time and again their intense determination to meet and overcome whatever obstacles may confront them.

And, like Thomas Jefferson, I put my unwavering faith in them to continue to do so.

I thank you.

Dilemma of the College Student: Draft Dodger or Patriot?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, among the many reasons advanced in opposition to the proposed extension of the present draft act is the increasing arbitrary impact of the draft upon the young men liable to service. The honored concept of a universal obligation, which served the Nation well during World War I and World War II, has been replaced, in fact if not in terms, by a system under which the incidence of the draft falls only on a small group.

Some of the problems arising from this are well described in an article by John C. Esty, Jr., which appeared in the Nation for January 10, 1959. Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

DILEMMA OF THE COLLEGE STUDENT: DRAFT DODGER OR PATRIOT?

(By John C. Esty, Jr.)

For the next few months, college seniors will be focusing their thoughts on how to find a proper place in a society which needs their talents desperately. The most frustrating barrier to this important process is the military manpower situation. Although the draft procedures are complex, it is not complexity that creates the problem for the students. The simple fact is that seniors are required to cope with Defense Department policies that are unimaginative, extemporary, unrealistic, and inadequate, even for military purposes. A few examples, drawn from my experience as military service adviser at Amherst, will illustrate the point.

I recognize him as one of our more alert seniors as he walks in and sits down in the chair by my desk. He has made a good record in college and holds great promise for a meaningful life. He comes right to the point: "I want to go to law school, but I think I should work for a year or two to get some perspective on law as a career. What are my chances of getting drafted during that time?"

This same question, this same slight frown, I have heard and seen hundreds of times. The reply is also the same. You'll probably get called within about a year after graduation. Wouldn't this be a good way to get some perspective and at the same time serve your military obligation?"

"Perhaps, but I'd hope to work in a law office, and, anyway, I want to get married in June. I don't want to drag my wife all over the country, especially when the housing is supposedly so bad around Army camps. What do you thing I should do? Go to law school right away and hope for deferment?"

Shall I tell him he shouldn't get married? That married life for a buck private isn't so bad? That he should go right to law school to dodge the draft, even though he's not sure it's the right field for him? This would work, of course, but maybe it would be as much of a time waste as the Army. I'd better just pull out the stock answer: "Why don't you wait and see what Congress does, or perhaps there will be another Executive order changing the ground rules again. Better not make plans now."

The next boy is also a senior—and married already. He has a good job in the executive-training program of a large industrial firm. Now he finds his farsightedness and assiduity rewarded by the prospect of military service, which will upset his plans completely. He wants to know if it's true that fathers are virtually draft free. When I confirm this, he shrugs his shoulders: "Well, we don't have any money and we thought we should wait on a family. But if fathers get out of military service, then I'll become a father."

Once during course registration—a time when our students typically make some attempt at relating their curricular choices to a future goal—a boy came to me with a neat scheme. Out of a generally versatile academic background, he was emerging with a clear talent in classical studies, perhaps headed for teaching or writing. This was the type of person a society must enlist to look backward and soak up the past, to carry along accumulations of wisdom, cultural tradition, and ethics; the kind who may not help to build missiles, but might help decide whether it's right to use them. He wanted to see the list of critical occupations for which draft exemption and reduction of re-

serve requirements are offered. He didn't find classical studies. He did find physics—and that's what he's majoring in.

Shall we call it lack of patriotism? Are these spineless or cynical young men of the silent, cautious generation, who don't care about their country? I think not. Listen to the Amherst Student editorializing on the campus visit of Marine officers recruiting for the platoon leaders course:

"We read daily how the intermediate range ballistic missile is now obsolete, how manpower is being slashed and draft calls are dwindling. Why then sacrifice 3 years and two summers to the USMC when, with a little effort and information, it is possible to fulfill a military obligation in less than a year, with a reserve commitment which can be waived for men that are entering critical-skills occupations in fields of chemistry, physics, geology, and foreign languages? It is possible to enroll in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 6-month program in a rural area where there is no filled quota of reservists, go on active duty after graduation, and go to work with no reserve commitment except in case of war, when all reservists are called by act of Congress. The military obligation can be fulfilled more easily than by a 3-year hitch with the Marine Corps. A contribution to the security of our country can better be made in a research lab than by participation in obsolete field maneuvers at some obscure military outpost."

What particular lecture on American democracy and patriotism do you give to the boy who, having been dressed down for asking directly how to avoid the draft, wonders, "I see so many getting out of it, why should I be the one to go?" You point out that there have always been inequities in manpower conscription; that the burden of Korea fell at first on the reservists of World War II, and that this is why Congress changed from "selective service" (service by just those selected) to "universal service" (where everyone serves, at least in theory); that war has always consumed those most valuable to society in any sense. But he smiles and asks, "Is the senior who goes to graduate school just to get out of military service universal? Is the father universal? Is it universal to be the one sucker in four who gets hooked?"

And it's not just getting hooked that hurts; it's also staying hooked. Consider the story of the boy who applied for admission to us 5 years after graduation from high school. He had wanted to go to a challenging eastern men's college, but had no money at all. So he went to work as a patternmaker, which carried an essential skills draft deferment. For 5 years he put money aside for his education, spending some of it along the way on night-school courses, mainly to prepare himself even better for college. When he came to be interviewed, we found he was a boy of high ability and one highly motivated to work hard. We accepted him on the spot and offered him a partial scholarship to augment his own savings. It was the kind of case that makes an admission officer, in the midst of his harassment, feel the whole business is worthwhile.

The boy went home elated, quit his job, and enrolled in some summer-school courses we thought would help him in preparation for entrance in September. A week later he was on the phone—with his induction notice in hand. He was not eligible for student deferment, since he was actually not in college, so I counseled him to try the 6-month program. We would let him enter in February and there was a local Reserve unit where he could continue his 5½-year Reserve obligation. He followed this advice and came to us at midyear. His academic record has borne out our expectation; he has attended his Reserve meetings faithfully. Hear his dilemma:

"We have training meetings two evenings a week, since the unit is geared to the ac-

demic year; and we are then free during school vacations. The trouble is that I have to study hard—you know I'm on scholarship—and two evenings shot each week is a lot. I would apply for a waiver of the 48 meetings required per year in return for an extra 2 weeks of summer camp (2 weeks is required anyway), but then I don't get my summer job. A lot of men don't show up half the time and nothing seems to happen; I just don't dare. Do you know what we do at these meetings? We sit. We listen to a halting personal account of supply operations in the Panama Canal Zone, a lecture on military administration, or a talk on Pentagon organization. Sometimes we stand up and do a few column lefts and dress rights. I don't know what all this has to do with missiles, strategic warfare or even landings in Lebanon. And I've got 4 more years of it."

These are the kinds of stories and problems a collegiate military-service adviser hears day after day. The advice we must give adds up to something like this: don't plan—wait; become a father sooner than you had planned; go to graduate school even though you're not ready; pick your college major after consulting the draft-exempt list. Any dean or counselor who gives that kind of counsel would ordinarily be fired for incompetency, yet this is what the present military-manpower policies are forcing us to do. We had always tried to proceed from one cardinal principle of advice: do your planning now, as though there were no threat of military service; then see how the service best fits into your plans, and act accordingly.

This idea seemed to be useful during Korea and up to about 2 years ago. Then the effects of three major changes in atmosphere went to work on the side of confusion.

First, our students read regularly about the great shifts to technological-defense weapons, which are manned by engineers instead of by armies. The brush-fire argument for many divisions of standing infantry was undermined by the small number of men involved in Lebanon. They can't help but wonder why so many men, especially unskilled draftees, are needed. (Nor can I; my bias must be showing by now.)

Second, unlike 6 years ago, education seemed to have gained respectability so that, as the student editorial quoted earlier suggests, it should be as patriotic to develop one's mind and intellectual talents as to serve as clerk-typist in company headquarters. If Congress is willing to appropriate enough money for a National Defense Education Act (inadequate though it is, especially in strengthening public school teaching), doesn't it make sense to let intelligent people serve with their brains instead of their feet—and at no cost to taxpayers?

Finally, the most demoralizing shift in climate has been the manifest breakdown of the Selective Service System in maintaining of any semblance of universality; that is, a sense of fairness as to who is drafted and who isn't. It is this aspect of military service which has led the Fund for the Republic, in a paper by John Graham entitled "The Universal Military Obligation," to question seriously the constitutionality of current manpower practices. Excerpted in numerous college newspapers, this paper clearly articulates the inequities which students feel as they try to plan their futures. The only course open to one charged with providing advice on military service is to point to the few fixed rules which may indicate some guide to planning. One simply answers four main questions in the minds of college students: What are the current obligations? What is the present status of the draft? What are the alternatives? What are the chances that all this will change?

The first obligation is that every male must register with the Selective Service Sys-

tem on his 18th birthday. Most colleges have some official designated as a local draft registrar for the convenience of students. Some time after registration, the registrant is required to fill out a questionnaire on the basis of which he is usually classified 1A by his local board. This classification means he is available for service until such time as he receives a deferment for academic, physical or other reasons. It is customary for students to hold the 1A classification throughout their college careers unless granted a student deferment by their local board (some boards grant deferments automatically). At the present time, students are rarely drafted much below the age of 23. A registrant is additionally obliged to inform his board of any address change (including college attended), any change of status, any plans to leave the country, and to carry his draft card at all times.

The law from which these obligations arise is the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, extended in 1955 by Congress until June 1959. It requires all physically qualified males between the ages of 18½ and 26 to serve 2 years of active duty and 4 years of Reserve duty—or some administrative equivalent such as 6 months' active duty and 5½ years' Active Reserve duty. Those who have received a deferment have their liability age extended from 26 to 35.

Currently any male who is physically qualified—apparently about 40 percent of any age group falls to qualify—and who is not eligible for deferment (as a student, as a father, as a person with dependents, as a ministerial or medical candidate) may expect to be drafted between the ages of 22 and 23. Doctors and dentists may be deferred because of their professional training, but they then become eligible for a special draft—or the alternative of accepting a commission for 2 years of active duty—until age 45. In most cases, it is possible for a student to complete 4 years of college untouched by the draft, but graduate school almost certainly requires deferment. The student deferment is still based on a student's score on the college qualification test and on his academic rank.

Even though receipt of a deferment technically makes a student eligible for the draft until he is 35, the Armed Forces are not interested in inductees over the age of 26. By Executive order, local boards are required to exhaust all of the men in each category in the following sequence:

1. Delinquents (i.e., legal draft dodgers).
2. Volunteers (in the order in which they volunteered).
3. Nonvolunteers, nonfathers between 18½ and 26 (oldest first).
4. Nonvolunteer fathers between 18½ and 26 (oldest first).
5. Men over 26.

Many draft boards are filling their quotas entirely from category 2, and the typical board is operating in category 3 at the 23-year-old level. The fact that these categories have been established to begin with, the fact that the age of probable drafting in category 3 is rising, the fact that the number of men in categories 4 and 5 is increasing dramatically, the fact that draft quotas are dwindling—all point to a huge and growing manpower pool with which the system cannot cope. The result is that more and more legally eligible men are escaping the draft, and the bankruptcy of the universal concept becomes clear.

Being drafted—or volunteering, to precipitate the issue—currently involves 2 years of active service in the Army, which for a college graduate holds fair hope of useful activity (in spite of the "round-hole-square-peg" stories). This is followed by a 2-year stint in the Ready Reserve, where active participation is supposedly enforced by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, and a final 2 years in the

Standby Reserve, which carries no special obligations except in case of general mobilization.

The first alternative to the draft which seems to occur to most college students is complete escape. The attraction of this avenue is directly proportional to the odds involved, which means it's looking better and better all the time. Aside from this unfortunate consequence of current policy, the most popular alternative seems to be the 6-month program. The main advantage is clearly the shortened active-duty time; the disadvantages are the long active-reserve period of 5½ years and the fairly useless nature of the total 6 years' activity. It is likely that before long this program will reach its saturation point; already seniors find that their local Reserve units have reached the allotted strength and can accept no more applications.

The second most attractive alternative, especially for those who want to be officers and are willing to give up an extra year or so for the privilege, would be one of the officer-candidate schools of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. After graduation, the candidate completes 16 weeks of training, 3 years of active duty, and some combination of Ready and Standby Reserve time for a total of 6 years. A similar program, the marine platoon leaders' course, substitutes two 6-week summer encampments during college for the post-college 16 weeks' training course, and commissions are awarded at graduation from college. Those seniors who might be interested in becoming aviation cadets are scared off by a 5-year active-duty commitment.

For some reason, there is great reluctance on the part of the Armed Forces to appoint officers directly on the basis of education, background, or civilian skills. When I went through officer-training school, the students came from three sources: direct appointment (my own category), ROTC, and appointment from the enlisted ranks. At the end of the course, the overall evaluation of each man—including military bearing, drill, leadership—was averaged for each source. The direct appointees, with no prior military experience, ranked significantly higher than the ROTC people and enlisted appointees, who followed in that order.

Various special programs for enlisted men create some interest for the college senior. Opportunities for specialized training—as at the Army Language School—are occasionally considered worth while enough to warrant spending an extra year of active duty. There is also the possibility of securing an officer-candidate school appointment directly from the ranks, although this is a real gamble. From time to time one hears of a special "quick opening" program of particular advantage for the college graduate, but these are announced softly and usually last only a short while, so capitalizing on them is a matter of luck.

The alternatives mentioned above are considered mainly by students whose college does not have a Reserve officers' training course (ROTC). Where such a program is available, the military obligations of those students not anxious to take a chance on the draft are comfortably attended to. But here again the dean, or military counselor, is placed in the position of advising boys to give up a fourth or a fifth of their college work just for the short-range assurance of knowing how and when they will discharge their military obligations. Typically, an ROTC student sacrifices the impractical or non-vocational courses, such as music appreciation and literature, which might have opened the way for years of leisure time richly and meaningfully spent; or political science, which might have engendered a greater sensitivity to the demands placed on an enlightened citizenry.

What are the chances that all this will change? The current draft law expires in June 1959, and Congress will have to act on new legislation this spring. It is apparent that the present situation will no longer be tenable after a few more months. Every executive action in the past 4 years has been directed at relieving the pressure of the manpower pool on the draft apparatus by creating more attractive alternatives. (Two years ago the Defense Department published a booklet, "It's Your Choice," listing more than 40 kinds of opportunities for military service.) Yet the monster grows each day. With the failure of these relief valves, the drafting age within category 3 will probably continue to rise until perhaps no one will be drafted except those who volunteer for service to avoid being drafted. The only way out of this paradox, under present law, would be to defer and exempt greater numbers, which would serve only to increase the present uncertainty and inequity. A particularly unfortunate aspect of the situation is the apparent unwillingness or inability of manpower officials to face these manifest breakdowns in the justification and operation of "universal" military service. Having talked with a number of these officials, directly and indirectly, I would guess that the Defense Department will simply recommend continuation of the present draft law.

I am aware that our military manpower policy has been criticized on the bases of unconstitutionality, inadequacy, waste, and expense. It should be. But about these grounds I am not especially informed, and can only grumble. I do know, however, of the draft law's effect on college students, and if they are considered to be an important segment of the society, then someone had better pay attention to their perspective. From that perspective, the status quo is absolutely unviable, the corruption of "universal" service is corrupting their sense of duty, uncertainty is making cynics of them, and their talents and training are deliberately turned from the service of their country.

It is not yet stylish to be unpatriotic, but the college student can't hold out forever.

Permanent Extension of Special School Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a bill to permanently extend a program which has great significance to the health of our schoolchildren—the special school milk program. I might add that this program also has a great bearing on the economic health of the dairy industry.

Congress has been appropriating the sum of \$75 million a year for the maintenance of this program. Under the present utilization system in our schools, this appropriation is sufficient through fiscal 1959.

Beginning on July 1, 1959, however, there is need of an increased appropriation or the program will need to be curtailed.

The value of healthful milk to the diet of our schoolchildren can hardly be overestimated. This program insures that

every American child, regardless of the financial status of his parents or guardians, will not need to be deprived of nature's most nearly perfect food.

I believe I speak for millions of schoolchildren and their parents when I say that this is one program of which Congress can be proud. Scarcely a year goes by when research does not uncover more evidence to bolster the contention of modern science that milk is a vital food for children and adults.

Milk furnishes the human body with 100 different nutrients—including a tremendous assortment of vitamins, minerals, fats, sugars, and high-quality proteins. It is a fact that milk is essential for three nutrients that many nutritionists advise in quantities larger than many people consume.

But it is for three inherent nutrients that milk is justly famous.

Milk provides mineral calcium which is needed throughout life for healthy bones.

Milk provides B-vitamin riboflavin which is essential for healthy skin and nerves which enables the body cells to use other nutrients carried to them by the blood.

And milk dispenses protein which is the main building-and-repair material of all tissues in the body.

Many people receive all too little of these three nutrients. It is of major importance that our children receive them, and the best way to insure this is to see that they drink plenty of milk.

This is why the special school milk program has a great stake in our country's future—because it deals with the bodily welfare of our Nation's youth. Every investment we make in the health of our schoolchildren will certainly result in a stronger America for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of this legislation.

The Economics of Progress—Reform of Tax Rates and Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my friend and distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [HOWARD H. BAKER], and myself, I would like to call to the attention of the House companion bills, H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001, which we introduced on Wednesday, January 21, 1959. These bills would reform Federal tax rates and methods to accord with the economics of progress. It is our conviction that this legislation should have priority over competing claims of all other Government policies and programs. We, therefore, urge its prompt consideration and enactment, and to this end solicit the interest and cooperation of our colleagues on the Ways and Means Com-

mittee, of all Members of the Congress, and of the executive branch.

The present Federal tax structure stunts economic growth since it both prohibits adequate capital accumulation and destroys capital once accumulated. We can no longer afford a Federal fiscal policy based only on short-term considerations, from fighting inflation in one year to fighting recession in another, while neglecting the root source of fiscal crises.

By removing tax blocks to progress, our bills would contribute more than any other possible Government action to our economic well-being and national security. In enabling the economy to grow much more rapidly and consistently than in recent years, these bills would:

Counter the challenge of Russian communism for world economic leadership;

Encourage other nations outside the Communist orbit to reorganize their tax systems to permit more rapid economic development out of their own capital;

Increase the supply and mobility of venture capital, thus insuring a rebirth of the American genius for the starting and development of businesses;

Provide new and better job opportunities;

Insure adequate revenues for military preparedness and all other necessary Federal expenditures;

Smother inflation with growth.

In introducing this legislative program, we call special attention to two matters. The first is that the revenue effect of comprehensive reform in tax rates and methods is so great that major goals can only be achieved by spreading out reductions over a number of years. The second is that any lesser program would still leave us far short of a sound tax system insofar as capital accumulation and economic progress are concerned.

We cannot correct the fundamental tax problem of our times by nibbles and bites.

Legislative proposals for thorough reform of the income tax rate structure over a period of years are not new. Such proposals were introduced in the 85th Congress—H.R. 6452, 9119, 9415, and 11461—and received overwhelming support from the witnesses who testified for broad tax reduction during the hearings held by the Ways and Means Committee just 1 year ago. These earlier bills were designed to deal only with the tax impact on accumulation of new capital out of current income. The new bills also would reduce the tax destruction and increase the mobility of capital accumulations, by deferring tax on gains of individuals from sales of long-term capital investments the proceeds of which are reinvested within the taxable year, and by reduction in the rates of tax on estates and gifts. The bills also would establish more realistic depreciation rules. Because of the revenue effect of these new provisions, especially those applying to depreciation, it has been necessary to set ultimate income tax rates under the legislation at 47 percent instead of 42 percent, as in the earlier bills.

CAPITAL AND PROGRESS

Mr. Speaker, the boldness of the challenge to free capitalism by the govern-

ment capitalism of Communist Russia was the story behind the news which launched us into the space era. Of all the steps to counter that challenge which may be taken in America, and in other free nations, none could approach in importance the reorganizing of tax structures in recognition of the inherent goodness of capital and its indispensable role in the preservation of freedom in the world.

Combined with man's energy, vision, and technological skill, capital is the source of all economic progress. Its beneficial effect starts with employment. The production of capital goods itself provides jobs. Then, these goods are used to increase the productivity of existing jobs and to create new production and new jobs.

Any tax method or rate which impedes the accumulation, use, or preservation of capital is a tax on human betterment and national strength. Our Federal tax structure must stand convicted of this fault.

By use of capital-destroying tax rates and methods we have prevented our economy from achieving anything like its potential for progress. This means we have fewer and less productive jobs than should be available. Our total production is far short of our national capability for progress and the standard of living of our people is correspondingly less than it should be. It also means that failure to effect fundamental reform of our tax structure quickly would put in jeopardy the industrial supremacy on which our national security depends.

The critical impact of destructive tax rates on the economic health and vitality of our economy has often been overlooked because of the persistent illusion that our economy has been continuously in the midst of a capital goods boom since the end of World War II. This illusion comes from looking at totals expressed in inflationary instead of constant dollars.

For a span of 60 years preceding the depression of the 1930's, our economy grew in the range of 4 percent a year. We achieved no net growth in the decade ending with 1939, and the using up of productive plant and equipment was much greater than replacement during the war years. Thus, at the end of World War II, we were faced with a deficiency in capital formation which had been building up for 15 years.

Despite this deficiency, total economic growth—measured in constant dollars of gross national product—averaged only 3.8 percent annually in the decade ending with 1957.

Moreover, there was a nearly 40-percent reduction in the rate of growth in the second 5 years of that period as compared with the first. Specifically, in the first 5 years ending with 1952, the growth rate averaged 4.6 percent, but in the second 5 years ending with 1957, the average slipped down to 2.9 percent. In 1958, we lost ground in the production of goods and services and much more in capital formation. While we are now in a period of recovery in production, there is a continued lag in capital formation out of which must come substantial fu-

ture increases in production. In fact, even at present inadequate production levels, the evidence indicates that we are using up capital plant and facilities at a rate 20 percent or more higher than we are replacing them.

In contrast with our postwar experience, Soviet Russia has made spectacular strides in capital formation and total production in recent years. Published estimates indicate that total Russian production which, only a few years ago was less than 25 percent of ours, is now upwards of 35 percent and expanding at a rate in the order of 8 percent a year.

These growth rates were achieved before the recent announcement of Communist leader Khrushchev of a program of capital investment in the Soviet Union between now and 1965, which would equal their total investment in the 41 preceding years of the Communist revolution. One does not have to accept at face value Khrushchev's boast of burying us under an avalanche of production to recognize that the goal of Russian communism is fixed and unchanging. It is political domination of the world. Even if we had not been told so plainly, we would know that their aim is to accomplish such domination by using industrial strength to sabotage governments, to enter and destroy free markets, and eventually to control whole economies throughout the world.

Khrushchev stated that they would equal our production in 1970. Actually, the Russians would not have to increase their growth rate of 8 percent a year in order to equal our total production by 1980, if we grow on at an average rate of 3 percent. If our growth rate should further decline to an average of no more than 2 percent, with Russia's continuing at 8 percent, their total production would approximate ours by 1975.

There could be no excuse for our Nation settling for growth rates in the future of no more than 2 or 3 percent. The core of the problem is in capital creation. In the Soviet Union, capital creation has absolute priority over all other matters, in sharp contrast to the situation in America. It is past time that we gave top priority to removing the tax blocks to capital creation. Under a tax system which did not penalize the accumulation and ownership of capital, and which allowed full play to the natural incentives for capital use, there could be no doubt of our capabilities for much more rapid progress than in recent years. We should not be satisfied through the indefinite future with an average growth rate under 5 percent. Even at that rate, if the Russian economy should continue to grow at 8 percent annually, they would reach our total production before the end of the century. Actually, there is no reason why we should not set our sights on a growth goal of 6 percent or more. Despite the arbitrary methods by which capital is created in the Soviet Union, we need not fear the challenge of government capitalism if our free capitalism is released from punitive tax rates.

SPECIFICS OF REFORM OF TAX RATES AND METHODS AND UNDERLYING REASONS

Mr. Speaker, in regard to a tax system which grossly penalizes capital accumulation and restricts economic progress the words "tax reform" could reasonably and logically have only one meaning, namely, to relax its penalizing and restrictive effects. In preparing our bills we have necessarily limited the proposed reforms to one type of action, regarding five major tax areas, which we believe would be most beneficial to economic progress, job creation and betterment, and national security. There are many other proposals for tax revision which merit the description of "reform" because their effect would be to reduce tax restraints on economic growth. Those involving substantial revenue effect have not been included in our bills since this would be possible only by the exclusion of some or all of one or more of the reforms provided therein. We believe that proposals, essentially technical in nature, involving little revenue effect, should be handled in separate legislation.

In the following discussion we describe the reforms in tax rates and methods included in our bills, with explanation of underlying facts and reasons.

THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Starting with January 1, 1959, there would be five annual coordinated reductions in all the graduated rates of individual tax, with the first bracket rate being reduced from 20 to 15 percent. With compression of the scale of graduation being the key to fundamental tax reform over the 5 years, the top individual rate would be brought down to 47 percent, from its present 91 percent. Specific examples of reductions in other statutory rates follow: \$4,000 to \$6,000 taxable income bracket, from 26 to 17 percent; \$8,000 to \$10,000 bracket, from 34 to 19 percent; \$12,000 to \$14,000 bracket, from 43 to 21 percent; \$16,000 to \$18,000 bracket, from 50 to 23 percent; and \$20,000 to \$22,000 bracket, from 56 to 25 percent. Appendix A shows the new rates for each year. Appendix B provides a means by which individual taxpayers can compute their tax liability at the end of the reduction period, as compared to present law.

The revenue effect of these reductions would be somewhat more than \$2 billion annually, or upwards of \$11 billion over the 5-year period, out of a total revenue effect for the legislation as a whole of about \$17 billion. Nearly 60 percent of this \$11 billion revenue effect—tax saving to the individual—would fall in the taxable income brackets up to \$6,000, as shown in Appendix C; and 79 percent in the taxable brackets up to \$18,000. Only 6 percent of the total would fall in the brackets above \$50,000. Of course, the data for the lower brackets include tax savings on all income falling in such brackets, including that of taxpayers whose total income also places them in higher brackets. The table demonstrates the point, however, that there could be no further significant reductions in the lower brackets by foregoing part of the reductions in the middle and higher brackets.

The emphasis we place on compression of the graduated scale of individual tax rates reflects the fact that graduation is the worst saboteur of the economics of progress. While the most senseless and uneconomic rates are in the highest brackets, the steepest climb in graduation is through the middle and not the higher brackets. In fact, half of the total range of graduation—the 71 percentage points between the first rate of 20 percent and the top rate of 91 percent—is reached at the taxable income bracket beginning with \$22,000, where the rate is 56 percent—basic rate of 20 percent, and graduated element of 36 percent.

The steeply graduated rates dull the incentives to earn higher income and to engage or invest in venturesome enterprises.

These rates drastically limit the accumulation of new capital in two ways. As income increases only a declining margin is available for saving. And, because of the impact on incentives, much less income is sought and realized in the middle through higher brackets than would be the case under moderate rates.

The high rates limit the investment potential even more than indicated by the immediate effect on capital accumulation. Savings of persons in the middle and higher income brackets are more likely to be invested in the risky or venturesome types of enterprise than are the savings of those with lower incomes. This likelihood would be greatly increased under moderate rates. Risk-taking investments always forerun opportunity for safer use of investment funds. Under sustained, higher level growth, which must be sparked and initially fueled by venture capital, there would be much greater accumulation and use of investment funds from all sources.

The limitation on total investment potential has its most severe effect as regards the starting of new businesses, and the expansion of small businesses once begun. Aside from the incentives to engage in business, or to make a business grow, the punitive tax rates make it impossible for the small business to secure venture capital from outside sources. The once prolific source of such capital, the successful person who was willing and able to invest in new enterprises, has been choked off by the punitive tax rates. When, under moderate tax rates, the successful are again able to accumulate substantial savings out of current income, we will find that they again will be interested in investing in such enterprises.

Moreover, even well-established businesses in the middle and larger size categories are often faced with an impossible problem of finding adequate new funds for expansion. All across the board, the steeply graduated rates of individual tax serve directly and indirectly to limit the accumulation of new capital funds so desperately needed to realize our Nation's potential for progress and security.

THE CORPORATION INCOME TAX, AND DEPRECIATION

Starting January 1, 1959, there would be 5 annual reductions of 1 percentage

point each in the rates of corporate tax, and 5 annual reductions of 5 percent each in the maximum required length of property lives for depreciation on new plant and equipment as measured from an average of present experience.

The first 3 reductions in tax rates would apply to the normal corporate tax, bringing it down from 30 to 27 percent, and the last 2 reductions would apply to the surtax, bringing it down from 22 to 20 percent. The combined top rate would thus be reduced from 52 to 47 percent.

The revenue effect of the corporate rate reductions is estimated at \$400 million annually, or a total of \$2 billion over the 5 years.

The depreciation provisions, applied to new acquisitions of business plant and equipment, would supplant Treasury determination of property lives under Bulletin F by substituting six broad statutory classifications of depreciable property. In actual experience many taxpayers have used, with Revenue Service approval, shorter property lives than provided in Bulletin F, and the aim in the legislation is to measure the reduction in lives from average actual experience.

In practical effect, the new lives available for use in regard to property acquisitions in the fifth and succeeding years would permit an average increase of one-third in the rates of depreciation allowances. These increases would come on top of the liberal allowances in early years under the sum-of-the-years-digits and double declining balance methods, made available to taxpayers through the 1954 Revenue Code, and the extra first-year allowance granted to small business taxpayers in the legislation of 1958.

While the long-range effect of depreciation speed-ups is to defer and not eliminate tax liability, the short-to-medium-range effects are the same as that coming from any type of tax reform.

On the basis of rough data we have estimated the revenue effect of these depreciation changes at up to \$600 million annually, or up to \$3 billion over the 5-year period. It is estimated that approximately 75 percent of the tax savings would go to corporate taxpayers, and 25 percent to unincorporated business taxpayers.

Potentially, corporate profits are a major source of new venture capital. The potential derives from two factors: First, profits retained within a corporation increase the stockholder's equity and hence are venture capital; and, second, people who own stocks could normally be expected to invest a large part of dividend income in new equities.

In recent years the first factor has been negated in large part because of the overstatement of corporate profits due to inflation. This results because depreciation charges are stated in dollars of original investment, instead of in dollars reflecting replacement cost. The difference, which is subject to the tax on profits, has to be made up out of retained profits in order to maintain intact the present value of investment. Only the remaining profits are available for net new investment in plant and

facilities. This problem is aggravated by the required spread-out of depreciation allowances over unrealistically long periods of time.

Under these conditions, it is understandable there would be advocacy of legislative action to compensate for the inflationary impact on profits by increasing depreciation allowances to reflect replacement instead of original cost. Such a procedure, however, would run counter to the purpose of our legislation, which is to stop inflation, not compensate for it. There are other reasons why it would not be feasible to incorporate a replacement cost formula, namely: the revenue effect would be so large as to prevent any contemporary reduction in corporate rates, as well as some of the reduction in individual rates contemplated in our bills; the tax reduction dollars involved would go entirely to establish enterprises without improving the depreciation situation of enterprises still in the development and initial expansion phases; and it would leave unresolved and even aggravate the problem of excessive property lives.

On the other hand, reduction of property lives as provided in our legislation would contribute to forces for stopping inflation; can be accommodated by foregoing a reduction of only 5 percentage points in the corporate tax; would benefit enterprises in accordance with the rate of new investment regardless of preceding development; and would constitute a major step towards a permanent solution to the problem of excessive property lives which otherwise could become intolerable under the rapid advance of technology. Moreover, as additional tax reduction opportunities open up, this procedure may be readily expanded to accomplish a total reduction of say 50 percent in property lives which would mean a doubling of depreciation allowance rates. As a final point, when this procedure brings property lives down to realistic levels, there would be eliminated one of the areas of persistent conflict between taxpayers and the Revenue Service involving tremendous time and cost on the part of both.

As regards the second factor mentioned above, stockholder reinvestment of dividend income is now largely prevented by the steeply climbing rates of individual tax. This situation would be greatly improved under the moderate individual rate scale provided in our bills.

THE CAPITAL GAINS TAX

In accordance with the precedent already established on the sale and repurchase of homes, our bills make statutory provision for tax free transfer of capital by individuals, but not by corporations, from one investment to another when the transactions are completed within the taxable year, and the investments sold have been held by the taxpayer for at least 6 months. The result would be a deferral of tax on long-term gains until such time as the taxpayer disinvests. We have included this application of the roll-over principle in the legislation since the only possible justification for taxing at any time the proceeds from sale of a long-term investment is that the seller is disinvesting

with the intention of using capital gains as income for consumption purposes.

Recognizing that consideration of this kind of procedure for prospective effectuation could result in an inflationary buyer's market for securities and other producing properties, as present owners held back from selling in the expectation of tax deferral on later sales, we have set the effective date for this provision as of January 1, 1959. Data are not available from which the revenue effect of this provision can be systematically calculated, but it could not be too large because of the exclusion of corporate transactions and also some other types of transactions, such as sale of timber-cutting rights as distinguished from the property itself, now classed as capital gains. The total revenue effect might go as high as \$1 billion, but conceivably could be as low as half a billion dollars.

Whatever the revenue effect, there would be a complete offsetting increase in the availability of new capital. A tax on a capital gain from investment is a tax on capital, and the existing supply of capital is diminished by the amount of the tax. Capital so destroyed must be replaced by new capital accumulated out of current income, before there is a net addition to capital supply for new investment.

In addition to decreasing the existing supply of capital, the fact of a tax on capital gains serves to reduce the mobility of capital, since it defeats the investor's judgment where the reasons for transferring capital from one investment to another do not outweigh the tax consideration. Capital immobilized in this way is described as locked-in. The result is particularly serious as regards new and small business since, other things being equal, it restricts movement of funds from ownership in well-established businesses to more venturesome enterprises involving the prospect of greater return. Thus, the capital gains tax serves to compound the prohibitive barrier of the graduated individual tax to the starting and development of business.

ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Instead of establishing a new formula for setting tax rates on estates and gifts, our bills would simply bring the top rate of estate tax down to 47 percent to coincide with the top rates of individual and corporate tax after 5 years, and consistent with the present relationship, reduce the top rate of gift tax to three-fourths of this figure, or 35.25 percent. All lower rates would be reduced in proportion. Thus, as set forth in appendix D, the estate tax rates would range by taxable brackets from 1.75 to 47 percent, compared with the present 3 to 77 percent, and the gift tax rates from 1.25 to 35.25 percent, compared with the present 2.25 to 57.75 percent.

These new rates would become effective on the day following enactment of the legislation. Because of the normal delay between the occurrence of death and payment of estate tax, the revenue effect of the legislation would not be significant in the first year. Thereafter, it is estimated the effect would be no more than \$400 to \$500 million annually.

Since a death or gift tax is a tax on capital these are but modest reductions in destructive rates. As with the capital gains tax, the net reduction of capital through estate and gift taxes can only be restored by withdrawals from new savings out of current income.

The high rates have been championed as a means for breaking up and redistributing the wealth represented in large estates. To the extent of the tax, however, capital is destroyed and not redistributed. Actually, the high rates have resulted in transfer of the bulk of many large estates to tax-exempt trusts and foundations. Instead of dispersing ownership, such transfers have created a new kind of concentration which, unlike individual ownership, is self-perpetuating.

In its competitive-free economy, operating under the protection of the anti-trust laws, America does not face the social dangers of concentration of wealth which have plagued other less dynamic societies. The higher the rate of economic growth, the greater will be the diffusion of income and new wealth throughout the population.

Actually, exorbitant rates of estate and gift taxes are a major tax cause of the merger of family and other closely held businesses with larger concerns. They complete the blow initially dealt the formation and development of new businesses by the graduated income tax.

FISCAL ASPECTS OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, it is our opinion that reform of the tax rate structure is of such urgent, overriding necessity in the national interest that it must not be further delayed for any reason. We further believe there could be no question but that, with enactment of this legislation, economic growth over the next 5 years would be adequate to offset the revenue effect of the legislation with a comfortable margin left over. It is roughly calculated that each 1 percent annual increase in the rate of economic growth, as measured by gross national product, will produce a billion dollars in additional Federal revenues. It is also estimated that the revenue effect of our bills would average out at less than \$3.5 billion annually, or the equivalent of revenue increase which would come from roughly a 3.5-percent rate of economic growth. Thus, if with enactment of this legislation economic growth should average 5 percent annually over the next 5 years, there would be an average annual surplus of revenue increase of at least \$1.5 billion over the requirements for effectuating the reforms provided.

Nevertheless, we recognize that the case for enactment must stand up against two natural questions.

The first would involve the danger that Government spending would increase so as to encumber the revenue gain from economic growth, whether or not induced by tax rate reform. The second question would involve the matter of timing, namely, whether any legislation should be enacted effectuating tax rate reductions in advance of our achievement of budget balance with a surplus in sight.

SPENDING VERSUS TAX RATE REFORM

In regard to the first question, the fundamental purpose of forward scheduling of income tax rate reductions, and depreciation rate changes, is to permit business planning, including the starting and development of business, in the knowledge of a more favorable tax climate in succeeding years.

In addition, forward scheduling would set up competition against encumbering revenue increase with new spending commitments, thus greatly increasing the likelihood that specific tax rate reductions will be possible within the framework of budget balance. Moreover, as with the earlier bills, we have provided a safeguard in the form of postponement procedures to guard against a renewal wave of deficit spending.

Taking the President's 1960 budget estimate as the benchmark, the legislation provides that income tax rate reductions may be postponed after those to be effectuated as of January 1, 1959. Postponement would be made in the event of determination as of November 15 in any year that spending for the fiscal year is running in excess of \$77 billion, and a state of budget unbalance is threatened.

In view of the clear case in the national interest for giving absolute priority to tax rate reform, we offer these postponement procedures with somereluctance but in the hope that they will continuously induce, on behalf of the executive branch and the Congress, the utmost discipline and prudence in regard to spending.

The legislation places the responsibility for initiating postponement in the hands of the President. Balance has been struck as between the Congress and the executive in the final exercise of postponement authority.

While the postponement procedures may be applied separately as between corporate and individual tax rate reductions, every postponement of an individual tax rate cut must be accompanied by a postponement of a corporate tax cut. The only limitation on this linkage is where the result would be to postpone a corporate reduction for more than 1 year.

The bill further provides that each scheduled reduction in either the individual or corporate tax may be postponed for only 1 year with the schedule of subsequent reductions also being moved ahead 1 year. Thus, if spending should not be kept under control, it would be possible to space out the income-tax cuts over a maximum period of 9 years without new enabling legislation.

INFLATION VERSUS TAX RATE REFORM

The second question, that of enacting tax rate reductions in advance of budget balance, stems from the belief that such action would be inflationary.

Putting the first income tax rate reductions, and depreciation changes, into effect on January 1, 1959, would have minimal revenue effect in fiscal year 1959, but perhaps \$4 billion revenue effect in fiscal year 1960. In addition, expansion of the rollover principle in the capital-gains tax would have an effect on revenues in fiscal year 1960 of perhaps some-

where between \$500 million and a billion dollars. It would appear superficially that these tax actions would unbalance the 1960 budget, on the basis of the President's estimates, by an amount over \$4 billion, but such a result is problematical.

In the first place, the President's revenue estimates for fiscal 1960 have been made on the basis of recovery trends which have not extended to business investment in plant and equipment and which leave with us a nagging problem of unemployment. It is possible that expansion in the use of current production facilities will carry overall economic activity to a point of producing up to \$77 billion in revenue, but such a level of production would not be long sustained in the absence of sharp revival in capital formation.

In the second place, even with the lag in rate of investment in plant and equipment, our economy under present tax rates is pressed to find savings out of current income adequate to meet current demand. It seems probable that any sharp set-up in the rate of business investment would be short-lived because of the inadequate rate of new capital accumulations.

Since we cannot continue to tolerate an inadequate rate of new investment, as this would in reasonable time prove self-defeating even insofar as Federal revenues and deficits are concerned, we come to the conclusion that a good beginning on tax rate reform is the first step to insure a positive closing of the deficit gap and then keeping it closed.

We cannot fight inflation by keeping the tax brakes on economic growth.

This conclusion may be further buttressed by two different propositions. The first starts with the fact that we would not now be running a deficit except for the lag in economic growth. Specifically, if in spite of existing tax rates we had been able to achieve economic growth at the historic average of 4 percent, instead of the actual average of 3 percent, in the 5 years ending with fiscal 1957, the revenue total in that year would have been some \$5 billion higher

or \$76 billion instead of \$71 billion. If such a trend had continued through 1958, revenues would have reached \$80 billion, which would have meant a budget surplus of \$8 billion in that year. If continued through fiscal 1959, the revenue total would be some \$84 billion or \$3 billion more than enough to balance the budget. Of course, if growth had been achieved and maintained through the present at a 4 percent rate, the budget would not now include expenditures which have been recession inspired, and the surplus would be greater than \$3 billion.

The second proposition requires understanding of the forces for continuous or repetitive inflation. The deficit spending of World War II greatly boosted the money supply and was the principal force for inflation for several years thereafter. Contrary to general impression, however, total budget operations in fiscal years after World War II ended have not been a net contributor to inflation. Combining all Federal accounts, the Government actually collected from the people approximately \$19 billion more than it paid out to them, in fiscal years 1947 through 1958. Even when the estimated cash deficit of over \$13 billion for fiscal year 1959 is added in, a cumulative cash surplus from 1947 on of nearly \$6 billion is shown.

This analysis is not intended to divert attention from the seriousness of budget deficits, nor of the obligation of the executive branch and the Congress to exercise the utmost restraint in budgetmaking and spending. It does, however, make us look elsewhere to identify the instigating forces for inflation in recent years.

Inflation in recent years has reflected the constant tendency of wages as a whole to increase faster than national productivity, thus forcing a constant increase in labor costs per unit of output. The current recession, and hence the current deficit, came when the inflation produced by increasing unit-labor costs overran money supply.

However, the increases in unit labor costs would have been less if increases in national productivity had been greater. It may be that the contemporary trend in wage increases would be too great under any circumstances, but we know that the American appetite for an increasing standard of living creates pressures for a steady increase in wage and salary rates.

Thus, while there is and will remain need for the utmost restraint by unions and management in determining general wage increases, to concentrate on this point without attention to the cause of inadequate growth in production and productivity would not solve the problem of recession, deficits, and then more inflation.

A great underlying force for inflation in our time is the continuing capital shortage, resulting in inadequate growth in production and productivity, and caused by punitive tax rates and methods.

For many years past, Federal fiscal policy has been based on short-term considerations from fighting inflation in one year to fighting recession in another, thus causing neglect of the problem of a revenue system dependent upon economically destructive tax rates. In retrospect we know this has been a self-defeating approach, resulting in repeated recurrence of fiscal crises stemming from retarded economic growth. Looking ahead, we can be certain that continuation of emphasis on short-range aspects of fiscal policy would be the most shortsighted of national policies.

If we will move now to enact comprehensive tax-rate reform, there is good reason to believe that the short-term revenue effect would be largely compensated for by a sharp upward trend in capital formation, and hence additional revenues, before the end of fiscal 1960. There could hardly be reasonable doubt that in succeeding years there would be full compensation, and in the long run we would be rid of the plague of recurring fiscal crises.

We must smother the forces for inflation with growth.

APPENDIX A.—Individual tax rates

Taxable income bracket ¹ (thousands)	Present rates	Jan. 1, 1959	Jan. 1, 1960	Jan. 1, 1961	Jan. 1, 1962	Jan. 1, 1963
0 to \$2.....	20	19	18	17	16	15
\$2 to \$4.....	22	20.5	19.5	18.5	17.5	16
\$4 to \$6.....	26	24.5	23	21.5	20	17
\$6 to \$8.....	30	28	26	24	21	18
\$8 to \$10.....	34	31	28	25	22	19
\$10 to \$12.....	38	35	32	28	24	20
\$12 to \$14.....	43	39	35	31	26	21
\$14 to \$16.....	47	42	37	32	27	22
\$16 to \$18.....	50	45	40	35	29	23
\$18 to \$20.....	53	48	42	36	30	24
\$20 to \$22.....	56	50	44	38	32	25
\$22 to \$24.....	59	53	47	40	33	26
\$24 to \$26.....	62	55	48	41	34	27
\$26 to \$28.....	65	58	51	43	36	28
\$28 to \$30.....	69	61	53	45	37	29
\$30 to \$32.....	72	64	56	47	38	30
\$32 to \$34.....	75	66	57	48	39	31
\$34 to \$36.....	78	69	60	51	40	32
\$36 to \$38.....	81	71	62	52	41	33
\$38 to \$40.....	84	74	64	54	44	35
\$40 to \$42.....	87	76	66	56	46	38
\$42 to \$44.....	89	78	68	58	48	41
\$44 to \$46.....	90	80	70	60	50	44
\$46 to \$48.....	91	82	72	62	52	47

¹ After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, married persons filing separate returns, and split incomes of husbands and wives filing joint returns.

APPENDIX B.—Tax computation tables—Individuals

If the taxable income is—	The tax—	
	Is: Present law	Will be: Year 1963
Not over \$2,000.....	20 percent of the taxable income.	15 percent of the taxable income.
Over \$2,000 but not over \$4,000.....	\$400, plus 22 percent of excess over \$2,000.	\$300, plus 15 percent of excess over \$2,000.
Over \$4,000 but not over \$6,000.....	\$880, plus 26 percent of excess over \$4,000.	\$620, plus 17 percent of excess over \$4,000.
Over \$6,000 but not over \$8,000.....	\$1,360, plus 30 percent of excess over \$6,000.	\$960, plus 18 percent of excess over \$6,000.
Over \$8,000 but not over \$10,000.....	\$1,960, plus 34 percent of excess over \$8,000.	\$1,320, plus 19 percent of excess over \$8,000.
Over \$10,000 but not over \$12,000.....	\$2,640, plus 38 percent of excess over \$10,000.	\$1,700, plus 20 percent of excess over \$10,000.
Over \$12,000 but not over \$14,000.....	\$3,400, plus 43 percent of excess over \$12,000.	\$2,100, plus 21 percent of excess over \$12,000.
Over \$14,000 but not over \$16,000.....	\$4,240, plus 47 percent of excess over \$14,000.	\$2,520, plus 22 percent of excess over \$14,000.
Over \$16,000 but not over \$18,000.....	\$5,200, plus 50 percent of excess over \$16,000.	\$2,960, plus 23 percent of excess over \$16,000.
Over \$18,000 but not over \$20,000.....	\$6,280, plus 53 percent of excess over \$18,000.	\$3,420, plus 24 percent of excess over \$18,000.
Over \$20,000 but not over \$22,000.....	\$7,480, plus 56 percent of excess over \$20,000.	\$3,900, plus 25 percent of excess over \$20,000.
Over \$22,000 but not over \$24,000.....	\$8,800, plus 59 percent of excess over \$22,000.	\$4,400, plus 26 percent of excess over \$22,000.
Over \$24,000 but not over \$26,000.....	\$10,240, plus 62 percent of excess over \$24,000.	\$4,920, plus 27 percent of excess over \$24,000.
Over \$26,000 but not over \$28,000.....	\$11,800, plus 65 percent of excess over \$26,000.	\$5,460, plus 28 percent of excess over \$26,000.
Over \$28,000 but not over \$30,000.....	\$13,480, plus 69 percent of excess over \$28,000.	\$6,020, plus 29 percent of excess over \$28,000.
Over \$30,000 but not over \$32,000.....	\$15,280, plus 72 percent of excess over \$30,000.	\$6,600, plus 30 percent of excess over \$30,000.
Over \$32,000 but not over \$34,000.....	\$17,200, plus 75 percent of excess over \$32,000.	\$7,200, plus 31 percent of excess over \$32,000.
Over \$34,000 but not over \$36,000.....	\$19,240, plus 78 percent of excess over \$34,000.	\$7,820, plus 32 percent of excess over \$34,000.
Over \$36,000 but not over \$38,000.....	\$21,400, plus 81 percent of excess over \$36,000.	\$8,460, plus 33 percent of excess over \$36,000.
Over \$38,000 but not over \$40,000.....	\$23,680, plus 84 percent of excess over \$38,000.	\$9,120, plus 34 percent of excess over \$38,000.
Over \$40,000 but not over \$42,000.....	\$26,080, plus 87 percent of excess over \$40,000.	\$9,800, plus 35 percent of excess over \$40,000.
Over \$42,000 but not over \$44,000.....	\$28,600, plus 90 percent of excess over \$42,000.	\$10,500, plus 36 percent of excess over \$42,000.
Over \$44,000 but not over \$46,000.....	\$31,240, plus 93 percent of excess over \$44,000.	\$11,220, plus 37 percent of excess over \$44,000.
Over \$46,000 but not over \$48,000.....	\$34,000, plus 96 percent of excess over \$46,000.	\$11,960, plus 38 percent of excess over \$46,000.
Over \$48,000 but not over \$50,000.....	\$36,880, plus 99 percent of excess over \$48,000.	\$12,720, plus 39 percent of excess over \$48,000.
Over \$50,000 but not over \$52,000.....	\$39,880, plus 101 percent of excess over \$50,000.	\$13,500, plus 40 percent of excess over \$50,000.
Over \$52,000 but not over \$54,000.....	\$43,000, plus 104 percent of excess over \$52,000.	\$14,300, plus 41 percent of excess over \$52,000.
Over \$54,000 but not over \$56,000.....	\$46,240, plus 107 percent of excess over \$54,000.	\$15,120, plus 42 percent of excess over \$54,000.
Over \$56,000 but not over \$58,000.....	\$49,600, plus 110 percent of excess over \$56,000.	\$15,960, plus 43 percent of excess over \$56,000.
Over \$58,000 but not over \$60,000.....	\$53,080, plus 113 percent of excess over \$58,000.	\$16,820, plus 44 percent of excess over \$58,000.
Over \$60,000 but not over \$62,000.....	\$56,680, plus 116 percent of excess over \$60,000.	\$17,700, plus 45 percent of excess over \$60,000.
Over \$62,000 but not over \$64,000.....	\$60,400, plus 119 percent of excess over \$62,000.	\$18,600, plus 46 percent of excess over \$62,000.
Over \$64,000 but not over \$66,000.....	\$64,240, plus 122 percent of excess over \$64,000.	\$19,520, plus 47 percent of excess over \$64,000.
Over \$66,000 but not over \$68,000.....	\$68,200, plus 125 percent of excess over \$66,000.	\$20,460, plus 48 percent of excess over \$66,000.
Over \$68,000 but not over \$70,000.....	\$72,280, plus 128 percent of excess over \$68,000.	\$21,420, plus 49 percent of excess over \$68,000.
Over \$70,000 but not over \$72,000.....	\$76,480, plus 131 percent of excess over \$70,000.	\$22,400, plus 50 percent of excess over \$70,000.
Over \$72,000 but not over \$74,000.....	\$80,800, plus 134 percent of excess over \$72,000.	\$23,400, plus 51 percent of excess over \$72,000.
Over \$74,000 but not over \$76,000.....	\$85,240, plus 137 percent of excess over \$74,000.	\$24,420, plus 52 percent of excess over \$74,000.
Over \$76,000 but not over \$78,000.....	\$89,800, plus 140 percent of excess over \$76,000.	\$25,460, plus 53 percent of excess over \$76,000.
Over \$78,000 but not over \$80,000.....	\$94,480, plus 143 percent of excess over \$78,000.	\$26,520, plus 54 percent of excess over \$78,000.
Over \$80,000 but not over \$82,000.....	\$99,280, plus 146 percent of excess over \$80,000.	\$27,600, plus 55 percent of excess over \$80,000.
Over \$82,000 but not over \$84,000.....	\$104,200, plus 149 percent of excess over \$82,000.	\$28,700, plus 56 percent of excess over \$82,000.
Over \$84,000 but not over \$86,000.....	\$109,240, plus 152 percent of excess over \$84,000.	\$29,820, plus 57 percent of excess over \$84,000.
Over \$86,000 but not over \$88,000.....	\$114,400, plus 155 percent of excess over \$86,000.	\$30,960, plus 58 percent of excess over \$86,000.
Over \$88,000 but not over \$90,000.....	\$119,680, plus 158 percent of excess over \$88,000.	\$32,120, plus 59 percent of excess over \$88,000.
Over \$90,000 but not over \$92,000.....	\$125,080, plus 161 percent of excess over \$90,000.	\$33,300, plus 60 percent of excess over \$90,000.
Over \$92,000 but not over \$94,000.....	\$130,600, plus 164 percent of excess over \$92,000.	\$34,500, plus 61 percent of excess over \$92,000.
Over \$94,000 but not over \$96,000.....	\$136,240, plus 167 percent of excess over \$94,000.	\$35,720, plus 62 percent of excess over \$94,000.
Over \$96,000 but not over \$98,000.....	\$142,000, plus 170 percent of excess over \$96,000.	\$36,960, plus 63 percent of excess over \$96,000.
Over \$98,000 but not over \$100,000.....	\$147,880, plus 173 percent of excess over \$98,000.	\$38,220, plus 64 percent of excess over \$98,000.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$120,000.....	\$153,880, plus 176 percent of excess over \$100,000.	\$39,500, plus 65 percent of excess over \$100,000.
Over \$120,000 but not over \$140,000.....	\$159,900, plus 179 percent of excess over \$120,000.	\$40,800, plus 66 percent of excess over \$120,000.
Over \$140,000 but not over \$160,000.....	\$166,040, plus 182 percent of excess over \$140,000.	\$42,120, plus 67 percent of excess over \$140,000.
Over \$160,000 but not over \$180,000.....	\$172,300, plus 185 percent of excess over \$160,000.	\$43,460, plus 68 percent of excess over \$160,000.
Over \$180,000 but not over \$200,000.....	\$178,680, plus 188 percent of excess over \$180,000.	\$44,820, plus 69 percent of excess over \$180,000.
Over \$200,000.....	\$185,180, plus 191 percent of excess over \$200,000.	\$46,200, plus 70 percent of excess over \$200,000.

¹ After deductions and exemptions.

APPENDIX C

Tax savings by taxable income¹ brackets, based on current income levels

Taxable income ¹ bracket (thousands)	Taxable income (millions)	Present rates	New rates, end of 5 years	Tax savings (millions)
\$0 to \$2.....	\$95,121	20	15	\$4,756
\$2 to \$4.....	15,967	22	16	957
\$4 to \$6.....	6,890	26	17	293
\$6 to \$8.....	4,090	30	18	491
\$8 to \$10.....	2,826	34	19	424
\$10 to \$12.....	1,984	38	20	357
\$12 to \$14.....	1,593	43	21	245
\$14 to \$16.....	1,074	47	22	209
\$16 to \$18.....	842	50	23	227
\$18 to \$20.....	720	53	24	269
\$20 to \$22.....	571	56	25	177
\$22 to \$24.....	424	59	26	306
\$24 to \$26.....	310	62	27	318
\$26 to \$28.....	234	65	28	215
\$28 to \$30.....	181	68	29	168
\$30 to \$32.....	142	72	30	130
\$32 to \$34.....	111	75	31	131
\$34 to \$36.....	89	78	32	94
\$36 to \$38.....	71	81	33	70
\$38 to \$40.....	58	84	34	53
\$40 to \$42.....	47	87	35	39
\$42 to \$44.....	38	89	36	31
\$44 to \$46.....	31	91	37	24
\$46 to \$48.....	25	93	38	19
\$48 to \$50.....	20	95	39	15
\$50 and over.....	231	97	40	102
Total.....	135,887			10,580

¹ After deductions and exemptions.

Tax savings by taxable income bracket groups

Brackets	Tax savings (millions)	Percent of total
\$0 to \$6,000.....	\$5,306	50.6
\$6,000 to \$18,000.....	8,419	79.5
\$18,000 and over.....	636	6.0

APPENDIX D

Rates of estate and gift taxes

Taxable estate or gift (thousands)	Estate tax rates		Gift tax rates	
	Present	Upon enactment	Present	Upon enactment
0 to \$5.....	Per-cent	Per-cent	Per-cent	Per-cent
\$5 to \$10.....	3	1.75	2.25	1.25
\$10 to \$20.....	7	4.25	5.25	3.25
\$20 to \$30.....	11	6.75	8.25	5
\$30 to \$40.....	14	8.5	10.5	6.25
\$40 to \$50.....	18	11	13.5	8.25
\$50 to \$60.....	22	13.5	16.5	10.25
\$60 to \$70.....	25	15.25	18.75	11.5

Rates of estate and gift taxes—Continued

Taxable estate or gift (thousands)	Estate tax rates		Gift tax rates	
	Present	Upon enactment	Present	Upon enactment
\$70 to \$80.....	Per-cent	Per-cent	Per-cent	Per-cent
\$80 to \$90.....	28	17	21	12.75
\$90 to \$100.....	30	18.25	22.5	13.75
\$100 to \$250.....	32	19.5	24	14.5
\$250 to \$500.....	35	21.25	26.25	16
\$500 to \$750.....	37	22.5	27.75	16.75
\$750 to \$1,000.....	39	23.75	29.25	17.75
\$1,000 to \$1,250.....	42	25.5	31.5	19
\$1,250 to \$1,500.....	45	27.5	33.75	20.5
\$1,500 to \$2,000.....	49	30	36.75	23.5
\$2,000 to \$2,500.....	53	32.25	39.75	24.25
\$2,500 to \$3,000.....	56	34.25	42	25.75
\$3,000 to \$3,500.....	59	36	44.25	27
\$3,500 to \$4,000.....	63	38.5	47.25	28.75
\$4,000 to \$5,000.....	67	41	50.25	30.75
\$5,000 to \$6,000.....	70	42.75	52.5	32
\$6,000 to \$7,000.....	73	44.5	54.75	33.5
\$7,000 to \$8,000.....	76	46.25	57	34.5
\$8,000 to \$10,000.....	77	47	57.75	35.25
Over \$10,000.....				

The Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials entitled "Talmadge Offers a Farm Plan," from the January 22, 1959, issue of the Waycross (Ga.) Journal-Herald; "Talmadge Bill Planned To End Farm Problem," from the January 21, 1959, issue of the Pasadena (Calif.) Independent; and "Our Perspective of Talmadge Bill Was Wrong," from the January 28, 1959, issue of the Kinston (N.C.) Daily Free Press.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALMADGE OFFERS A FARM PLAN

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE has introduced a bill which he believes will help to put the

Nation's hard-pressed farmers on the right road.

His plan is simple. It would abolish all present production controls and price supports and give each farmer a domestic marketing quota for major crops.

Farmers would get direct Government payments for sales within these quotas. The payments would be enough to cover the difference between market prices and 100 percent of parity.

As we understand it, the payments would not cover everything farmers sell—just the volume of crops included in the domestic consumption quota. His bill further provides that no individual farmer could get payments of more than \$25,000 a year.

TALMADGE has estimated that the program he proposes would cost between \$1½ and \$2½ billion a year which is far less than present price support programs.

The Georgia Senator, one of the best informed men in Washington on farm problems, concedes that his bill is not the complete solution to the Nation's vexatious farm problems.

But he points out that the present farm program has failed and that a fresh start is needed and that perhaps his plan can be used as the basis for drafting a brand new national farm program.

Certainly his bill deserves serious consideration. Both the farmers and the taxpayers are due a better deal.

TALMADGE BILL PLANNED TO END FARM PROBLEM

The price support program was written to protect the farmer when the price of his crop dropped so low that he couldn't maintain a reasonable standard of living. It was meant to keep small farms alive, to avoid the wholesale exodus of the depression years by farmers to the Far West and the big cities.

The program has not only failed to halt the abandoning of small farms, but has cost the American taxpayers sums undreamed of when the original support program was written. This fiscal year the tab will be nearly \$7 billion.

Instances where big wheat farmers receive upward of \$100,000 a year apiece for crops the government can't use are a national disgrace. Various schemes to limit crops have proved an irritating, expensive failure.

Clearly, a new concept in Government farm welfare is necessary. The farm program must be brought back to its original

purposes if the Nation hopes to keep the national budget in line and to halt the fantastic buildup of food stockpiles, much of which is rotting in the bins.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, has suggested a bold new law which will give the farmers the protection they have been denied for the past 6 years without placing an intolerable burden upon the taxpayers.

The bill TALMADGE introduced would abolish present Federal farm programs and substitute direct Government payments for part of a farmer's output. All Government planting controls and price supports would be thrown out.

In their place, farmers would get quotas covering Government payments, but they would be allowed to grow as much as they wanted. Payments would be based on the difference between 100-percent parity and open market price. The system is similar to wool payments, which have been in effect for years.

For instance, a wheat farmer might be given a quota of 1,000 bushels. He plants 1,500 bushels and sells them for \$2 a bushel on the open market. Established parity price is \$3 a bushel. The Government pays the farmer \$1,000, which is \$1 a bushel (the difference between parity and market prices) times his quota of 1,000 bushels.

No farmer would be allowed to collect more than \$25,000 a year.

TALMADGE estimates the cost of his plan at between \$1.5 and \$2.5 billion a year, considerably less than the present \$7 billion.

The program may have serious flaws in it. We won't support it until we hear further argument about it. It may be less sensible than other direct-payment plans such as limited Government purchase of each crop.

However, the Talmadge bill is bold and it is designed both to save taxpayers money and to keep the little farmer in business without too much redtape, fuss, or feathers. We couldn't ask much more of any measure.

OUR PERSPECTIVE OF TALMADGE BILL WAS WRONG

In our issue of January 17 an editorial appeared under the title: "Who Pays Such Bills?" It referred to proposed legislation of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, to abolish the present Federal farm programs and substitute direct Government payments to farmers for part of their output.

Since the article appeared Senator TALMADGE has been kind enough to send us a full copy of his speech on presentation of his bill, Senate bill S. 3963 which he introduced first in June 1958 and later the early part of this month. We find the bill is actually very much more practical and reasonable than we concluded with insufficient information of its actual contents and provisions.

In his address to the Senate when he introduced the bill Senator TALMADGE called attention to the fact that despite substantially increased Government payments the net farm income had shown a decrease in the 5 years between 1952 and 1957 of \$3.6 billion.

Senator TALMADGE also points out that "farm production expenses increased from \$22.6 to \$23.5 billion yearly and it is estimated that the final total for 1958 will reach an alltime high of \$24.5 billion or more. The spread between farm and retail prices has widened by \$75 for each \$1,000 spent for farm produce and the farmer's share of the market-basket dollar has dropped from 47 to 39 cents."

The Senator points out that "It is not strange that the Department of Commerce reported between 1950 and 1957 that 2,349,000 persons migrated from the farms of the Nation to compete for increasingly scarce jobs in urban areas."

The Senator suggests, and wisely, we believe, that the situation has "reached the point where it is essential for the future wel-

fare of not only the farmer but also the tax-paying consumer that an entirely new approach to the solution of the Nation's farm problems be found." He emphasizes a number of pertinent points, including the desire of the farmer to return to a free-enterprise economy and a desire for a stabilized farm program. Experience of the past, he points out, is conclusive proof that those ends cannot be achieved through existing concepts.

The Senator says the only way to remedy the situation is to discard completely the present patchwork of discredited farm laws and start all over again.

He thinks that such a renewed program must have three fundamental objectives:

- "1. To let the farmer farm;
- "2. To guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national purchasing power; and
- "3. To place American agricultural commodities back on the world market at competitive prices."

Senator TALMADGE goes further and says that he is convinced that desirable ends cannot be achieved "until the Federal Government is removed from the business of buying, storing, and selling agricultural commodities; until the responsibility for marketing the produce of our farms is returned to the farmer and private enterprise, where it belongs; until the farmer is free to plant and sell where he pleases; until the role of the Federal Government in agriculture is limited to paying the farmer the difference between the prices he receives for commodities sold for domestic consumption and 100 percent of parity."

The Free Press is glad to clarify its former comment.

This paper endorses 100 percent the contention that the farmer has been handicapped by the rules and regulations denying him the privilege of individual initiative in pursuit of his calling.

An Adequate Military Shield for U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Planning Association is a private research organization which has made a number of valuable studies of both domestic and international policy issues. Among current projects are those on security through arms control, the economics of competitive coexistence, and case studies of U.S. business performance abroad. Studies on the technical assistance program in Latin America have recently been completed.

The distinguished members of the National Planning Association committee on international policy represent agriculture, business, labor, and the professions. The recent statement by the committee on "An Adequate Military Shield for U.S. Foreign Policy" has received widespread attention.

I am pleased to invite the attention of my colleagues to the statement, which I feel is a thorough, objective, cogent analysis of one of the most critical problems facing the Congress and the Nation today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NPA INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON AN ADEQUATE MILITARY SHIELD FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Last spring, the committee on international policy of the National Planning Association issued a statement on "A Positive Foreign Policy for the United States" which outlined the diplomatic, economic, and psychological measures required to reassert American leadership toward a better and more secure system of world order. While progress has been dishearteningly slow in improving the positive content of U.S. foreign policy, a more alarming deficiency now appears to threaten the military shield without which, under existing conditions, all of America's international efforts will be placed in dire jeopardy.

There is the very real possibility that, if present trends continue, the Soviet bloc will within a few years have a decisive military advantage over the United States and its allies. This frightening possibility arises not only from the intensified military development efforts of the Soviet Union but also from serious limitations and lags in U.S. defense concepts and programs. Past Communist behavior demonstrates that, in the absence of adequate military strength, it would be even more difficult—if not impossible—successfully to pursue the positive and constructive goals of U.S. foreign policy. Hence, this statement of the NRA international committee is focused on the necessity to achieve and maintain adequate military strength as one essential precondition for making U.S. foreign policy more effective.

Unless we are vastly mistaken, there is a profound and widespread uneasiness throughout the country about the way America's international affairs have been drifting in the global struggle in which the United States is engaged. In spite of many reassuring statements, the feeling persists that the position of the non-Soviet world, and notably of the United States, has been materially weakened by the inadequacy of its response to the ever-growing challenge of the Communist bloc. The longer this process is allowed to continue, the greater will be the national peril. The launching of the first sputnik came as a distinct shock both to the Government and to the public, and resulted in an intensification of U.S. military defense efforts. Unfortunately, this intensification seems to have petered out, and a new complacency appears to have settled on Washington. Once again, the defense of the budget seems to be mistaken for the defense of the Nation.

Before the Soviet Union's latest challenge to the freedom of West Berlin, it had been announced that the Armed Forces were to be cut again and that new appropriations for military defense were to be rigidly held within the limits set last year, although owing to rising costs this expenditure would provide even less in manpower and material. True, the latest Berlin crisis has produced some upward revisions of these figures. But, nothing yet suggests that there is any serious intention to make the major revisions required if the military strength of the United States is not to be dangerously deficient by the early 1960's.

There seems still to be little recognition of the fact that, desirable as a balanced or approximately balanced budget is in normal times, to seek it above all else in the circumstances of today may prove the prelude to disaster. For this is no peacetime budget with which the American people are presently concerned. It is a budget to insure the successful conduct of U.S. foreign policy

under the conditions of the cold war. And, although this would be far less burdensome than the budgetary exactions of a shooting war, it is a profound mistake to think that expenditures can prudently be held in the straitjacket which peacetime fiscal measures soundly conceived would properly impose.

The argument is often heard that the United States cannot afford even the present inadequate level of defense expenditures and that, if it is long continued, the American economy will collapse, thereby enabling the Soviets to triumph without war. Hence, it is concluded, the best defense against the Communist threat of world domination is a reduced and balanced U.S. budget. It is high time that the American people realized the dangerous fallacies inherent in this argument. As studies of the National Planning Association and other institutions have repeatedly shown, the United States could afford substantially higher budgetary expenditures if national economic policies were adopted which would enable the American economy to achieve more of its truly enormous growth potential. With an adequate rate of economic growth, the U.S. economy could afford a larger budget not only for increased military defense expenditures but also for the greater social capital investments necessary to sustain economic growth. With little less than national survival at stake, it would be a critical mistake to make a fetish of arbitrary budgetary limitations.

But the argument against adequate military expenditures contains another fallacy, even more dangerous. For, it must by now be obvious to every open-minded American that the successful conduct of U.S. foreign policy at a time when all the cherished values of western civilization are challenged as never before depends upon the adequacy of American military preparedness. If, through lack of foresight, the United States permits a further unfavorable shift in the balance of world power, it would inevitably encourage the intransigence of the Communist adversary; it would play into Soviet hands throughout the vast uncommitted areas of the world; and it would leave the closest friends and allies of the United States wondering whether this country had taken the full measure of the mortal danger to which the free nations are exposed—whether Americans are going to assume in time the burdens of sacrifice necessary to fend that peril off.

Mindful of all this, we feel that U.S. diplomacy and constructive economic measures will in a divided world be greater handicapped unless they have the full support of the will to prevail which only determined leadership backed by military strength can arouse. With considerable daring and at great risk, the Secretary of State has countered in recent years more than one move of the Sino-Soviet bloc. If, as we believe, appropriations contemplated for the military are inadequate, we can see the time approaching when a shift in power relationships will make the taking of such risks little more than a desperate gamble. This is a position which the United States must strive at all costs to avoid.

A formidable, resourceful, and unscrupulous antagonist has for the time being gained the advantage of the initiative. Probing ceaselessly for soft spots, the Sino-Soviet bloc keeps the United States constantly on the defensive. While it is true that neither the Soviet Union nor its Red Chinese ally has in the past year and a half gained the avowed allegiance of any nation previously outside the Sino-Soviet bloc, their influence in many areas seems in the ascendant, and the pressure they continue to exert is unrelenting.

The members of this committee are inclined to the belief that the Sino-Soviet bloc has at present as little desire as the United

States to precipitate a general war. But quite apart from the fact that the Soviets recognize as does the West the utter devastation that such a conflict would involve, they are motivated by the belief that the world balance of power is moving inexorably against the United States and its allies. On this account, they look forward to a prolonged period of what they euphemistically call peaceful coexistence, during which they propose to consolidate their control over the vast areas now under their dominion, enormously increase their industrial and agricultural productivity, and gradually from an ever more secure base make further advances throughout the non-Soviet world by means of adroit diplomacy, by the skillful use of their growing economic potential, and by ideological penetration and subversion.

This presents for them an alluring prospect. The long-term objectives of the Soviet Union have in no sense changed nor has their view on the international outlook. Only recently in the "World Marxist Review: Problems of Peace and Socialism," published in 15 languages, the following occurs:

"No matter how bourgeois ideologists and their revisionist henchmen may try to embellish imperialism, the economic and political instability of the capitalist system grows more and more obvious. State monopoly capitalism, which evokes such raptures among the apologists of imperialism, only intensifies the anarchy of production, the hardships of the working people, the oppression and arbitrary rule of capitalism—as recent events in the economic and political life of the capitalist countries are once more showing. The inevitable result of the growing sharpening of the contradictions of imperialism will be to hasten its downfall. The present balance of forces on the world arena is more and more changing in favor of the peoples who are building socialism and fighting against the colonialists, in favor of the peoples who are defending the cause of peace, democracy, and national independence."

The strategy of the Soviet Union and its Red Chinese partner remains unaltered. The grand design is to draw into their orbit gradually ever more of the world's population. To this end, there will be a continuing effort to capitalize on that anticolonialism which is so easily kindled into resentment toward the West not only in the lands which still maintain a colonial status, but even in those nations which have recently emerged from it. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union and its Red Chinese partner will confront the free world with a succession of crises, hoping in this manner to undermine the smooth function of our system and eventually to bring about its inevitable collapse. When and if this program has met with its anticipated success, and the shift in world power in favor of the Soviet Union has become so pronounced that in their view the only alternatives open to the free nations will be surrender or annihilation, then the moment will have arrived when the Soviet Union will be prepared to implement the threat of thermonuclear war.

If in broad lines this proves to be the policy which the Soviet Union will continue to follow, it would at least have the advantage of affording the United States time to marshal more effectively than it has in the past all of those great elements of strength, spiritual and material, residing in nations and peoples deeply opposed to the realization of Soviet ambitions. We reject the view of world communism that its victory is inevitable. It is well to remember that the Soviet Union faces immense difficulties of its own. The Hungarian revolt evidenced dramatically the enormous vitality of the desire for national independence and for personal liberty. Ten years of the most intensive propaganda did not convince the Hungarian people that they were living un-

der anything but a foreign despotism. And it is far too early to assume that in China the historic traditions of an ancient people will finally be extinguished by the latest moves of its Communist rulers. We continue to believe that, given time, the human spirit will emerge victorious over the forces bent on its enslavement.

But it would be folly not to recognize that the United States may be afforded far less time than is now optimistically anticipated. The unstable balance of terror which characterizes a bipolar world dooms the free peoples to a prolonged period of anxious uncertainty. Until more rational conduct can be brought to prevail once again in human affairs, the world will be constantly exposed to the danger that the holocaust of thermonuclear war may be set off either by accident or by design. For this danger, the United States is at present insufficiently prepared. The notion of a devastating surprise attack on a potential enemy is repugnant to the deepest instincts of the free nations. On this account, while realizing that the Soviet Union shares no such inhibition, the United States has placed its main reliance on deterrence. There was a time, not so long ago, when this reliance was justified by then existing military strength. The capability of the Strategic Air Command to inflict untold punishment upon an aggressor was so great that it was likely to remain unchallenged. The assumption was that no matter what the nature of an attack, the strategic air arm would still be able to perform its allotted task.

But the dismal fact is that unless the United States takes many measures not contemplated in its present military program, the moment is approaching when this assumption will have lost its validity. According to much expert testimony, if steps are not promptly taken vastly to strengthen American retaliatory capability, the Soviet Union in the not distant future will be in a position, by the use of intercontinental and intermediate-range ballistic missiles armed with thermonuclear warheads, to inflict so strong a blow on SAC bases in the United States and in Europe that retaliation by the United States would be held within limits acceptable to the Soviet Union. Just because such an eventuality as this is not inevitable, it is worth underscoring the fact that it remains within the realm of the possible.

It is in no sense ordained that the United States has to accept the possibility of such a development. The recent successful flight of an Atlas missile over its full range gives earnest of what U.S. military capabilities could be if adequate resources and efforts were devoted to their early realization. But, neither the present state of preparedness nor that contemplated for a few years hence under present programming will suffice. There are measures, at least in the planning stage, which, if promptly implemented, would materially increase the U.S. retaliatory capabilities likely to survive a surprise attack. Undertaken with courage and determination, they would greatly reduce the danger, although it would be idle to pretend that they can any longer remove it.

The measures proposed cover a wide spectrum and in their totality would undoubtedly be costly. On this account, they should be subjected to the most critical screening. But, certainly no doctrinaire attachment to fiscal orthodoxy should be permitted to stand in the way of the more promising choices. As the Committee on International Policy of the National Planning Association has stated on other occasions, where little less than national survival is at stake, budgetary considerations should yield to military necessities.

Until this view, with the sacrifices it may involve, has been accepted, the U.S. Government will remain hopelessly handicapped

in the conduct of its foreign policy. Once this view is accepted, however, new avenues will be opened for the development of a positive and constructive foreign policy. For far too long, the United States has allowed the impression to gain currency that in spite of its avowed dedication to the cause of peace with freedom and justice, it has not been willing to assume the burdens that the nature of world problems and of the Soviet challenge demanded. As a result, in spite of vaunted American strength, the United States has come to be looked upon more and more as an erratic and undependable associate.

This has done immense harm not only among our Western allies, but among the countless millions who would like to be friends of the United States. The damage is real, but it is not irreparable. Notice to the world that the United States was in the process of adopting policies and programs based upon a more realistic appraisal both of the peril to which Western civilization is exposed and of the problems of developing a better world order would have a heartening effect throughout the non-Soviet world. There has been little doubt about the broad purposes and objectives of American policy. The question that has created such concern is whether the United States has the wisdom and the determination actually to do whatever may be required to achieve those purposes and objectives.

It is the plea of the Committee on International Policy of the National Planning Association that this question now be answered by word and deed with a categorical affirmative. In this even, we would foresee an immediate and perceptible turn in the tide of world opinion. Confidence in the will and in the capacity of the United States successfully to meet the challenge of the times would be reawakened. It would be clear for all to see that while circumstances had obliged the United States to increase its efforts in the field of the military, it was embarking on this course as the surest way to avoid for all mankind the ultimate catastrophe of atomic warfare. Adequate military strength would provide the necessary shield behind which it would be possible to recapture the initiative in the cause of peace with freedom and justice. Then, by skillful diplomacy, the propaganda of truth, and constructive economic measure, the United States could again appeal effectively to the longing of men and women everywhere to escape from the vicious circle of competitive thermonuclear insanity, and to join in the great adventure of building that better world order which modern technology and science have brought within our grasp.

It would be too much to expect an early and favorable response from the Soviet Union. Yet the hope seems warranted that in the not too distant future the time would be ripe for a new approach designed to resolve many differences. For, in the light of the new American orientation, it will become increasingly clear that Soviet ambitions could not be realized at an acceptable cost. Deprived of the bright prospect which the leaders in the Kremlin see stretching before them today, it is just possible that they might be brought to cooperate with the free nations in the establishment of a tranquil world order from which the horror of thermonuclear war, if not of war itself, had been removed.

This statement has been formulated and is published in the continuing belief that the whole country and much of the free world as well are still prepared to follow imaginative, courageous, and great-hearted leadership from Washington.

Washington and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the current "Washington and Small Business" column sponsored by the National Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS

(By C. Wilson Harder)

A warning has been issued to small businessmen by the Federal Trade Commission against a loan racket.

The operation of this new hoax came some time ago to the attention of the field offices of the Small Business Administration and were reported in detail to George Burger, Washington vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, when he recently made a field trip to visit all the SBA offices.

In operation, the scheme is somewhat as follows: Sharp operators ascertain in a given community which small businessmen are seeking a loan for operating capital, for expansion, or for some other purpose. For the hoax player's purposes, it is better if the businessman has so far been unsuccessful in securing a loan.

The gyp artist then makes it a point to inspect the business premises in such a way he is asked the purpose of his visit.

He then reveals that he is an inspector for a group of philanthropic organizations with ample money to loan and whose philosophy is that small business must be helped, and he is sure that a loan could be arranged for the business, usually naming a figure of about twice what the businessman is seeking.

Of course, there is a long and plausible explanation that a contract must be signed, and that this calls for a modest fee in advance in order to compete the formalities of getting the loan.

Usually, too late, and after nothing has happened on securing a loan, the victimized businessman finds that the contract he signed, states in very fine print, that the "con" man, in exchange for the advance fee in cash, has only agreed to recommend to legitimate lending agencies that the businessman is a fine fellow, has a nice business, and should get a loan.

Obviously nothing but a racket.

Small businessmen are advised to shy away from any stranger who wants any advance fees for securing a loan.

As a matter of fact, it is recommended that small businessmen seeking a loan first try their bank. If they cannot secure the aid needed from this source, they are advised to contact the nearest field office of the Small Business Administration.

This agency of the Federal Government will try to work out any possible solution for the individual problem, either by making a direct loan with Government funds, or sharing a loan with a private lending agency.

As a matter of fact, the SBA welcomes inquiries from small business firms on financing problems and is prepared to exhaustively study each case in an attempt to work out a solution.

In fact, in many cases, these studies have been so complete, that they have revealed valid reasons for a loan that had previously been overlooked by a bank loan officer with the result the private bank has gone ahead and made the loan.

But the official warning is, "Don't pay anybody an advance fee to get a business loan."

Review by Senator Fulbright of Walter Lippmann's Book "The Communist World and Ours"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Walter Lippmann's book, "The Communist World and Ours."

The review, which appeared in the Washington Post of February 1, 1959, provides an excellent introduction to Mr. Lippmann's able and suggestive analysis.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS MR. K. SAID TO LIPPMANN

("The Communist World and Ours," by Walter Lippmann; reviewed by J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

No man has contributed more to the thoughtful considerations of the American scene than has Walter Lippmann during his long and distinguished career. He has a genius for extracting the essential threads of meaning from complex and confusing circumstances. In domestic affairs, his analysis often clarifies the abstruse and puzzling questions which arise from our complicated system of government.

This latest book in the field of foreign affairs from Mr. Lippmann's pen does not offer a cure for all the ills which afflict our relations with the U.S.S.R., but it does make some sensible suggestions regarding those relations. International affairs may not yield quite so readily as do domestic affairs to logical analysis, but understanding of statecraft and a feeling for the traditions of organized societies have produced in this instance, an interesting, a useful, and a provocative volume.

This work is divided into two parts, the first being the interview with Khrushchev and the second the author's own views and policy suggestions.

Mr. Lippmann's report of the interview is objective and matter of fact, but he conveys an interesting and lively impression of a powerful and ominous man. Khrushchev, he says, was quite relaxed and had none of the symptoms of a busy and preoccupied man.

In the anteroom to his office there were no guards, no people waiting, no secretaries carrying papers, no newspapermen, and there was none of the hustle and bustle which usually prevails in the outer rooms of busy and important officials. Under such conditions a man can think, and a man who directs a powerful nation with the ability and the opportunity to think can be a formidable and troublesome antagonist.

Khrushchev believes, says Mr. Lippmann, that American policy rests on an obsolete estimate of the existing balance of military power, because our forward bases in Germany and Turkey cannot be defended against Russia's rockets. However, communism, according to Khrushchev, is not a danger as a military policy, but as an ideology. We—the Communists—will cause you, the Americans, more trouble each year. Under the new 7-year plan, the Communists expect to surpass the United States in per capita production. The United States, says the master of the Kremlin, is living the last years of its greatness.

One of Khrushchev's principal complaints against the United States was that we are contributing to the remilitarization of Germany. He warned that such a policy could well result in Germany being destroyed or more probably joining the U.S.S.R. in order to avoid destruction by nuclear missiles.

Perhaps the most significant revelations of the interview were Khrushchev's concern about German affairs and his confidence in the power and effectiveness of his missiles of intermediate range.

The cause of our bad relations with Russia, Mr. Lippmann says, is the suspicion each side holds that the other side intends to commit aggression. This suspicion arises from the belief that in the long run neither side can tolerate the other.

In spite of all the propaganda to the contrary, we do not inhabit one world, says Mr. Lippmann. But looking at the history of the globe, the truth, as I see it, is that there has never been one world, that there has never been a universal state or a universal religion.

So, he concludes, we should not approach this conflict as if it were a religious war in which the contending positions are absolute. Such a policy leaves no room for maneuver, for diplomacy, for statesmanship, or in short no hope for any solution except total war.

Mr. Lippmann is not without hope, that is, if we keep our powder dry and keep plenty of it, as he advises us to do. But we must find a way to provide adequate armaments without working ourselves up into a frenzy of threats and fear and without insisting that all the smaller nations of the world line up on one side or the other.

The main threat of the Communist states lies not in their clandestine activity but in the force of their example. Their example of material achievements has especial appeal to the underdeveloped peoples of Asia and Africa, an appeal not easy for us to meet. He suggests that the only convincing answer to this challenge is for the West to help India match the achievements of China without sacrificing her free society.

In Europe, the critical area of the movement, we should strive to bring about the withdrawal of the Red Army gradually and with prudent safeguards. I think, says Mr. Lippmann, that we are missing the bus as long as we fail to identify ourselves with the idea of bringing to an end, however gradually, the military occupation of the European Continent.

Such sentiments only a short time ago aroused a storm of protest. They may again, but the less we plunge ourselves into hysterics, the more likely we are to take good care of our affairs, wisely concludes the author of this succinct and penetrating book.

Frank Park Samford: Man of the South for 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of remarks of Hon. Thomas W. Martin, chairman of the Alabama Power Co., upon the presentation of the Man of the South for 1958 award to Hon. Frank P. Samford of Birmingham, Ala., at a dinner given by friends of Mr. Samford at the Mountain Brook Country Club of Birmingham on January 20, 1959. The Man of the South awards are presented annually by Dixie Business magazine of Decatur, Ga., and its publisher, Col. Hubert F. Lee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANK PARK SAMFORD: MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1958

(Remarks of Thomas W. Martin, Man of the South for 1946, at the dinner given by friends of Mr. Samford, Mountain Brook Country Club, Birmingham, Ala., January 20, 1959)

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Lee, Mr. Samford, members of his family, gentlemen, it is with a feeling of pride that I come before this important group to say something about the Man of the South for 1958.

At the outset, I want to express my cordial thanks to the toastmaster, Mr. Frank E. Spain, and to Col. Hubert F. Lee of Atlanta, editor of Dixie Business, for the honor and privilege of making this presentation.

The initiative for originating the plan by which flowers for the living are handed to them while they are still able to enjoy them came entirely from Colonel Lee. It has been carried forward by him for many years.

Obviously, time, effort, and dollars are involved in gathering the nominations, arranging the balloting, and supervising the awards. With Colonel Lee, it has been a labor of love. He has had no reward other than the consciousness that he has done something that makes life more stimulating and more interesting for those who live in the South.

When he began, he indicated that he would carry on his interesting work principally as a hobby, rather than as moneymaking enterprise. We owe much to him as a citizen of the South for giving of his time and means. Of course we like the name of his magazine, Dixie Business, which he founded in 1929 and of which he is the editor and owner. He thus shows himself to be a true southern gentleman with a feeling for tradition and a sense of the past.

It has been my fortune to be familiar with Hubert's work for a good many years. With one notable exception, men have been selected who in the opinion of others were worthy of the distinction of being the Man of the South. In looking over the records of these men, it is obvious that it was not the day-to-day business of the individual that brought him to public acclaim, but rather the things he did in religious, cultural, or other activities wholly outside his enterprise.

And, with respect to one of those selected, Colonel Lee said of him that he had a goodly heritage; but that that heritage did not consist of silver and gold, but rather in character and devotion to ideals. Thus we have an interpretation of the principles that have guided Colonel Lee.

Mr. Samford attended State Normal School in Troy, Ala.; high school in Montgomery. He received his bachelor-of-science degree from Alabama Polytechnic Institute in Auburn. He is a member of Alpha Tau Omega fraternity and Omicron Delta Kappa honorary fraternity. He was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Howard College of Birmingham. Mr. Samford has been a member of the Southside Baptist Church in Birmingham for many years, is a deacon of the church, and has served as the chairman of the board of deacons from time to time.

Soon after graduation he entered the life insurance business with the Manhattan Life Insurance Co. of New York. When the Insurance Department of Alabama was created, he was the first deputy insurance commissioner, serving for 4 years. He was elected secretary-treasurer of the present Liberty National Life Insurance Co. in 1921, vice president in 1932, and president in 1934.

Mr. Samford is a director of a number of important enterprises, including Southern Bell T. & T. Co.; West Point Manufacturing Co.; Brown-Service Manufacturing Co. (Birmingham); Service Insurance Co. of Alabama (Birmingham); Malone Freight Lines (Birmingham); Birmingham Trust National Bank; Continental Gin Co.; Dixie Mills, Inc. (Ga.); Columbus Manufacturing Co. (Ga.); Equinox Mill (S.C.); Wellington Sears Co. (N.Y.); Cabin Crafts, Inc. (Ga.).

Outstanding is his work for education. He is a trustee of Alabama Polytechnic Institute, is president of the board of trustees of Howard College (Birmingham), and is a trustee of Southern Research Institute (Birmingham). I speak with some feeling and personal satisfaction for his support of the activities of the Southern Research Institute.

It was said over a hundred years ago by a great writer that:

"Kings, warriors, and statesmen have hitherto monopolized not only the pages of history, but also those of biography. I do not begrudge destructive heroes their fame, but the constructive ones ought not to be forgotten."

The growth of Liberty National Life Insurance into the 45th largest in the Nation constitutes a tribute, not only to Frank Samford and his associates, but to the enduring principles of every private enterprise, without which no progress is possible. Indeed, he and his company are truly constructive forces in our society of today.

Mr. Samford's counsel and support have been sought in innumerable worthy causes. His response has always been generous, wholehearted, and effective. His words, his deeds, and his attitude have marked him as a man of vision, wisdom, tolerance, and humanity. The social consciousness of American businessmen is one of the distinguishing marks of the American form of capitalism, a quality too little honored. Possessed of these qualities, we acclaim him as one of the most useful citizens of our time.

The reality cannot be escaped that Frank Samford has found that the good life is good for him who lives it, as it is good for those whom it serves. Such realities provide an illustration of what counts most in the mysterious adventure of human existence. It is clear anew that the major satisfactions come from concern and labor for others. They who give themselves to such concern find that they have come upon the source of the most precious values men know in living.

For example, Frank Samford recently caused to be erected on his office building in Birmingham a replica one-fifth the size of the Statue of Liberty at New York Harbor. That statue, as you know, was presented in 1886 by the French people to the people of the United States; and we who live in Birmingham look with pride upon this patriotic act of Mr. Samford's. The replica of this great statue will not only adorn his office building, but it will symbolize the spirit of a city—Birmingham.

In every field, art, science, industry, or religion—we have a legacy reaching back many centuries—to the man who first drew a picture on a cave wall; made the first wheel; fashioned the first instrument of metal; or raised his eyes in worship to the stars. The progress of civilization has been uneven, but every generation can add something, be it little or much, to this heritage of the past.

Let us remember that these great human advances have not been brought about by mediocre men and women. They were brought about by distinctly uncommon people, with vital sparks of leadership, such as Frank Samford.

And so with great pleasure I present to you, Frank Park Samford, the plaque which tells you of your selection as the Man of the South for 1958.

The Establishment of National Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, reliable newspaper reports indicate that within the administration itself, that is, on the President's staff, there is fear that President Eisenhower may be moving too far in the direction of giving this country leadership. Sound fantastic?

Recently the New York Herald Tribune reported that the President's recent passing reference in his state of the Union speech to the establishment of national goals for this Nation shook up some members of his staff. They expressed fear that the recognition of where this country ought to be going, like in building schoolrooms, paying teachers, building homes, might lead to a public demand that the Government ought to do something to help us get there.

Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal carried an excellent editorial recently that nailed this negative nervous Nellie fear for what it is. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OF COURSE, WE NEED GOALS

President Eisenhower's plan to create a study group to establish national goals got a lot of favorable support. But not, according to the New York Herald Tribune, from his own White House staff.

The staff didn't like the word "goals." And, the newspaper says, if the staff gets its way, the committee will confine its work to studying such areas as education, housing,

natural resources, technology. And it will then suggest ways of advancing in each of these fields. But it won't set goals. Why not? Well, the Herald Tribune quotes a White House staff member to this effect:

"Suppose the committee said there ought to be 100,000 new schoolrooms or 1 million new homes a year and then they weren't built. Why everybody in the land would be demanding that the Federal Government step in and see to it that they get built."

This is something like asking your garage repairman to find out what's wrong with your car—but not to tell you in precise terms lest you decide to get it fixed. We don't need a study to tell us that the country can use more and better houses or that education could be improved. We know those things. What we need to know is the extent of the need and how to meet it.

Expect Best, Maybe Castro Will Deliver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, having read in the Indianapolis Star an excellent editorial by Holmes Alexander entitled "Expect Best, Maybe Castro Will Deliver," and noting that a reference is made therein to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Jan. 24, 1959]
EXPECT BEST, MAYBE CASTRO WILL DELIVER
(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—They still have a one-party system in Cuba—dictators. Batista made himself president. Fidel Castro appointed a stooge who in turn named Castro his military chief. Neither way is any way to run a republic.

If Cuba were as far away as Laos, the choice of dictators would be an academic, harmless game in the United States. But with Cuba only 90 miles off our coast and an economic dependent of American business, we had better stop playing games and start looking up remedies for offshore revolutions.

In the game of choose-your-dictator, some members of our press have regrettably followed their party line instead of the facts. One metropolitan paper around New Year's reached back to pre-Christian classical days to find an analogy of the bearded young hero riding to the liberation of his worshipful people. But let us draw the curtain of charity across these embarrassing extravaganzas. With Castro in and Batista out, the joint interest of both Cuba and the United States is to rescue Castro from the revolving door through which so many Latin dictators have come and gone. We should use him as a safe conduct to a constitutional government in Cuba.

STATESMANSHIP SPOTTY

American statesmanship has been spotty but with patches of excellence. We owe a lot to Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. He was the first of the liberal fraternity to point out that blood was flowing in Cuba

and that this was more than a matter of whose ox was gored. MORSE deserves credit for arousing both public opinion and the State Department against the slaughter which temporarily has abated. All in all, the forbearance of the American Government has been worthy of our position as a major power and a mature country. True, Latin ways are not our ways, but until we have a perfect system at home we had better favor self-improvement over self-righteousness.

It's also a good idea, and fairly widely observed in the press and in Congress, to resist the temptation to shout Communist at every foreign event which goes against our interest. But it would be naive to forget Russia's fondness for fishing in troubled waters. Under the Batista regime, Russia agreed to buy some Cuban sugar. As a result Soviet merchant ships, chock-a-block with electronic reconnaissance equipment, have been cruising off our shores. We could be more indignant about this if American traders had not recently been so cordial to Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan.

But neither will it do to write off Fidel Castro and his ubiquitous brothers as agrarian reformers and innocent progressives. For instance, Time Magazine, July 8, 1957, carried a digest of a Fidel Castro speech, published at his own expense, in which he promised the following program should he become dictator of Cuba:

1. Nationalization of U.S.-owned power and telephone companies.
2. Confiscation of all wealth gained by corruption.
3. A drastic land reform.
4. Profit-sharing for labor.
5. Expansion of industrialization, public housing, rural electrification.

Our Foreign Cultural and Information Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from La Gazette Del Massachusetts of January 16, 1959. I think that this editorial identifies one of the ways in which our foreign cultural and information programs could have greater impact. The editor of La Gazette Del Massachusetts, Mr. Caesar Donnaruma, has been one of the most effective editors in foreign language journalism in America, and his newspaper has always been one of the most constructive voices in Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IS THIS SOUND THINKING?

One of the most effective ways of offsetting the propaganda employed by Communists in their false diatribes about capitalistic America is through the use of American newspapers which are circulated in European countries where communism is a problem.

This is particularly true in the case of newspapers printed in foreign languages. People in countries where Communists abound are able to read. They are also

liable to believe what they read. Their opinions of the democratic way of life in America are more susceptible to the knowledge they absorb from American newspapers than to the claims of Communists that are disproved in these newspapers.

Many thousands of American newspapers are mailed every week to European countries. The *Gazzetta* is proud of a very large group of subscribers in almost every province in Italy. They spend money to subscribe to this newspaper. They are so dedicated to reading articles that appeal to them that when their papers are not delivered they are quick to protest.

To make it more difficult for these subscribers to American foreign language newspapers, the Post Office Department with the approval of President Eisenhower and the Congress has increased the postal rates on newspapers sent to Italy and other countries by 1 cent.

A cent is of no importance but to be forced to pay such an additional charge every week in the year is of far reaching importance. The money involved would not halt the wheels of the Post Office Department if it should be lost.

Money is not the issue. The real issue is that perhaps unwittingly, Senators and Congressmen and even Mr. Eisenhower himself, have never considered the importance of the American foreign language press in contributing to the defeat of communism in countries into which the United States is continuing to pour billions of dollars of the American taxpayers. It seems that there is too little thought given to one of the best sources of propaganda that the United States possesses. Perhaps the men in Washington are too concerned about big problems to even think of the far more productive little problems. They should wake up.

William T. Evjue Wins High Honor From Government of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in his lifetime of dedicated public service as a crusading liberal newspaper editor, Mr. William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the *Capital Times*, of Madison, Wis., has been widely honored. Last week, he was awarded another high honor of which I am sure he is especially proud.

King Olav V of Norway has conferred on Mr. Evjue the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav. This is the highest honor which the Norwegian Government awards to civilians of this country. It is a rare and coveted honor.

Mr. Evjue has always been proud of his Norwegian descent, and those who know him agree that his nationality may, indeed, be given a share of credit for the qualities of tenacious courage and dedication to public interest which have won him recognition as one of the Nation's leading liberal crusading editors.

Mr. President, in recognition of the high honor Mr. Evjue has earned, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the *Capital Times* of Tuesday, January 27, 1959, and an editorial from the Wis-

consin State Journal of Madison, Wis., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madison (Wis.) *Capital Times*, Jan. 27, 1959]

KING CONFERS HIGH HONOR—NORSE MAKE EVJUE KNIGHT OF ST. OLAV

William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the *Capital Times*, was informed today that King Olav V of Norway has conferred upon him the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav, the highest Norwegian honor awarded to civilians in the United States.

In a letter to Mr. Evjue, Helge Akre, consul general of Norway in Chicago, invited Mr. Evjue to come to Chicago to receive the decoration and to lunch with the consul general.

The honor includes the St. Olav medal and a certificate signed by King Olav V.

Consul Akre pointed out today that the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav, is very seldom given to citizens of the United States. He said that he recalled only four or five similar presentations during the time he has been consul in this country.

Upon the death of a recipient, the medal must be returned to the King of Norway, who retains ownership, Consul Akre explained.

He stated that this highly merited award is made to those civilians for services on behalf of Norway in this country, and services furthering the ideals, heritage, and culture of that land.

Consul Akre compared the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav, to the Legion of Honor of France.

The Order of St. Olav was founded in 1847 by King Oskar I as a general order of merit, both military and civilian. It is given in reward for services rendered to king and country or to art and science.

The order is named after Olav Haraldsson, King Olav II of Norway, national hero and patron saint, who was canonized as St. Olav in 1164.

Olav, who was born about 955, fought with the Danes in England and was a member of the Jomsborg Vikings. After years of sea roving led him to Normandy, Spain, and the Holy Land, he returned to Norway in 1016 and defeated Earl Sweyn, the virtual ruler of Norway. Olav established peaceable relations with Sweden and Denmark and soon achieved a greater measure of power than any of his predecessors. He spread Christianity throughout the kingdom and reorganized the Government of Norway.

HONOR TO WILLIAM T. EVJUE

[From the Wisconsin State Journal]

The Wisconsin State Journal takes pleasure in bidding its congratulations to the many directed to William T. Evjue today.

King Olav, of Norway, has conferred the Knight's Cross First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav, highest Norwegian honor awarded civilians in the United States, upon the editor and publisher of the *Capital Times*.

Mr. Evjue richly merits the distinction for his services on behalf of Norway in this country, which the award recognizes.

The ideals, heritage, and culture of Norway always have found a place of endearment in his newspaper, and his personal columns of reminiscences of early-day Norwegians and their communities in Wisconsin, and his accounts of his travels and visits among them have brought delight to many of his readers.

And his faithful reporting of church dinners in the luteal season has made him practically the official guide to good feasting and fellowship for all nationality groups who

have him to thank for an introduction to the old country delicacy.

The St. Olav Knighthood is rarely given to citizens of this country. It is all the more significant, then, that Mr. Evjue is the third distinguished citizen of Madison to win it in recent times.

The late Albert G. Schmedeman, four times mayor of Madison and later Governor of Wisconsin, was similarly decorated by the late King Haakon while he was U.S. Minister to Norway from 1913 to 1921.

And the same King bestowed the honor on Prof. Einar I. Haugen, chairman of the department of Scandinavian languages at the University of Wisconsin.

Another pleasant point is that the man who has honored Mr. Evjue himself was honored here when, in 1939, the then crown prince received an honorary degree from the University of Wisconsin and a commission as honorary colonel in the 105th Cavalry, Wisconsin National Guard, from Gov. Julius Hell.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Washington Post and Times Herald dealing with the subject of labor reform legislation, one of January 25, 1959, and a second one of January 29, 1959. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the New York Times of January 30, 1959, as well as a column by Arthur Krock published in the Times that day on the subject of labor reform.

It seems to me that the pressing need in the field of labor legislation is for internal reform and democratization of unions. While I recognize that some amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act are necessary and useful, it appears possible that the Congress may again concentrate its energies on arguing the merits of Taft-Hartley amendments and delay essential labor reform legislation.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 25, 1959]

QUESTION OF PACKAGING

Senator KENNEDY has shown good judgment in introducing his revised labor reform bill early in the session and in moving promptly for committee action. In general it is a good bill. Whether or not it would "virtually put Mr. Hoffa and his associates out of business," as Senator KENNEDY claims it would certainly put more squeeze on the racketeers in the ranks of organized labor than they feel today. The chief question about Mr. KENNEDY's bill is not whether it looks in the right direction but whether it goes far enough—or, to look at the matter from a different angle, too far.

In general, the bill would strike at corruption within unions by requiring detailed disclosure of their financial operations and of any transactions by their officers which might involve a conflict of interest. It seeks

to give workers control over their unions by requiring secret-ballot election of officers or of delegates to the conventions at which officers are chosen. Numerous specific safeguards to prevent undemocratic procedures would be written into the law, and the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to institute court action to upset improper elections and to substitute therefor honest elections supervised by his Department. Various safeguards would also be set up to prevent the use of trusteeships for exploitation of local unions and concentration of power.

Mr. KENNEDY has tried to draw a distinction between his reform bill and the larger task of overhauling the Taft-Hartley Act—a task which he promises to undertake later in the session, with the aid of a committee of experts. There is much to be said for this two-package approach. All the efforts of the last decade to achieve a comprehensive overhaul of Taft-Hartley have gone down to failure, carrying urgent reforms with them, although it must be remembered that the relatively mild Kennedy-Ives bill died in the House last year but this was partly because it was regarded as not strong enough.

In any event, Mr. KENNEDY has blurred the logic of his argument by including in his bill several Taft-Hartley changes that would normally go into the second bill. These are provisions to eliminate the no-man's land in the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board; to ease the bargaining problems in the construction industry; and to give replaced strikers the right to vote in representation elections. If these amendments are to remain in the bill, Secretary Mitchell will have a strong case for including also his proposed reforms dealing with black-mall picketing and abuse of the secondary boycott. The indications are that Senator McCLELLAN will also introduce a bill including some of the stiffer reforms that Senator KENNEDY wishes to avoid.

Undoubtedly the two-package approach is more likely to result in prompt action. But when all the sweetening is added to the first package the incentive to load it also with the stiffer reforms becomes irresistible. We think Senator CASE of New Jersey is right in suggesting that the Taft-Hartley amendment be shifted to a second bill.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 29, 1959]

ONE TO ONE ON LABOR REFORM

President Eisenhower sought to contrast his complete and effective labor reform proposals with a piecemeal program (doubtless the Kennedy bill), but actually there is a striking similarity between the two. Eleven of the twenty points in the President's message to Congress yesterday are very similar to provisions of the Kennedy bill. Several other provisions of the rival programs are in partial agreement. It should not be difficult for the labor committees to write satisfactory legislation on the basis of these recommendations.

The areas of greatest agreement are on the reporting of labor union finances and procedures, the regulation of trusteeships, the requirement of secret-ballot elections, and the correction of several defects in the Taft-Hartley Act. Both programs would also eliminate the no-man's land in the regulation of collective bargaining. But the President would authorize the States to intervene in cases where the effect on interstate commerce is slight and the NLRB does not function. Senator KENNEDY would direct the NLRB to assert its full jurisdiction, except that it might relinquish local cases to State agencies operating under laws similar to the NLRB.

The major differences between the two proposals lie in their treatment of picketing and secondary boycotts. The Kennedy bill

would outlaw shakedown picketing—the use of pickets to extort payoffs from employers. The President would strike at all varieties of black-mall picketing with the general objective of preventing unions from coercing employers beyond the scope of legal and legitimate collective bargaining. This is a favorite weapon of the Teamsters Union. It has been widely used in support of racketeering, and we think the President is right in saying that provisions against it belong in the antiracketeering bill.

It is also clear that the Taft-Hartley Act provisions on secondary boycotts need to be overhauled. The existing experimental provisions leave unions free to coerce and destroy employers who are not engaged in any labor dispute. There is danger, however, that if Congress brings this controversial item into the antiracketeering bill the whole measure may again go into the discard instead of onto the legislative books. The first consideration should be the enactment of an effective reform bill, and this means it must be acceptable to a majority in both Houses as well as to the President.

The next step might well be an attempt to agree on what should go into the initial reform bill and what should be left for later discussion. The administration could give up its demand for a single bill in return for assurance by the congressional leaders that a second labor bill devoted chiefly to changes in the Taft-Hartley Act would be brought to a vote on the floors of both the Senate and House.

Certainly both sides will have to yield in some measure if the national demand for reform legislation in this sphere is to be met. One item that the administration ought to abandon in any event is the meaningless and mischievous gesture of extending the non-Communist oath required of union leaders to employers as well. On his part Senator KENNEDY could greatly enhance the attractiveness of his two-package approach by confining the first "package" to the most urgent anti-racketeering reforms and leaving to the second "package" the sweetening (Taft-Hartley changes sought by organized labor) which properly belongs with a more detailed overhaul of the existing law.

LABOR UNION REFORM BILLS

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1959]

The overwhelming demand of the public, supported by the AFL-CIO that dictation and corruption by union officials be outlawed in this country may now be thwarted again by partisan politics and irrelevant issues. Two competing measures are now before Congress, where there should be only one—and a bipartisan one at that. They are the Kennedy bill, cosponsored by 11 other Democratic Senators, and the bill introduced by Republican Senator GOLDWATER, based on the President's labor message to Congress.

But a striking feature of these bills is their wide agreement on ways to democratize and purify unions. Both require full reporting and disclosure, policed by the Secretary of Labor, on such matters as organization and governing procedures, financial operations and transactions that involve a conflict of interest. Both require the administration of union funds solely in the interests of the members, backed by punitive sanctions. Both call for a secret ballot, free of coercion, in periodic elections of officers; freedom to run for office, with a ban on the use of union funds to support any candidate, and minimum standards for trusteeships of local bodies. Incidentally, why not require a majority vote of all members involved to validate a strike?

Bipartisan support for a measure along these lines should not be too difficult to mobilize. The main trouble is that the two bills differ widely—both as to what is in them and what is left out—in such matters as

picketing, secondary boycotts and the jurisdiction and operation of the National Labor Relations Board, which call for amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. And not only are the differences between the bills extremely hard to reconcile, but the problems they deal with are controversial in themselves—which intensifies the differences.

But, after all, these are matters that primarily involve the power and external relations of labor unions, not how they manage their own affairs. Doesn't this mean that amendments to the Taft-Hartley law should be made through a separate and carefully considered, overall measure? They seem like excess baggage which might well be temporarily jettisoned now for the sake of reaching the main and immediate objective: greater democracy, honesty and efficiency within American labor unions.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1959]
IN THE NATION—PROSPECT OF COMPREHENSIVE
LABOR BILL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—Democratic Senators KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and ERVIN, of North Carolina, have offered to Members of Congress an easier solution than the administration's of a political problem very common at the Capitol. This problem is, how to respond to the public need and the promptings of conscience for some legislative curbs on union labor at this session without incurring the resentment of labor leaders who can express it effectively at the polls.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill strikes at many, though not all, of the roots of union corruption, with legislative correctives which cannot be either safely or soundly opposed by labor leaders. The administration measure does this also, perhaps a little deeper. But it includes curbs on flagrant misuses of organized labor's special political power, such as the secondary boycott, that have been widely employed to nullify the Bill of Rights.

THE OPPOSING CONCEPTS

These are omitted in the Kennedy-Ervin bill on this representation: (1) The paramount necessity of American society is to penalize the appalling union corruption which has been revealed by the McClellan committee of the Senate; (2) amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, which the administration measure proposes with respect to secondary boycotts, should, as a matter of parliamentary strategy, be dealt with in a separate bill because they are controversial; (3) if these are combined with the anti-corruption curbs, opposition will be invoked that may result in no labor legislation at all at this session.

The opposing concept of the administration bill is this: (1) Corrective labor legislation is very difficult to attain anyhow, particularly in a Congress composed of many members who attribute their elections to union support; (2) if two separate legislative packages are submitted, No. 2, because it will deal with industrial controversies, including the secondary boycott, will have far less chance of passage than if combined with No. 1, which is generally endorsed by labor, management, and the public.

WEAKNESSES IN KENNEDY BILL

Senator KENNEDY's position has several weaknesses. Although he would separately legislate Taft-Hartley amendments, his bill includes a few. These are all favored by organized labor, and may fairly be classified as "sweetening" of the anticorruption dose on the evidence of a statement by a labor witness before the subcommittee yesterday. He said that, if these amendments are stripped from the Kennedy-Ervin bill, his group would certainly reconsider its support of the remainder. The third weakness is implicit in the much milder correctives

of blackmail picketing in his measure as contrasted with those proposed by the administration. Finally, the long stalemate in Congress on basic labor correctives makes an unpromising prospect for a separate and deferred measure on which powerful union leaders could and would concentrate their attack.

If this opposition prevailed at the current session, only the most naive could expect it to be overcome at the next, which will occur in the presidential election year.

SHORTCOMINGS NOT EXCLUSIVE

The weaknesses in the administration's draft are also patent. The fundamental source of the excessive power of union labor in the economy is its special group immunity from the antitrust laws. A basic source of its political power are the devices with which unions circumvent the Federal law that forbids them to use their funds as political contributions. The administration bill ventures no correction of either.

There is, of course, a practical consideration which supports the Kennedy-Ervin approach. This is that any progress toward curbs of the excessive power of the unions is worth making; that the Kennedy-Ervin measure provides this, will surely be appreciated, but may fall if amending it as the administration proposes leaves organized labor with the choice between all or none.

This consideration appeals to many Members of Congress who cannot be fairly accused of timidity or tagged as pawns of the unions. And naturally it appeals to others: Those for whom it is politically safe to vote for the Kennedy-Ervin bill but not for the administration supplements; and those who, welcoming progress in the field of industrial relations, sincerely oppose the curbs in the administration's draft.

Need for Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent column by Mr. Victor Riesel. This column gives a convincing demonstration of the need for action this year by the Congress on a bill such as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and I have introduced.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Miami's sunny real estate has not seen its last tycoon. A fellow by the name of Jim Hoffa has just put \$4 million into the refurbishing of the Everglades, a residential hotel on the mainland. It is some distance from the Gold Coast's motel row where the Teamsters already have put \$1,250,000 into a sandlot drive-in palace called the Castaways. All this is atop some \$4 million in a west coast housing project and some \$12 million in million dollar deposits in as many Midwest banks.

So when Senator JOHN KENNEDY says he has a law to put Hoffa out of business—it's a pretty big business, for there are other millions I've not listed here and tens of millions more in welfare funds still available.

Some experts put these funds at a billion dollars for Hoffa's dollar diplomacy.

But Senator KENNEDY's proposals are big enough to contain even Hoffa.

This antiracketeering bill will get more kicking around than an English soccer ball. But if it survives as the minimum law we, the people, get this year, this is how KENNEDY believes the public can win this final conflict:

There are nine main assaults on racketeering. KENNEDY's most dramatic proposal calls for the summary dismissal of all ex-convicts from their union posts. This means that any union leader anywhere with a long police sheet which has a conviction for arson, larceny, extortion, narcotics pushing, mayhem, or any other major crime must be dropped from his post the moment the Kennedy bill becomes law. If the ex-convict stays in office, the Justice Department can automatically move in, demand his ejection and bring criminal proceedings against the union leaders. The union itself can also be fined heavily.

No union official ever will be able to draw dues money for yachts, homes or major items like convention hotel bills without everybody getting a real X-ray look at his personal accounts. Kennedy's bill calls for full public disclosure of all salaries, expenses and other disbursements of every single official and employee who receives more than \$7,000 annually from a union. This will include virtually every paid national and local labor leader.

In the past, the looting crowd has been able to cover up by passing bylaws enabling leaders to hide or destroy union books each year. If the Kennedy bill passes, it will be a Federal offense, punishable by a 5-year jail term and heavy fine, to steal, deface or destroy union records.

Believe it or not, embezzlement of union funds is not a Federal offense. Under this bill, it will be illegal to steal union funds. That's progress. Imagine having to fight to pass such a law in the Congress of the United States.

Under the bill, the rank and file can go into a State or Federal court and sue the till thieves for recovery of union money even if the union itself does not act to recover the stolen funds. This means that a rank-and-file committee can ask the court to turn boats, cars, country homes, furniture, and even clothing back to the union if officials simply paid for the comforts out of "expense" accounts or just lifted union dues.

There are other powers for the rank and file. If they believe there's been a crooked election, the bill gives them the right to ask the Secretary of Labor of the United States to investigate. He would have subpoena powers. He could seize all records affecting the election (any records for that matter). He would then have the right to set the election aside—whether a local or an international union was involved.

The proposed law would give him the power to call new elections. He could see to it that no intricate union statute kept any member from voting or running for office so long as his dues were paid on any day of the month, not just on the first of each month as is called for in the Teamster bylaws.

There are six specific rules against any union official, who earns more than \$5,000 a year, buying into companies which deal with his labor outfit, thus causing a conflict of interest. There are proposals against union loans to officials of more than \$1,500; proposals against employer loans to union men, and proposals against the use of picket lines for extortion.

If we, the people, get all this written into law this year, some of our heartaches will have been worthwhile.

The West Puts Its Brand on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as all of us know, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] is one of this Nation's most capable writers, as well as one of the most able and conscientious Members of the Senate.

Further proof of the Senator's perceptiveness as a writer appeared yesterday in the New York Times magazine, which published Senator NEUBERGER's article entitled, "The West Puts Its Brand on Congress."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Senator NEUBERGER's article, from the February 1 issue of the New York Times magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEST PUTS ITS BRAND ON CONGRESS—
SOMETHING NEW HAS BEEN ADDED TO POLITICS: THE PRESTIGE AND POWER OF THE FAST-GROWING WEST.

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

After he had sent Lewis and Clark on that first westward trek across our land, Thomas Jefferson visioned a vast commercial empire in the realm the great explorers had discovered. Their reports to him told of virtually limitless riches in pelts, timber, fisheries, deep harbors, minerals, and valleys ripe for homesteading. And so Jefferson foresaw for the American West a mighty role in the burgeoning nation. Yet it is doubtful that even our buoyant third President, with his dreams of Western expansion and success, could have imagined the influence and prestige that the West holds in the nascent 86th Congress—and will hold perhaps in the sessions of Congress for many years to come.

Two factors have combined to make the West far more prominent and influential on Capitol Hill than ever before. One is a national migration that has moved steadily and inexorably toward the sunset rim of the continent during the past two decades. The other is a renewal, after a hiatus of almost half a century, of the historic process of adding States to the Union.

But what is the West? After all, a place as rooted in the East as the University of Michigan has an alma-mater song that refers to its athletes as the champions of the West. By comparison, Capt. Meriwether Lewis, on his journey of high destiny, felt he had reached the real West when he glimpsed peaks nearly 3 miles high notching the distant horizon. The West has been defined more explicitly by one of its foremost chroniclers, the late Bernard DeVoto, as "the huge and fateful area extending from the eastern ramparts of the Rocky Mountains to the shores of the Pacific Ocean."

Today this area consists of twelve immense States—Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Nevada, California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska—covering nearly half the land mass of the Nation. It includes teeming metropolis and lonely upland in its span from ocean strand to glacial summit.

Alaska, of course, is the latest addition—the first new State since Arizona was admitted in 1912. Inevitably the next new

State, and probably soon, will be Hawaii. Its admission to the Union will change the geographic definition of the West, but it will assuredly be considered part of the West, especially since its shares many of the social dilemmas and climatic and crop conditions of its principal contact on the mainland, California.

The political growth of the new West can be seen at its sharpest in the House of Representatives. Between 1940 and 1950, the West gained eight seats in the House because of population increases. People are traveling westward to operate aircraft plants, to staff military bases, and to produce and test the original atomic weapons. According to the latest estimates from the Bureau of Census, the West will qualify for an additional nine Representatives when the next congressional reapportionment occurs in 1960. Most of these will accrue to California, which in recent years has passed Illinois, Ohio, and even Pennsylvania in population, and by 1965 is expected to challenge New York's supremacy as the most populous State in the Union.

As for the Senate, the West now occupies 24 out of the 98 seats. When Hawaii becomes a State, western membership will increase to 26 out of 100. This will mean, for example, that western Senators will outnumber those of the Solid South by eight.

What will the new West do with its aggregate of political power? Will it act as a bloc? Is there, for example, a western stereotype in the Senate, as we have come to think of one for the Senators from the South and even the East?

Mention of southern politicians often conjures up pictures of men hostile to civil rights legislation, proud of the TVA, fervently in favor of price supports on cotton and tobacco, and proficient at dramatic and flowery oratory. The typical Member of Congress from one of the great cities of the East is regarded as an ardent sponsor of civil rights, an opponent of restrictive immigration laws, and frequently friendly to such broad causes as urban renewal and public housing.

Western Senators, however, cannot be so easily characterized. They share no uniformity of experience or antecedents or political views. The two new Members from the fledgling State of Alaska, to cite a case in point, are E. L. BARTLETT, a former prospector for gold in Alaska's foaming creeks, and ERNEST GRUNING, a former editor of newspapers and magazines in New York City. Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, known as the silent Senator, rarely speaks from the floor, while Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, is famous for his feats of oratorical endurance.

The very name Montana creates visions of cowpokes and six-shooting frontier sheriffs, but Montana's popular junior Senator, MIKE MANSFIELD, is a former professor of oriental history who specializes in scholarly studies of foreign policy. The West claims the Senator of longest tenure, HAYDEN, now in his sixth successive term, and the Senator of youngest age, FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, 34.

Western Senators include Protestants, Catholics, Mormons, and Jews. They range from Arizona's BARRY GOLDWATER, critic of labor unions, to JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, their defender; from WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, foe of public power, to Washington's HENRY M. JACKSON, its advocate; from WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, proponent of 90-percent price supports on basic crops, to CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, an adherent of the flexible scale for farm commodities. While Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, warns against business monopolies, Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of neighboring Colorado, calls for Federal action to suppress monopolies in organized labor.

There is no clear western position on civil rights, one of the most heatedly discussed issues of our era. This was evident during

the bitter Senate debate in the summer of 1957 when southerners succeeded in having a crippling jury-trial amendment added to legislation which sought to assure southern Negroes access to the ballot box. Twelve of the twenty-two Senators then from the West answered to their names in favor of the amendment, while 10 western Senators opposed it.

Not even on such a regional issue as the great water-power site at Hells Canyon, along the Oregon-Idaho border, is a so-called Western viewpoint discernible. Every Democratic Senator from the West voted for Federal development of the mile-deep chasm; all the West's Republican Senators favored a private utility company. This was almost exactly the same partisan division that prevailed on the issue among Senators from other parts of the country.

The West's sheer immensity and geographic and economic diversity prevent a monolithic point of view. A Senator from Los Angeles or Portland has totally different pressures upon him from those affecting a Senator from Pocatello or Carson City. As a member of Oregon's Legislature, I had sponsored one of the early State fair employment practices acts in the Nation. But in the Senate I soon discovered that some of my colleagues from other Western States—particularly those from the States that lie behind the battlements of lofty mountain ranges—had had little or no local experience with this issue.

A Senator from California, where thrive such specialty crops as lettuce and asparagus and citrus fruits, thinks differently on agricultural matters from a Senator whose home is Montana, where upland wheat and other grains are the all-important farm commodities. In the Southwest the fundamental problem is lack of water for drinking and irrigation, but in the Northwest flood-control projects are needed to hold back the Columbia's rampant freshets.

In the vital realm of foreign policy, the West is riven by many points of view. Geographical diversity is a factor here, too. Some of the world's finest harbors dot the Pacific seaboard—Puget Sound, the mouth of the Columbia River, San Francisco Bay, San Pedro Bay. Congressmen from these areas are receptive to reciprocal trade. They know that accelerated overseas commerce means jobs for their stevedores, sailors, and warehousemen. They support foreign aid and other instruments of internationalism.

On the other side of the trade issue, representatives of the mountain States are often conscious of the economic impact of imports on the ores, sugar beets, and finished minerals produced by their constituents. During the last session of Congress, the administration proposed generous subsidies for certain ores such as lead and zinc in an effort to win the support of some western Senators for continuation of the reciprocal trade program.

It has been regarded as inevitable that the West's increasing strength in Congress will bring about a dilution of the great political power long wielded there by the South. The only challenge to southern domination of Senate committees, through the holding of key chairmanships, comes from western Senators of lengthy service such as HAYDEN, of Arizona, and MURRAY, of Montana. Nor can it be overlooked that the President pro tempore of the Senate is not a southerner but Mr. HAYDEN, who first came to Capitol Hill as a House Member almost 47 years ago. No southerner would think of challenging him for this honor.

Yet westerners and southerners are not necessarily arch rivals, as some seem to assume. If there is a prevailing western viewpoint on economics, it is that too much of the country's manufacturing is concentrated in a few Eastern States. The South shares this attitude. Despite the financial vigor of the California colossus, the West in general

needs new industrial payrolls; so does the South. Too many of the West's natural resources are hauled out as raw materials, rather than processed by native industries. The South murmurs against the same inequity.

Oregon's timber industry complains that the structure of national freight rates tends to make prohibitive the local manufacture of lumber into finished products. Southern sawmill owners voice an identical protest. A Western Democratic Senator, looking at the swift reaches of the Columbia and Colorado Rivers, has many of the same thoughts as his Democratic colleague from the realm of the Tennessee and its surging tributaries; each hopes that cheap kilowatts in abundance will lure new manufacturing payrolls to his State.

Thus, the expanding strength of the West in Congress may not be so distressing to the long-dominant South as has been predicted, particularly in the field of economic legislation.

Despite the lack of a Western stereotype, are there some policies which Congressmen from the West may be expected to promote with special diligence? I would say such issues fall into a few categories:

1. Water. During the past quarter of a century, the Federal Government has spent more than \$10 billion to develop Western water resource projects. This pace will probably be accelerated in view of the West's new numerical strength—although Western Republicans and Democrats may continue to split over the question of Federal power-plants versus private-utility dams.

2. Recreation. The West is the scene of many of the country's outdoor marvels—Yosemite, the Grand Canyon, Crater Lake, Yellowstone, Mount Rainier, and Mount Hood—and tourist trade is a key part of the economy of most Western States. Westerners in Congress are certain to unite behind requests for additional appropriations to be spent in the national parks and national forests.

3. Transportation. The West needs better roads, especially in its sparsely settled farming and timber areas. Western Members of Congress will favor acceleration of the Federal aid program on interstate and secondary highways.

4. Hemisphere relations. The West is highly conscious of its neighbors on the North American continent. Mexico shares tourists, rivers, and wetback migratory laborers with such border states as California, New Mexico, and Arizona. Off to the north, Oregon and Washington and Montana seek a mutual agreement with Canada for joint use of the still untapped Columbia River water power. Alaska's Senators desire a similar pact on the Yukon.

5. Credit and monetary policy. Tight money has not been popular in the West. Traditionally, the West has sought low interest rates in order to encourage expansion. Residential housing, crucial to the logging and lumber industries of the Pacific Northwest and northern California, relies on abundant and cheap credit. Higher rates of interest contribute to more expensive public works projects. All of these things may make the West a factor in opposing tighter Federal controls over interest and credit.

Despite these common causes, western Senators and Representatives enjoy a far wider latitude on major issues than do their counterparts from other regions, who are often blocked by local prejudices and conclusions. Elections in the South and East can turn for or against a candidate on a single issue. I do not know of any one political question that alone could determine the fate of a major candidate in a Western State.

The West is, in effect, a genuine third force in the Congress, capable of entering new alliances and adopting untried positions. Its

bargaining power is enormous if only because its allegiance cannot be forecast. In the elections of 1958 westerners triumphed who advocated a firm stand on Quemoy and Matsu, but so did those who called for recognition of Red China.

As the newest American region (I have talked with pioneers who remember the Indian wars), it perhaps is fitting that the West is the least strapped by political straitjackets. When the West is older, its ideas will jell and harden; strong voting blocs may materialize; spokesmen in Senate and House may be handcuffed by phobias. But now the West is young.

Statement by Chief Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, on Recent Resolution of the Chief Justices Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a recent resolution of the Chief Justices Association condemning the Supreme Court, which was passed in Pasadena, Calif., August 23, 1958, has caused considerable comment. I believe the views stated by Chief Justice Weintraub, of the New Jersey Supreme Court, will be of interest to the entire Senate. I ask unanimous consent that these views be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chief Justice DETMERS. The Chair recognizes Chief Justice Weintraub, of New Jersey. Chief Justice WEINTRAUB. Mr. Chairman and members of the conference, I am confident that every member of this conference has carefully considered this important resolution and has reached, as I have, a firm view with respect to it. I sense that the resolution will attract a spanking majority. I doubt that extended debate will add very much. I speak simply because, in the light of the importance of the matter, I should state the reasons why I cannot join in the resolution. May I say to members of the committee who prepared the report that my difference of view certainly does not suggest any personal criticism. I am just one lawyer differing with another.

I place no institution, office, or public official beyond full and frank public criticism. Nor do I question the right of any member of this conference, at least in his capacity of private citizen, to express his disagreement with the work of the Supreme Court. But I do question the wisdom, and indeed the propriety, of a joint pronouncement by this conference of Chief Justices, assembled as it is in an official or quasi-official capacity. I doubt that it is within the proper function of this conference to issue what in essence is a blast, devoid of any specific recommendation as to any specific matter. More importantly, in my judgment, the criticism and characterizations in the report are unwarranted.

As I read the report it laments the readjustment of power and authority between the National Government and the States and then belabors the Supreme Court for its role in the process.

I agree that John Marshall would be astounded by the present scene. This, I believe, is most fortunate, because if the present scene were such as to appear at all familiar to him, our Nation would be a third- or fourth-rate power, if indeed it would exist at all. The report itself acknowledges the inexorable sweep of scientific and economic events which have dictated the readjustment of responsibility and power, events which have led the States themselves to look to Federal authority for the solution of problems beyond their abilities.

I am sure that if the Federal Government would abandon its many programs of local assistance and release to the States the sources of revenue gathered for those purposes, my little State—small in acreage but large in population, industry, and tax remittance to Washington—would profit greatly. Yet I would not urge so provincial a view, because the welfare of the several States and Territories is single and indivisible. For the same reason, in all matters involving the relationship between the Nation and State, the rights of a single State must yield to Federal needs. And for the same reason, in international matters it is today unthinkable that any State may possess the power to pursue a course of action or inaction which may embarrass or jeopardize the well-being of the entire Nation.

Such is the background against which the Supreme Court must resolve the issues before it. Its horizon is different from ours. We may lament the course of history and even weep in its wake, but let us not suppose that we can, by resolution, stay the current of events.

The report assails decisions of the Supreme Court in two areas: interpretation of acts of Congress and interpretation of Constitution, especially the 14th amendment.

The report cites a number of decisions as to many of which it is adversely critical.

I assume it is not intended to obtain a vote in this conference upon each of those decisions. I should be surprised if some 50 justices could, upon careful consideration, be unanimous as to any of those decisions and I would be amazed if unanimity were achieved as to the basketful. And although each of us might venture a curbstone view with respect to the cases cited, I doubt that we would assume responsibility for a public pronouncement without consideration of the record, briefs and arguments presented in each case. We would want the benefit of the same material with which the Supreme Court was favored in those matters.

Hence we can only deal with the generalized conclusions and criticisms which appear in the closing portion of the report.

With respect to the interpretation of acts of Congress, the Supreme Court is contending with a well-known phenomenon, legislative ambiguity. I think it enough to say that if the Court has incorrectly divined the legislative intent, correction is within the easy reach of the authors of the ambiguity.

As to its work in the interpretation of the Constitution, we may of course readily disagree. But our disagreement should be tempered by our understanding of the inherent difficulties of the constitutional interpretive process. It would hardly be a justifiable criticism to say the Supreme Court engages in a process of evaluation and judgment. The Constitution does not offer a literal, definitive answer to the awesome problems which confront the Court. One may read the commerce clause, the due process clause, the equal protection clause, a thousand times and still not detect the slightest clue to the proper decision. The answer must be found elsewhere. The constitutional framework, as we all know, is a mere skeleton expression of governmental power and individual rights. The actual contours of those powers and rights must

be determined in the context of changing conditions, by a process which is more than a mere mechanical application of a constitutional phrase to a set of facts.

We may of course disagree with the nine gentlemen at Washington. Lawyers have always disagreed with each other and always will. But while we may register disagreement, we cannot justly impute to members of the Supreme Court anything less than conscientious devotion to duty as they see it.

And hence I disapprove strongly of what to me is the essence of the report—the charge that the Justices of the Supreme Court have violated the duty of judicial self-restraint in constitutional areas, the suggestion that their behavior has been such as to raise considerable doubt that we remain a government of laws and not of men. I have no doubt whatever that the Justices are men of conscience and honor, that they respect the rule of law, that none would set himself above the law or seek to arrogate power or responsibility which he believes is not his.

It is one thing for a judge to say that he disagrees with another; it is something else to impute to that other a violation of the basic standards of judicial behavior. I find no bill of particulars within the report which in my view supports the charge and I know of no facts that would sustain it.

I think it unfortunate that the prestige of the conference of Chief Justices should be placed behind so serious an indictment. I think it unfortunate that there should emanate from this conference a document which will surely be misunderstood and so readily lends itself to misuse by anyone who tilts with the Federal Government. Any man or group of men who choose to place themselves above constituted authority or to flout basic rights as the Supreme Court authoritatively finds them to be, will surely claim comfort and support in the sweeping reflection upon the Supreme Court in the report.

Reduction of Ferry Fare Increases Granted to Erie-Lackawanna-New Jersey & New York Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the township committee of West Milford, N.J., concerning reduction of ferry fares granted to the Erie-Lackawanna-New Jersey & New York lines.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is at present pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, under dockets Nos. 32840 and 32532, applications for the reduction of ferry fare increases granted the Erie-Lackawanna-New Jersey & New York lines; and

Whereas it is to the best interest of citizens of the township of West Milford in the county of Passaic that said ferry fare increase be reduced: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the township committee go on record as petitioning the Interstate Com-

merce Commission by this resolution to grant the reductions requested.
Introduced January 2, 1959.
Approved January 2, 1959.

CHESTER A. PULIA,

Mayor.

Attest:

GEORGE F. ECKHARDT, Jr.,
Township Clerk.

No Double Standard in Code of Ethics— Philadelphia Inquirer Commends Senator Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Inquirer has published a thoughtful editorial about a measure introduced by the junior Senator from New York. It was a personal pleasure for me to read these comments about my long-time colleague. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO DOUBLE STANDARD IN CODE OF ETHICS

Most Congressmen are strong for a code of ethics—for others. They favor regulatory measures to curb influence peddling—so long as they are not included.

That's why we think the move to enact legislation on ethical practices in Government, though badly needed, won't get far in the 86th Congress.

It isn't that the majority of Members of the House and Senate are involved in backstairs deals in favoritism. They just don't like having this sort of law aimed at them.

The newest effort to set up a real Government code of ethics is about to come up for hearings before the House Antitrust Committee. It would apply to all officials and employees in the executive branch and to persons doing business with the Government.

The proposed code would provide for dismissal of Federal employees and cancellation of Government contracts, loans, grants, or permits for violation of its provisions. It is plain that the Bernard Goldfine-Sherman Adams-vicuna coat theme has figured in some of the Committee's deliberations.

But Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, New York Republican, says this isn't enough and we agree with him. He urges legislation barring Congressmen from using their official position to obtain unwarranted privileges or exemptions.

It is right and proper to prohibit influence peddling with the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and all myriad agencies of the Government. Why, then, should not Members of Congress, some of whom have been revealed as parties to influence deals, be included?

As KEATING says, "We cannot afford to take a holier than thou attitude. There should be no double standard in Government morality."

Senator KEATING is exactly right and we hope he sticks to this line. Let us have a code of ethics that covers all the Government agencies and those who do business with them—and, in addition, all Members of House and Senate.

A Commendation of the Texas Board of Education by the Houston Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas Board of Education has approved that State's participation in the new National Defense Education Act program.

The board acted on the recommendation of the Hale-Aikin School Study Committee, which last October reversed an earlier decision, and recommended that Texas participate in the new program. I praised the committee's decision at that time and I now highly praise the action of the board.

I had the privilege of being a co-author of this National Defense Education Act, which provides for loan scholarships, teacher institutes, college fellowships, stepped-up vocational education program and other aids aimed at overcoming America's lag in some educational fields.

From students came sputniks, from education came Explorers. Today's pupils will plan tomorrow's peace.

Mr. President, as a further extension of my remarks, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in one of Texas' finest daily papers, the Houston Post, for Monday, January 12, 1959, under the heading "Defense Education Plan Approved." The Houston Post has served the cause of education well. It has crusaded to improve Houston's public schools; it has supported school lunch and vocational educational programs, and has now endorsed Texas participation under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE EDUCATION PLAN APPROVED

The State board of education has acted wisely in approving participation by Texas in the new National Defense Educational Act program despite personal dislike for Federal aid to education by some members of the board.

The board's action is permissive. The final decision on participation is left to the individual school districts. Those that wish to receive Federal Government aid may do so and those that prefer to do without it are not required to take the proffered money. Congress has authorized the allotment of \$8,893,152 to this State for various phases of the national defense education program.

Jack Binion, Houston attorney, who headed a board committee on Texas' participation, said he thought the Government is trying to do something good for the country through the aid to education program. He commented that he had not noticed the people of the State breaking their necks to raise teachers' salaries or to spend money for educational improvements, although educational improvement is generally favored.

The major fear of those who oppose Federal aid to education is that it may lead to Federal control of education. Binion pointed

out that Texas already is getting Federal aid by the millions and there is no Federal control.

The board's action was in line with its policy of allowing local districts to operate their schools with the least possible State control. For those districts which want the Federal aid, the board will act only as intermediary in obtaining and disbursing it. The money should be of great help to school districts which cannot now afford adequate science courses.

The World Is Adopting America's System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the observation that Russia and other Socialist-type countries have been adopting the American system has been made by many writers in recent years. The ably edited Columbia (S.C.) Record reiterates this in one of its January 30 editorials, entitled "World Is Adopting America's System."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD IS ADOPTING AMERICA'S SYSTEM

Enterprise all over the world is increasing and improving. And most of it is in the pattern of the world's most successful enterprising Nation, the United States of America.

It is virtuous to welcome and commend such progress outside of the United States, but it would be naive and shortsighted to overlook the certainty that this worldwide enterprise will have a strong impact upon our own.

The United States is already finding itself in an international competitive situation which is markedly different from that in which we, for so long, were so much ahead in productive and distributive enterprise. Our competitors were limited to only a few nations, even the best of which rated below us.

Now Arthur Larson, a former White House aid, has written a book on the subject entitled "What We Are For," portions of which appear in the current issue of Fortune magazine.

Mr. Larson has given this world economic awakening a name—enterprise democracy. He says it is being applied even in Soviet Russia, and that in recent years people everywhere "have been moving in the direction of what we are for." Mr. Larson reports an inevitable development of such enterprise in Russia. The Soviet leaders were compelled to adopt private enterprise methods and incentives to increase their lagging production. And he also reports that in the sciences the Russian leadership has found that freedom of thought, ordinarily poison to Communists, is essential.

"Not only freedom of thought," Mr. Larson writes, "but also independent economic power will continue to grow in the Soviet Union. Eventually we may see the crucial combination—substantial economic power joining political power—in the hands of large numbers of individuals with independent ideas, and the ingredients of evolutionary

change toward a freer regime will be at hand."

There is good and bad news in this forecast by Mr. Larson. A joining of the sort of political power which exists in Russia today with increased production could create a force perilous to the whole world. But if Mr. Larson should be right in his prediction that it would mean a beginning for a freer regime, that could conceivably be good news.

In any event, the United States may be facing such competition from the spread of its own process, enterprise democracy, as to have formidable effect in this country.

The race is on, and the most encouraging factor on our side is that our team is deeper and more experienced in the know-how of enterprise democracy.

Even more critical would be some basic change in our system, such as too much nationalization, as to set us back in our own successful formula for enterprise and success. That could possibly mean others would proceed, with our own idea, while we would be denied its full force. Nationalization is the opposite of free enterprise.

The Missile Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial and an article by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post on Monday, February 2, relating to the current missile controversy. Both pieces contain some sharp observations regarding the administration's unrealistic attitude on the missile gap. I ask unanimous consent to have these items printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSILES BY THE NUMBERS

The testimony of Secretary McElroy and other defense officials about the country's missile preparedness would be more impressive if there were not unhappy memories of very similar arguments nearly a decade ago. For budgetary reasons the administration is proposing a missile program that in future numbers will fall far behind the Soviet capability, with the explanation that a balance of delivery methods will assure American superiority. Much of the same sort of case was made for the \$12.5 billion defense budget on the eve of the Korean war.

Now, to be sure, there is a vast difference between a \$12.5 billion budget and the \$41 billion proposed for the next fiscal year. A number of able and sincere men have devoted their energies to weighing the various demands in the budget. They would not consciously sell the country short. Moreover, there is good evidence that American missile development, as contrasted with quantity production, is coming along well, even ahead of schedule. It is reassuring to learn that funds have been released to permit maximum work on the Air Force solid fuel Minuteman—though why this fact could not have been disclosed earlier is an unanswered question.

But fundamentally the defense program remains a big gamble. The validity of the decision to accept a possible 3-1 numerical

lag behind the Soviet Union in intercontinental missiles depends upon the assumption that other means of delivery—intermediate missiles and strategic bombers—would not be neutralized and would be adequate to break through enemy defenses in the event of war. There seems to be a concerted effort to play down intelligence estimates of Soviet capabilities, particularly in intermediate missiles; and there seems to be an accompanying tendency to discount possible improvement of Soviet defenses. Recent history is unfortunately replete with instances in which this country has underestimated the Soviet Union.

Obviously, it would be presumptuous to say that one fixed sum would assure an adequate defense program and that anything short of it would be insufficient. The military power of the United States will be formidable by any analysis. Nevertheless, there is serious question whether a decision not to keep pace with the Soviet Union in certain basic elements of strength—plus the lack of any conspicuous effort to build up limited war forces—might not diminish the effectiveness of the deterrent and invite enemy risk taking in the future.

Some of this apprehension is detectable in the statements of members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Whereas the Chiefs agree that funds are sufficient for the next year, each member seems to have a reservation about the future. The cumulative effect of the failure now to provide for replacement of ships and planes and for modernization of the Army could sap future effectiveness. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that security is being shaped to budgetary edicts instead of the budget being shaped to security requirements.

If the administration were investing heavily in other items related to the overall struggle there might be some justification for added risks in defense. A strong case can be made that, provided that the basic deterrent is maintained, the most pressing challenge is in economic development for the emergent countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But here too budgetary myopia afflicts the program.

The new mutual security report for the first time breaks down economic aid country by country. It emphasizes how pathetically inadequate have been American efforts in areas of the greatest challenge. Yet the administration has been unwilling to ask for long-term capitalization of the Development Loan Fund and has cut back its own recommendations. There is no attempt to ask for even 1 percent of the American gross national product for economic help, although this is a bare minimum. To do less than enough to make possible an economic breakthrough in countries like India is to engage, really, in waste.

It would be wrong to accuse the administration of lack of faith. It has altogether too much faith of the wrong kind—a sort of Micawberish hope that something will turn up and things will come out all right. What is lacking is another kind of faith, faith in the maturity of the American people to accept the hard facts of the challenge and willingness to respond to leadership in approving the measures, including more taxes if necessary, to assure that the country will do what it is capable of doing.

THE McELROY GOSPEL

(By Joseph Alsop)

By studying last week's testimony by the Defense Department leaders as scholars study the Bible, you can now discover the strange mainstays of the Eisenhower administration's decision to accept inferiority to the Soviets in ballistic missiles.

The clue to the mystery lies in budget pressures, plus the great difference between the liquid-fueled missiles the first gen-

eration and the solid-fueled missiles of the next generation.

In brief, liquid-fueled ballistic missiles cannot be kept fully ready to fire. Their minimum reaction time is a quarter of an hour or rather more. Even by maintaining a costly fuel alert, in other words, these missiles cannot be fired within less than 15 minutes of the first warning of the enemy's attack. Because of the same fueling problem, bases for these missiles are also very costly. The expense is further increased by a wide margin, if the bases are "hardened" in order to protect the missiles on their pads against anything but a direct hit.

These characteristics make liquid-fueled IRBM's and ICBM's much more suitable for a nation that can attack first and by surprise, like the Soviet Union, than for a nation like the United States, that has vowed not to attack first. If the necessary money is spent to disperse and "harden" the launching sites, liquid-fueled Atlases and Titans in sufficient quantity can certainly even up the ICBM balance between this country and the Soviet Union. But Atlas and Titan are interim weapons, which will certainly have to be replaced as soon as possible.

The planned replacement is the solid-fueled Minuteman missile. Minuteman will hardly be able to carry as heavy a warhead as the more powerful liquid-fueled Atlas and Titan. But the solid-fueled Minuteman missiles will be cheap to produce in quantity. Having built-in fuel, they will have zero reaction time and their launching sites can even be made mobile, for greater protection.

For the United States, therefore, the second generation of ICBM's is immensely preferable to the first generation, except for one tiny fact. Atlas missiles can be obtained now, and Titan missiles can be obtained soon. Minuteman missiles, in contrast, will hardly be available in operational quantities until 5 years from now, and the delay may be considerably greater than this.

All these facts are so important because the Eisenhower Defense Department has never been able to get used to the idea of disposable weapons. This is certainly odd, in a country that invented the disposable facial tissue, and in a Defense Department reshaped and still dominated by that great man, Charles E. Wilson, who is such a strong advocate of the disposable automobile. Nonetheless, Wilson also rebelled, and his successor, Neil McElroy, still rebels against the basic need to maintain force-in-being by purchasing weapons now that have to be replaced later.

This being the psychology, the Defense Department is buying very few liquid-fueled missiles now, and waiting to buy a lot of solid-fueled missiles later. The result, inevitably, is acceptance of heavy inferiority in missile striking power, at least until the distant date when the Minuteman missile will become available in quantity.

This lighthearted treatment of the missile gap has in turn been justified by two devices which would cost the greatest executive his job, if he used them while still in private business. In the first place, the missile gap has been made to seem very much less dangerous by comfortably downgrading the opposition. To be sure, the comfort of General Motors would not be long-lasting if General Motors' production and pricing policies were based on the belief that the people over at Ford were a bunch of slack-twisted incompetents. But this is the best parallel for the Defense Department method of judging Soviet missile capabilities.

In the second place, the dangers of the missile gap have been further obscured by the simple act of cooking the defense balance sheet. The comparatively useless IRBM's being sent to our NATO allies are counted on the balance sheet as major assets, the far more numerous and immeasurably more useful Soviet IRBM's are not

counted at all; or, if reluctantly mentioned under senatorial pressure, the Soviet IRBM's are not put down on the debit side of the balance sheet. Other examples of this interesting practice might also be cited.

If American newspapers would print something comparable to the grimmest Biblical commentary, chapter and verse could also be cited to prove all the foregoing that may seem incredible. But for present purposes, this is commentary enough on the McElroy gospel. It remains to examine the risk, the allegedly calculated risk to which the McElroy gospel exposes the United States and the free world.

The Mikoyan Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, an article entitled "Facts Spotlight Mikoyan Hoax," written by George E. Sokolsky and published in the New York Journal-American of January 21, 1959.

I have placed this article in the Record as a further means of alerting the American people to be aware of the true aims and purposes of the Soviet propaganda campaigns of which the Mikoyan visit is an open move. The people of the United States need to be made constantly aware of the new Soviet offensive, which the Kremlin boldly states will bring about their control of the world without the need of a hot war or a cold war. I for one do not intend to stand idly by and witness any such eventuality.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FACTS SPOTLIGHT MIKOYAN HOAX

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The Mikoyan hoax is bound to disclose itself because too many persons have willingly become involved in it and therefore it is no longer secret that as far back as last November, the State Department was busily at work softening up small groups on a local level to be nice to Russians. There is also some evidence that Dag Hammarskjöld was interested in the project and one wonders why he would interfere in the internal affairs of the United States or any State or city thereof. Hammarskjöld is an alien here whose job is to run the United Nations which is an institution for speech cultivation situated on the East River in New York City. Beyond that he ought to mind his own business and when it is suggested that he approve or disapprove something in or about the United States, he is not minding his own business and his intervention is not appreciated.

Slowly the evidence is coming to me of the activities to have Americans meet Russians as a softening-up process, undoubtedly part of the people-to-people movement, except that involved were not people but a Russian official and soft-minded businessmen who for an eighth of a buck forget dignity, honor, and the glory of their flag. The Russians must be roaring with laughter at how they can take these people in, particularly those who arrange the special affairs and those who during November and December held

private dinners in quiet places to be let into the secrets of grand diplomacy.

If Joe McCarthy were alive and heading a Senate committee, some of the arrangers of these parties would be summoned to explain their activities, but today, the Russians can play their games and nobody looks askance at improprieties, except perhaps John Foster Dulles who will have to transfer some personalities in the State Department from a soft desk in Washington to Mongolia or Tibet or some other uncomfortable place.

In a word, although we have been led to believe that Anastas Mikoyan came here as a tourist and walked about the streets for a day or two until he was recognized, it is now incontestable that as early as the first fortnight of November, arrangements were already being made to soften up Americans to welcome Russians with whom ordinarily these people do not associate.

WELL-PREPARED FUNCTIONS

The result in New York was seen in well-prepared dinners and luncheons and receptions for Anastas Mikoyan, none of which could have been arranged spontaneously on the scale and magnitude which the city witnessed.

The Economic Club of New York dinner, for instance, was held in the Grand Ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria. The seating list shows about 1,000 diners and gives the tables itemized all except tables 89 and 114 which are for "see information desk," probably for some who do not care for a permanent record of their attendance. The seating list shows who sat at each table, but does not diagram the dais, although that is usual custom. Their names do appear in the alphabetical list.

As I look through this list, I see no names of important public officials but the banks are numerous. For instance, the Bank of America had table 52; Bankers Trust Co., table 6; Hanover Bank, tables 22 and 23; Irving Trust Co., table 43; and so it went. General Dynamics Corp., which sells submarines and airplanes, had a table. There was a table for a Standard Oil Co., but it does not say which one. It could be that these banks and others who were present attend all Economic Club dinners. It could also be that some came out of curiosity to see what an Armenian bank robber become statesman looks like. But it cannot be, in the circumstances prevailing in New York, that this dinner appeared spontaneously without long and painstaking preparations.

It is not the dinner that is important; it is the attempted hoax on the American people that Mikoyan came as a tourist and had no other purpose than to look at his old friend known as Smiling Mike, the Russian Ambassador. That is untrue, and the proof that it is untrue is beginning to take form.

The Welfare Lullaby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are many able editors of smalltown newspapers in South Carolina. One of these, Tom O'Connor, of the Allendale County Citizen, reprinted in his January 30, 1959, edition an editorial written by him 10 years ago, entitled "The Welfare Lullaby." This editorial is even more appropriate today than it was a

decade ago, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE WELFARE LULLABY

(By Tom O'Connor)

There has been a lot of talk lately of security, the protection of the people from want and care all through the days of their living. Plans are extant for systems of governments that promise to do just that. All, say the planners, shall be adequately fed, clothed, and housed, no matter what the circumstance. The fat shall get the same ration as the lean and the rich shall have no more than the poor.

Such systems sound fine on paper, but in practice, where they have been tried, they have led the people down unhappy roads to more want and more care than had been the lot of the sturdy individual pitting his wit and his strength against chance and destiny.

Many persons in this country today give promise of being advocates of such systems. The word security is on many lips, the dream of a life of freedom from the struggle for bread finds many adherents. Most overlook that it is a dream. A thing that fades with the dawn of reality. Most overlook these facts, the longing for security is immature, it is based on impossible premises, actually born in the childish game, "Suppose." With an equal share of everything no one has anything. Most business is founded on personal ambition and initiative, doomed under socialistic and welfare states of being.

With an incentive only to stand quietly in line to get the monthly welfare check, men soon deteriorate and the check is far from enough to supply the simplest wants of most men. What then is, and has been the outcome of these planned states? The answer is aggression. Unable to supply their people with needs for daily existence, the planners have had to reach out to take from others what they cannot provide with the best of plans.

Actually, there is no security. Perhaps Nature intended there should be none. Men are tired of the dog eat dog aspect of life. But until man becomes a creature far different from what he is today, the game of "Suppose" can best be left to the nursery, where the dreamers, with a certain sharp sense of reality, content themselves with what is at hand.

Until the day when man's material wants can be met without the aid of the plowshare, the lathe and the loom, and the saw, it should be the aim of man to better himself against the future betterment of his lot.

The social planners sing a lullaby, such as the wee ones sing when the day grows old and the comforting bottle is at hand. It suffices for a while but even the children will be up and doing on the morrow. So, pray, shall we all.

Education and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Admiral Rickover, who has already played an outstanding part in strengthening our

national defense, is now making a provocative contribution to the debate over the adequacy of our Nation's educational effort.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of Adm. H. G. Rickover's book, "Education and Freedom," by Arthur Bestor. This review appeared on page 1 of the New York Times Book Review of February 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW SHOULD WE RETOOL OUR SCHOOLS?—A HISTORIAN AGREES WITH ADMIRAL RICKOVER'S PROPOSALS

(By Arthur Bestor)

The problems of the world—today, our problems—will tomorrow be our children's problems. Are we equipping the younger generation to deal effectively with them? This is the central question in education—a perennial question, which every adult generation must, in a sense, answer anew, taking into account the changes that may have occurred in the nature of the world's problems.

In the great debate now going on over the adequacy of American education, both sides take off from this same starting point. Defenders and critics unite in believing that the public schools should prepare young men and women for the world in which they are going to live. The debate is over the kind of education that will do the job. Parents and citizens should keep the central issue in mind, for efforts are frequently made to obscure it.

Professional educationists in the United States often claim to be the only group interested in preparing young people for contemporary life, and they accuse their scientific and academic critics of wishing to turn back the clock. This completely misrepresents the position of those who are anxious to reemphasize intellectual discipline in the public schools. One of the most distinguished spokesmen for the latter point of view, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, states the matter with complete clarity in his latest book, "Education and Freedom." Through "bitter disappointment," he writes, we have come "to the realization that America's predominant educational philosophy is as hopelessly outdated today as the horse and buggy."

The educational philosophy that Admiral Rickover considers outdated is the one that takes life adjustment for its central aim. The result, he charges, is substitution of know-how subjects for solid learning and the widespread tendency of schools to instruct pupils in the minutiae of daily life. His own alternative is concisely stated: "English, foreign languages, mathematics, sciences, history, geography—these are the subjects which must be mastered. They are the intellectual tools that enable us . . . to understand the complexities of today's tense and uncertain world. Those who do not have the mentality to master all these subjects need the same kind of intellectual fare, only less of it."

The issue is squarely joined. How completely opposite the two positions are can be neatly shown by a single sentence that Admiral Rickover quotes from an educationist source. The sentence describes a situation that Admiral Rickover would obviously consider sound. In actual fact, the sentence appears in a pamphlet published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association as a description of the situation which that association prides itself on having helped to destroy: "Physicists wrote the text on physics; literature was selected and interpreted for high school pupils by college professors; mathematicians decided on the order

and content of arithmetic texts; and so the experts dominated the content of the curriculum."

The question, be it remembered, is which kind of education will best prepare young men and women for the task of the immediate, foreseeable future. Professional educationists argue that they alone are competent to answer the question. They insist that no one but an expert in pedagogy possesses the kind of information and experience necessary to reach a sound judgment. The arrogance of this argument is bad enough, but what destroys it utterly is its manifest illogicality.

Who, after all, is an expert on the nature of the intellectual problems that are posed by the technological world of today and tomorrow? Is it the professor of education, employed to teach teachers how to teach, and perhaps engaged in research on the ways of adolescents? Or is it the scientist constantly engaged in solving the problems that arise along the advancing frontiers of knowledge of the professional man, actively applying new ideas to practical affairs? Merely to ask the question is to wipe out the educationist's claim to expertise on the question before us.

No one is better qualified than Admiral Rickover to assess the intellectual demands that the future is certain to make, for his pioneer work on nuclear powerplants for the Navy has brought part of the future into actual being. Generalizing from his experience in these development projects (including that which produced the *Nautilus*), he writes: "Whatever the world of tomorrow may turn out to be, one thing is certain. Greater mental effort will be required of all mankind." Military considerations are not necessarily uppermost in the author's mind. Some of his most telling passages picture the need for a prompt and intensive technological effort to stave off the collapse of civilization through exhaustion of fuels, metals, and other natural resources.

Given the intellectual needs of contemporary society, Admiral Rickover reaches the conclusion (inescapable to this reviewer's way of thinking) that the first duty of American schools is to develop in all children—talented, average, and below average—the highest level of intellectual competence of which they are capable. The author intends every word to be taken literally. He believes that even below-average students are capable of far greater intellectual effort than American schools usually call upon them to make, and he proves the point by citing the achievements of pupils of like ability in Russia and other countries.

Though defenders of the educational status quo will no doubt call this a book of negative criticism, it is, in fact, crowded with positive suggestions, attesting Admiral Rickover's sincere and intelligent concern with the improvement of American schools. Almost the first of his specific suggestions, one should note, is phrased as follows: "An immediate step in solving our educational problem is to increase [teachers'] salaries drastically."

Of most concern to him is the education of the talented, because the waste of their abilities exposes the Nation to the most direct and immediate danger. A rigorous program in the basic intellectual disciplines, with a minimum of electives and a maximum of continuity, is his prescription for the top 15 or 20 percent of the population in intellectual ability. Special accelerated tracks for these students in the high schools he considers indispensable. And in his most publicized proposal he urges the setting up of 25 demonstration high schools throughout the country to show the acceleration possible for talented students under subject-trained teachers in a strictly academic environment with a lengthened school year.

Such an experiment might well be a *Nautilus* for American education.

The Best Is Yet To Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a broadcast made by Joyce Roberts, the public relations director of the pineapple companies of Hawaii, over the Aloha Broadcasting System in Hawaii. I do so, Mr. President, for the reason that the script contains some very excellent excerpts from an article entitled "The Best Is Yet To Be" prepared as a guest editorial in the Hartford (Conn.) Times by Mr. Sam Pryor, the distinguished vice president and assistant to the president of Pan American Airways. Many of my colleagues know Mr. Pryor because of his distinguished achievements in aviation and also as a former Republican national committeeman from the State of Connecticut.

I hope that Senators will take the time to read Mr. Pryor's comments about the constructive approach rather than what I have constantly decried as the derogatory approach to the potential of America in its progress under this administration.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BEST IS YET TO BE

(By Joyce Roberts)

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. This is Joyce Roberts speaking.

Do you sometimes find yourself wondering a bit about this land of ours—these United States of America—and her future, and our future, in this troubled world?

Do you sometimes wonder if maybe this dream of freedom come true—if maybe this dream of freedom come true is going to disappear as a dream, after all—and not continue as the new and real revolutionary way of life that it has been for nearly 200 years?

It would not be surprising if you did sometimes wonder, for if we would listen only to all the attacks made on us, on our country and its leaders and institutions and on our many groups of people, we might get to thinking that nothing is right, and everything is wrong.

From without, there are those who attack our system of government, our prosperity, our good intentions toward other peoples.

From within, there are those who also attack our system of government, who would destroy confidence in our courts and system of justice, and would undermine our own confidence in our own Government.

And even within the great and overwhelming majority of Americans who have unquestioned allegiance to this idea we call America, even within this group we hear charges and countercharges that might lead one to ask, Where is the unity of purpose and ideals that any people must have for growth and progress?

Is labor a reckless force whose growing power is to be feared, and whose leaders are not to be trusted?

Is management, are business leaders, as shortsighted and selfish and opposed to social progress as some labor leaders charge?

Are all public officials and would-be public officials either so poorly equipped or so morally weak that we can neither expect any-

thing from them nor place any hope in our future?

During these times when we as a people are faced with a challenge of world leadership unknown in history, and our shortcomings at home and abroad are so magnified by election-year oratory that it may seem there is nothing good, it might be a good idea to stop a moment to look at the other side of things.

And this is what a recent visitor to Honolulu did in one of the finest brief articles we have read for some time—a short article entitled "The Best Is Yet To Be"—written by Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., a national and international leader in aviation. Mr. Pryor is vice president, assistant to the President and a director of Pan American World Airways, as well as a director of several other large American corporations—and incidentally he is also a director of the Boys Club of America.

A former Republican national committee-man from Connecticut, Mr. Pryor was in charge of Wendell Willkie's eastern headquarters during the 1940 presidential campaign.

On his return from a business trip for Pan American to Australia, Tahiti and Fiji last month, Mr. Pryor stopped in Honolulu at which time this article, "The Best Is Yet To Be" was reprinted by the Honolulu Advertiser following its original appearance as a guest editorial in the Hartford (Conn.) Times.

And here is why Mr. Pryor says, the best is yet to be.

And now we are quoting Mr. Pryor.

"When I was a student at Yale, William Lyon (Billy) Phelps, the great professor of English literature, was of world prominence.

"Billy's cardinal philosophy was best expressed in the words of his favorite poet, Robert Browning—'The Best Is Yet To Be,' which very words happen to be on the sundial in my garden," says Mr. Pryor.

"If Billy were here today," he writes, "I am confident he would again look optimistically into the future and repeat those words.

"Never at any time in our history was there a greater truth. Never before has any civilization enjoyed the blessings and the standard of living which are now so synonymous with America.

"My business, continues Mr. Pryor, taking me into 67 countries of the world, allows me to see this at first hand with my open eyes.

"The future holds so much more for all of us, if only all of us can realize that we have in our power to create—if only all of us will recognize that the cries of a defeatist's economy—the preachings of the gospel that America is finished—are the voices of false prophets.

"Recently a group of economists—noted Mr. Pryor—gathered together and took a conservative look at what America can be like 10 years from today.

"Here are some of the things they say can happen:

"America will have a population of 175 million people—14 percent higher than in 1951.

"There will be over 67 million people in our labor force—an increase of more than 3 million people over 1951.

"America will produce goods and services worth \$380 millions—16 percent higher than in 1951.

"Consumers will spend around \$255 billions, up \$50 billions over 1951.

"Business will spend about \$27 billion to improve its plants, its products, and its services, \$4 billions more than in 1951.

"And—continued these economists—the average man will work about 40 hours a week, as compared with 44 hours in 1951—depending on how much money is invested in new tools for him, how well he uses them, and how much incentive he is given to use them well.

"The output per man-hour can be worth \$2.70, in contrast to \$2.24 in 1951.

"Concluded these economists, Americans may have disposable personal income, after providing for the necessities of life, of \$260 billions, as against \$233 billions in 1951.

"Then," continued Mr. Pryor, "from my own knowledge of international air travel, I predict that with the reduced fares the number of Americans going abroad will double shortly. They now number 2 million. By 1962 international air travel time will be cut in half. For example, London will be but 6 hours from New York. With more world travel will come more world understanding.

"On every side," continued Mr. Pryor, "pessimists are being disproven, as the industrial and labor teams of America works new miracles. We are told that there is almost no lid to the growth of the fabulous chemical industry, that new fibers will completely revolutionize the textile industry, that the use of byproducts of oils has barely scratched the surface, and that equally staggering growths can be expected in the fields of medicine, electricity, metals, transportation, and food, to mention only a few.

"What all of this can mean to human happiness is staggering to contemplate," says Mr. Pryor.

"But a big element in realizing this vision still remains. It is not material. It is spiritual.

"It is not whether America has the sense and the courage and the foresight to do this job.

"The question is, Do we have charity toward and understanding of our fellow man?

"Let's realize that we are not members of separate teams, but one team.

"Let's realize that you and I can't do it alone—that America has enough for all of us.

"If we increase our productivity, keep ourselves informed, maintain our Defense Establishment, and exercise our franchise to vote, we will preserve our two-party system, our American form of government, the finest Government on earth, and can look with confidence to the future.

"Instead of saying, 'Down with labor. Down with management. Down with the farmer. Down with everyone who doesn't see it my way,' let's try:

"Up with labor.

"Up with management.

"Up with the farmer.

"Up with everybody who wants to help build a happier country.

"Up America.

"The best is yet to be."

So concluded Samuel Pryor.

Yes, never before has any civilization enjoyed the blessings and standards of living which are now so synonymous with America and so much a part of us.

And yet, as Mr. Pryor says, if we will but realize this, and realize, too, that we are not members of separate teams, but of one team, and say, "Up with everybody who wants to help build a happier country," then the best is yet to be.

This is Joyce Roberts speaking. Good-night.

The Need for Moral Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, columnist Constantine Brown, in the January 30 edition of the Evening Star,

and our own Senate Chaplain, Dr. Fredrick Brown Harris, in the February 1 edition of the Sunday Star, discuss the need for moral strength at this time. These two columns are worthy of the consideration of all leaders in Government, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brown's column, entitled "When Moral Strength Counts" and Dr. Harris' article "The Moral Thermometer" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN MORAL STRENGTH COUNTS—BELIEF IN RIGHT CAUSE AND WILL TO RESIST HELD CRUCIAL WEAPONS AGAINST ENEMY

(By Constantine Brown)

Politicians and technicians who gauge the capabilities of this country against a Soviet onslaught are talking in terms of how many of this and that America has as compared to Russian and how many of that this the Bolsheviks have in contrast to the United States.

Facts and figures are produced for news-eager people, indicating that in some phases of armament we are far ahead of our enemies, while in others we are well behind. But nobody—despite the existence of a great bureaucracy in the psychological warfare divisions—is willing to point out that moral stamina, the conviction of a whole people that they are fighting a worthy cause, has anything to do with final victory, either in a conventional or nuclear war.

The governments which initiated the last two world wars suffered crushing ultimate defeat despite their enormous military and technical superiority. The German military machine in World War I was far better than that of the allies. So were most of the German military leaders. Yet ultimately the German armies were crushed because the Western allies, backed by American intervention in 1917, had enough moral stamina to continue the fight until the aggressor was defeated.

The Nazi forces in World War II were so much better trained, equipped and inspired to establish the millennium that it appeared to superficial observers after the fall of France that a quick victory was inevitable. The collapse of France was not due, however, to the Nazi tanks and Stukas, but principally to the education the French people had received in the three years before the outbreak of hostilities that the Nazi armies were unbeatable.

France's fall was due also to the Communist subversive elements in the French forces (before the fall of France, Stalin was Hitler's ally) which created confusion and panic in the ranks. Another contributory factor was that a number of officials in sensitive positions were either Communists or fringe Communists. One of these was Pierre Cot, Minister of Air, who managed to give France only five planes a month when the Germans were producing several hundred. And lastly, the weak governments which had succeeded each other since 1934 had become soft on nazism and actually believed it was possible to coexist with Hitler.

France, too, enjoyed a Mikoyan visit from Nazi Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, who was wine and dined by the French Government and French industrialists who were anxious to enter into partnership with the big German industries. No wonder that France collapsed from lack of stamina rather than the blows of Hermann Goering's air armadas.

The air attacks against the British Isles were far more disastrous and costly than those against France. They continued without interruption day and night for many months. But the British were morally better prepared to withstand Hitler's attacks. Brit-

ish politicians, too, had made the fatal error of believing in coexistence with dictators. And Britain had been caught napping and was not prepared to defend herself. But the Communist infiltration before the war was negligible. The people believed in national honor (regarded as jingoistic trash by the increasing number of crytobliberals all over the world) and put up a desperate resistance when everybody believed they would have to surrender.

In 1950 the South Korean armies showed what stamina means in resisting aggression. They were practically annihilated in the early stages of the Communist attack. They were reorganized, and after we equipped them the Korean fighters became as good as our own veterans of the last war, while the people themselves stood unflinchingly the brunt of hardships.

The American people have been served large doses of figures about how far advanced the Russians are in rocketry. They are told daily about devastations which a Soviet onslaught would inflict on this country. And they are told by Khrushchev and Mikoyan as well as Americans awed by these two characters that coexistence on Moscow's terms is preferable to resistance. But few remember that it takes more than the latest destructive weapons to destroy peoples whose fiber has not been weakened.

THE MORAL THERMOMETER

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

George Washington warned that morality cannot be maintained without a genuine religion.

Morality is the fair flower of religious convictions and experiences. But there is a great gulf between what has been called "churchianity" and Christianity. Long ago Mark Rutherford had that difference in mind when he referred thus to a certain man, "Oh he is a miserable cur; for 40 years he has attended church regularly until he thinks that church going is everything and meanness is nothing." By "meanness" he meant practices in the realm of common decency which violated accepted moral standards.

A great deal of so-called discussion about religion these days has to do with churchianity rather than Christianity. There is, of course, much in present-day church statistics at which we rejoice, but the vital question growing out of the reported church prosperity is what is it doing to raise the moral temperature outside the church. The fact is, that while the church thermometer is on the rise, the moral thermometer is dropping. Certainly it takes no alarmist to point to the gang wars on the streets of our great cities, lighting up the awful problem of juvenile delinquency which only accentuates parental delinquency and the tragic breakup of the American home; the really appalling increase in consumption of beverage alcohol with the frightening personal catastrophes to which any preacher or social worker can testify, to say nothing of the colossal cost in loss of life and crime. All this seems to be more and more accepted as a part of American life, poisoning every aspect of it, and this at the very time that Russia, seeing the danger, is using its regimented authority to discourage such excessive drinking.

Then, there is the unbelievable condition revealed by gangster control of certain crucial labor organizations, as unscrupulous leaders feather their own nests from the dues of the tolling millions and threaten to control the Nation's transportation arteries by underworld methods.

A national radio program holds up in lurid

light the alleged growing practice of utilizing sex, and the degradation of womanhood, as an allurements to clinch business deals. And now an actress, having publicly torn to shreds her marriage vows, is given a star role in a picture with "happiness" in its title. Thus is this woman featured as a movie queen, glorified for teen-agers as fit to entertain the American public. So low sinks the moral thermometer in these times when the survival of our way of life is at stake. The list of degradations could go on and on.

But not only in these flagrant examples of the breakdown and the breakthrough of moral bulwarks, but in the ordinary practice of many, in the day-to-day transactions with their neighbors, there are unmistakable evidences of moral sag. Said a prominent lawyer recently in a luncheon conversation: "I find that things have come to such a pass that nowadays when you remind people that what they are doing is not exactly ethical by the old standards, they simply shrug their shoulders and reply, 'Well, by those old rules perhaps what I am doing may not be morally correct, but it's legally right, so what.'"

And so a lack of personal honor has seeped into public life, commercial life, even sports life, to a degree that is ominously disturbing. The primary consideration is, can I get away with this? Rather than, is it right?

A recent article in a nationally read magazine had for its caption, "Are We Becoming a Nation of Chiselers?" The chiseler is one who studies the rules, not to follow them but to dodge them. The chiseler's guide is not conscience—it is anything he can get away with.

In the colleges today are those who will soon be at the wheel of American business life. By what standards are they running their lives now? A recent survey at the University of Pennsylvania showed that 40 percent of the undergraduates freely admit to frequent cheating. The surveyors noted that these chiselers often admitted it with no apology or sense of wrongdoing. In a western university a 21-year-old coed argued that the sort of cheating which is dubbed "cribbing" is simply "collaborating."

The annual cost of shop-lifting in America is pretty close to a billion dollars. Eighty percent of these thieving operators are not professionals, just light-fingered mothers and sisters out of decent homes.

America with its sagging morals needs to listen most to a wise prophet of old who formulated a timeless principle. He enunciated a law which is as valid for our towering-skyscraper age as it was for that ancient nomadic tent-drawing day. That law of the tent is, when you lengthen the cords you must strengthen the stakes. If you neglect this procedure you are heading for calamity, catastrophe and collapse. It is impossible to go on majoring in length if you forget the correspondingly vital matter of strength.

With the supporting stakes of our glittering civilization bending and breaking, the chief danger to America grows out of a pathetic and tragic trust in length without strength, in goods without good, in commercial maneuvers rather than in ethical sanctities. That is the danger to which Edna St. Vincent Millay points with alarm as she saw the tremendous energy of this dynamic day constantly pulling the straining ropes out to wider expanses as the moral thermometer was going down. Here are her warning lines:

"Above the world is stretched the sky,
No higher than the soul is high.

And he, whose soul is flat—the sky
Will cave in on him by and by."

Mikoyan's Espionage Into Our Industries During World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "How Mikoyan Got U.S. Secrets," written by George Todt, and published in the Valley Times, San Fernando Valley, Calif., of Saturday, January 24, 1959.

Mr. Todt discloses many revealing facts about Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan's days during World II as chief of Soviet espionage into our war industries. I found this well-written commentary to be so informative that I have asked that it be printed in the RECORD as an additional means of bringing it to the attention of the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MIKOYAN GOT U.S. SECRETS

(By George Todt)

"The advanced state of Soviet technology today is due more to Soviet success in espionage than it is due to their apparatus, good as it is." (Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, Chief, Army Research and Development, 1958.)

Actually, one of Comrade Anastas I. Mikoyan's chief duties during World War II was to serve as chief of Soviet espionage into our war industries.

His main spy headquarters was located in Washington. It was called the Soviet Purchasing Commission.

Some years after the war had ended, a former member of SPC—Victor Kravchenko—gave some pertinent testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Here is what he said, in part:

"The Soviet Purchasing Commission during the war had more than 1,000 employees. Some of them came to the United States as simple engineers, but in reality they were in top positions in industry or in scientific research. Some came as civilians, but really they were officers of the navy or artillery or tank troops or the air force. . . . On the seventh floor of the SPC, behind the iron door at 3355 16th Street . . . there was a special department of the NKVD. . . ."

Kravchenko told of one order from Mikoyan in 1943 which stated, "that we had to find out all secret information about industrial development in the United States, and especially the military industry."

These boys, under the present Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, did right well at their job, too. For Mikoyan was the Russian counterpart of our own (?) Harry Hopkins, and apparently these gentlemen had a thriving partnership arrangement that really flourished—at least for Moscow.

This might have never come out except for the fact that an American major named George Racey Jordan got nosy one day and pried into supposedly immune Red diplomatic pouches inside some airplanes which our pilots were ferrying to Alaska, there to be picked up by Russian pilots and continued on their Eurasian journey.

What Jordan discovered when he sneaked a look at the Red loot made him start talking to himself. Included was a letter in

longhand from Hopkins to Mikoyan, formulas for the atom bomb, and materials for its manufacture. His subsequent protests to Washington went unheeded.

One well-known atomic authority, Dr. Medford Evans, said:

"It is possible that U²³⁵ and plutonium, the nuclear components of the atomic bomb, have been systematically diverted from Oak Ridge, Hanford, and Los Alamos in sufficient quantities to charge perhaps 20 atomic bombs."

All of which gives us some small idea of just how effective Comrade Mikoyan was when he was here in our country before.

In fact, he was so outrageously successful in obtaining any and all of our secrets he wanted, including the atom bomb, that a new light has been thrown upon nuclear scientist Robert J. Oppenheimer's reluctance to help in the creation of the even more deadlier hydrogen bomb.

What Dr. Oppenheimer told the Atomic Energy Commission's Personnel Security Board in 1954 was essentially this: If we built a hydrogen bomb, Russia would build one—but if we did not build the thermonuclear device, the Russians would not construct it, either.

Essentially, Dr. Oppenheimer may have been implying that the Reds couldn't steal from us what we did not make; and that if we didn't make a hydrogen bomb, the Reds wouldn't have a model to steal away from us for later mass production purposes.

If this was the way that Dr. Oppenheimer figured it, he may very well have been right.

There is more and more evidence being uncovered which amply demonstrates that the Russian scientists have been wizards at copying the work of others—but with very few scientific firsts of their own.

Their best agent in the securing of our most priceless industrial and military secrets has been—Anastas I. Mikoyan, who is only one notch removed on the Red totem pole from "Mr. Big," himself. He is a very competent and efficient Bolshevik workman.

Some day he might even become the Soviet Union's headman. Who knows?

The Greatness of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of a sermon entitled "The Greatness of Lincoln," delivered by Rev. Richard S. Emrich, Bishop of Michigan, in the Washington Cathedral on January 11, 1959, in connection with the Lincoln sesquicentennial celebration.

The sermon—learned, eloquent, and moving—was preached at a special service in Washington Cathedral inaugurating the Lincoln sesquicentennial celebration. The service, in which the Bishop of Washington participated, was attended by the Vice President of the United States, Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON, members of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, and a large congregation.

Hon. Ralph Bunch and the senior Senator from Kentucky, members of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, read the Scripture lesson for the service.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE GREATNESS OF LINCOLN: A SERMON BY RICHARD S. EMRICH, BISHOP OF MICHIGAN, PREACHED IN THE WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL, JANUARY 11, 1959, IN CONNECTION WITH THE LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

My friends, I count it one of the privileges of my life to speak to you on this occasion. I do not know any more about Abraham Lincoln than most of you here, and I know far less than some of you; but I will affirm that I love the man, and that wisdom and the grace of God have come to me through him.

Our text is the well-known statement of our Lord, "By their fruits shall ye know them."

It is common knowledge that when one stands too close to a mountain range, one cannot see which mountain is the highest and towers above the rest. It is only at a distance that a true perspective is gained, and the great peak can be distinguished from the foothills. So it was that some who lived close to Lincoln could not see his greatness, and failed to see which speech was great at Gettysburg. So it is that we, 150 years after his birth, are able to see that no American is greater; that he was the grandest figure on the crowded canvas of the 19th century; that he represents the America we love as does no other man; that he abides and grows greater with the years; that there was in his simple figure an Olympian quality, a nobility and a grandeur; that he was of God; that it is fitting and proper his kneeling statue should be in this cathedral; and that all of this greatness is revealed in the mood approaching religious awe which we feel when we visit his memorial. One hundred and fifty years since his birth, and the outline of his figure, towering above his contemporaries, becomes clearer with the distance.

As preparation for this occasion I read with care his letters and addresses, trying to enter his mind and spirit that I might see his greatness from within and in some small manner understand it. The purpose of this address, and I hope of the whole sesquicentennial celebration, is that we may so understand him that something of his greatness will rub off onto our poorer natures.

There are, of course, some aspects of his figure which we will never understand, and at which we can only wonder. Trying to understand his strange combination of sorrow and jest, of loneliness and wit, is like gazing into a great forest: you can see so far, and then there is hidden mystery. Or how was it, to take another example, that in the midst of an age in which histrionic and florid oratory was the style, a man arose—with 1 year of formal schooling, poor, self-taught—who used language as clean, chaste, and a simple expression of his thought? From what mysterious spring did he drink that he would not, could not, fit into the oratorical pattern of his day? And how was it that he who did not strive for beauty yet achieved it? We can never comprehend him, grasp him, wrap him up in a neat package; but we can from his writings see the broad outline of his greatness.

But, it is not enough to say that he was wise, moderate, merciful, forgiving, humane, a thinker of the first rank, and because of all these virtues the savior of the Union. We must try to go deeper than that, into the fabric of his mind and spirit, to see why he was these things. He looked at the world in a certain way; he reasoned in a certain manner; and then from the basic unity of his person the specific virtues arose. Great character is not a series of disconnected virtues—like a picket fence—but the great trunk of a tree that organically spreads out its strong branches.

Why was he so great? Why does the poet say that his deep spirit broods over this Nation? Why, a few short years, after the most bitter of partisan struggles, was he accepted as a nonpartisan and unifying figure? Let me share with you my poor analysis, in which I have been helped by other men, and ask that you continue it in your own thoughts.

I

First, we live in a world where men tend to have their thoughts determined by their immediate interests and surroundings. They are white and think white, rich and think rich, easterners and think eastern. The tragedy of history is not simply that men are prone to obvious evil, but that they put their virtues and nobility at the service of their party or little group. Their virtues serve a limited perspective and a parochial imagination. How few Russians there are, for example, who are able to see the aspirations, interests, and fears of America—and vice versa? The result of this is enormous group egos that clash self-righteously with each other.

But occasionally, very occasionally, there appears a man like Lincoln, who mysteriously rises above background, self-interest, and even his age to think and speak for all men. He viewed the world in the deepest perspective, and had constantly about him the Olympian outlook. (See Richard Weaver, "The Ethics of Rhetoric.") The Lincoln Memorial catches this; but you can see it also in his photographs with their homely grandeur and the faraway look in the eyes.

But most of all we can see this grand perspective in what Lord Charnwood calls the "arresting and simple beauty" of his language. "Fourscore and 7 years ago our fathers"—the faraway look back across the long years to the founding of the Nation. He deals with the Founding Fathers systematically and at length in the Cooper Union address that, knowing where they came from, his listeners may know where they are. Some men were violently from Massachusetts or South Carolina, but Lincoln had to say "brought forth on this continent" with a great sweep of thought. And then in the same address there is the faraway look into the future, "The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here." Or again with the great perspective, "I shall do nothing in malice. What I deal with is too vast for malicious dealing." Or again, with the Olympian outlook above section or partisanship, "In the present Civil War it is quite possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party." Or, again, the great inclusive view, "As I have not felt, so I have not expressed any harsh sentiment toward our southern brethren. I have constantly declared, as I really believed, the only difference between them and us is the difference of circumstances." Or, again, going beyond America he states the meaning of America for all history and time, "... that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time."

It was from this perspective that the other virtues came. This is the trunk, and the other virtues are the branches; for, if you have a true and great perspective, you know that you are only one actor in a vast drama—and humility is born. And, knowing the greatness of the cause and feeling the travail of a whole continent, you are willing to bear suffering and apologize if only the great cause may go forward. On October 24, 1862, he wrote to General McClellan with very human irritation, "I have just read your dispatch about sore-tongued and fatigued horses. Will you pardon me for asking what the horses of your army have done since the Battle of Antietam that fatigued

anything?" That is a temper like yours and mine. But 3 days later the great perspective rises again. Yours of yesterday received," he writes to McClellan. "Most certainly I intend no injustice to any; and, if I have done any, I deeply regret it."

II

Second, there was something truly remarkable about his method of reasoning. We all know that this self-educated man went deeper than most men, and that after a century much of what he said is still strangely fresh. Why is it, as Richard Weaver says, that he is more quoted than the more intellectual Jefferson or the academic Wilson? What can we learn about his method of reasoning?

Well, he was not corrupted by the modern advertising assumption that the average mental age is 12 years, or by a trust in promotional tricks that make all things trivial. He respected the people, and, as Herndon said, would not think of cheating a man out of his vote any more than he would cheat him out of his money. For his own sake and for his hearers he liked to boil a matter down to a terse statement. "I could not sleep, although I tried to, when I got on such a hunt for an idea until I had caught it; and when I thought I had got it, I was not satisfied until I had repeated it over and over again until I had put it in plain language enough, as I thought, for any boy I knew to comprehend. This was a kind of passion with me." Herndon says that his opponents were afraid of his condensation. This means that Lincoln never threw a battery of arguments at people, like a scattering shotgun. He went to the essence of the matter; or, as he said, he liked to come at a question like a surveyor, from the north, south, east, and west until he had focused on it. And then this essence was passed on to the people. "We won't break up the Union, and you shan't." " . . . of the people, by the people, and for the people." " . . . to do the right as God gives us to see the right." "Slavery is a violation of eternal right. We have temporized with it from the necessities of our condition; but as sure as God reigns and schoolchildren read, that black foul lie can never be consecrated into God's hallowed truth." These essences of a clear mind soaked down into the public consciousness until he was able to carry the people with him. He was, says Lord Charnwood, "free from ambiguity of thought or faltering of will."

But Herndon says another thing that brings us still closer to the secret of his power, and reveals the effect of his speaking. "All opponents dreaded his originality of idea, his condensation, definition, and force of expression; and woe to the man who hugged to his bosom a secret error if Lincoln got on the chase of it." Or again, "He was the strongest man I ever saw, looking at him from the standpoint of reason and logic. He came down from that height with irresistible and crashing force." Why? Well, partly the condensation we have already mentioned, but more profoundly the fact that he based his arguments on a definition of the nature of man, the nature of government, the nature of a nation, the nature of the war. This is why we quote him.

If you argue from expediency, your words will disappear in the sand; for the circumstances, upon which your expediency is based, will change. You will be clever, but not necessarily wise. But if you argue from the nature of man, from definition, your words will remain; because human nature does not change. Definition implies a general view which goes beyond the immediate circumstances. Definition requires courage, for you have committed yourself. Definition, based upon the nature of man, is reverent reasoning; for you are asserting the given fact, the final fact, the grain of the universe. So, slavery is attacked at dead center as contrary to the grain of the universe, corrupting the

nature of the slave and the slaveholder. The facts of human nature, he believed, could be observed. It is God's decree which can never be reversed.

Is free government strong enough to survive, or must it always be smashed by a minority?—That was the basic question about the nature of free government which was being tested by the war. Or how, with the Father of Waters flowing through the middle of this Nation, do you divide it north and south? The nature of a continent, the nature of man, the nature of government, the defined nature of the war. And because he went in his reasoning to the one essential fact as distinguished from the peripheral and secondary, because he went to the argument behind which there is no other argument, his words endure. And some of them came out with thunder and finality. As Lord Charnwood said, he learned to reason with Euclid and to feel and speak with the authors of the Bible.

III

Finally, we consider the mystery of his religious stature which includes, of course, all we have said so far. This mystery is simply that of his total person. Formal education is good and necessary, but he was wise and profound without a formal education. Church membership with its means and Grace and nurturing fellowship is good and necessary, but he was a saint in politics and a man of God without Church membership. Just as in a lonely way he educated himself, so in a lonely way by reading the Scriptures and by profound meditation he nurtured his soul. "By their fruits shall ye know them"; and his good fruits reveal he was a good tree. If any man, freed from self, seeks the common good, he is a converted man, said William Temple—by that test he was a converted man. As a young man he was a sceptic, but the trials of his life drove him to God. He became a prophet bearing God's righteous and reconciling word to his people. While the church is as necessary for mankind as is the school, we must always recognize that "The wind bloweth where it listeth," and not try to domesticate the Almighty. We must, at the same time, recognize that in church attendance and Bible reading he did receive the water of life.

I first sensed his tremendous religious stature when his life helped to open up for me the meaning of the Beatitudes, which Senator Cooper read in the second lesson this afternoon. "Blessed are the merciful": kindness and mercy were in the fabric of his being. "Blessed are they who do hunger and thirst after righteousness"—"Beyond and above all skill, says the editor of a great newspaper who heard him at Peoria, "was the overwhelming conviction imposed upon the audience that the speaker was charged with an irresistible and inspiring duty to his fellow-men."

"Blessed are the pure in heart": purity of heart is, apart from selfishness, to will one thing, that God's will be done and the good of all the people be served. "Blessed are the peacemakers". "Blessed are ye when men shall revile and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake". "Blessed are the poor in spirit," for, knowing their own need, and not arrogant in spirit, they turn to God in their need. "Blessed are they that mourn"; if you truly love men, you must mourn when they die in battle. Sorrow is the other side of the coin of love.

"Blessed are the meek"; meekness is the opposite of self-centered pushiness. It is to be so centered in God's great purposes that one's own little ego is out of the picture. Lincoln refused to be angry when McClellan snubbed him, even insulted him. He wrote to General Grant, " . . . When you got below and took Fort Gibson, Grand Gulf, and vicinity, I thought you should go down the river and join General Banks, and when

you turned northward, east of the Big Black, I feared it was a mistake. I now wish to make the personal acknowledgment that you were right and I was wrong. Sincerely, Abraham Lincoln." "Blessed are the meek."

Before closing with three passages in which we will listen to Lincoln's own words, consider this description of how it appeared to those who heard him. "As soon as he lost thought of himself in his subject his voice and manner changed; deeper notes, of which friends record the beauty, rang out, the sad eyes kindled, and the tall, gaunt figure with the strange gesture of the long, uplifted arms, acquired even a certain majesty."

1. He said about a Negro slave, "In some things she is certainly not my equal, but in her natural right to eat the bread that she has earned with the sweat of her brow, she is my equal, and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of any man."

2. He said, "I know there is a God, and that he hates injustice and slavery. I see the storm coming, and I know that His hand is in it. If He has a place and work for me—and I think He has—I believe I am ready. I am nothing, but truth is everything. I know I am right because I know that liberty is right, for Christ teaches it, and Christ is God. I have told them that a house divided against itself cannot stand, and Christ and reason say the same; and they will find it so. Douglas don't care whether slavery is voted up or voted down, but God cares, and humanity cares, and I care; and with God's help I shall not fall. I may not see the end; but it will come, and I shall be vindicated; and these men will find that they have not read their Bible aright."

3. He said, "When . . . you have succeeded in dehumanizing the Negro; when you have put him down and made it impossible for him to be but as the beasts of the field; when you have extinguished his soul in this world and placed him where the ray of hope is blown out as in the darkness of the damned, are you quite sure that the demon you have roused will not turn and rend you? What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea coasts, our Army and Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subject of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

Praise be to Thee, O God, for thy servant and prophet, Abraham Lincoln.

Ten Points Deserving Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in South Carolina editorials frequently are published in many of the newspapers around the State under the byline "The Spectator." In the most recent column

by the Spectator he lists 10 points well worth considering. There was a time when no one would question any of these points. I should like to think that such will soon be the case again. These 10 points were sent to the Spectator by Mr. G. R. Battle of West Columbia, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the 10 points were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN POINTS

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

The Flying Wheels Visit Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last evening one of the most exciting basketball games of the year was played at Bethesda Naval Hospital gymnasium. Yet not one of the players is able to walk, let alone run. This was a game of wheelchair basketball, played by brave young veterans who carry on almost normal lives despite the loss of the use of their limbs.

Their story has been well told by John B. Old as follows:

BEST YEARS OF THEIR LIVES

(By John B. Old)

Paralyzed veterans by definition are fine young Americans who will never walk again. They're paralyzed from the waist down. Most of 'em are victims of an enemy bullet in the spine. Others are victims of polio or tragic accidents. All served their country gallantly.

Many are continuously bedridden. Others find themselves chained to wheelchairs for the rest of their life, compelled to return periodically to VA hospitals for checkups and medical attention.

Their incentive to live isn't the same as most people—or so you might reasonably assume. Not so with the courageous members of the Flying Wheels, all-star wheelchair basketball squad of the Long Beach, Calif., Paralyzed Veterans Association.

They're out to prove to themselves, to their less fortunate bedridden PVA brethren, polio victims everywhere and the world at large that the years to come should not be wasted in self pity or vain regrets sitting on the

sidelines of life. They're going to be participants.

The agonies of the souls which all hopelessly crippled young veterans must have suffered can only be imagined. What gutsy guys like the Flying Wheels are doing today takes more courage, in a way, than they were called on to display against the enemy.

Although their mode of living is limited, they have but one code: "Ability, not disability, counts." Wheelchair basketball is doing much to keep that spirit alive and contagious.

It all started early in World War II at the now discarded Birmingham VA hospital, Van Nuys, Calif. Hunting a way to inspire bedridden patients, Bob Rynearson of the recreation department hit upon the idea of wheelchair basketball—played just like able-bodied teams do with only slight variations—such as two pushes on the wheels, while the ball rests on a player's lap, is the equivalent of a dribble.

Occasionally a veteran would wheel down to the gym. On the court self-confidence was bolstered. Returning to his ward, he'd brag of his shooting—a direct challenge to ward mates to get out of bed. As the competitive spirit lurks in the heart of every American youth, many accepted. Later more and more. For most of the paraplegics it was their first real inspiration to get out of bed, back into the American competitive way of life, if only to beat a bunk mate.

Once on the court they gained physical benefits far and beyond the reach of calisthenics. A new and hopeful mental outlook was born. They bit heavily into the challenge to excel, found they were no longer cognizant of their handicap. Now all wheelchair basketball players love crowds—especially when backward fellows with similar handicaps are watching. Their brilliant court play is inspiring proof positive: "Ability, not disability, counts."

Because of its proven value, wheelchair basketball is now played wherever PVA groups assemble. Unfortunately for the southern California group, there is no other VA paraplegic center west of Kansas City. Hence these annual coast-to-coast, non-profit, noncommercial tours. The Flying Wheels want to meet and beat the best wheelchair teams in the country.

Hall to the gallant crusading Flying Wheels.

An excerpt from Veterans' Administration Technical Bulletin TB 10-503, page 36, paragraph 5, reveals:

The importance of competitive games for physical and psychological rehabilitation of paraplegics must not be forgotten. These games maintain the musculature in good condition, improve coordination, and put to severe test the paraplegic's ability to balance as in a fast basketball game conducted from wheelchairs.

The mental goal achieved by such competition is a loss of self-consciousness and a gain of self-reliance.

It is medically desirable that tournaments be regularly arranged between the several paraplegic centers in the Veterans' Administration.

Dr. Ernest Bors, medical chief, paraplegic section, Long Beach Veterans Hospital, observes:

Having witnessed the very beginning of the athletic rehabilitation of paraplegic patients, I am impressed with the beneficial effect wheelchair basketball has on the morale and on the physical well being of the paralyzed veterans.

Successful rehabilitation of the severely disabled person is contingent upon the mental approach. It is evident that the self-consciousness of patients, who are bound to use a wheelchair, has been greatly relieved by competitive performances before specta-

tors. Good muscle function, so vital to the patient with a spinal cord injury, is obtained through participation in wheelchair basketball.

The patient's desire to play wheelchair basketball makes his mental and physical rehabilitation a voluntary pleasure.

In 11 coast-to-coast wheelchair basketball tours and 3 national championship trips, the Flying Wheels have amassed the amazing record of 86 victories, 29 defeats in 115 intersectional games. They have averaged 35 points per game, a remarkably high percentage.

Their best years were in 1948, 1950, 1953, 1955, and 1958.

The Long Beach, Calif., PVA All-Stars have accounted for three national championships—in 1948, 1955, and 1958. In 1948 they were named U.S. champions by the Helms Athletic Foundation of California.

In 1953, the Flying Wheels, after capturing the Pacific Coast Wheelchair Basketball Association title, registered nine straight triumphs without a loss on their 11th annual transcontinental tour. Then they traveled to Rantoul, Ill., where they eliminated the St. Louis Rams, 50 to 28; the Brooklyn Whirlaways, 58 to 40, and the defending champion Pan-Am Jets, 51 to 42, to win the national championship.

The record: 1948, won 12, lost 1, national champions; 1949, won 7, lost 4; 1950, won 10, lost 1; 1951, won 3, lost 6; 1952, won 3, lost 3; 1953, won 9, lost 1; 1953, won 1, lost 2; 1954, won 5, lost 4; 1955, won 9, lost 0; 1955, won 3, lost 0, national champions; 1956, won 6, lost 3; 1957, won 5, lost 3; 1958, won 9, lost 0; 1958, won 3, lost 0, national champions. Totals, won 86, lost 29.

The 1959 Flying Wheels team members are the following:

No.	Position	Name
10	Guard	Roger Latham: Korean war veteran (Air Force), staff sergeant, gunner. Born in Mount Vernon, Ohio, Apr. 30, 1930. Graduated from military academy in Woodstock, Va. Attended VMI, SVC, and Long Beach State College. BA degree in psychology. Letterman in college wrestling and also won letters for football and baseball in high school.
11	Forward	Esker Hester: Korean war veteran (Air Force). Born in La Mesa, Tex., Aug. 16, 1930. Moved to Hollywood, Calif., at age of 16 and graduated from Hollywood High. Studied accounting at UCLA. Spent 4 years in Air Force, a navigator. Hobbies include chess and bridge.
12	do	Chauncey Durand: World War II veteran (Army). Born in Rochester, Minn., Dec. 6, 1924. Graduated from Rochester High after playing football and ice hockey. Attended Rochester Junior College and studied business administration. Also attended a trade school for instruction on radio and television repair. Chee Chee is his nickname.
14	Guard	GH-Ortiz: World War II veteran (Army). Born in Anaheim, Calif., Sept. 30, 1924. Lived in Chandler, Ariz., greater part of his life. He was a high school letterman in basketball, football, and baseball. Studied journalism at Long Beach State. Hobbies run from hunting to fishing. He was voted all-America third-string guard at national tourney, 1958. Spider (long arms) is his nickname.

¹ National championship tournaments.

No.	Position	Name
15	Guard	Dean Traxinger: Korean war veteran (U.S. Marine Corps), corporal. Born in Memphis, Minn., Feb. 18, 1933. Graduated from St. Louis Park High School. Attended Minnesota Business College and studied accounting. During high school days was active in basketball, football, and baseball. Dean has been married 3 years.
16	Forward	Frank Behunin: Korean war veteran (Army). Born in Fillmore, Utah, Mar. 10, 1931. Graduated from Provo High School, Provo, Utah, and won his letter in basketball. His hobbies are archery and wood carving. He also has done some outstanding work with the Artesia, Calif., Boy Scouts. He is married and has a daughter.
20	Center	Gene Atkinson: Korean war veteran (U.S. Marine Corps). Born in San Francisco, Sept. 16, 1928. Graduated from Balboa High School. Letterman in high school football and also played sports in service. Gene is single.
21	do	Ray Mitchell: World War II veteran (1st Lieutenant, Army). Born in Kansas City, Mo., Aug. 24, 1921. Attended Kansas City High School. Holds bachelor of science degree at UCLA in personnel management. Also master of business administration. Hobbies and sports include swimming, water and wheelchair basketball, football and "rooting for the Dodgers." He is married, the father of 2 boys. A veteran of wheelchair basketball world.
22	Guard	Ronald Rynders: Korean war veteran (Navy). Born in Van Nuys, Calif., Oct. 4, 1931. Attended Van Nuys High School where he won letters in track and basketball. Contracted polio in 1956. During war won battle ribbon and 3 battle stars. Also awarded Korean Presidential unit citation. He is now in private business in the appliance and furniture field. Is married, father of a girl.
		Tom Culp (coach): Korean war veteran (staff sergeant, U.S. Marine Corps). Born Aug. 5, 1932, in Akron, Ohio. Graduated from Akron West High School. Was a letterman in basketball, football, and golf. Attended Long Beach City College where he studied prelaw. He is now a director for the Lakewood, Calif., Recreation Department. Tom is single and this is his 1st Flying Wheels' coaching assignment.
		Russ Churchman (assistant coach, trainer): Korean war veteran. (Navy). Born in Hardin, Ill., Mar. 17, 1933. Graduated from Hardin High and was letterman in baseball and basketball. Served 4 years in Navy—a yeoman 2d class in the Pacific and Korea areas. Attended Long Beach City College. He works for the Lakewood, Calif., Recreation Department as a director. Is married and has a little girl.
		James E. Smith (manager): World War II veteran (Army). Born in Brockton, Mass., Mar. 12, 1927. Graduated from Brockton High School. This is Jim's 2d year with the Flying Wheels. He is president of the Pacific Coast Wheel Chair Basketball Association.

Able-bodied personnel accompanying the Flying Wheels are the following:

Coach, Tom Culp, Long Beach, Calif., Recreation Department.

Physicians, Dr. Martin Hansen and Dr. Peter J. Rocovich, both of Queen of Angels Hospital, Los Angeles.

Trainer, Russ Churchman, Long Beach, Calif., Recreation Department.

Publicity director, Sam Schnitzer, Los Angeles Examiner.

Tour director, John B. Old, Los Angeles Herald Express.

All traveling expenses for this tour—and last 5 years—paid by the Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express

through the courtesy of Mr. David Hearst, publisher; and Mr. George Hearst, business manager.

Expenses for the first seven coast-to-coast tours were raised by John B. Old through personal solicitation of his friends.

Korean-American Proxy Adoption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a press release issued by the Presbyterian News Bureau entitled "Korean, American Church and Welfare Leaders Endorse Proxy Adoption."

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KOREAN, AMERICAN CHURCH AND WELFARE LEADERS ENDORSE PROXY ADOPTION

SEOUL, KOREA.—Proxy adoption as currently provided for under American congressional legislation is an essential element for any real solution of the Korean-American orphan problem, according to strong statements made here by Korean and American representatives from a dozen interested agencies now at work in that phase of Christian and secular relief and welfare operations in Korea.

Meeting in a seminar held under the auspices of Korea Church World Service, the participants took strong exception to representations by visiting International Social Service Director William Kirk, who insisted that proxy adoption should be eliminated as a valid procedure under future orphan legislation. Kirk, currently touring ISS branches in Asia, proposed that only orphan placements arranged by professional graduate social workers in long-established welfare agency programs be accepted as acceptable, sound practice.

Dr. G. H. Rue, M.D., well-known Seventh-day Adventist director of the Seoul Sanitarium and Hospital, was the first of those present to confirm the fact that present independent programs are moving the overwhelming majority of mixed-blood orphans, and have piled up a record of impressive success—including a replacement figure comparable to that found in more time-consuming professional programs.

"We do our own work," Dr. Rue said. "We find that it works very satisfactorily, and we've had no trouble at all."

To answer why the Seventh-day Adventist orphan-placement program does not make use of the services of the professional welfare agencies at work in their area, Dr. Rue stated that the main reason was because "it takes forever and a day."

Mrs. Oak-soon Hong, director of the Child-Placement Service of the Korean Government, added that her own organization had found it necessary to use proxy adoption to move orphans because of the large number of professional welfare agencies in the United States which refuse to release home studies to any other agency except International Social Service. There was general agreement that commonsense home studies based on the judgment and opinion of pastors and a broad base of mature individuals already thoroughly acquainted with the prospective

adopting home were essential in order to cope with Korean conditions under which professional agency delays often lead to serious illness or death for the mixed-blood orphan.

Two representatives—Mrs. Wilbur Bacon, Korea director for Pearl Buck's Welcome House program, and Miss Marion A. Shaw, Methodist leader in orphan welfare work for Korea—backed up the professional welfare concern for home studies conducted along traditional time-consuming lines, but spoke out strongly for proxy adoption as the sensible way to expedite the process once child and home have been matched.

Only fireworks of the seminar developed when the visiting International Social Service director charged that already hundreds of Korean-American orphans have been so badly placed by the five non-ISS agencies that they have undergone abuse and described their detailed followup programs which have protected each child and resulted in happy second placements for the approximately 1 percent of Korean-American orphans who failed to become satisfactorily integrated into their new homes.

Independent observers from missions not directly engaged in adoption programs joined in emphatically to say that they felt they could not credit Kirk's allegation because they had personally followed large numbers of children through the independent programs to their new homes and had found nothing but happy adjustments. Miss Olivette Swallen, longtime worker in home visitation for the United Presbyterian Mission, stated, "I positively know that very, very few have been changed. It's been a very, very small number, and altogether there are hundreds and hundreds—thousands—of children sent from this country to happy homes."

Major statistics as brought out in the seminar included:

Orphans moved from Korea

Agency (in alphabetical order):	
American Soul Clinic	13
Child Placement Service, Ministry of Health and Welfare, Republic of Korea	1,508
Holt adoption program	1,070
International Social Service (no statistics)	(*)
National Catholic Welfare Service	* 23
Seventh-day Adventist	* 23
Welcome House	21

Total reported..... 1,800

* Through June 1958 only.

* ISS estimate, around 200; Korean Government estimate based on issuance of orphan passports, ISS, around 50.

* In 1958 only.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the GTA Daily Radio Roundup broadcast by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association on January 15, 23, and 30, 1959.

There being no objection, the text of the radio broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF JANUARY 15, 1959

Do you remember those \$10 hogs back in the fall of 1955? That was a disastrous price. But farmers had to sell. You don't just turn off the machine, stack hogs in a warehouse, and wait for a better price.

So farmers sold, took their beating, and readjusted production programs. Hundreds of thousands gave up hog raising in disgust or cut way down on their herds. No businessman can sell at a loss for long and stay in business.

As soon as the hog glut was flushed out of the market, prices started climbing. In the meantime, the administration in Washington had been busily trimming price supports on grain and, of course, cash prices weakened, too. Again, farmers couldn't turn off the growing crops, so the country became flooded with cheap feed grain. What to do with it? Well, hog and cattle prices were perking up, "so let's throw this cheap feed into more and more cattle and hogs and take another price gamble."

Now, all this isn't done in a day. It takes 5 to 6 months to feed up a hog to market weight and around 2 years for a beef cow. With the wild fluctuations on the wide open livestock markets—who can guess the price that far ahead?

It's a multibillion-dollar gambling game and farmers have no choice but to keep rolling the dice.

Now it looks like we have again arrived at the jumping-off place for hog prices. At least that's the opinion of economist Francis A. Kutish of Iowa State College. He warned the other day that the hog market could get rough in the late February-March-April peak marketing period. It seems that fall production of pigs in 1958 was up 17 percent over 1957. In South Dakota alone the jump was 49 percent, as we see by the South Dakota Farmers Union paper.

And on top of that, another pile-up of 16 percent is expected when spring pigs are farrowed, beginning in a short time.

So the Iowa economists tell farmers to market fall pigs in the next 30 days, as fast as they reach 210 to 220 pounds. It sounds to us that he is telling farmers to unload before the price bust. That's the advice of Francis A. Kutish, Iowa State College economist. We're just passing it on for what it is worth to you as individual farmers.

Well, we don't pretend to be livestock marketing experts but we do note that Glenn Long, manager of Farmers Union Marketing Association, is warning of a general slump in livestock prices, too.

The tragedy is that farmers can't do much about it now except maybe to plow under little pigs and cows—and that goes against just about everything farmers have always believed in. They believe in abundance and fair prices to consumers. They don't believe that food production should teeter on the verge of scarcity just to hold up prices. Farmers have said so time and again through their organizations like Farmers Union, and through their cooperatives like GTA. All they ask in return for this abundance is fair prices and a fair return on their labor, investment and management. Legislation to smooth out the free-wheeling—roller-coaster prices that are so ruinous to farm business management. And that's why more and more farmers are organizing and cooperating—GTA—the co-op way.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF JANUARY 23, 1959

For many years now certain groups have been attacking the cooperatives that you farmers built. They say your co-ops don't pay taxes.

The truth is just the opposite. Every year the co-ops in the United States, from your hometown to the big cities like St. Paul, pay out many thousands of dollars in taxes. The same property—and real estate—and

special taxes that any other business pays.

The only tax that the co-ops do not pay is the income tax that corporations pay on their profits. And why not? Because the earnings of a co-op belong to the people who do business with it and they are returned to these people in cash or securities.

Now, nearly all farmers know that. But many city people do not. It always comes as a surprise to them when they find out that co-ops are big taxpayers. In many communities, GTA or the local co-op is the biggest single taxpayer.

So on January 19, when President Eisenhower said in his budget message that corrective amendments to the laws on taxation of cooperatives will be transmitted to the Congress shortly, farmers were not concerned because they are willing to pay their fair share of taxes and they believe that their privately owned, taxpaying co-ops are paying their fair share.

There was some talk in Washington that the Government could get \$50 million a year more from co-ops. But Alfred D. Stedman of the St. Paul Pioneer Press says in a newspaper article that co-op leaders he has talked to agree that the Treasury's proposition is plainly not a revenue measure but a move to block future cooperative growth. Some doubted that it would yield any substantial revenue at all.

Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, headquartered in Washington, says that co-op friends and even some of their enemies consider the Treasury proposal to be extreme, unfair, and punitive. It would force co-ops to pay a specific minimum interest rate and dictate the terms of their obligation to members. It would also reduce the ability of co-ops to expand services and activities that have been voted by members.

What is the treasury co-op tax proposal? It says that co-ops can keep their earnings for only three years despite the wishes of members. And they would have to pay 4 percent interest. At the end of 3 years it would all have to be paid out in cash no matter whether the co-op needs the money to grow and expand, or to carry on operations that have been ordered by the farmers.

And this, of course, is a drastic change from the historical treatment of cooperatives. The former Senator Robert A. Taft, a conservative and a Republican leader, said in 1951: "It is true that cooperatives may be able to accumulate reserves and build facilities from those reserves. But again, if the farmer is to have his fair bargaining power in the marketplace he requires physical facilities and there is no place where he can get the necessary capital except from the operation of the cooperative itself." That was Senator Taft's statement.

Unless there is strong co-op protest to the President's co-op tax plans, they could be railroaded through Congress. So it is up to co-ops and their farmer members to make themselves heard in Washington.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF JANUARY 30, 1959

The most amazing thing about President Eisenhower's farm ideas is the fact that they are absolutely inflexible. They are rigid as a steel pole, and they haven't changed even a little bit since he named Mr. Benson as his Secretary of Agriculture back in 1953. The President, way back then, began demanding lower flexible farm price supports, and he did it with inflexible singlemindedness.

Almost every farmer in America, however, remembers the Eisenhower "Golden Promise" of full parity income for farmers. It was made in the 1952 campaign at Kasson, Minn., and repeated at Brookings, S. Dak. But by 1953, the golden promise was broken.

So the farm ideas that the President laid before Congress Thursday came as no sur-

prise to farmers. They are Secretary Benson's ideas. The President apparently endorses them 100 percent. The very program that the President calls excessively expensive (and it is, both to farmers and taxpayers) is the handiwork of his Secretary of Agriculture.

Now even the big newspapers, and many important Republicans, are admitting that the President is wrong. The newspapers are full of criticism of the farm message—coming from both sides of the political fence. Just about any criticism you want to make already has been voiced by some top-ranking Republican or Democrat or farm leader.

One says the farm message is "conceived out of a desire to punish farmers for the sins of the Agriculture Department." Another says: "A plan to reduce farm prices 25 percent, and that's 100 percent wrong." You'll be hearing plenty more, too.

It has been obvious for some time now that Secretary Benson has been trying to put his hex sign on wheat. St. Paul newspaper writer Al Stedman says that "A terrific farm fight looms in Congress to head off a cut of 10 to 39 cents or more a bushel in Federal wheat price supports next year—and further cuts later." And he's right. The President called for wheat prices "competitive with corn and other feed grains." That would mean about \$1.30 a bushel for wheat in 1960.

It's either that, the President indicated, or ironclad production cuts, along with lower price supports, down to about \$1.43 a bushel. And either way, the wheat farmer would find that he must get along on less money. That's no choice.

Is there an alternative? Well, one suggestion that sounds reasonable is this: Farmers who are asked to cut way down on production should be given decent prices, on a parity yardstick. Be paid a living wage. How do you think that would work? Right for the moment, on the sunny side of the barn, there is the fact stated by GTA General Manager M. W. Thatcher. He said that Congress will decide this year's farm legislation, not Secretary Benson. And we note that Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON backs that up with a promise of new and better legislation.

But while you are waiting, don't forget that your cooperatives are on your side, both at home and in Washington. Patronize them, because they work for you, GTA—the co-op way.

Social Welfare Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on a recent tour of the Far East, Dr. Frederick M. Lange, executive vice president of the Dallas County Community Chest Fund, Dallas, Tex., delivered to audiences in Delhi, India, an outstanding address on social welfare work.

Dr. Lange, for many years an outstanding national leader in the American Community Chest movement, addressed the Delhi School of Social Work and the Indian Conference of Social Work.

I am informed that this address will cover slightly more than two pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a total cost of \$216, but so well does it examine

the operations and ideals of community social welfare work that I believe it should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the people of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL WELFARE WORK

(Address delivered by Dr. Frederick M. Lange, executive vice president, Dallas Community Chest Trust Fund)

Under our Government we have a broad system of social insurance called social security participated in by all employed persons. Also almost all citizens carry life, accident, and hazard insurance with commercial firms. Further we have programs of financial assistance, some of which are under the joint auspices of our National and State Governments and some given by our local city and county governments. In general, our governmental social services are related to the need for financial assistance and medical care caused by misfortune, handicapping accidents, unemployment or old age. Many of our specialized social services, particularly in relation to personal and family counseling, child care, health education, research on various diseases, and preventive services are financed privately. In the latter our churches play a very significant part.

As you can see, in the United States of America most of our leaders as far as possible, try to get things done through private rather than governmental means. There is a conviction that we should not ask government to take on programs which can be carried effectively by private individuals or private organizations. Our community leaders resist the tendency to unnecessarily centralize authority in the National Government. If governmental help is necessary they do not ask the State to do what the local government could do, and they do not ask the National Government to do something which the State government could do.

Although our leaders made every effort to provide constructive and essential social services for individuals and families, they have a strong belief that these services should be given in such a way that they will encourage people to help themselves as much as possible. They have a conviction the social services should be given in such a way that they will restore and preserve the personal independence, responsibility, and initiative of the individual and his family.

In your kind invitation you suggested that I tell you about the work of the community chest. This is a complicated story and I will try to do it in general terms. You may wish to ask questions about specific matters later on and I will be glad to elaborate on any phase that interests you. Many of our voluntary agencies are older than the governmental services, many of which came into being during the widespread economic depression in the 1930's. Many of the national governmental agencies were created at that time because large numbers of persons were out of work and the need mounted so rapidly that it was not possible for private organizations to finance all the necessary help.

Every large American city has a very large number of private welfare organizations, each devoted to a specific area of service. In my community there are at least 75 such private organizations. To understand this complex situation some explanation is necessary. The main reason we have so many organizations in the field is because so many private groups are interested in and doing such a great variety of things. Their services touch the lives of everyone regardless of economic or social position. Welfare services in the United States of America are not

confined to services for the indigent. A good example of this is the tremendous amount of money spent on research, public education, and case finding in regard to almost every known disease. We have many services classified as welfare services in which all economic groups participate. For instance, the Community Chest raises funds to support our Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, Girl Scouts, Young Men's Christian Association, and Young Women's Christian Association. Boys and girls from the very high income families participate in these activities in exactly the same way as do children from homes where for various reasons the income may be modest. In certain programs some of the participants pay and some do not. The knowledge of who pays and who does not is kept confidential and is known only to the administrative office. As far as participation in the program is concerned, everyone is on an equal footing and treated alike.

In addition to the fact that our social services are for everyone, we have many agencies in the field because social work in the United States of America is specialized. Through constant studies our professional workers have learned a great deal and have developed skills which enable them to give more effective help. When a worker specializes, he gets to know more about his field and has greater competence, but they also must have a knowledge of the entire field.

Because of the number of these organizations, it is essential that there be some place where they all can come together, so that they can plan their many activities cooperatively and coordinate their programs. As you can readily understand, unless this is done there would be chaos and waste. Every large American city, therefore, has an organization called a council of social agencies or a welfare council. Representatives from all these organizations, both governmental and private, together with interested citizens, come together to plan their part in the total effort. The result is that these organizations are made aware of what social services are needed most in their county, and they are encouraged to give those services with as little duplication as possible. Although this coordinating and planning council works with all organizations, it is financed by voluntary gifts through the community chest.

I am telling you about the work of the council of social agencies before I tell you about the community chest because in this way I believe that my later remarks will be clearer. In addition to working and planning with representatives of all the agencies in our county, the council is constantly making studies concerning changes which need to be made as a result of changing social and economic conditions. The council also keeps the general public informed about what is being done, and also about what needs to be done in the future. The council on the basis of experience knows that an effective overall social welfare plan in any city must include a variety of basic social services. If more money than necessary is spent on one problem, this can mean that another problem, perhaps equally important, may be neglected. Too much of one service or too little of another upsets the balance and can make for inefficiency. Although this planning and coordination through the council is voluntary and not prescribed by government, it is remarkably effective. When the council recommends that a new service be created or a service changed or discontinued, the recommendation is usually followed because it is generally accepted that the recommendations are based on study and experience and in the best interests of the total community.

In an effort to generalize the many complex problems and services in a large city, some communities, including Dallas, classify the numerous social services into four large categories:

First. Those problems and services directed toward what we call economic needs. In other words, directed toward those individuals and families who cannot provide minimum living essentials for themselves because of some misfortune. This usually means food, shelter, and clothing.

Second. Problems and services related to health and health education. These services are directed toward everyone. Those who cannot afford to pay for essential medical care receive it free. Others pay in accordance with their ability depending upon their income, based on a scale developed by the council of social agencies called the standard family budget which is developed by expert homemakers. Much service and treatment is available from social agencies which is not available anywhere else.

Third is the area which we call counseling services. This area concerns casework, counseling, psychological testing, guidance and psychiatric services for individuals, including children, who have emotional or personality problems which are causing difficulties. Here again these services are for everyone.

The fourth area of service is the recreation, group work, informal education field. This includes community centers, clubs, scouting, and group activities for all ages but especially for young people. We have learned that providing opportunities for creative play and enjoyment is a necessity, not a luxury. Experience of such national groups as our National Recreation Association has indicated that constructive group activity is essential not only to good physical but also to good mental health.

I want to say a word of caution about the four areas of service which I have mentioned. I have greatly oversimplified a complex picture for the sake of brevity.

July 1956, I appeared before a group of social welfare leaders in Stockholm, Sweden under the auspices of the control committee representing 16 private business associations in Sweden. The members of these associations contribute to separate appeals by voluntary philanthropies approved by the committee. Last year they gave 47 million kroner for the support of Swedish voluntary agencies. I was pleased when my remarks at that meeting were printed and made a permanent record of our National Government in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States of America. The Swedish leaders were most interested in one particular aspect of my remarks, the fact that so much of the private social work activity in my country is carried on by nonpaid volunteers. This fact seemed to impress them most of all. In our total private welfare effort there is a low proportion of paid professional workers to nonpaid volunteers. We have several organizations where just one or two professional workers have several hundred volunteers to call upon to help get the agencies' work done. We have a very large number of volunteers who contribute their time working in hospitals, thus freeing the professional and technical staffs from doing many of the non-technical chores. Another typical example is our group programs where a few well qualified professional workers recruit and train large numbers of volunteers to carry on the bulk of the program.

This same thing is true of activities directed toward financing private social services. Thousands of interested citizens volunteer their time in soliciting funds during the intensive campaigns. This participation on the part of nonpaid volunteers not only helps to lower costs but also builds up a strong interest in the social services on the part of the citizens. For these reasons you can see that social services in my country are truly for everyone and supported by everyone.

I cannot overemphasize this fact since it is so important. Because everyone benefits from these services and helps support them, it removes the old fashioned idea that social

services are an act of condescending charity on the part of those who have financial means toward those in the lower economic group. In our city social service is, "Many in one, for all." This is consistent with our democratic way of life.

Because so many citizens are involved in supporting these activities, it is impossible for anyone to tell exactly how many there are. I can only give you these examples and estimates. For instance, in one campaign for funds on the part of a health agency 20,000 citizens in my city actively participated. I believe it would be conservative to estimate that at least 75,000 citizens in Dallas are engaged in some form of nonpaid volunteer activity in our social service organizations. This does not include doctors, lawyers, and other professional groups who give millions of dollars of service free, contributing thousands of hours both day and night.

One of the most notable developments in this field in the United States of America is the community chest. This is the part of the total picture which I know best since I have been engaged in work related to social service for the past 25 years and have been a director of the Dallas Community Chest for the past 13 years. However, I come here realizing that what will operate successfully in my country may not necessarily work successfully in another country. I can only tell you what we do and leave the judgment of its values to you.

Of course, I have not come here as a missionary trying to convince you that our plan is the only one. I am certain that as leaders in this field in India, you have given considerable thought to these matters and that you have evolved an approach to your problem which is related to your particular needs and conditions. My only reason for going into detail about the plan which we use in the United States of America is to give you an opportunity to compare your methods with ours. This meeting will also give me the same opportunity and enable me to go back with new knowledge.

Because we have a great many voluntary welfare organizations their financing through private contributions is a large task. Many years ago each of these organizations collected its own funds by making separate appeals to the population. It was realized many years ago that this pattern of each one asking funds separately was inefficient. Gradually more and more of these private organizations came together and had one large appeal during the year for the benefit of all. The first American attempt at such a cooperative appeal for charitable purposes took place in the city of Denver in 1887. However, this venture was not permanent. The first cooperative appeal which is generally regarded as the first community chest was organized in the city of Cleveland in 1913. This method of raising funds for private welfare organizations has been very successful and has spread rapidly. According to United Community Funds and Councils of America, last year about 2,000 American cities used this method and the movement has spread to Canada, Hawaii, Australia, Cuba, the Philippines, and South Africa. Funds raised this way in 1956 for use in 1957 totaled more than \$379 million, and represented contributions from over 26 million individuals and companies. This total effort was carried on by over 3 million volunteer citizen workers and supported the programs of over 21,000 private welfare organizations.

It is easy to understand why this method of fund raising is increasing in popularity. It allows the volunteer solicitors to concentrate on a single campaign instead of separate campaigns for each agency. It relieves the director and workers of the agency of the responsibility for raising their own funds and so enables them to concentrate on per-

forming needed service. It helps the contributor because he knows that each organization which will receive money has been thoroughly studied by the citizen leaders in the community chest. Because the cooperative campaign is larger and more inclusive, it has an appeal to all people at all levels.

These cooperative fund-raising efforts in the United States of America have various names, many are called community chests and generally include only local agencies. An increasing number of local community chests are taking in more nationwide organizations and are becoming known as united funds. The prime purpose is the combining of many appeals on the part of private organizations into a single campaign. The success of this movement is not accidental. We believe that its success is due not only because it conserves funds and effort but because it builds public confidence in the work of the organizations. It helps the people to understand better not only the need for these organizations but to understand how their many activities are interrelated.

These large cooperative appeals can be made dramatic enough to gain the interest and support of the very top leaders in the community. Because of the inclusiveness and size of the appeal, more citizens can be enlisted as volunteer workers. This inclusiveness enables people and organizations of different faiths and backgrounds to work together. Through these efforts in the annual appeal an ever-increasing number of citizens have a more informed outlook about welfare matters and become the leaders of our total welfare effort. This is possible because they learn about the relationship of the voluntary agencies to the governmental agencies and therefore have a better understanding of both.

I would like to tell you how this plan works in my home county of Dallas. The Dallas Community Chest, which includes 35 local welfare agencies and 2 nationwide voluntary agencies that give services locally, has made significant strides in recent years. For instance, in 1948 we raised \$1,470,000. In 1957 we raised \$2,619,448. This is an increase of 78 percent. In 1948, 105,000 persons contributed. In 1957, of the 336,000 employed in Dallas County, 205,000 persons contributed. This is an increase of 94 percent. Remember we are talking of voluntary giving.

The Dallas Community Chest has an overall board of directors composed of 105 men and women. These people come from all walks of life. The board of directors, elected by those who give at least \$1 to the fund, sets the general policies of the community chest, while many of the important day-by-day decisions are made by a 16-member executive committee. The small year-round paid staff of 15 members carries out the policies and decisions of the board and executive committee. As representatives of the overall community, these people vouch for the efficiency and integrity of the community chest operation. I cannot overemphasize the fact that all significant community groups are represented.

This citizen participation is further strengthened by the fact that each of the 37 member agencies of our community chest, operating a total of 105 centers of operation, has a board of directors of its own. There is a total of 670 board members serving with the member agencies. Agency board members help operate their agencies and also are expected to work in the chest campaign. This broad citizen interest is further strengthened by an additional 6,000 citizens who volunteer to work in the central fund-raising efforts. Each of these volunteer workers learns much about the work of the agencies and becomes an informed spokesman for them. It is their community chest and the agencies are their agencies. This whole project is carried on with the phi-

losophy of "Many in one for all." Put in another way, when we help people who need us, we are helping everyone, and what hurts the general welfare hurts everyone.

To some degree our success depends upon our year-round public relations program. All publicity media are used. Television is being used more and more. Agencies are encouraged to use constructive human interest stories for publicity purposes. Each agency always states in its publicity that it is a member of the community chest. Periodically, we have public relations clinics, when agencies are given ideas of how better to interpret their services to the general public. In all of this the chest receives invaluable help from a publicity committee made up of outstanding public relations and advertising people in Dallas who give their time free. People who help in these ways become active partners in this enterprise.

In the actual solicitation of contributions every encouragement is given to make the giving convenient and fair. The total campaign organization is divided into divisions according to the major grouping of contributors, based on their type of business and ability to give. In this we have the cooperation of many business and labor union leaders; for instance, the worker can pledge an annual amount of money and have this amount deducted from his regular pay check in monthly installments. At the employee's request the firm he works for will handle the deduction and send it to the community chest office. In our community, most salaried workers are encouraged to give 1 day's pay as a fair share while people with higher incomes are encouraged to give on a more generous basis. Their giving or not is a matter of conscience and election on their part.

A speakers bureau composed of informed volunteers gives talks before civic, professional, and employee groups explaining these matters. In all of this we have the encouragement of our National Government since under our income tax regulations a corporation may make tax-free gifts for charitable purposes up to 5 percent of profits. Individuals can make tax-free gifts of 20 to 30 percent. There are so many aspects of our operation that I can only pick a few to describe in detail.

One more factor which requires attention relates to the activities of our appeals review board. All fund-raising efforts for charitable purposes in Dallas must be licensed by the city government. In this way time of the campaign is designated also, so that several campaigns are not carried on at the same time. In addition, the leading business and industrial people in Dallas have a committee called the campaign screening committee. This group works closely with our Council of Social Agencies, and studies the need for the proposed campaigns before they contribute to them. As you can see, this helps the essential welfare efforts by discouraging the unessential ones.

Another of the many important aspects of our work is the way in which we determine the annual overall amount which is needed for the operation of the combined agencies of the chest for the coming year. This is the amount which we call our annual campaign goal. The community chest receives monthly financial reports and monthly activities reports from each member agency. This makes possible year round study and budget control and trends are noted quickly.

Each spring outstanding local citizens are appointed to serve on what we call the citizens budget committee. It would be impossible for 1 committee to review the budgets of all 37 chest agencies. Therefore, the committee is divided into four groups and each agency is assigned to one of the four budget groups, depending on its field of service.

The board of directors of each chest agency every year studies its own program in view

of future financial needs. Then each board of directors draws up a proposed budget which it believes its agency will need during the coming fiscal year beginning November 1. In June, a committee from each agency personally appears before the community chest budget committee to explain and justify the request for future funds.

During these conferences staff of the community chest and also of the Council of Social Agencies are present. The chest staff has at its finger tips data concerning previous expenditures of each agency, for each of the many individual items which comprise the total budget. Staff members of the Council of Social Agencies whose overall job is to know the work of all the many welfare groups in Dallas, are available during the discussions for consultation.

This procedure is used with all chest agencies, regardless of how much or how little of the agency's total income comes from the chest, and how much is derived from charging fees for its services, or from other sources. Several chest agencies in Dallas receive only a small proportion of their total income from the chest. On the other hand some agencies receive all of their funds from the community chest. This is so because, depending on the nature of service, some agencies can charge fees while others cannot. Some agencies have been able to supplement their chest income by receiving grants from foundations and trusts; still other agencies receive part of their funds from the community chest and part from the local government. The scrutiny of each budget item is the same regardless of the sources of the funds.

A good example of an agency which receives funds from a variety of sources is the Dallas Child Guidance Clinic which provides psychological testing and psychiatric services for emotionally troubled children. That agency is currently receiving support from six sources: the community chest, fees from clients, the Texas State Department of Health, the Dallas public schools, a local private foundation, and a private statewide foundation. The budget of this agency is handled in the same way as the budget of the Neighborhood Recreation Association, a small community center which receives all of its operating funds from the community chest.

The campaign goal for the year is based upon information provided by the budget committee. An additional amount must be added and earmarked as a reserve for necessary unforeseen expansions during the coming year. Also, an amount must be added as a reserve for emergencies and an amount for uncollectible pledges and shrinkage. I can go into more detail about this in the question period if you wish.

Each agency is immediately notified of the action taken on its particular budget request. Should the agency feel that its request was not given proper consideration, that agency can return to the budget committee for a rehearing. Although in Dallas the chest raises over \$2½ million, the total expenditures of the chest agencies are close to \$6 million. This means that for an investment from voluntary contributions of \$2¼ million the chest agencies are providing \$6 million worth of service to the community.

The budgeting process is an important part of not only financing, but planning for welfare services. The chest budget committee made up of outstanding local citizens represents the persons who use the agencies' services and who contribute to the cost of the services. It includes people of all races and religious backgrounds, housewives, salaried workers, union labor officials, professional men, career Government men, and leaders of business and industry. It is important to clarify that although these people are identified with these various groups, they do not come as official delegates. They come as citizens and are free to act as in-

dividuals. For instance, the man or woman from industry or labor does not speak officially for their organization nor do they commit their group but because they are leaders in their field their opinion is highly regarded. This is consistent with our democratic way of life. However, the benefits of this budgeting system are greater than giving representation to people who use and pay for the services. Through this close review of each agency's budget, citizen leaders get to know a great deal about their community.

The budgeting process pledges to the community that the funds which the community chest collects for the agencies is vitally needed and is being spent wisely. Also, the budget committees learn very quickly that the various agencies could provide more good services than current funds can support. This means that the budget committees must choose and approve only those expenditures which they feel are important. Because of this they can tell the general public the necessity for, not only attaining the current goal, but the need to raise more money in future years, so that additional services can be given. It is democracy at work through public education and voluntary commitment.

I believe you will agree with me that the process which I tried to outline contributes much to our community life. It is far more than merely a check on the validity of the agencies' request. It not only keeps fund raising costs low, it not only makes for greater efficiency, it not only helps to keep balance among the many various types of social services; but it has educational, social, and spiritual values.

Many of our people say that the byproducts of the community chest fund raising efforts are just as important as the direct results in terms of money; for instance, our business firms tell us that working in the chest campaign is excellent leadership training for their young executives.

Working together for a common unselfish goal is basically a spiritual experience which cuts across all religious and denominational lines. We never lose sight of this fact. Participation by clergy of all faiths is emphasized. Many of the campaign meetings are led by outstanding spiritual leaders and the efforts of the volunteers and the significance of the money raised is constantly translated into spiritual values.

We are convinced that the democratic way of life is best. We are convinced that the quality of our democracy depends upon our standard of values, which in turn depends upon the quality of our religious life. We know that our community chest efforts gives our people an opportunity to put their religion to work. Through this work they dedicate themselves to the finest in life. There is no question in our minds but that this program, hand in hand with the church, strengthens the foundations of our lives. This truly is our concept of many in one for all.

Thank you very much for your interest and attention. I shall be happy to try to answer your questions.

The Farmer, the Public, and the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note with increasing frequency the pub-

lication of statements and reports and speeches on the situation of farmers that put this situation into the clear light of objective examination. Apparently, more and more people are able to see through the smokescreen of propaganda put out by the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials of the administration and by those who expect a huge volume-low price farm economy to increase their profits.

At the 57th Annual Farm and Home Week Convocation on the St. Paul campus of the University of Minnesota recently, Lauren K. Soth, editorialist for the Des Moines (Iowa) Register and Tribune, spoke out some home truths on the relationships of the farmer, the public, and the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Soth's address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FARMER, THE PUBLIC, AND THE GOVERNMENT, AN ADDRESS BY MR. LAUREN K. SOTH, EDITOR OF EDITORIAL PAGES, DES MOINES REGISTER AND TRIBUNE, TO THE 57TH ANNUAL FARM AND HOME WEEK CONVOCATION, ST. PAUL CAMPUS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, JANUARY 15, 1959

It's human nature that your difficulties seem less burdensome when you observe your neighbor facing greater hardships than your own. When you're in the hospital you feel much better if you see someone across the hall in worse shape.

In the interest of this kind of therapy, it might be a good idea for Americans to compare their farm problem with that of the Soviet Union. In these cold war days, we are making comparisons with the Russians all the time—on progress in atomic energy, space satellites, intercontinental missiles, and so on. Some of these comparisons don't make us very happy. But just take a look at the farm problems of the two countries and you'll get a real lift.

The Soviet Union needs a great deal more farm production; it needs more meat, eggs, milk, and other high-quality protein foods; and it needs higher output per man in farming to release more people for work in Russian factories and offices. Dictator Khrushchev knows very well that industrial expansion will be limited by the productivity of agriculture. Since Stalin's death, the new Khrushchev regime has been promoting agricultural research and education, offering incentives to farm people to produce more, granting more freedom of initiative to farm managers, and in other ways driving for a more productive agriculture. A large number of Russian farm delegations have been sent to the United States, Canada, and other countries to pick up ideas on better methods.

In the United States, our farm problem is having too much rather than too little. In spite of efforts by the Government to hold farm production in check, farmers are continuing to turn out more than we can possibly use. Nearly everybody in the United States is well fed, and Secretary Benson is trying hard to ship more of our grain, livestock products, cotton, and other farm products overseas. Still, the stuff keeps piling up. We have more than a year's supply of wheat ahead. We could stop producing wheat for a full year and not run any serious risk of shortage, either for ourselves or our normal foreign outlets. Feed-grain supplies have been building up, and farmers now are beginning to convert more and more of these feed supplies into pork, beef, chicken, and other livestock products. In the next few years, livestock farmers will face a serious crisis of low prices and low

net incomes. Overabundance of American agriculture is proving to be a chronic, and certainly an unsolved, problem.

Since Ezra Benson seems unable to prevent farm surpluses and Vladimir Matskevich, the Russian minister of agriculture, seems unable to prevent farm shortages, it has been suggested that the happiest solution all around would be for us to trade secretaries of agriculture with the Soviet Union. I suspect that this idea would have some support both in the United States and in the Soviet Union.

Joking aside, Americans ought to consider their farm problem in the light of the Russian farm people, which is a much more common one in the world than our own.

Our kind of farm problem, overproduction, is a serious one for farmers, to be sure. But from the general public point of view, it is not a problem at all, it is a mark of magnificent achievement. The American people have no worries about being short of food. Agriculture is not a limiting factor on economic growth in this country.

Yet many Americans seem to have the idea that farming is a horribly inefficient industry, heavily subsidized and mismanaged by the Government. One even hears talk like this from the highest echelon of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It is not surprising, therefore, that many ordinary city dwellers think they are victims of a greedy farm pressure group, with rich farmers getting large handouts from the Government.

What are the facts? Is it true that the American people are being gouged by farmers? Is the public paying too much for the food abundance, the food security, it receives from farmers?

First, let's look at the cost to the public in the form of taxes. The U.S. Department of Agriculture budget is one of the largest nondefense items in the Federal budget. In recent years it has amounted to from \$5 billion to \$7 billion a year. This huge sum often is labeled as a farm subsidy, and despite attempts by some farm leaders to put the facts straight, the myth still lives on.

The greater part of the Department of agriculture budget goes for general services which are of benefit to the entire population, not just to farm people. These services include scientific research, education, grading of farm and food products, market reporting, the U.S. Forest Service, soil conservation work, and a great many other activities. The budget also includes such things as the Rural Electric Co-operative loans, which are being repaid on schedule and can hardly be lumped off as a subsidy.

The benefits of agricultural research and educational activity go to consumers very promptly. The purpose of these public programs is to improve agricultural efficiency; and their effect is to increase total farm output, thus bringing down prices of farm products and the cost of food. I want to say more about the whole Federal-State program of farm research and education later. But let me move on now to the subsidy question.

In the last 25 years the Federal Government has been trying to protect agriculture against the effects of its own abundance—by price supports, direct payments for making acreage adjustments, putting land into soil conserving uses and so on. How much have these subsidies amounted to? According to the Department of Agriculture's calculation, the cost of programs for stabilization of farm prices and income never amounted to as much as 1 billion dollars a year until 1955. In 1955, it amounted to \$1.4 billion, in 1956 \$1.9 billion, and in 1957, \$3.3 billion. The 1958 figure may be still higher, but it will be a long way from the \$7 billion often labeled as farm subsidy. But even these Department of Agriculture figures on cost

of farm income supports are somewhat misleading.

The \$3.3 billion for 1957 include more than \$600 million loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation from sales of farm commodities to foreign countries. There is a question whether this loss should be called farm subsidy or foreign aid. The CCC also lost \$171 million in 1957 from the sale or donation of farm products in this country, including distribution in the school lunch program. Is this general welfare program all to be charged as subsidy to farmers? In our public accounting, we should make allowances for some of these dual-purpose programs.

The cost of farm price and income support programs has gone up sharply in recent years, though price support levels have been lowered. Why is this? Part of the reason is that the CCC has been taking its losses on commodities accumulated in earlier years. Also, crop production has been unusually large and market prices of major crops have dropped. So CCC has had to put out more cash to provide price support even though the guaranteed levels are lower.

The reason why price supports cost the Government so much money is that farm production controls have not worked. The drive to improve farm technology, spurred by Federal and State research and educational programs, has been a far more powerful force in American agriculture than the acreage allotments and other efforts to limit output.

Or, to say this the other way around: If farm production controls were effective, market prices of farm products would be above the support levels. So the cost of farm income supports would not appear in the Federal budget. Instead it would appear in the price of food, and the public would pay all of it in the food bill instead of partly in the tax bill. That's the way tariff subsidies are paid, of course; they don't loom up in the Federal budget.

One more point should be mentioned. A sizable proportion of the cost of farm programs consists of payments to private warehousemen, exporters, and other handlers of grain, dairy products, and cotton. In recent years, these charges have been from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{4}$ billion annually—out of a total cost of \$2 to \$3 billion.

No one should assume that all the money for farm programs goes to farmers.

The price supporters and storage operations are ever-normal granary or stabilizing operations with wide variations in costs from year to year. So, to get a more accurate picture of what the programs have cost the taxpayer, CCC losses should be averaged over a period of years. For the 10 years through 1957, they averaged just under a billion dollars a year. If you take the entire 25 years of such programs, the cost averaged about \$600 million a year. In the war years, CCC actually showed a profit on grain and cotton acquired during the late 1930's.

So much for the cost of farm income support programs to the taxpayer.

The public also has had to pay somewhat higher prices for food in certain years than it would have paid without the programs. Undoubtedly, food prices would be lower today if the Government had not removed a portion of the supply of some farm products from regular commercial markets.

Whatever this cost has been during periods of accumulation of surpluses, it should be balanced against the effects of the stabilization programs to reduce food costs in periods of short crops and in wartime. Over the last 25 years, the cost to the consumer certainly has been small.

When these programs began back in the early thirties there was great fear that the consumer would be injured. A consumer's counsel was established in the Department

of Agriculture to guard the public interest. This fear that a giant farm monopoly, established through Government, would gouge the consumer proved to be unwarranted.

In fact, the American consumer has done very well under the farm programs. The proportion of his income spent for food has declined steadily. It's true that people buy more packaging, more precooking and other services with their food. But they spend relatively less for the food itself than they did before the farm programs began.

Another way to assess the effect of the farm programs is to look at income per person on farms, compared with the average income of nonfarm people. The average income of farm people, including money value of house rent and food and fuel consumed on the farm, was about half the average income of city people in the mid-thirties. Farm income per person today still is about half of nonfarm income per person. Farm income rose during the war relative to nonfarm income, but it has declined in the last few years. So farm people are no better off compared with the rest of the population than they were in the mid-thirties. This surely indicates that the farm programs have not resulted in great transfers of income from the general public to farmers.

When the farm programs began in the thirties, it was also feared that progress in farming efficiency would be stopped. Controls, it was said, would stifle farmers' initiative. Farm income would be so high, moreover, that too many people would stay in farming—and necessary population adjustments would not be made. This criticism of farm programs is still being made. It's nonsense. Farm production and marketing controls have not stifled initiative, and they haven't prevented change.

Farm production efficiency has continued to rise very rapidly—more rapidly in recent years than productivity in nonfarm industry. Moreover, people have been leaving farming in droves. Since 1940, about one-third of the entire farm labor force has left agriculture. This is a terrific adjustment, and it is still going on.

A good case could be made, I think, that the net effect of acreage changes under the allotments, plus incentives for better land use through conservation programs, plus the reduction of uncertainty through price supports, have advanced the overall efficiency of U.S. agriculture, increased total output, and lowered food costs to consumers.

Far be it from me to defend all the farm acreage allotments, price support, and other programs. Many of them have been ill-conceived. The price supports on a few basic crops have been a clumsy way of trying to protect farm income in a period of overabundance. Acreage controls haven't worked well and have led to some distortions in production. We need to be looking for better ways of stabilizing farm income.

But the present programs have been better than nothing. Without them, farm people would be much worse off than they are today. It is only with these programs that farmers have been able to hold their own in the great advance in national income of the last 20 years.

In examining the farm income support programs of the last 25 years, we ought to put them in perspective. These programs of price support, acreage allotment, and direct payments are comparatively minor in the whole picture of Government intervention in agriculture.

The really big Government programs are in research and education. And they have been going on for almost 100 years. The Land Grant College system of experiment stations and extension services has had far more impact on agriculture than any of the so-called subsidy programs of recent years.

For nearly a century the American people have been pumping new technology into agriculture. They have been urging farmers, in effect, to produce more and to produce more efficiently. And farmers have responded. This has been an extremely important factor in the general economic progress of the United States. Why is it that it takes only about 10 percent of our working population to produce food and fiber when it takes about 25 percent for Europe and about 40 percent for the Soviet Union?

It isn't just that we have good land and a free enterprise system. It is in large measure the result of a deliberate public policy of promoting farm efficiency. Government intervention in agriculture on a massive scale. The land grant colleges, the Department of Agriculture, the county agent system, the high school vocational agricultural teachers, all these are a part of it. In recent years the Soil Conservation Service also has helped push farm technology forward.

This vast program of farm research and education has been good for America. Farm leaders, Government farm officials, and farm educators have been remiss in not explaining to the public who it is that benefits from this effort to make farming more efficient. In recent times farmers as a group actually have suffered because of the advances in technology which have stimulated total farm output. The reason is that prices of farm products decline more than enough to offset the lower costs. The highly inelastic demand for food makes a big farm output sell at a far lower price than a small output.

If agriculture were using the methods of 1940 today, the country as a whole would be much poorer. But farmers would be much richer. Prices of food would be far higher, and Mr. Benson would have no surpluses to worry about.

Let me reemphasize the issue here. We have had a consistent public program, socialistic program if you like, to increase farm output. When the results of this policy show up in surpluses and low prices, it seems hardly fair to tell farmers they must make the necessary adjustments on their own in a free market.

What are the policy choices then? One choice is to adopt a free market policy all the way. This would mean greatly reducing the public investment in research, education, soil conservation, reclamation, and so on, as well as ending price supports.

This policy would impose a drastic adjustment on agriculture, with low prices and incomes for some years ahead. But eventually a balance would be reached and farm prices and incomes would rise. The cost to the present farm population and to future generations of consumers from such a policy would be a high one indeed. No one would seriously consider the reckless course of dismantling all the public facilities for encouraging more efficient farming.

Another choice is a real production control program for agriculture with quotas in bushels and pounds. This would give farmers some bargaining power and would raise income. But it would also require tight discipline and limited entry into farming. It would be difficult to enforce. It might slow down the advance in farm technology. From the public viewpoint, this also would be a costly and undesirable choice.

A third choice would be to continue and improve present government programs to support farm income. Even if these programs cost the taxpayer a considerable amount of money, and even if they create difficulties in handling surpluses, this choice is preferable to an elaborate control system. The total cost to the public, considering the price of food and the technical progress of the farm industry, would be much lower.

As is so often the case in difficult public policy problems, the middle way turns out to be the most desirable way.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Victor Herbert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this year all America is celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of that great Irish-born, German-bred, and American-adopted musician, Victor Herbert. Creator of numerous operettas and two grand operas, symphony conductor and virtuoso, Herbert is especially remembered today for such perennial melodies as "Ah, Sweet Mystery of Life," "Kiss Me Again," "Sweethearts," and "Indian Summer." A generous friend to his fellow composers, Herbert was one of the founders in 1914 of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers—ASCAP—which is dedicated to the proposition that no composer of music which has ever found its way into the hearts of Americans shall ever want for the necessities of life—nor that composer's widow and children.

Hugh Mulligan, talented writer for the Associated Press, has condensed Herbert's colorful career in a short article which I commend to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an excellent summary of Herbert's character and accomplishments. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 1, 1959]

VICTOR HERBERT'S ANNIVERSARY RECALLS HIS LOVE OF QUIET

(By Hugh A. Mulligan)

Victor Herbert, born 100 years ago today, never lived into the age of television. He was lucky.

Although he would have enjoyed writing for it, he would have abhorred listening to it, especially if the neighbors had a set and insisted on playing it into the wee hours.

A musician all his life, the composer of 43 operettas, 22 grand operas, and innumerable concertos, suites, ballets, and other pieces, Herbert asked only one thing of the world: quiet.

But the world was reluctant to comply. Sometimes it seemed that all the forces of man and nature conspired to torment the artist in his atelier. Rag pickers blew bugles in the streets below his window. Ferry boats and switch engines intruded on his musical musings with unscoured horn solos. Children shouted, trolleys clanged, cattle mooed and bleated on their way to the big stockyard on the corner. And invariably the little girl next door decided to take up the piano right in the middle of one of his most intricate stage compositions.

In desperation, the volatile Irishman once had double doors installed in his upper Manhattan studio and hired the U.S. Gypsum Co. to do a thorough soundproofing job—this in a day when even opera houses lacked such acoustical refinements. Two weeks later a music professor moved into the adjoining apartment with five grand pianos, two violins and an octet of young lady students who came for sorely needed voice lessons.

"His caterwauling all day long is driving me crazy," cried the exasperated composer. "We hear it before breakfast and it doesn't stop until quite late at night, but if the music were any good we wouldn't mind."

Herbert informed the soundproofing firm it could go whistle for its money outside his double door. He would hear them all right, he fumed, but he wouldn't come out to pay. He successfully defended his stand in a celebrated court battle, then tried unsuccessfully to have the board of health dispossess his musical neighbors as a public nuisance.

This predilection for peace and quiet may seem strange for a man who once directed America's biggest brass band, conducted the great Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra and spent most of his life creating noise—thrilling, melodious noise that still echoes down the years whenever an orchestra plays "Kiss Me Again," "Indian Summer," "Kiss in the Dark," "Sweethearts," or any of the dozens of other great tunes that flowed from his fertile imagination.

But that's the way the "Prince of Operettas" was. He could build a summer home at Lake Placid in the Adirondacks, buy up the houses on each side to make sure the tenants had no pianos and then spend his afternoons playing the cello with a little band down in the village square that had the butcher playing flute, the blacksmith on cornet and other tradesmen sitting in as their time allowed.

To him music was a happy, gregarious way of life, filled with good friends, good wine, good food, good cigars. But it was a way that brooked no interference.

Herbert is best remembered for operettas like "The Red Mill," "Babes in Toyland," "Naughty Marietta," "Eileen," "Mlle. Modiste," and "The Fortune Teller." People forget that in his day he was considered the world's greatest cello virtuoso, an accomplished musician who did all his own orchestration, was an intimate friend of Tchaikovsky, Dvorak, Liszt, Richard Strauss, and played a major part in the development of American music.

The American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP) was founded at his famous gourmet's table in Luchow's restaurant on 14th Street in Manhattan. He remained a member of its board of directors until his death in 1934. In a historic test suit involving his music, he battled all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court to win royalty payments for composers.

Fritz Scheff, Vernon and Irene Castle, Helen Hays, Peggy Wood, Elsie Janis, Gus Van, Fay Bainter, Marilyn Miller and a host of others won critical acclaim in his productions. A second generation of Herbert fans arrived in the thirties with the Nelson Eddy and Jeanette MacDonald movie versions of his works. And now a third generation is being mustered by television spectaculars and hi-fi recordings.

United States Is Now Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following text of an article which appeared in the November 14, 1958, issue of U.S. News & World Report. This article presents a very thorough and encouraging picture of just where the United States stands in comparison with

Russia in all areas of rivalry. It would appear from this article that the United States is today, despite all of Russia's boastful claims, still the No. 1 world power and is expected even to widen her lead in the future.

UNITED STATES NOW AHEAD—WILL IT GAIN MORE IN WEAPONS? ATOMIC POWER? SCHOOLS? SCIENCE? INDUSTRY?

Is Russia threatening the U.S. position as No. 1 world power? Hardly. Despite gains, Soviet Russia still lags far behind in practically everything. It's a primitive nation by U.S. standards. But are the Communists gaining, closing the gap? Take a look at the record.

Signs grow that the United States today is ahead of Soviet Russia in all fields of rivalry and still is gaining.

The lead—lost sight of when Sputnik I went into orbit—is in diplomacy, in science, in schooling, in weapons, in industry, in well-being of people, in freedom of the individual.

Recent events signal the American lead over the Soviet Union.

In the Far East, around Quemoy, Communists pulled back from war when challenged.

In the Arab world, Egypt's Nasser, Soviet ally, is being checked in his drive for an empire in the Middle East.

In Europe, France is taking a sharp turn to the right. Communist parties in all of the countries of Western Europe are steadily losing strength.

In space, United States has three satellites in orbit; Soviet Russia, one. United States has probed 80,000 miles toward the moon; Soviet Russia, only hundreds of miles. United States, with its X-15 rocket plane, possesses the only manned vehicle capable of flight into space.

WHO'S REALLY SECOND-RATE?

Those are a few outward signs of inner trends that shape the course of affairs in the world of today. In that world, United States-Soviet rivalry is basic.

A claim is being made at this time that the United States today is a second-class power, reduced to a status below that of Communist Russia.

All evidence points to the contrary conclusion: United States today is the world's No. 1 power; Soviet Russia the world's No. 2 power—its only real strength resting upon arms.

FORCE ON ONE SIDE, FREEDOM ON THE OTHER

A simple measure underlines that conclusion. The measure being applied is this:

Soviet Russia, at home and within its empire, is dependent upon armed force to keep its people in line. Force alone holds the Communist empire together. Remove force, and the whole structure topples.

The United States, on the contrary, lives free from fear. People are not afraid of the Government. Government does not live in fear of the people. Allies of United States remain allies by choice, not allies held by armed force.

Fear is found to represent the basic weakness of the Soviet Union—fear of people on the part of Government; fear of Government on the part of the people.

It is against that background that other measures of strength and weakness are being applied now to United States and Soviet Russia.

IN ARMED MIGHT, A DECISIVE LEAD

To the world, the arms race is a measure of who is ahead. Let Soviet Russia gain the lead, and she'll chance World War III, aim for her goal of world rule. Keep a U.S. lead, and Soviets will stop short of a showdown.

The United States lead in weapons, in thermonuclear explosives, and ability to deliver them, is regarded by military officials as

decisive at this time. The lead, as the military sees it, lies in these fields:

Bases

The United States and its allies have more than 400 U.S. air and missile bases ringing the Soviet Union. At sea are a score or more of mobile air bases and missile bases. One false move by Russia, and her destruction could follow.

Bombers

Russia is far behind United States in jet bombers. The major Soviet effort in long-range striking power is concentrated on ballistic missiles. United States today, in bombers, possesses the means to destroy Soviet Russia.

Aircraft carriers

The Communists never entered this race. In these ships is another powerful U.S. striking force.

Long-range missiles

Neither United States nor the Russians possess at this time operational missiles of ballistic type with 5,000-mile range. Russia may be slightly ahead in development work. She has a rocket motor more powerful than the United States has. But United States today possesses operational long-range air-breathing missiles, and Russia possesses none.

Other missiles

In medium-range missiles, United States and Russia are described as nearly neck and neck, but with United States ahead. With overseas bases, medium-range missiles suit United States best. In anti-aircraft missiles, United States is ahead. In air-to-air missiles, United States is much ahead. In battlefield missiles, United States is ahead. In ship-borne missiles, United States is far ahead.

Submarines

The Soviet Union is ahead in numbers of submarines. However, United States possesses, and Russia lacks, nuclear-powered submarines capable of operating indefinitely under water. Atomic submarines soon will provide capability of launching medium-range missiles to strike most of Soviet Russia.

Atomic weapons

United States, with a long head start, is well out front with specially tailored atomic and thermonuclear weapons of all types. Russia, to date, is testing cruder-type bombs of great power, described as "dirty" because of heavy fallout of radioactive material.

Ground armies

Here the Soviet edge in terms of divisions of troops is great. Reliability of Soviet and satellite armies in event of trouble is described as "uncertain." Satellite armies proved highly unreliable during Hungary's anti-Communist revolt of 2 years ago.

As of now, American military officials describe the U.S. lead in the arms race as "impressive."

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE RACE TO SPACE

But what of space? Isn't the Soviet Union far ahead in the race to conquer space? Will the one who wins that race control the world?

The answer informed officials give is this: Sputniks are not weapons. They are objects tossed into space and placed in orbit. The time when space will become a major battlefield is so remote that nobody need now become excited about it.

Even so, who is ahead in space exploration? The answer:

Earth satellites

United States has successfully launched four; Soviet Russia, three. The Communists have launched the largest satellite; United States, those capable of producing the greatest variety of scientific information. Russia showed that she possesses rocket motors with a thrust greater than present American motors. Today it's a toss-

up in the satellite race but with United States moving ahead fast.

Moon shots

In October, when a U.S. space vehicle first went 8,000 miles toward the moon. Soviet scientists conceded that the Americans were far ahead in that type of space probe.

Space ships

In the X-15, United States possesses the nearest thing to a man-piloted space ship, capable of traveling under its own rocket power. Capt. Iven Kincheloe, before he was killed in a jet accident, piloted an earlier test plane to the very edge of space and, briefly, experienced the sensation of weightlessness. No other nation is even close to the United States in this race.

Balloon exploration

Again United States is ahead. Space exploration is in its early stages. United States is at least equal to the Soviet Union in this experimental field. Every indication is that it is pushing ahead, now that a race has started.

KHRUSHCHEV CHOOSES BRAIN OVER BRAINS

Now about education. One year ago, when Sputnik I orbited the earth, a furor arose over the quality of U.S. education.

All the youth of Soviet Russia was pictured as feverishly busy studying mathematics and physics. Engineers were pouring out of colleges, scientists being developed on a mass-production basis.

A big backdown

Today, what do you find? The goal of 10 years of schooling for all in Russia is being abandoned by Nikita Khrushchev, Soviet dictator. An eighth-grade education is to be considered good enough for the average Soviet youth. Manual labor is set as the highest goal.

But let Khrushchev explain the reforms that he is making in education.

Under the new Khrushchev school system: The great majority of Soviet youths will leave school and start work at age 14 or 15. By American standards, Soviet Russia will exploit child labor.

Said Khrushchev in Pravda, Soviet newspaper, to Russia's youngsters: "You will get what amounts to a high school education not through present-day schools, which are divorced from life, but through a network of evening or correspondence courses."

Work all day and go to school at night, that's the new offer. There is a further promise of on-the-job training for youths who show special skills.

Why not a high school education for all? Said Khrushchev: "Everything indicates that it would not be advisable, at the present time, to make high school education—in its present form—universal and compulsory."

"The majority, having completed high school and received their diploma, turn out to be unprepared for life. They don't know where to go from there."

Said Khrushchev, too: "A number of high school graduates are reluctant to go to work in factories, on collective farms and on state farms, and some of them even regard such work as degrading. Our society raises people who do not respect physical labor and are out of touch with life. We cannot put up any longer with such a bad situation."

A paradox

The Soviet dictator is not impressed by Soviet schools, as some American educators profess to be.

Khrushchev told parents of Russia: "If a child studies badly, some parents will tell him: 'If you don't do well in your studies, you won't get into college; you'll go to the factory as an ordinary laborer.' Some people use physical labor as a kind of scarecrow with which to frighten the children. This

is insulting to working people in a socialist society.

"Although college entrance examinations do exist," Khrushchev said, "it must be admitted that to get into college it is often not enough to pass the examinations successfully. The influence of parents also plays a large role. Young people who are trying for college often say that, after they are through competing among themselves, there begins a competition among their parents, and it is this competition that often decides everything."

"We cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are few children of workers and peasants in our colleges and universities," Khrushchev added. "In Moscow colleges and universities, for example, only 30 to 40 percent of students are children of workers and peasants."

"Some of our agricultural colleges have their own farms, but at these farms the animals which the students are supposed to study are cared for by laborers. What kind of aristocratic setup is that? Under this kind of system a student who comes to the farm is scared out of his wits when a cow shakes her head."

That is higher Soviet education as Khrushchev describes it.

A democratic shift

Now there is to be change. In most colleges and universities, students will hold down full-time jobs during the first 2 or 3 years. They will go to school and study outside working hours. In the concluding period there will be full time for study—"except for the necessary practical training."

Khrushchev said in Pravda: "This system will be democratic since more nearly equal conditions will be created for all citizens: Neither the position of parents, nor the exertions of these parents will free anyone from productive labor. Secondly, this system will constitute a wonderful school for the raising of all youngsters in the spirit of the heroic traditions of the working class and of the collective-farm peasantry."

Better than the American system? Most educators say: Definitely not.

Behind the switch

Why the sudden change in Russia? Reasons being given are two:

1. A labor shortage plagues Soviet Russia. School changes will free 2.5 million to 3 million for work each year.

2. Educated youths are found to be politically unreliable. Soviet periodicals are sprinkled with references to incorrect attitudes and activities of students. Khrushchev's idea: Break up campus life, and nests of unrest are removed.

FORMULA FOR PROGRESS: STEALING OF SECRETS

Where, then, does this leave the Soviet Union in the field of science? The answer, it seems, is this: Far behind United States except in a few fields related to war.

In rocket-motor development, the Russians are equal to United States, if not ahead. In nuclear physics, the Soviet Union is far advanced, but United States is still out front, as many Russian scientists themselves admit. The main Soviet textbooks in advanced nuclear physics are American books translated into Russian.

In the whole vast field of chemistry, Soviet Russia is not even in the race. The Soviet government is seeking to buy equipment and know-how from United States in order to break into the chemical industry.

Medical backwardness

In another major field, that of disease-combating drugs, the Soviets are far behind. Soviet medical research is still wrestling with the problems of overcoming epidemics of diphtheria, scarlet fever, and other diseases which were virtually licked in the West decades ago.

Of science in Russia, Lieut. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, the U.S. Army's Chief of Research and Development, said this:

"The advanced state of Soviet technology is due more to Soviet success in espionage and subversion than it is to their scientific apparatus, good as it is."

And what do Russia's scientists themselves think about the relative standing of United States and Russian science? For an answer, listen to academician A. I. Berg, one of the Soviet Union's leading scientists. At a meeting called to celebrate the launching of the first sputnik, Berg stated:

"Hardly any of us thinks that American scientists and engineers are lagging behind us from the point of view of science and technology."

Atomic Power: The Standing

It is somewhat the same story in the development of atomic power.

Soviet Russia has the world's largest single reactor for development of electric power. The United States, however, has over 80 atomic-power test reactors in operation or in various stages of development—a program whose scope has been officially described as "not approached by any other country."

Other countries, in fact, are now beginning to turn to the United States for the purchase of such reactors.

An even more impressive lead has been established by the United States in the use of atoms in industry. More than 1,300 U.S. firms are now using atomic tools for such processes as gaging the thickness and density of products, testing metal castings and weldings, etc. The use of radioactive isotopes for improved production techniques is saving U.S. industry \$500 million a year.

United States is making important advances, too, in putting the atom to work in medicine. Radioactive isotopes are used to diagnose or treat the ailments of about 1,000 Americans each year.

In spite of all the talk, U.S. science still seems well ahead of Soviet science.

LAND OF MUD HUTS AND VILLAGE PUMPS

Or measure strength with other yardsticks. Success of a nation or a system may be judged by the well-being of its people.

Apply that measurement, and what do you find? Russia a first-class power?

Diet

In Soviet Russia, basically the diet is cabbage soup, coarse bread, potatoes. Meat is scarce.

Shelter

One room to a family is standard in major Soviet cities. Mud huts or log cabins are home for rural families.

Clothing

Quality is poor, price high, style standardized, colors are dark and drab, a subject of comment by visitors from the West.

Plumbing

Fewer than half of Soviet cities have public water supplies; fewer than one-fifth, a sewage system. Apartments offer usually courtyard water pumps and outdoor toilets.

Privacy

Largely nonexistent. A kerosene stove usually is shared with other families. Bathrooms, where provided, are shared with several families.

Refrigeration

Largely nonexistent. Modern kitchens are unheard of. Electric power is little used in homes except for limited lighting.

Travel

Highly restricted. Police permits are required. Private cars are a rarity. No really modern highways exist in the whole of Soviet Russia. Air travel is unavailable to the general public.

Family life

Difficult. Half of Soviet Russia's working force is made up of women. In United States it is one-third. Women do much of the heaviest manual labor in Russia; almost none in United States.

Use any standard for measuring the well-being of people, and United States is far ahead.

WAR ECONOMY VERSUS ABUNDANCE OF PEACE

Why is Russia so far behind United States in good things enjoyed by the people? The economy of Soviet Russia is strictly a war economy. A bare subsistence is offered the civilian. The economy of United States is overwhelmingly a peace economy. The military is required to get along on a small fraction of the Nation's total effort.

Apply the measure of national effort going to military and nonmilitary purposes, and you get a further answer to who's ahead.

With United States operating at about 80 percent of capacity, the military is getting what \$40 billion will buy. The civilian economy is enjoying the product of \$400 billion in national effort.

For each \$1 going to the military, \$10 is spent to satisfy the needs of civilians.

Straining at every seam, the Soviet Union, officials estimate, is able to provide the equivalent of \$40 billion of goods and services for the military. This leaves some \$130 billion for the civilian economy.

For each \$1 going to the military, a little over \$3 is spent to satisfy the needs of civilians.

For U.S. citizen, \$1,700

In United States, the \$400 billion being spent on civilian needs is divided, approximately, as follows: \$110 billion for capital investment and \$290 billion for goods and services. These goods and services are shared among 170 million civilians. The average American citizen enjoys the equivalent of over \$1,700 each year in goods and services.

For Red citizen, \$350

In the Soviet Union, the \$130 billion being spent on civilian needs is divided, roughly in this fashion: \$60 billion for capital investment and \$70 billion for goods and services. These goods and services are shared among some 200 million civilians. The average Soviet citizen enjoys the equivalent of \$350 each year in goods and services.

If a system's success is measured in well-being of peoples, the United States today is far ahead of Soviet Russia.

WHY RUSSIA NEEDS 52 MILLION FARMERS

Or apply another measure—the efficiency of agriculture, which is basic.

It requires the labor of 52 million workers on farms in Russia to provide food for the population. That leaves 58 million individual workers for all other occupations, including the military. In Russia, nearly one-half of a labor force of 110 million persons is engaged in agriculture.

Even so, the diet in Soviet Russia is wholly inadequate by American standards. Farms in Russia produce nothing like the abundance and variety of crops produced by U.S. farms.

There are 6 million persons working on American farms. That leaves 63 million workers available for all other occupations, including the military.

In the United States, less than one-tenth of the Nation's labor force is engaged in agriculture.

With fewer than 1 worker in 10 employed on a farm in the United States, the American diet is greatly superior to that of Soviet Russia. At the same time, an immense surplus of foodstuffs exists in the United States after large amounts are exported.

Facts reveal in drastic fashion the superior efficiency of American farms and factories when compared with those of the Soviet Union.

FOR RUSSIA'S CITIZENS: SHACKLES OF FEAR

In terms of rights of the individual, there is no real basis for comparison between the United States and Soviet Russia.

Freedom of speech

In the United States short of libel or obscenity, the individual is free to write or to say what he pleases. In Soviet Russia the right of simple criticism is denied the citizen if that criticism is directed at the Government. Boris Pasternak, Soviet poet and novelist, is vilified for moderate criticism of the Soviet system in a novel, "Dr. Zhivago," which was awarded a Nobel prize. Mr. Pasternak finally refused the award.

The vote

An iron dictatorship rules the Soviet Union. In the United States voters choose those who rule them and those who make policies.

Freedom of person

Secret police are an ever-present threat in Soviet Russia. The individual who is accused of a crime against the state can be imprisoned indefinitely. There is no right of habeas corpus. There is no guarantee of free trial.

Right to strike

Strikes are illegal in the Soviet Union. In the United States, there is no real limit upon the right of workers to strike if dissatisfied.

Travel

The American citizen can travel without restriction within the United States and with no real restriction outside the United States. The Soviet citizen can travel within the Soviet Union only after receiving official permission. Only the most carefully screened Soviet citizens are allowed to voyage outside Russia. Wives and children are seldom permitted to make trips abroad with husbands. The families stay home as hostages.

Work books

In the United States every worker is free. In Soviet Russia, every worker must carry a work book. On the job, this book is held by his manager. The boss can tie the worker to his job by adverse reports in his work book.

The meaning of all this? Simply that it is a basic measure of the strength of two systems. In the United States, the individual is trusted and enjoys rights that are firmly protected. In Soviet Russia, the individual is feared and enjoys no rights that cannot be taken from him at the slightest whim of a boss or a Government official.

ON WORLD FRONT, CLOSING OF RANKS

Against that background, who is ahead today and gaining in the field of diplomacy and world influence?

Once more there is a thumbnail method of measurement that helps to provide a clue. In recent years there has been a contest between the United States and Soviet Russia in providing aid for nations that are regarded as friendly.

Apply that measurement, and here is what you find:

U.S. aid

In the years since World War II, U.S. taxpayers have given nearly \$70 billion in aid to other nations. Most of that aid has been in the form of gifts.

Soviet aid

In the years since Soviet Russia began to challenge the United States in the field of foreign aid, loans in the amount of \$1.9 billion have been promised. Of that amount, \$1.5 billion is economic aid through loans, and \$400 million is in military aid through loans. Less than one-half of these loans has been drawn against by those to whom they were made. Practically all Soviet aid must be repaid. Moscow doesn't go in for gifts.

In every year since the end of the war, the United States has dispensed, on the average, about \$5 billion in foreign aid—or more

than twice the amount of the entire Soviet foreign aid program.

If size of aid is a measure of strength in alliances, the United States is found to be far ahead of Soviet Russia.

Glance around the world today, and signs of gain on the part of the United States are becoming impressive.

France

A strong government under Gen. Charles de Gaulle is prepared to limit the power of Communists in that nation. Communist influence is on the decline.

Great Britain

The Conservative Party government, under Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, is strengthening British ties with this country. The British Labor Party, inclined to try to play off Russia against United States is reported to be losing popular strength.

West Germany

An ally of increasing importance to United States. Strongly anti-Communist.

North Mediterranean

Spain becoming stronger. Italy's Communist Party divided. Greece and Turkey are firm allies of the United States.

In the Pacific

South Korea, Japan, Formosa and the Philippines all are firm allies. Communist strength is not great in any of them.

South Pacific; Indian Ocean

South Vietnam, Thailand, Burma, and Pakistan are all in strong hands, firmly anti-Communist. Indonesia, flirting actively with communism not many months ago, has cooled off. Nehru's India is increasingly concerned about the aims of Communist China.

In recent months, United States has made gains in the world.

Now glance at the Soviet side, in this contest in the world.

Eastern Europe

Armed forces of the Soviet Union continue to be needed to hold down the people and support Communist regimes. The flight of people from East Germany continues on a broad scale. Revolt simmers everywhere.

Red China

There are signs that the Soviet dictatorship is not happy about the new drive by Chinese officials to speed industrialization by putting a large share of the population into communes—a form of slavery. Mao Tse-tung, Chinese dictator, is reported to feel that dictator Khrushchev is an upstart who has no real claim as a revolutionary.

Middle East

Soviet Russia has managed to get a foothold in the Middle East. But Moscow's friendship for Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, for example, has not solved all Nasser's problems. Aid from the Soviet Union, while continuing to flow in the form of loans, has been insufficient to do the things Nasser wants to do at home and abroad. The Egyptian dictator is not getting the financial support that he had expected from oil-rich areas of the Middle East.

When Khrushchev looks around, as American appraisers see it, he has little reason either to be confident or to be happy. At this time, things are not going his way, in the opinion of these appraisers.

OUTLOOK IS FOR UNITED STATES TO WIDEN ITS LEAD

How does it all add up?

The answer, at bottom, as the facts disclose, is the one that follows:

The Soviet Empire rests upon force and restless peoples. Within that empire are vast amounts of territory and, in spots, an extremely high density of population. At the same time, resources are not what they might be either from the point of view of quantity or of proper location for efficiency.

The Soviet system, based upon decisions reached by a few planners, is an inefficient system.

The United States is an immensely powerful Nation, possessed of a highly efficient industrial and agricultural system and with ready access to the richest markets of the world. Available resources appear limitless.

Today, based upon all the evidence, United States is far ahead in the world and still gaining. That lead and the gains can continue, officials say, barring colossal mistakes of judgment. Big war does not enter into the picture as it is developing for the future.

Need for Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on Thursday, January 22, 1959.

Once again we are reminded of the ravages of the uncontrolled rivers and the ensuing floods. If the flood-control projects already approved by the U.S. Army engineers had received the necessary appropriations by the Congress and the administration, thousands of persons living in the Allegheny River Valley would not have had the horrifying experience of the recent floods, as well as the millions of dollars in losses to property and the lives of our people.

The article follows:

FLOOD STRESSES NEED FOR KINZUA DAM—MISSING LINK WOULD HAVE HELD WATERS AT BAY IN WARREN, OTHER TOWNS

Thousands of persons living in the Allegheny River Valley were suffering again today because of the missing link in Pittsburgh's flood-control system.

Forecasters were predicting a record-breaking flood in the upper reaches of the river which is expected to crest above 18 feet at Warren, where the water touched 18.4 feet in March 1956.

River experts pointed out that if the Kinzua Dam above Warren had been built as planned back in 1937, flooding along the banks of the stream would have been negligible.

They recalled estimates made following last year's flood by Col. Howard E. Sprague, district Army engineer at Pittsburgh.

"Construction of Kinzua Dam could have cut that 18.4-foot crest at Warren to 8.9 feet, well below the 14-foot flood stage," Colonel Sprague said. "Any damage to the town would have been averted."

During hearings on the dam, the engineers estimated that 2 to 6 feet would be cut from flood stages at Oil City, Franklin, Pittsburgh, and Wheeling, depending on where the floodwaters originated.

The rapidly rising waters of the Allegheny today were lending new force to the colonel's arguments.

He noted that the 10 flood-control dams in the Pittsburgh area already have prevented \$250 million in damages since they were built.

"This is twice their original cost of \$114 million and their economic benefits are just beginning to be felt," Colonel Sprague said.

Construction of the proposed 180-foot-high Kinzua Dam, the engineers estimated would control about 22 percent of the runoff from the entire Allegheny River Basin and eliminate the last major flood danger in the western Pennsylvania area.

The Army experts said 10 feet could be cut from Allegheny flood stages in the Pittsburgh district by the dam.

Construction of Kinzua has been held up by the opposition of the Seneca Indians, whose Allegany Reservation north of Warren would be partially flooded. The case currently is being appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

So far Congress has appropriated \$2 million for preliminary work in connection with the \$101-million dam but the President's budget submitted last week asked for no new appropriation.

The previous appropriations carried the specification that no money should be spent for construction until the Senecas' suit was settled. Consequently only a small fraction of the original money has been spent so far on surveys and planning.

For Better Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Rockford, Ill., Morning Star, entitled "For Better Courts":

In an address before the Chicago Bar Association, Illinois Supreme Court Justice Charles H. Davis, of Rockford, offered a meritorious blueprint for improvement of the Illinois court system and the administration of justice by legislative action and amendment of rules of the State supreme court.

Justice Davis called for immediate court revision through legislation providing for creation of adequate supervisory powers in the judicial branch of government to be administered through an administrative officer of the supreme court, with power of assignment over judges of any court of record; elimination of courts of record in cities, villages, and incorporated towns and absorption of their personnel into the circuit courts; increase the number of judges of the circuit and superior courts if necessary; revision of the probate act to require that all appeals from probate court rulings be taken to the appellate or supreme court, thereby abolishing an intermediate review by the circuit court; transformation of the offices of justice of the peace and police magistrate from a fee basis to a salary basis; use of impartial medical testimony in resolving medical issues in civil litigation; amendment of the civil practice act to permit the use of a jury handbook, rather than to require the court to give all instructions to the jury at the conclusion of a trial.

The provision for elimination of city and village courts of record would not apply to the municipal court of Chicago.

Justice Davis would amend supreme court rules to permit either party to a lawsuit to require the trial court to grant a pre-trial hearing and to require the bar to expand its list of trial lawyers.

All of the recommendations made by Justice Davis are designed to expedite litigation, streamline the judicial process, and generally improve the workings of justice.

These recommendations merit the earnest consideration of the legislature, the judiciary, and the bar. Illinois State Bar Association is preparing legislation providing for some of these improvements. It is recognized that necessary revision of the court system can be accomplished by legislative action.

Who's Overseeing the Oversighters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable J. Sinclair Armstrong, entitled "Who's Overseeing the Oversighters?" Mr. Armstrong is leaving the Government service, and his address is predicated on considerable testimony before the Oversight Committee of the House. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Public Printer that the estimated cost of printing the manuscript is \$263.25. I believe the address has a bearing on certain pending questions. Otherwise, I would not ask that it be printed notwithstanding the cost.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S OVERSEEING THE OVERSIGHTERS, AN ADDRESS BY J. SINCLAIR ARMSTRONG, BEFORE THE SECTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW OF THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AT THE MAYFLOW HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 6, 1958

In early January 1957 the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, dropped in the hopper the resolution by which the House of Representatives authorized that committee to make investigations and studies into matters under the jurisdiction of certain of the so-called independent regulatory agencies. This was the now well-known House Resolution 99, and it included authority to investigate and study the adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various securities acts.

In discussing the resolution on the floor, the Speaker, Representative SAM RAYBURN of Texas, with obvious pride, mentioned that during the time he had been a Member of Congress every board and commission except the Interstate Commerce Commission had been set up, many of them from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He particularly mentioned the Securities and Exchange Commission and certain of the Federal securities laws. He said, referring to the chairman of the committee, Representative HARRIS, "I trust that the gentleman will set up a subcommittee, and I think under the broad authority of this resolution he has that authority to go into the administration of each and every one of these laws to see whether or not the law as we intended it is being carried out, or whether a great many of these laws are being repealed or revamped by those who administer them."

Replying, Representative HARRIS mentioned that it was his intention to set up a special

committee to investigate the administration of the laws as intended by Congress which come under the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. "As the resolution indicates," he said, "many of these agencies come under our jurisdiction. They are established as arms of the Congress and appropriately report to the Congress."

Representative WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, of Illinois, a member of the committee, stated: "I think the committee ought to go back through the years from the time that the law was first put into effect to determine what the trend has been over that period of time. That is perfectly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think the House would like to know, because the agencies which are under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce cover almost every facet of business in America today. If that is done and done properly, you could have a study and it would have a good effect, not only so far as this particular committee is concerned but upon business generally."

Thus was set in motion, at the beginning of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, the now famous Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight.

We might pause for a moment to consider just what "legislative oversight" means. In 1946, by the Legislative Reorganization Act, Congress established various standing committees and assigned to them the duty to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies of the laws.

Responsibility to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of the Federal securities laws by the Securities and Exchange Commission was assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. Pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Securities and Exchange Commission had made regular biennial presentations at the opening of each Congress to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or to its standing Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, of its programs in administering the Federal securities laws.

Also, throughout 1955, a whole year before the establishment of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, the Commission had presented to the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the programs and problems of the Commission in the light of the drastically changed conditions of the securities markets which confronted the Commission as a result of the tremendous increases in the marketing of new issues of corporate securities, in trading on the exchanges, and in trading in the over-the-counter market, and the consequent development of abuses and enforcement problems. Particular emphasis was placed on the penny uranium stock boom, and our efforts to improve the administration of the exemptive regulation for issues of small size.

During the spring of 1956, the Commission developed its proposals for legislative changes that would be needed to assist the Commission in better coping with these problems. They were submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the late Representative J. Percy Priest, of Tennessee, in May. There was not time for the committee to take them up before adjournment, but early in August, right after adjournment, the chairman assured me that these legislative proposals would have the prompt and early consideration of the committee at the beginning of the 2d session. Unfortunately, in October Representative Priest passed away, and the great support which he gave to the work of the Securities and Exchange Commission, during his tenure as a senior member and finally chairman of

the committee, was thus unfortunately withdrawn.

Another most unfortunate change in personnel of the committee was the retirement from Congress of Representative Arthur W. Klein, chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, to become a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. Justice Klein had been a member of the commission staff earlier in his career, and understood and supported the work of the Commission superbly.

In February 1957, at the opening of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, I met with the new chairman of the committee, Representative HARRIS, in his office, to explain to him the importance to the work of the Commission in protecting the investing public of an early hearing on the Commission's legislative proposals. Unfortunately, no such hearing was accorded either by the committee itself, by the standing Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, or by the newly formed Legislative Oversight Committee.

After House Resolution 99 was passed. It occurred to me that the assistance of the Speaker, whose great interest in the securities laws was well known, could be enlisted. So I obtained an interview with him a few days later, in his office, and urged him to consider promptly action by the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee of the Commission's enforcement problems, particularly in light of the uranium penny-stock boom and the boiler-room fraudulent, high-pressure sales boom, with all the staffing and budgetary implications of these. I also requested consideration of other aspects of the Commission's legislative program. The Speaker indicated to me great interest in the problems of the Commission which I described to him in this meeting. Unfortunately, no progress in the way of a hearing with the committee or either of the subcommittees resulted from my meeting with the Speaker.

Thereafter, in March 1957, Representative PETER F. MACK, Jr., of Illinois, who was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, invited a discussion with me of a case with which the Commission was then dealing. Some of you may remember that Representative Mack took considerable exception to my testimony last June before the subcommittee on this subject, as he seemed to feel that I regarded his inquiry about this case as improper in some way because I compared it with inquiries from White House staff members about cases. I think the record should be perfectly clear that I do not regard inquiries by Members of Congress about matters pending before the Commission as improper, any more than I regard the White House staff as barred from inquiring into the status and progress of cases pending in the agency.

At any event, in this meeting with Representative MACK I again pressed the urgency of consideration by the committee, or any of its subcommittees, of the Commission's legislative program. Unfortunately, no continuous interest or watchfulness was shown by Representative MACK for the Commission's programs and problems.

Neither the committee nor any of its subcommittees considered the Commission's legislative proposals during 1957 in the 1st session of the 85th Congress. Nor did the committee nor any of its subcommittees take these matters up in the 2d session in 1958. I think this constitutes a very clear failure by the committee of Congress, which has a statutory duty to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of the Federal securities laws, to discharge its obligation and duty to Congress and the public. The committee did not exercise continuous watchfulness at all after 1956. It was solely for the purpose of calling as wide public attention to this as one individual could that I brought this sorry record of lack of attention to serious problems in the se-

curities markets to the attention of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee in my testimony before the subcommittee in June of this year.

I do not propose to spend any time this noon on the record up to now of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee itself, other than to say that it is only just beginning to deal with fundamental problems confronting the Commission in the Commission's effort to carry out the basic purposes of investor protection embodied in the Federal securities laws.

The subcommittee circularized the Commission on the question of whether members were being unduly traveled or entertained by the regulated industry. That was a good thing for the subcommittee to do, because it is always well for Congress to keep a close watch on standards of behavior of officials in the executive branch. But it was hardly a major effort in carrying out the purpose, which I read a moment ago, expressed in House Resolution 99, or of the duty of oversight expressed in the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Also, the subcommittee concerned itself at great length, and in my opinion unfairly and unduly, about alleged pressure brought to bear by the White House staff in particular cases. The record made before the subcommittee has conclusively demonstrated that there was no pressure brought to bear by the White House staff in any case before the Securities and Exchange Commission. The record also shows diligent efforts by the Commission to enforce the law, under staffing handicaps and in hard-fought litigation. I think it is perfectly obvious from the record that had there been pressure brought to bear it would have been resisted by the Commission just as we resisted congressional pressure.

In passing, I might say that the number of congressional inquiries during the 4 years I was a member of the Commission exceeded by many hundredfold the number of White House inquiries. I think the subcommittee has done a grave disservice to the confidence of the public in the administration of the law by independent agencies by creating the impression in the public mind that members of independent agencies are automatically susceptible to pressure from the White House, any more than they are susceptible to pressures from Congress. The Securities and Exchange Commission during the 4 years I served on it was entirely free of any susceptibility to pressure from the White House, Congress, or anyone else, including the securities industry. I also think that the subcommittee has done a grave disservice to the public by attempting to create the impression that because agencies, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, are independent they are under the administrative control of Congress. This they are not. The laws by which these agencies were created, as well as other basic laws enacted by Congress, such as the Budget and Accounting Act and the Administrative Procedure Act, make it perfectly clear that these agencies possess executive and quasi-judicial powers, as well as quasi-legislative powers. Under our Constitution, it is the function of Congress to write the laws, not to administer them. The designation of these independent agencies as arms of Congress is a convenient colloquial description. However, it is completely at variance with the concept under which the Securities and Exchange Commission and the other so-called independent agencies operated during their early years, when their close collaboration with President Franklin D. Roosevelt was well known. After all, the famous Humphrey case on the tenure of Commissioners arose from the unwillingness of one Commissioner to truckle to the White House, as a result of which President Roosevelt attempted to fire him without cause. To call the Com-

mission an arm of Congress does not validly carry the legal conclusion which the subcommittee has attempted to create, that these agencies are or should be independent of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

So much for the record of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee to date. I recognize that the subcommittee, and particularly its new chairman, Representative HARRIS, have had unusual problems, to say the least, both among its members and its staff, with which to contend. Every encouragement should be given to the subcommittee and to its new chairman, Representative HARRIS, to get on to the important work that lies ahead in carrying out the purpose of House Resolution 99 and the duty of continuous watchfulness imposed by the Legislative Reorganization Act. I am personally hopeful, as I have been in times past, that this is going to go ahead in the next Congress. I am hopeful that the chairman of the subcommittee and the Commission will soon address themselves to the Commission's problems and its legislative programs. I pledge to Representative HARRIS my personal support and cooperation if there is any help and assistance which I can give the subcommittee in its consideration of these important legislative proposals and problems of administration of the Federal securities laws.

Let us look for just a moment at what some of these legislative proposals are and why they are needed.

First, I would like to speak of the Commission's study pertaining to the desirability of the registration of unlisted securities of certain companies having large public investor interest. In the winter and spring of 1955, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee conducted a so-called friendly study of the stock market. The only legislation which came out of this study was the reintroduction of legislation which the Commission had earlier recommended back in 1947 and 1950 of a bill which would extend the financial reporting, proxy and insider trading provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to companies which, by reason of the broad distribution of their securities and their failure to have registered them under the Exchange Act and listed them for trading on a stock exchange, were exempt from these provisions of the Exchange Act.

During 1955, our Commission made the first full, complete and factual study to determine the companies which might be affected by this bill, the extent of their compliance with the applicable financial reporting requirements of the Commission, and their practices in soliciting proxies. About 1,200 corporations were affected, having estimated assets in excess of \$35 billion. Serious deficiencies were found, particularly in the proxy soliciting material, and in 1956 the Commission endorsed the enactment, with some minor changes, of this legislation. Unfortunately, the Senate Banking Committee under the chairmanship of the bill's sponsor, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, more or less lost interest in the proposal, and my personal efforts to have it considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce also failed.

In 1957, the Commission made a similar study in regard to the practices of insurance companies which were exempted from the original bill. Toward the end of the last session, the Banking Committee amended the bill so as to reduce its coverage and reported it to the Senate, but no legislative action was taken.

The Commission expressed the opinion that this bill would provide additional protection to investors in securities in which there is a broad public investor interest, and which are sold and are traded in the interstate securities markets, by requiring disclosure of the business and financial facts pertaining to the corporations issuing them.

and that it would strengthen the protections against fraud afforded to investors. In my opinion, there was a sorry lack of legislative attention to one of the most important financial studies ever made by the Commission.

Next, let me refer to the so-called technical amendments proposed by the Commission. These resulted from the most exhaustive legal study of the statutes which the Commission administers that has been made since 1940. The proposals were designed to strengthen the jurisdictional provisions of the statutes, correct certain inadequacies, and, most important, to facilitate criminal prosecutions and other enforcement actions. As I mentioned, they were first submitted in 1956 and again in 1957. During 1957, in order to facilitate the work of any committee of Congress which might take up these problems, the Commission obtained approval of the respective Senate and House committee chairmen to circulate the proposals to the public and hold hearings on them. Thus, in a sense, the Commission did some of the committee's work for it in advance.

After the Commission had held hearings and conferences in the winter of 1957, and had considered the testimony and written comments received, the proposals were re-drafted and revised and, as I mentioned, again submitted to Congress. No hearings were held nor was any action taken.

I was delighted to read in a talk which the present Chairman of the Commission, Edward N. Gadsby, delivered just a few weeks ago that the Commission presently intends to reexamine these legislative proposals in the light of comments which have been made since their introduction. He said: "It is reasonable to predict that the proposals will be reintroduced in substantially the same form in the 1st session of the 86th Congress which is scheduled to convene on January 7, 1959."

I would just like to mention briefly several things which these legislative proposals, if enacted, would do to aid the Commission in its enforcement work. The proposals to amend the Securities Act of 1933 would provide more workable administrative procedures and more time within which to conduct investigations in connection with registration statements for new issues, would clarify the jurisdictional basis of the civil liability provisions of the statute, would make clear that showings of past violations were sufficient basis for injunctive relief, and that aiders and abettors may be responsible in administrative proceedings, and would extend civil and criminal liability to documents filed with the Commission under the exemptive regulations as they now are when filed under registration provisions.

The proposals to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 would make it a violation of Federal law to embezzle money and securities entrusted to the care of an exchange member or a registered broker-dealer, would make the status of an exchange member or a broker-dealer doing business through a member or a registered broker-dealer basis for Federal jurisdiction, would clarify and strengthen the provisions relating to manipulation and the financial responsibility of brokers and dealers, would authorize the Commission to regulate the borrowing, lending, or holding of customers' securities by a broker-dealer, would make it clear that attempts to purchase or sell securities are covered by the antifraud provisions of the statute, and would make various other improvements.

These are just a few of many important and necessary changes which Congress should consider making in these laws if the Commission is to continue to serve the investing public in today's active securities markets.

In 1953, and again in 1957, the Commission amended and strengthened the rules relating

to the disclosure provisions of its exemptive regulation relating to the sale of small issues of securities, that is, issues not in excess of \$300,000. These are exempt from the full registration provisions. In the light of these protective improvements in the exemptive regulation, the Commission recommended to Congress that the Securities Act of 1933 be amended to provide for an increase in the exemptive amount from \$300,000 to \$500,000. We believe that this would be beneficial in facilitating the attraction of new capital, particularly new equity capital, to small business enterprises. The difficulty of small business today to attract new equity capital is one of the serious problems of our economy and one to which a number of committees of Congress have from time to time addressed themselves.

The proposed increase in the exemption was unanimously passed by the Senate in 1954 but blocked in the House by the opposition of Speaker RAYBURN himself. Similar bills again passed the Senate in 1958. I believe it is high time that the committee considered favorably this effort on the part of the Commission to facilitate the freer flow of vitally needed new capital to small business.

In addition to the Commission's legislative program, there are a number of rule-making problems with which the Commission is attempting to deal. I was delighted to read in Mr. Gadsby's address, to which I referred a moment ago, his statement that, "The Commission may legislate by adoption of rules only within the framework of the powers entrusted to it by the Congress. It may not add to the statutes by rule, but it has the statutory duty to implement them. The remedy for an inadequate statutory delegation of powers is by amendment of the statute and not through the adoption of rules."

The Commission has adopted a number of rules which, in my opinion, are very much in need of legislative scrutiny. I do not intend to dwell on this at length, but one of the most important of these is the so-called no-sale rule under the Securities Act of 1933. The rule in effect provides that the registration and prospectus requirements are inapplicable to securities issued in connection with mergers, consolidations, reclassifications and transfers of assets between corporations. The rule does not purport to provide an exemption from the antifraud provisions of the act.

The statutory construction embodied in this rule was developed in the early days of the Commission, and in 1956 we concluded that the rule should be reconsidered. Various revisions have since been proposed. I have spoken on this subject at length, particularly in a talk which I gave before the Illinois Society of Certified Public Accountants in June 1957.

Suffice it to say that, as an interpretive rule, I consider it to be an incorrect interpretation of the statute. The terms "offer" and "sale" are specifically defined in the statute to include every contract of sale or disposition of a security for value, and every attempt to dispose of a security for value. That definition in my opinion applies to the solicitation of stockholders' votes for a plan of merger or like transaction which will involve the issuance or exchange of securities for value, and the solicitation of such votes in my opinion is an attempt to dispose of a security or interest in a security for value.

Moreover, elsewhere in the statute certain other exchanges are expressly exempted from the registration provisions. Furthermore, the exemptions from the registration provisions of the statute for certain types of securities and certain transactions are broader than the exemptions from the antifraud provisions of the act. Thus it is clear that Congress was perfectly capable of stating what exemptions it intended and what it did not intend.

The no sale rule has the practical effect of adding a substantial category of transactions to those expressly exempted from registration. I believe this is unsound as a matter of statutory construction. Congress did not give any power to the Commission to add to the classes of securities exempted by the act, except in one instance not here relevant. This problem is urgently in need of legislative correction. No matter what rule the Commission may now adopt modifying the present no sale rule, careful lawyers will inevitably be reluctant to advise clients to rely on it.

Unfortunately, the existence of the rule provided a loophole through which securities involving millions of dollars were issued and sold in promotions freed of all Commission interference during the boilerroom resurgence of 1955 and 1956.

Another most important phase of the Commission's enforcement program, which I believe urgently needs staffing and follow through, is the program of inspection of registered investment companies. Investment companies have shown striking growth since the act was passed in 1940. From assets with market value of \$2.5 billion that year, their assets increased to \$15 billion in 1957. This enormous pool of public investors' funds is subject to virtually no State or other Federal regulation, and, because of staff inadequacies, not until 1956 did the Commission ever consider any program of regular inspections. That year, because of the rapid expansion of the industry, we projected an inspection program for 1957. However, because of staff lack only six inspections could be completed. This is obviously totally inadequate in view of the size of the industry and the possibilities for abuse.

The mutual fund business is probably the most important single segment of the capital market through which the savings of millions of individual American citizens are invested. The financial integrity of this segment of the market is vitally important to these millions of small investors. The danger of this large industry suffering abuses by the inability of the Commission to perform even the most elementary of supervisory functions called for by its present statutes could result in tragic consequences.

The Legislative Oversight Subcommittee should carefully review the Commission's legislative authority over investment companies to determine whether it is adequate in the light of present day circumstances and market conditions to protect the investments of the multitude of citizens in whose interest this Commission was established.

Such a program should be supported by responsible segments of the investment company industry, because the whole industry could suffer loss of public confidence by abuses which might occur in a few mutual funds which in themselves were of no great importance.

Finally, I invite the consideration of the subcommittee to the Commission's enforcement problems in the light of the entirely new conditions which prevail in the securities markets today. Conditions at present require a most vigorous and accelerated program, including new measures of enforcement, for at no time in the history of the Commission has activity and public participation in the securities markets been so great. For example, the dollar volume of securities registered increased 94 percent from \$7.5 billion in 1953, to \$14.6 billion in 1957. The market value of all stock on all stock exchanges increased from \$111 billion in 1950, to over \$262 billion in 1957. The dollar volume of securities traded on stock exchanges rose from \$17 billion in 1953 to \$34 billion in 1957. The number of holders of shares in publicly owned corporations is estimated to have increased from 8½ million persons in 1952, to over 8½ million by 1956.

Unfortunately, a substantial segment of the public again appears to believe, as it did in the roaring twenties, that it is possible for the unskilled to reap large and quick profits in the securities markets. An increase in the number of uninformed and unsophisticated investors, and an increase in their willingness to purchase unknown and speculative securities, has increased the opportunities for illicit profit in illegal or fraudulent sales of securities. The problem of boiler rooms, the problem of sale of unregistered securities based on claimed exemptions, the evasion of registration requirements through the no sale theory, which I mentioned above, and problems in connection with promotional stock, particularly in new insurance and financial ventures in some parts of the country, have all drastically increased the work of the Commission in enforcement. Also, for reasons which I have recently discussed in the Virginia Law Review, State blue sky law administration is almost completely ineffective in protecting the public in today's predominantly interstate securities markets.

The Commission's efforts to cope with this problem by increased broker-dealer inspections and civil and criminal action in the courts have met with considerable success, but they are limited by staff and budget. Fortunately, the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, under the able leadership of Representative ALBERT THOMAS of Texas, has taken a genuine interest in these problems and, indeed, has provided the only effective forum for the Commission in the House during the past few years.

As a matter of fact, back in 1955 at the request of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, the staff of the Library of Congress made a study of the work of independent agencies with a view to determining whether they were properly carrying out their functions, which in my opinion made a real contribution to the work both of the subcommittee and of the Commission.

With the backing of the Director of the Budget and the Independent Offices Subcommittee, the Commission's staff has been increased from about 650, the 20-year low which occurred in the spring of 1955, when I became chairman, to about 1,000. A great deal more needs to be done, and support from the committee of the House which has substantive jurisdiction, namely the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for the Commission's enforcement program and staffing and budgetary problems, is urgently needed.

In conclusion, I would like to make a few observations as to the purpose of Federal regulation of the interstate corporate securities markets. As lawyers, we sometimes tend to become so deeply immersed in the complexities and niceties of law and legal procedures that we lose sight of the basic social and economic objectives which the law serves. In a free society, with modern scientific and industrial techniques, the only way in which the production of the many things needed to provide a high standard of living and national security is through large aggregations of capital provided by millions of small investors. Today we have in the United States just such a system of free private enterprise. The means of production in our country are owned by the people, not through the state as would be the case under socialism or communism, but, rather, directly through ownership of corporate securities. If corporations are to attract the funds needed for capital purposes in an expanding economy, with a burgeoning population, and under conditions of enormous national security responsibilities at home and in the free world, they must have access to the savings of millions of individual investors. If these savings are to be made available voluntarily, these millions of in-

vestors must have confidence in the integrity of the capital markets. Because of abuses and other conditions which prevailed in the late twenties, the confidence of the American people in our capital markets was destroyed. Reestablishment of this confidence by Federal regulation became a basic policy of the Government, commencing with the enactment of the Securities Act of 1933. This act, incidentally, was based upon studies made by the Federal Trade Commission, commencing in 1928. A series of laws were placed on the books up to 1940. They have remained substantially unchanged since. As they have been administered over the intervening years by the Securities and Exchange Commission, with maximum and effective cooperation from a reorganized and highly responsible securities industry, the confidence of the investing public in the integrity of the capital markets has been restored. This is vitally important to the continued success of our free enterprise system. Hence, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and its Legislative Oversight Subcommittee have a great responsibility to the American people to support and aid the Commission in its efforts to improve the administration of the Federal securities laws. Thus, in the last analysis, the answer to, "Who's overseeing the overseers?" is the American people.

It will be obvious to all of you that I feel strongly about these problems. I spent most of my time as a practicing lawyer for 12 years assisting business and industry in raising capital under these laws. Then for 4 years I was privileged to participate in administering them. I believe in them. They must be made to serve the public, and they must be improved. I have spoken my piece on this subject, in Washington and around the country.

For the past year and a half I have had nothing to do with the Commission. The views I express here are my own. I hope I haven't ruffled any feelings by what I have said or done. During my tenure on the Commission, I experienced most heartwarming support from responsible members of the bar, the securities industry, and Congress, not to mention fellow Commissioners and staff, for whom my personal admiration and to whom my debt for their hard work, intelligence, and loyalty is truly enormous. I hope I have helped to stimulate responsible consideration of vital problems affecting our Nation's securities markets and the success of our free-enterprise system.

A Tribute to Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, since we are nearing the birthday anniversary of our former President, Abraham Lincoln, it seems fitting and proper to include a statement delivered in the House by a distinguished and former Member of Congress, the Honorable Homer Hoch, who represented the Fourth District of Kansas during the period March 1919 to March 1933. It is a classical tribute to a great American, to a great President, Abraham Lincoln.

There is no new thing to be said of Lincoln. Nor is there a new thing to be said of the mountains or the sea or the stars. The mountains ever tower in solemn majesty

above the drifting clouds, the mysterious sea ever sobs upon the shore, and the silent stars ever keep holy vigil above a tired world—but to mountain and sea and stars, men turn forever in unwearied homage. And thus was Lincoln. For he was a mountain in grandeur of soul, he was sea in deep undervoice of sadness and mystery, he was star in steadfast purity of purpose and of service. And he abides. With the name of Lincoln tears are called from old men's eyes, and with the name of Lincoln childhood learns to hush a patriot's devotion. And there is no new thing to be said of him—what need, for such as he. But while the republic stands on whose altar he laid his great mind and heart, while liberty is cherished, while civic virtue and service and sacrifice are honored in the earth, the name of Lincoln will be spoken in undying love by the sons of men.

President John L. Lewis, United Mine Workers of America, Vehemently Protests the Ill-Advised Action by the German Government in Levying a Customs Tax of \$4.76 on Coal Imports While the Flood of Foreign Oil to Germany Is Exempt From Such Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to my protest to Congress on January 27, 1959, regarding the action of the German Government in levying a customs tax of \$4.76 per ton on coal imports, I wish to call attention to the letter dated January 26, 1959, written by President John L. Lewis, United Mine Workers of America, to Hon. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs of the Department of State, in protest over the arbitrary and discriminatory action by the German Government.

Mr. Lewis minces no words in evaluating the disturbing factors apparent in the shortsighted action taken by the German Government and which is certain to prove of aid and comfort to Soviet Russia in development of its export and barter programs.

Mr. Lewis' letter follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1959.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your department is familiar with the protests of all elements of the coal industry against the proposed plans of the German Government, in its policy of discrimination against imports of American coal. Despite these protests and the sympathetic cooperation of your department, the German Government now officially announces a customs duty of \$4.76 a ton, chiefly effective against American coal.

I point out:

(a) That the tax is not applicable to foreign oil, vast quantities of which are now entering Germany.

(b) That the tax will not affect coal imported from Poland, nor lignite from East

Germany, now and in the future delivered under barter arrangements.

(c) The arbitrary imposition of this tax will nullify term contracts with U.S. coal producers in the approximate amount of 10 million tons per annum. It will lay idle \$100 million of investments made by American coal, railroad, and shipping interests, to provide facilities and highly efficient quality, requisite to deliver the tonnage obligated under existing term contracts. These investments were made upon the invitation of German coal, steel, and governmental interests, who gave assurances that continuity of purchase on the part of Germany would last over an indefinite number of years, and make possible the amortization of the afore-said investments.

(d) Motivation on the part of the German Government is political in nature and not, in itself, economic. Germany is planning to increase its trade with Russia, Poland and East Germany on a barter basis, and has now pending requests from Russia for additional barter deals. The Russian development of the East Caspian and other coal fields now being planned will release vast quantities of Black Sea coal, now being mined by Russia for export and barter purposes.

(e) The employment of 20,000 Americans now employed in the coal, rail and shipping industries, will be destroyed by this contemplated action on the part of Germany, and the internal revenue of the United States will be diminished accordingly.

The contemplated arrangement smacks of bad faith on the part of the German Government, and will create bitterness and resentment on the part of those who will be the victims of such contemptible treatment. It is astonishing that this action should come at a time when the integrity of Germany, guaranteed by the United States, is being threatened by the nation which Germany now hopes to placate at the expense of her benefactor.

The arbitrary action of the German Government should be effectively protested by the Government of the United States, and economic reprisals resorted to if necessary, to protect our American economy against such ill-conceived and hostile action. Without hesitation, Mr. Secretary, I assure you that the overwhelming majority of all Americans adversely affected by the proposed act of the German Government support the sentiments I herein enunciate.

Yours truly,

JOHN L. LEWIS.

The Import Difficulties of the Automobile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress, I included in my remarks the text of an address made by Mr. Roger M. Blough, the board chairman of the United States Steel Corp. Mr. Blough called attention in his speech to the increasing flood of imports of steel and steel products and their resulting adverse effect on the American steel industry and our domestic economy.

Mr. Blough did not believe that reasonable tariffs to equalize foreign and domestic costs were the solution to the

steel industry's problem. Rather, he felt that restraint with respect to wages could offer a solution. I pointed out at the time that, while I agreed with his statement of the problem, I did not agree with his solution.

Now another leading industrialist, Mr. Ernest R. Breech, chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Co., has cited the problems facing the American automobile industry as a result of the economic resurgence of Europe.

Mr. Breech and the other automobile manufacturers have good reason to be disturbed about the flood of imports and the failure of other nations to reciprocate our Government's generosity with respect to admitting imports. Yet, in part, policies which he espouses have caused this situation.

For the year ending October 31, 1958, the United States imported 398,791 automobiles. Over the same period we exported 130,723. From the viewpoint of the shareholders and workers in the automotive industry, such a 3-to-1 adverse ratio can scarcely be interpreted to mean that the foreign trade policies of the United States were written and are being administered with their welfare in mind.

And the situation would appear to be deteriorating rather than improving, in view of the fact that our automobile exports for the first 10 months of 1958 were down 10 percent from the same period of 1957; and our imports were up almost 100 percent.

While I am not an expert in the affairs of the automobile industry, one has only to do some simple arithmetic to compute the effect of this situation upon our workers. Some 600,000 people on the average were employed in the industry in 1958; production was 5,119,720 units. Thus, it might be said that roughly each worker produced about 8.5 automobiles during the year. Employment figures for the automotive industry show substantial month-by-month variations. The 600,000 figure is believed to be a relatively conservative one, rendering the results discussed elsewhere also on the low side.

Hence, we see that the 398,791 automobiles imported displaced some 44,300 jobs in the automobile industry.

On the other hand, and for the latest available 12 months' period, the exports of 130,723 vehicles provided jobs to some 15,400 workers.

The next time the free-trade advocates from Detroit express concern over unemployment in that area, they might well give some thought to the fact that the difference between the jobs displaced and the jobs created showed a net deficit of 28,900 jobs. That conservative estimate is no insubstantial number of unemployed American citizens, the vast majority of them in Michigan.

Now, in its monumental study, "The United States in World Trade," the American Tariff League makes the following statement:

It can be estimated that for every 100 jobs permanently lost, a community is deprived of \$360,000 in annual retail sales; \$270,000 in bank deposits; 107 automobile registrations; 112 households; 74 jobs in other enterprises; 4 retail establishments.

In addition to this approximate equation, other significant cutbacks must be computed, such as reduced Federal, State and local tax revenues; greater outlays for unemployment compensation; declining school budgets; less income for charitable purposes.

If these 28,900 jobs are permanently lost in the automotive industry, we can then apply the league's ratio of 74 additional jobs lost to each 100 manufacturing jobs lost, and we have 21,200 more unemployed, or a grand total of 50,100 jobs lost—again mostly in Michigan.

Let us assume that the annual wages of each of the 50,100 workers would have been \$4,000 a year, a conservative figure. Again by simple arithmetic, we find that the imports were costing American workers \$200,400,000 in wages lost over the 12 months named—again mostly in Michigan.

I would now like to call my colleagues' attention to the conclusions of Mr. Breech. While I would agree with him that the problem is serious and that American automobile manufacturing suffers from a serious cost disadvantage, I differ markedly from some of his conclusions. As one of his conclusions, he states:

If America's cost disadvantage continues to increase, however, it seems to me that we must anticipate an increasing flight of American capital and much more sourcing of parts and products abroad. A trend in this direction is already evident. American manufacturers of tractors and farm implements, as well as typewriters, office machines, cameras, and optical instruments—particularly goods having a high labor content—are increasingly sourcing and manufacturing in Europe, Latin America, and Japan for sale in the American market. I suggest that what is now a trickle may grow to a flood which could disrupt both production and employment patterns here in the United States.

I disagree with him that this trans-plantation abroad of American capital and, more importantly, American jobs is now only a trickle. It already is disrupting both production and employment patterns here in the United States. Already substantial, it will inevitably continue to grow under the foreign trade policies our Government has practiced for the past 25 years. I agree with him that any such deteriorative situation is unfortunate.

His next conclusion deals with the same point:

Now it seems to me that, if we want to sell in expanding world markets, and more importantly if we do not want to see American production and jobs disrupted by the flight of capital and industry abroad, we are going to have to remain competitive in design, quality, costs, and prices with foreign industry.

By all means we must remain competitive in design and quality. However, with the labor differential so substantial between our workers and those abroad, we cannot now compete with respect to costs and prices; nor will we be able to do so in the foreseeable future. This problem is not unique to the automobile industry; it is true of hundreds of other American industries.

Mr. Breech rejects the use of reasonable tariffs to make our prices and costs

competitive with those of foreign industry.

I do not agree.

Reasonable tariffs offer us at least a partial method of insulating our American standard of living against the ravages of cut-rate, foreign competition. And yet, as every Member of this House must know, I have never advocated the use of the tariff simply as a mechanism to exclude foreign goods from our markets. Rather, I have long advocated the principle of fair and open competition between American manufacturers and their counterparts overseas; and one way to insure this kind of competition is to use reasonable tariffs as an equalizing device.

If our automotive industry is to reduce its costs and prices as he suggests, all I can suggest is that they had better hurry up.

Mr. Breech also considers the lack of reciprocity abroad to be a major problem and I agree with much of what he says on this:

Here I want to point out that, whatever our own problems of cost reduction, we must be granted full and free competitive access to foreign markets.

The theory that trade is a two-way street applies just as much to our foreign competitors as it does to us. If we are to give free access to the American market to foreign producers with size and efficiency comparable to ours and with substantially lower wage costs, we must ask an equally fair crack at their markets.

Here I would point out that in 1957, Great Britain allowed only 265 American automobiles to be imported, and a scant 576 found their way to West Germany. This does not seem to me to be reciprocal trade. In 1957, the United States exported 142,000 cars, while West German auto exports exceeded 500,000 and Great Britain shipped 426,000. Both countries, of course, did much better in 1958.

For 25 years, the State Department has been, in effect, telling us that, if we provided a good example by lowering our tariffs, other countries would reciprocate. I believe that Mr. Breech's own remarks show how unsuccessful that policy has been:

Today, some European countries have tariff and quota barriers so effective, or penalties so high, as virtually to exclude all imports of various U.S. manufactured goods. Take the case of automobiles.

As you may know, our tariff on imported cars was recently lowered from 10 percent to 8½ percent. We have no quotas or other restrictive devices such as currency controls.

Now consider a 1959 Ford Fairlane 500 Fordor Hardtop, with full optional equipment, delivered in Pittsburgh. The suggested list price is about \$3,600, including State and Federal taxes, although, as in the case of many other products, it is common knowledge that the actual cost to the customer may be somewhat lower than the manufacturer's suggested retail price. If you wanted to buy the same car in France, England, or Italy, you would have to hurdle barriers of severe quota restrictions and heavy cost penalties.

In France, the delivered price of that car is about \$3,200. It includes no less than \$3,200 of duties, a 40 percent premium for dollars called an equalization fee, and special purchase taxes. You would also pay an annual use tax of about \$240. In Italy, it would cost \$5,800, with a penalty of \$1,400, plus an

annual use tax as high as \$302.50. In England, the price would be about \$8,000, with the penalty composed of a 30 percent duty and a 60 percent purchase tax—which is applied without discrimination, however, to all passenger vehicles.

As if these formidable barriers were not enough, imports are further limited by severe quotas and related devices. France admits only 12,000 vehicles a year from all sources, the United Kingdom presently restricts imports from the United States and Canada to 650 automobiles per year—even that quota has not been filled every year—and Italy admits only a few hundred American cars.

I have many times commented on this lack of reciprocity which Mr. Breech so clearly documents in his address. For 25 years I have been listening to the State Department promise that the condition would be corrected.

Imports are not the only problem which has faced or now faces American industry. Obviously there are others, such as styling changes, consumer tastes, management-union controversy, and a host of like problems. But I would state, as anybody who goes out to a nearby traffic light can see for himself, that imported automobiles are one of them—and an extremely serious one at that.

I am concerned about the small shareholder who has invested his hard-earned savings in the automobile industry. I am concerned with the men and women who have lost their jobs. I am concerned with the young people who are unemployed because of diminishing job opportunities.

The major segments of the automobile industry have for some years preached the doctrine of ever-freer trade. Leaders of the United Auto Workers have also preached this doctrine. I should think that their shareholders and union members would today be wondering about the wisdom of such policies.

I might, therefore, respectfully urge that those business and union statesmen, who have been preaching freer trade, might wish to reevaluate their own policies.

I deeply regret I can foresee no immediate improvement in the situation.

Poison in Your Water—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Missouri Conservationist of September 19, 1958, setting forth compelling reasons for a vigorous program of Federal action to combat pollution in our waters. That article is entitled "Freshwater Cancer," by Mr. Bill Towell, director of the Missouri Conservation Commission.

That article outlines the terrible problem of sewage and other pollution as it affects the people of Missouri. This, of course, is a single example of the great problem besetting all of America—pollution.

I hope all will read this article and understand why it is necessary that we have vigorous enforcement and a continuation of the Federal grant program inaugurated by Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress making grants to municipalities for construction of sewage abatement works.

The article follows:

FRESHWATER CANCER

(By Bill Towell, Director)

We know from records of permit sales that one out of five persons in Missouri is interested in fishing and hunting. This does not include the thousands who are interested in the out-of-doors purely for the aesthetic value. Regardless of the particular interest, clean water is always a center of attraction.

With this in mind, we remember that only about one percent of the total surface of Missouri is water. This means that we are entertaining one-fifth of the people on one percent of its area, and this includes only hunters and fishermen. We have no accurate record of the thousands who seek outdoor recreation but do not wield a rod nor shoulder a gun. Together all of these must reach an enormous total. This, in our opinion, is significant in demonstrating the need for maintaining clean water. The importance of outdoor recreation is confirmed further by the fact that in Missouri expenditures related to hunting and fishing alone amount to an estimated \$69 million annually.

Water pollution kills fish and other aquatic life, it lowers the fish supporting capacity of water for more desirable fish species and renders water unfit for recreation. These effects and their severity depend upon the kind and extent of the pollution. All occur in Missouri every year.

The conservation commission conducted a statewide survey of pollution in 1949. It showed that over 900 miles of streams in 69 counties and the city of St. Louis were polluted, and by mid-1957 these values had increased to more than 1,200 miles of stream in 74, or roughly two-thirds, of Missouri's 114 counties and the city of St. Louis. This represents an increase of 300 miles of polluted streams in 8 years.

Pollution is caused by many substances which vary in their effect upon fish and other aquatic life. Some pollutants which are lethal to fish directly include industrial chemicals, acid mine wastes, lead, zinc, iron, brine, insecticides, lime, plating liquor, and water treatment compounds. Others remove dissolved oxygen from water. These include sewage, dairy, corn products, canning, and meat packing wastes. Some of those listed have both of these properties and still others impart off-flavors to water and fish.

Other kinds of pollutants blanket the bottom of streams, ruining them as spawning and feeding grounds for fish. These include sediments resulting from washing barite, iron ores and gravel, oil, sawdust, glass fiber, coal washings, wood fiber and varnish.

The extent of some pollutants is more widespread than others, and the effect differs with the type and volume of the pollutant. Thirteen streams in 16 counties and the city of St. Louis are affected by industrial chemical wastes. A serious effect of this type of pollution is the foreign flavor imparted to fish. Although fish are not always killed, this condition renders them unfit for use. The commercial fishery in the Mississippi River from St. Louis to Cape Girardeau has been practically ruined by industrial wastes which enter the river in the Bi-State area surrounding St. Louis, and their effect has been reported downstream for at least 300 miles. Industrial wastes from the Kansas City area have a similar effect on the commercial fishery in the Missouri River in the

56-mile reach from Kansas City to Lexington, and during low flow, off-flavored fish have been reported at Boonville, about 180 river-miles below Kansas City.

During the 10-year period from 1947 through 1956, the number of licensed Missouri River commercial fishermen operating below Kansas City in Clay, Jackson, Ray, and Lafayette Counties declined 62 percent, and in the Mississippi River below St. Louis the number of these fishermen declined by 64 percent in the reach of river bordering Jefferson, Ste. Genevieve, Perry, and Cape Girardeau Counties. The reported commercial fish harvest in the latter 4 counties declined 71 percent.

Forty streams in nine counties are contaminated by coal mine waste. Acid water formed in coal mines probably kills more fish and aquatic life than any other single pollutant. This water contains sulfuric acid and iron compounds formed by the action of air and water upon coal exposed during the mining operations. Usually, there is some lag in time between the exposure of pyrites and the formation of the acid. Consequently, abandoned strip mines are serious potential sources of pollution. If corrective measures have not been followed, these mines cause trouble indefinitely.

The harmful effects of coal mine wastes are many. Not only do they kill fish, fish food organisms, and plants, they also render the stream unfit for stock watering and other purposes. Acids kill fish by coagulating the mucus of the gills resulting in the complete stoppage of the flow of blood. We are pleased, indeed, to note that some mines have adopted corrective measures, but pollution by coal mines remains a serious problem in the north-central, west-central, and the south-west portions of the State.

Thirty-eight streams in 30 counties and the city of St. Louis are affected by raw or poorly treated sewage. It affects fish in several ways most importantly by using up the dissolved oxygen in the water. None but the most tolerant fish can live in such water and these fish are not the kinds preferred by the angler. Sewage also contributes to fish disease, and sludge is ruinous to spawning grounds and to fish foods used by the kinds of fish which occur in clean water.

The washing of clay from barite ore has caused sedimentation in 10 streams in 3 east-central Missouri counties. Heavy sedimentation and high turbidity result from this operation and the accumulated sediment is carried downstream with increased discharge following rainfall. This causes the destruction or deterioration of fish habitat by destroying spawning grounds and fish food organisms and by reducing the transparency of the water to the extent that slight-feeding fish are not able to feed properly. In some instances fish have been killed by the clogging of their gills.

Oil pollution is quite widespread, affecting 19 streams in 16 counties of the State. The sources are refineries, leakage from barges and tank cars, waste from industrial users of oil, aircraft overhaul bases, service stations, and others. Refinery wastes contain phenols and other substances which impart an off-flavor to fish. Often oil kills fish by clogging the gills or it destroys eggs and kills fish food organisms. An oil film on the surface prevents normal aeration of the water and oil sometimes blankets the bottom of a stream for miles. This is particularly true of the Mississippi River below St. Louis, where oil deposits are found on the bottom for 83 miles downstream from the source.

Oil pollution in this reach of the Mississippi also has an important influence on waterfowl movement. The Conservation Commission's waterfowl counts between 1936

and 1955 show that for many years there has not been a measurable number of migratory birds in the reach of river between St. Louis and Ste. Genevieve. Contamination from oil has had a similar effect on waterfowl concentrations on the Missouri River. Pollution on this stream has been observed consistently in routine aerial censusing during the fall migration since 1937. After 1943 oil slicks became continuous in the Kansas City area and frequently were observed as far as Waverly, 80 miles downstream. Over a 20-year span covered by the Commission's observations, we believe that waterfowl habitat in the Missouri River has gradually deteriorated for a distance of 50 miles below Kansas City. Waterfowl specialists report few birds in this part of the river. Oil is particularly harmful to waterfowl because their feathers become saturated and the birds cannot fly.

Salts of zinc, lead and other heavy metals have caused fish kills in the east and southwest sections of the State. Six streams in four counties are affected. In southwest Missouri, this contamination resulted from pumping out inactive lead mines while in the eastern lead belt region it results from the escape of water in processing ore. The salts of lead and zinc are directly toxic and are lethal in low concentration.

Most organic wastes have an effect on fish similar to those described for raw or poorly treated sewage. These include dairy, meatpacking, canning, and corn products wastes. As they decompose, all have a high demand for oxygen which renders water unfit for all but the most tolerant species of fish. Dairy wastes alone contaminate 23 streams in 18 counties.

Wastes of the meatpacking industry affect seven streams in as many counties. This includes extensive contamination of the Missouri and Mississippi rivers. Decay of the organic matter in these wastes rapidly depletes the dissolved oxygen. This is also true for the 12 miles of three streams in two counties affected by canning wastes. The waste of an out-state corn products industry affects 25 miles of the Mississippi River in three Missouri counties. This has a high demand for dissolved oxygen and commercial fishermen report that it clogs their tackle.

Sawdust, glass fiber, mine, gravel, coal and iron ore washings, varnish and wood fiber wastes are others which cover the bottom of the stream, ruining it as a spawning and feeding ground for fish. Some of these create intense water turbidity. Sawdust affects about 18 miles of seven streams in seven counties, mostly in the Ozarks. It also has the property of giving off organic acids and lowering dissolved oxygen.

In recent years, insecticides have killed fish in several streams throughout the State. Toxaphene, DDT, aldrin, benzene hexachloride, chlordane, and others are extremely toxic to fish. Several of them kill fish in concentrations as low as one part insecticide in 100 million parts of water. The mere runoff from vegetation sprayed with aldrin recently killed many fish in a nearby slough and some insecticides are believed to be toxic to warmblooded animals.

This describes briefly the influence of water pollution on fish and wildlife and points out the value of recreation in the form of hunting and fishing. We often refer to pollution as the cancer of fresh water. I believe this is a reasonable analogy because pollution is the dark side in the future of fishing and other recreational uses in which the waters of Missouri are involved. If it continues to increase as it has in the past 10 years, pollution will soon make a serious inroad on fish and other forms of wildlife at a time when there is a greater demand for this resource than ever before in Missouri's history.

To Revive Europe: More Competition and Fewer Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker I wish to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Robert M. Burr which appeared in the September 13, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "To Revive Europe: More Competition and Fewer Cartels." I believe it merits the attention of the Members of the Congress:

TO REVIVE EUROPE: MORE COMPETITION AND FEWER CARTELS

(By Robert M. Burr)

As a nation we have been spending much time and money to increase living standards throughout the world. Our ability to defend democratic institutions against the spread of communism and other types of authoritarianism depends in large measure upon the success of this effort.

But what has made it possible for the United States in the last 50 years to outstrip all other nations in productivity and living standards? A number of authorities say: "Competition." The British Specialist Team on Industrial Engineering of the British Productivity Council, after an extended tour of the United States in 1958, stated that "more than any other factor, competition provides the drive for more frequent analysis of costs and application of industrial-engineering techniques in the United States."

For more than 50 years we in the United States have been developing and perfecting a very uncomfortable form of capitalism for producers and sellers, but a very satisfactory one for consumers.

We have had our ups and downs, as has every other economy. But no other economic system thus far created has developed as potent and effective motivations for the achievement of maximum distribution of wealth as have been nurtured under our system of competitive capitalism. It is these strong motivating forces that need to be exported and sold throughout the world.

Restrictive trade practices are rampant abroad. For example, at the end of last year, an official count showed more than 1,900 restrictive agreements in existence in Great Britain. More than 650 cartels exist in Switzerland, and virtually every industry operates under such agreements. In a few countries, tentative, cautious, creeping steps have been taken toward overseeing or limiting such practices. A West German anti-cartel law, passed in July 1957, is the boldest act so far. Great Britain requires the registration of various types of agreements. But Great Britain exempts agreements affecting export and international trade, and Germany is seeking authority to reestablish its cartels in international trade. The Swiss rejected by a substantial margin (191,934 for and 549,842 against) a constitutional amendment which would have made illegal all agreements intended to limit competition. Four years ago, Japan announced that it was going to reestablish its cartels. Nowhere in the world is there even a resemblance to competitive capitalism as practiced here.

The margin between living standards abroad and in the United States has shifted

very little in the last 10 years. It is going to take much more than foreign aid, foreign investments, technical assistance and tariff reductions to change this situation. What is needed is the establishment of a dynamic society throughout the world comparable to our own.

We must rework our foreign economic policy so that the advancement of competitive capitalism throughout the world becomes one of its major planks. We should adjust our administration of foreign aid, the trade-agreements program and the Tariff Act to encourage the spread of competitive capitalism abroad and safeguard its practice here.

The Military Draft Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1959, the Universal Military Training and Service Act will expire unless the Congress act to extend its life. In view of the growing number of both military and civilian critics who feel that our present method for recruiting members of the Armed Forces is filled with flaws and inadequacies, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article by Mr. Fletcher Knebel appearing in *Look* magazine, May 27, 1958, entitled "The Fight To Kill the Draft." It raises questions fundamental to the security of our country, the morale and effectiveness of our military forces and our quality of leadership.

Under unanimous consent I include the article in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHT TO KILL THE DRAFT

(By Fletcher Knebel)

"We must abolish the draft—bury it in the military museums alongside the muzzle-loading rifle and the cavalry saber. We must create a new military manpower system; one that will give the services the kind of men they, and the Nation, desperately need."

This is the battle cry of a small but growing group of manpower experts who are directing a withering fire at the Selective Service System. They see the draft as a poison that infects our Armed Forces and gives us delusions about our military strength. They point out that modern war is a business for razor-sharp, highly skilled specialists ever ready to handle the newest weapons. They argue that compulsory service isn't doing the job—that it's a museum piece. It worked fine in its days, but it fails miserably to meet the standards set by the cataclysmic threat of the nuclear-space age.

Ralph J. Cordiner, president of the General Electric Co., and chairman of a committee that spent 18 months devising ways to make a military career attractive, says, "The explosive speed of advances in modern war technology makes it almost impossible to train a specialist in 2 years." (That is how long draftees serve.)

"I talked to hundreds of enlisted men," adds Cordiner. "I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who don't stay. The trainers are discouraged. They resemble the poor teacher whose every class flunks."

Air Force Maj. Gen. Harold R. Maddux, a West Pointer who directs the Defense Department's division of manpower require-

ments, says, "The next war might come with only a few minutes' warning. It is impossible to provide the required state of instant readiness with men who don't want to be there. We need a professional service, manned by men who are proud of their uniform and trained for the job."

"We need dramatic changes in pay and attitudes to upgrade a military career in the eyes of the Nation. We can't get that change with huge numbers of men compelled to serve against their will."

Dr. Eli Ginzberg, director of staff studies for the National Manpower Council, sees the conscription system coming under more and more scrutiny and criticism from experts and the public. "More and more people are questioning the status of the draft," he declares. "A compulsory system that is supposed to be universal—and isn't—creates political hazards. The trouble with the system is that there is a tendency for the defense management to seek the remedy for its errors by the simple method of calling up more manpower."

Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana, Democratic whip of the Senate, looks at the men the draft serves up and finds serious weaknesses. One third of the 179,000 draftees in 1957, he reports, were rated "dull" or below normal in intelligence. Like other responsible men who are beginning to doubt the draft, Mansfield wouldn't wipe out the conscription law without a substitute that would keep 2,500,000 men, about our present strength. But once this substitute is found—and Mansfield backs the Cordiner report, which would upgrade service salaries to attract better men—he says, "The draft should be abolished."

It was 18 years ago, with the shadow of World War II reaching toward America, that the first \$21-a-month draftees were called up. On July 1, 1959, the present draft law runs out, and the Eisenhower administration will ask Congress for an extension, probably for 4 years. Here are some charges against the draft that already are being leveled, and that will resound when the Congressmen must decide:

INEQUITY

"The Universal Military Training and Service Act"—the draft law's official name—is one of the least universal of our laws. This year, some 1,170,000 boys turn 18 and must register. But draft calls have been running under 200,000 a year.

Ought exemptions, for ministers and conscientious objectors, are few. But no fewer than 4,115,000 out of the 10,144,000 men currently liable for military service have deferments, according to the Selective Service System's latest report. For many other men, service is postponed until they escape the draft in practice if not in theory. Childless men between 19 and 26 are supposed to go first. But if a potential draftee becomes a father before he's caught in a quota, he drops a notch on the available list. If he passes 26 and still hasn't been called, he goes down still further. Meanwhile, thousands of younger boys keep coming along each year.

COMPLACENCE

The draft guarantees an endless flow of young bodies, as many as needed. Only the Army has been taking draftees, but the Air Force and Navy use the draft indirectly. Both say the threat of conscription is what gives them enough enlistees.

As a result, the Armed Forces can—and do—shrug off their shortcomings. They seem to be as strongly manned as the budget will allow. There is no pressure on them to provide the kind of leadership and morale that long have been a spine-tingling tradition of the all-volunteer Marine Corps.

The administration is also draft-deluded. It is under no pressure to sponsor and cherish the type of military service that would make young men proud to join and stay. As evidence is the way servicemen's fringe

benefits have been raided and curtailed. Military housing has been a recurrent scandal. Military pay reforms languished until the Cordiner Committee put steam into reform proposals.

The heat is off Congress to pass the legislation needed to attract competent men to a profession of arms. With the Armed Forces always filled to the limit, the public also gets complacent. Actually, the 2-year draftee is a babe in the woods in an era of airlifted armies, missiles, and nuclear bombs. He just begins to learn about the arsenal of modern military science when he's sent back home.

LEADERSHIP

"The draft has poisoned our military system," says a ranking officer. "The rot of draft motivation extends from the newest group of inductees up through thousands of officers."

These officers took their commissions merely to escape conscription. One Pentagon official estimated that "80 percent of our officers below the rank of general are draft-motivated." He says the poison has spread to the service academies with terrible results. He asks, "What kind of leaders will we have when hundreds of boys at the academies are there, not because they want to be officers, but because they don't want to be enlisted men?"

The Reserve officers' program on the college campuses is filled with men who intend to serve their 3 years and then return promptly to civilian life. Seventy-three percent of them quit the minute their compulsory tour of duty is up.

WASTE

Ninety-seven out of every one hundred draftees return to civilian life as soon as their hitch ends. This is just the point in their training when they would begin to be of some value to the Army. A private company would go broke quickly with such a wasteful turnover of apprentice personnel. And the Defense Department, costing \$76,000 a minute to run, is the free world's largest enterprise.

The Army, the Cordiner report showed, has only half the career enlisted men it needs to maintain electronic gear; the Air Force, less than half, and the Navy, only one-third. Assistant Defense Secretary William H. Francis, Jr., says that 6½ wings of Strategic Air Command bombers on the average have been made idle recently for lack of trained ground and air crews. So a favorite argument of Air Force and Navy officers—that they don't want draftees, but do want the draft as a persuader for voluntary enlistments—fades away. Conscription provides raw manpower—but not men to do the vital jobs. For draft pressures are of scant benefit in making the trained men stay at their posts.

MORALE

Americans look down their noses at institutions rooted in compulsion. The Armed Forces are no exception: Military service must be bad, it is said, if men have to be forced into it against their will. A private poll conducted for the Pentagon showed that the public rates a military career far down the prestige scale of occupations.

If the civilian snoots the uniform, say foes of the draft, how can the man who wears it be expected to respect it? Not until every man in the services is there of his own choice will the uniform be vested with the dignity it deserves at a time when our Armed Forces are defending not only this country, but the whole free world.

Those who favor continuation of the draft are disinclined to meet this battery of arguments head on. Rather, they shift their fire. They argue, first, that the draft is a symbol of American preparedness. The draft's number one champion, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, believes that shedding this symbol would be

catastrophic abroad. "We would say to the world," says Hershey, "that we don't have the stamina and will power for leadership. The results would be terrible—disintegration for the NATO alliance, neutrals fleeing to the strong arms of communism and Russia emboldened to new aggression."

The importance of the draft symbol was demonstrated during the 1956 campaign when Adlai E. Stevenson aired his qualms about the effectiveness of draftee forces. It appeared to many voters that he wanted to weaken our defenses. His attempts to explain were lost in the heat of the campaign. This explains why some congressmen who privately question the value of the draft hesitate to do so publicly.

The second chief argument against abolition of the draft takes the form of a question asked over and over in Congress and at the Pentagon: "Suppose we do abandon the draft in favor of a substitute program—are you willing to risk decimation of the Armed Forces on a gamble?" Defense Secretary Nell McElroy, President Eisenhower, the Joint Chiefs of Staff—all answer, "No." As Assistant Defense Secretary Francis puts it: "Because a shoe doesn't fit, we'd be foolish to cut off the foot." The Army believes it must have a draft or fall below manpower requirements. Without conscription, the Pentagon chiefs fear that enlistments for the other services, now running at 300,000 a year, would wither. It is a common saying at the Pentagon that volunteers might man a service of 1,500,000 men, but anything above that has to be draft-induced.

This doesn't mean that the Pentagon admires conscription. Rather, it is viewed as a necessary evil. Brig. Gen. James P. Berkeley, chief of manpower for the Marine Corps, states the prevailing attitude succinctly: "We don't want any part of the draft in the Marines. We want every man a volunteer and proud of it. But we've got to have the draft law to provide the pressure that propels boys into our recruiting offices. After that, it's up to us to make marines of them."

A curious fact about the draft is that Americans have accepted it so placidly in recent years. Once we hated the draft with a passion. Millions of us are descended from immigrants who fled Europe to escape conscription by the old armies of empire. Only 95 years ago, more than 1,000 persons were killed in New York City's Civil War draft riots. In 1941, a proposal to lengthen the draftees' term of service passed the House with only one vote to spare—and that at a time when World War II was under way in Europe.

For years, the peacetime draft has been accepted without question at the Pentagon. Now, doubts about it have arisen in the wake of dire shortages of skilled manpower. And the challenge to compulsory service will grow in volume. For one basic fact is too stubborn to yield. Our military manpower system is not supplying the skills our defenses demand in an age when the issue is nothing less than survival.

to the Committee on Internal Security runs exactly contrary to the best American traditions.

It implies that the immigrant is a potential security risk or suspect, instead of a potential good American.

It tends to stop consideration of the immigrant as a man seeking freedom and justice—for these are factors that a judicial function considers—and instead makes of the immigrant a man possibly guilty of subverting our institutions, and therefore the business of a security committee.

The transfer of passport controls to such a committee is equally bad. Instead of keeping the emphasis on the right of every American citizen to travel, as a free man, the emphasis would now be placed upon the danger of any American citizen being allowed to move at will about the world.

The implications of such transfers of function thus run far beyond the administrative questions involved. They go to the very essence of the picture of freedom which we present to the world abroad, and to our people at home.

Even on the administrative level, however, immigration questions bear much closer relationship to the courts and the Department of Justice—and therefore to the Judiciary Committee—than they do to police or security functions. If any other interest were to be consulted, it would logically be that of the departments and committees charged with labor and economic questions.

The same is true respecting passport affairs, which fall basically within the area of the State Department and the Senate and House committees charged with the supervision of foreign relations.

Any departure from this logical distribution of authority could only be justified on the theory that a special police or security function is involved in these matters.

Clear Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, entitled "Clear Choice":

Congress now has a clear choice between intelligent labor reform offered by President Eisenhower and ineffective legislation proposed by congressional liberals and backed by the labor bosses themselves. The President's program gets at serious abuses which are sidestepped in the milder legislation embodied in the Kennedy-Ervin bill, which is a reproduction of the measure Senators KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and IVES, of New York, sponsored unsuccessfully last year.

In his labor recommendations, President Eisenhower challenged Congress to do the kind of a job that needs to be done in the way of labor reform. He made clear that he will give determined leadership to the fight for effective legislation. The President can count on strong support from northern

and southern conservatives in Congress and from the public, which has been made aware of the seriousness of the problem by the McClellan Rackets Investigating Committee.

President Eisenhower has asked Congress for changes in the basic Taft-Hartley labor law to ban racket picketing and tighten curbs on secondary boycotts. The President's program would require union leaders to make detailed annual reports on financial operations and election procedures. It also calls for public disclosure of union finances, secret ballot election of union officers, and other safeguards which would protect rank-and-file members.

The President said he was offering a complete and effective approach, rather than piecemeal legislation. The fact that Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, presented the President's program gives further assurance of its effectiveness. Senator GOLDWATER fought hard last year for effective labor reform.

The President's program stops short of what many feel must be the ultimate objective of applying the antitrust laws to organized labor. Exemption from the Sherman Act, which restrains business from endangering the public interest, has made the labor monopoly possible.

Senator KENNEDY's liberal labor bill would set up rules for union finances and require democratic procedures within unions, but it is silent on the matters of racket picketing and secondary boycotts. That silence makes it acceptable to the union leaders who have a strong influence in the Democratic-controlled Congress.

President Eisenhower is making the fight that must be made in the interest of the public and labor itself.

Wool Act Should Protect Sheep Growers and Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I have become acquainted with a serious problem of cut earnings and unemployment among sheepshearers in some Western States. This decrease in earnings and work is not due to economic conditions in the industry. Instead, it is the result of importing workers who labor under semi-peonage conditions and undercut the wages of sheepshearers who have long lived and long worked in the areas.

The crews who are being imported into the woolgrowing areas from Texas are paid as little as one-fourth of the wages of the sheepshearers who live in the Rocky Mountain and west coast States. They are tied to the contractor who brings them into the wool areas because they owe him the money he has advanced them in the winter or non-shearing months.

The conditions of these crews who come into the woolgrowing areas to shear sheep is short of fantastic. They are crowded into trucks like cattle. They must sleep around the trucks. They are provided only the lowest quality foods.

Consideration of Immigration Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to transfer consideration of immigration matters in the House of Representatives from the Judiciary Committee

This exploitation of substandard living and working conditions has resulted in serious harm to the sheepshearers who live in the woolgrowing areas. Their jobs are being taken away. Their wage rates are being seriously undercut. They are finding it increasingly difficult to get work.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that these conditions exist while the Federal Government supports the earning of wool growers. The wool act was enacted to put a floor under the earnings of the growers. It is aimed at allowing American growers to compete with foreign ones.

It is obvious that the growers have a protection which workers do not have. It is obvious that workers need the same sort of protection against imported labor, which undercuts their wages, as the growers have protection against imported wool whose price undercuts their income.

I sincerely hope that legislation to protect sheep shearers will be enacted by Congress. If we are to protect one part of the wool industry, we must protect the other also.

In the past, I, as well as many other Representatives from urban areas, have voted for the Wool Act and other measures which aided the wool industry. I am certain that these city Congressmen believed, as I did, that our votes would help not only the woolgrowers, but also the workers who shear the sheep.

Workers should certainly have the same protection which the growers have. This is simple justice. If the growers opposed legislation to provide fair labor standards for the workers, I would certainly reconsider my position toward the Wool Act. I would see little justice in renewing the act, as we do every 3 years.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, such a situation will not come about. I hope legislation to protect the earnings of sheep-shearing workers will be enacted, just as legislation now exists to protect the earnings of woolgrowers.

Strong Labor Law Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star of January 30, 1959:

STRONG LABOR LAW NEEDED

Senator JOHN KENNEDY's new labor-management bill, as everyone knows, is considerably less than is needed to protect workers and the public from union racketeers and monopolists. But the old half a loaf is better than none argument has been trotted out to justify it.

Sometimes the half a loaf argument is logical. But this is not one of those times.

The sordid record of lawlessness in some unions so far produced by the McClellan

committee has been brought to the people by every communications medium—newspapers, radio, television, magazines, and newsreels. It has alarmed labor union members as well as the general public. Never has the need for comprehensive reform in any area been so clear and so well understood.

To say that it would be useless to expect Congress to pass a sweeping reform bill, because it is a Democratic Congress heavily indebted to labor union politicians, is to say that the party owes a greater debt to labor bosses than to the rank and file of labor and to the people of the United States.

If the Democrats in Congress feel that way about it, let them bear the blame for failing to vote a reform that is widely demanded. And instead of accepting half a loaf, which would theoretically appease the public, let us continue to demand real reform and set about electing a Congress in 1960 with enough courage to give it to us.

Senator KENNEDY's bill is aimed at characters such as Jimmy Hoffa and his associates. It would drive hoodlums out of labor unions. But it would do nothing about the monopoly power of unions, such abuses as the secondary boycott, blackmail picketing or the dangers that have grown up with the uncontrolled power of some unions.

Labor unions once needed the protection of the law against big business. Now they themselves have become big business and their power, in some instances, is greater than that of the robber barons of business who brought on antitrust and other restrictive legislation. Public protection against this unrestricted power is as necessary as worker protection against racketeers in unions.

The need for comprehensive reform is proven. The public demand is unmistakable. This is no time to talk of settling for half a loaf.

Constitutional Government Imperiled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the fact has become more and more evident that the U.S. Supreme Court is following a studied pattern of attempting to amend our Constitution and change our laws through usurpation of authority which the Court does not possess. Judges, lawyers, and citizens in every section of the country are concerned and alarmed at these destructive blows which are being struck at our constitutional form of government.

The American people as a whole believe in law and order, and respect constituted authority. However, when one branch of the Government deliberately oversteps its authority and usurps functions belonging to another branch of the Government, such reprehensible conduct is good reason for vigorous and emphatic protests on the part of good citizens and right-thinking people throughout the entire country.

A very able address on this subject was delivered by the Honorable Marlin T. Phelps, now Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court in Phoenix, Ariz., on November 13, last year. I have just recently had the privilege of reading Chief Justice Phelps' address. I was so im-

pressed by it that I have obtained permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and pursuant to unanimous consent of the House I attach the address herewith as a part of these remarks:

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT IS IMPERILED

(Text of speech delivered before the Arizonaans for America Organization, Phoenix, Ariz., on November 13, 1958, by Hon. Marlin T. Phelps, Justice, Arizona Supreme Court)

GOVERNMENT OF MEN REPLACES GOVERNMENT OF LAWS

Ladies and gentlemen, in order to get a better perspective of what has taken place and what is taking place in our Nation today I believe it would be well to go back to the inception of our Government and briefly refer to the considerations which brought it forth even at the expense of repeating much that is trite.

Original concept

In the first place this Government is the result of a concept never before adopted by any people as their governmental philosophy. It rests upon the postulate that all the powers of sovereignty should forever reside in the people and that the government they were about to establish should be a limited government subject always to the will of the people.

Pursuant to this concept resulting from their broad knowledge of the history of governments that had risen and fallen in the past and their knowledge of the frailties of man, our forefathers sought to create a government limited both in the duties assigned to it and limited in its power to discharge those duties with such checks and balances incorporated therein as would insure that all public officials should forever remain subservient to the will of the people. They had experienced the oppressive hand of British rule as a result of unbridled power, and they had witnessed the adoption of oppressive legislation by some of the American Colonies after they had gained their freedom from Britain.

They, therefore, determined that, insofar as they could prevent it, they would establish a government that would secure to its citizens, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, declared in the Declaration of Independence to be inalienable rights of all men. Lincoln afterward defined the government thus created on this basis to be a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It was designed to be a government of laws and not a government of men. The framers of the Constitution were of the view that the checks and balances provided for therein between the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government would result in a wholesome restraining influence as between these two branches. Nevertheless, they provided that the judicial branch of such government should have the power of review over the official actions of both the executive and legislative branches in order that they may be securely kept within the constitutional limitations delegated to them. The final arbiter in such matters was vested in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Judiciary unrestricted

Unfortunately, however, they provided no checks against the exercise of excessive powers by the Supreme Court although most of them agreed that this constituted a great weakness in the framework of the proposed new government and expressed fears of the potential dangers that lurked therein. The only restraint that exists today against the exercise of excessive power by the Supreme Court is that restraint which the conscience dictates to the individual members of the Court. Congress has the constitutional power to limit its appellate jurisdiction under such regulations as the Congress shall make

but it refused to exercise such power at its last session. Experience has confirmed the historical fact that the conscience of the men who are vested with great power in government is inadequate to protect the governed from oppression. Jefferson recognized that when he said: " * * * free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence, which prescribes limited constitutions to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power; that our Constitution has accordingly fixed limits to which, and no further our confidence may go. * * *

"In question of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

And with respect to the Supreme Court he said:

" * * * there is no danger I apprehend so much as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless and therefore unalarming instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

Fear prompts amendments

It was the fear of the inadequacy of the limitation provided for in the original document that prompted the immediate adoption of the first 10 amendments. The 10th amendment to the Constitution reserved to the States respectively, or to the people, all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution. This was done to serve as a check against all the branches of the Federal Government and it served its purpose splendidly for 150 years; but if the present Court is aware of its existence, it has shown no evidence of it in recent years. If there were ever any cases in which this amendment should have been considered it was in the Court's decisions in the sedition and segregation cases.

The segregation decisions concerned the public school system of the sovereign States of the South, a matter which had always been considered to be of purely local concern and therefore subject to the exclusive control of the States under the powers reserved to them under the 10th amendment. The identical question decided in these cases was adversely decided by the same Court in 1896 and reaffirmed in 1927 in a school case where both the equal-protection of the law, and the separate-but-equal-right questions under the 14th amendment were directly raised. The Supreme Court then headed by Chief Justice Taft unanimously decided both questions in favor of segregated schools provided for by the constitution of the State of Mississippi. The Court then said the same question had been many times declared to be within the constitutional power of the States without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution.

Fourteenth amendment overworked

Please remember I am not discussing segregation, I am discussing the proposition that the present Supreme Court does not feel itself bound by either precedent involving the same constitutional question, or by the Constitution itself. Without any qualms or apologies they set aside the previous decisions of the Court which had been recognized by the Court itself as binding upon it for nearly 60 years. These decisions were handed down in 1954 based upon the provisions of the 14th amendment providing equal protection of the law to all citizens as well as due process of the law. The 14th amendment is a limitation only upon the States. The Court said in *Brown v. Board of Education* in discussing these questions that "we hold that plaintiffs and others similarly situated, for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. This makes unnecessary any discussion, whether such section also violates the due-process clause of the 14th amendment."

But, in the *Bolling* case involving the District of Columbia decided on the same day the Court invoked the provisions of the fifth amendment which applies to the Federal Government only. It does not have in it the equal-protection clause but only contains the due-process clause and with its usual disregard of constitutional provisions in reaching its decisions it held that the "due-process clause" in the fifth amendment should be construed also as an equal-protection clause as respects the Federal Government, although on that very same day in the *Brown* case, it distinguished between the two clauses and after it decided the equal-protection clause had been violated it said it was unnecessary to also discuss the due-process clause of the 14th amendment whether such segregation also violates the due-process clause of that amendment.

Unstable decisions

Ladies and gentlemen, its decisions are as unstable as the shifting sands of the desert and are as unsound as they are unstable. A decent respect for the provisions of the Federal Constitution would have demanded the consideration of the 10th amendment in these cases. Many of the greatest judges and lawyers in the United States condemn these decisions as being purely legislative in character and wholly beyond the power and jurisdiction of the Court to pronounce.

A cursory examination recently made by some of the law clerks in our court indicates that approximately two-thirds of all the cases which the Supreme Court has accepted for consideration since Warren's ascension to the bench have been cases involving Communists and undesirables whom the Government has attempted to deport, and out of the first 39 such cases considered by the Court, 30 of them were acquitted which resulted in a wholesale release of Communists throughout the Nation charged with similar offenses—Chief Justice Warren voted for the acquittal in 36 of the 39 cases. In the October 28 issue of the *Arizona Republic* I noticed that the Court has decided to review the case of William L. Green who lost his job as an \$18,000 a year vice president of a Maryland engineering research firm in 1953 when the Defense Department withdrew his security clearance. This involves the right of the Federal Government to impose loyalty and security standards in defense plants. It's dollars to doughnuts that the right to impose such standards will be denied.

Decisions not supreme law

The Attorney General of the United States and the President and others who are following their lead are telling the people of the Nation that the decisions of the Supreme Court on these constitutional questions are the supreme law of the land and that it is the duty of every citizen both public and private to obey them. The Supreme Court itself in a supplemental opinion a few weeks ago in the segregation cases stated that the decisions in those cases are the supreme law of the land. The fact is that no individual has to obey these opinions except the parties who were litigants in court any more than you have to obey a decision of the supreme court of this State unless you are a party to the cause of action in which the opinion is rendered. This is just simple common-sense. And it has been the declared law of all courts for 150 years and until Mr. Warren established his arbitrary rule of being bound neither by precedent nor the Constitution. The most that can be said concerning their effect is that they furnish a standard by which all cases of a like nature must be determined until the Court reverses its position again. The Constitution states in clear and simple language that "this Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made and to be made under

authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land."

The Constitution, acts of Congress and treaties with foreign nations alone constitute the supreme law of the land by which the sovereign States of the Union and the people of the United States are bound. There was nothing farther from the minds of the framers of the Constitution than that the decision of the Supreme Court should ever become the supreme law of the land. This was clearly evidenced by the pronouncement of Jefferson quoted above.

Not until the Supreme Court reverses its philosophy of government and takes the position that it is bound by a previous decision of that Court on the same constitutional question (interpreted according to cardinal rules of construction, i.e., upon the intent of the framers, the purpose of its adoption, and its historical background) and that such decision is integrated into the Constitution and becomes a part of it as much so as if originally written therein, can anyone justifiably and truthfully say that the decisions of the Supreme Court are the supreme law of the land binding upon all persons public and private. It will then become the supreme law of the land not because it is a decision of the Supreme Court but because it has been integrated into and become a part of the Constitution.

Unwarranted emphasis

The unwarranted broadening of the scope of the 14th amendment by the Court has been the basis of all of the decisions of the Court liberating hundreds of dangerous Communists in this country by restricting the congressional and executive branches of the Government in the exercise of their constitutional powers. It has been the too frequent use of this amendment and the broadening of its scope that makes it so dangerous to the liberties of the citizens of this Nation. It has been one of the Court's springboards which it has employed in its practical destruction of States rights. Both Justices Holmes and Hughes recognized this danger. Justice Holmes stated in an opinion (in *Baldwin v. Missouri*, 281 U.S. 586) that he had not adequately expressed the more than anxiety he felt at the ever-increasing scope given to the 14th amendment in cutting down what he believed to be the constitutional rights of the States, and Justice Hughes said, in substance, in a speech in 1937 before a joint session of Congress, that it was just as essential to preserve the rights of the States under the 10th amendment as a check against the encroachment of the Federal Government upon the liberties of their citizens as it was to preserve inviolate the checks and balances of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government against each other.

The Supreme Court is not alone to blame for constitutional violations and the continued centralization of power in the Federal Government. Congress enacted a law in 1935 providing that anything which affects interstate commerce is a part of an interstate transaction which has been interpreted by the Court to cover window washers and elevator operators in a building where there is located a business engaged in interstate commerce subjecting them to the provisions of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, and therefore under the control of the Federal Government. By the enactment of this law Congress opened the door for these opinions. The Constitution only gave Congress the right to regulate interstate commerce. By the use of the term "affect interstate commerce" it broadened its own powers, which has been construed by the Court to empower Congress to regulate transactions wholly within a State upon the theory that it affects interstate commerce. There is not a business in Arizona today that the Court cannot say is engaged in inter-

state commerce. This gives the National Labor Relations Board exclusive jurisdiction over all disputes between building contractors, plumbing contractors, or any other kind of contracting business and labor unions in Arizona, or any other State. Even if the National Labor Relations Board declines to accept jurisdiction of such a case the courts of a sovereign State of the Union cannot determine their own jurisdiction in the matter but must first obtain the consent of the National Labor Relations Board to exercise such jurisdiction before it can do so. Think of it. The courts of sovereign States in whose citizens all powers of sovereignty reside, must petition a Federal administrative agency for permission to exercise the powers of sovereignty. Until this new and strange philosophy sprang up it was always considered by the courts of the States that such courts had the inherent power implicit in the sovereignty of the State of which it was an arm, to determine its own jurisdiction in all cases wholly independent of any interference from Federal restrictions and especially from a Federal administrative body.

Congress abdicates powers

Both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government are deliberately violating the Federal Constitution. The President violated the Constitution when he sent Federal troops into Little Rock to picket a high school there and to order citizens off of their own front lawns and that of their neighbors. There wasn't a semblance of legal authority for this action.

In 1934 at the request of President Roosevelt, Congress passed a law commonly known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, in which Congress delegated to the President the power to enter into a reciprocal trade agreements with foreign nations. This grant of power to the President was upon the understanding that it was a legislative expediency to aid the President in pulling the Nation out of a great depression and that it would not be extended beyond the term granted. Notwithstanding these assurances at the end of each period to which the authority had been extended, at the insistent demand of Mr. Roosevelt and each of the succeeding Presidents, this power delegated to the President has been extended again and again and is still in full force and effect except that it has been now, by executive agreement, removed beyond even the power of the President to fix a tariff on any imported commodity by agreement with other nations. President Truman, in 1947, without authority from Congress entered into a series of multilateral agreements with 36 other nations including at least one Communist country (Czechoslovakia) by which the United States has lost its control over our tariffs. Under the present arrangement with these nations known as GATT, tariffs on commodities imported into the United States are fixed by these 37 nations and we have only 1 vote in 37 in fixing our tariffs on imports. The result has been disastrous to American industries. President Eisenhower in urging its renewal stated that it was vital even to our safety as a nation. It is reputed that the reason for this statement is that the State Department (Mr. Dulles) is using it as a bargaining instrumentality in establishing our foreign policy. A government whose actions are based upon expediency such as this rests upon a foundation of sand and can withstand neither wind nor wave.

President violates Constitution

The power to lay taxes, imposts, duties, and excises and to regulate commerce with foreign nations is vested in the Congress of the United States by the Constitution, and Congress unlawfully abdicated its constitutional powers and its Members violated their oaths of office and the provisions of the Constitution when Congress gave the Execu-

tive the power either to lay a duty on imports or to regulate trade with foreign nations, and the President is violating his oath to support the Constitution when he urges its violation by Congress and in exercising that power. It is elemental as a fundamental principle of law that both the executive and legislative as well as the judicial branch of Government must function within their constitutional limitations if we, the people, are to remain free. Failure to recognize and to function within such limitations destroys the very concept upon which the Federal Government was founded. It makes this Government a government of men and not of laws. It destroys the sovereignty of the people and empowers those whom we have entrusted to administer our Government to enslave its citizens.

Trade Agreement Act disastrous

Since the power to fix duties on imports has been exercised by the President, over 700 textile plants have been forced to close their doors resulting in the unemployment of over 350,000 textile employees. Repeated protests have been made by textile operators concerning this situation but to no avail. Textile plant owners are having to pay 20 percent more for cotton today than foreign textile plants have to pay and they cannot compete with these foreign cotton goods manufacturers with their cheap labor under such condition. They are told they may procure money from the Government to build a textile plant in a foreign country and ship their products into the United States but the Government refuses to raise the tariff on imports of these commodities from other countries, primarily I presume, because it cannot do so until it gets the consent of 36 other nations. But Congress has never ratified the Truman agreement and it could have refused the extension of such grant of power. However, it again supinely yielded to the President's demand at the last session of Congress.

Since 1934 tariffs on imports have been reduced to one-third of what they then were. Dean Manion reports that in 1938 there were 70 sewing machines shipped into this country but as a result of this reciprocal trade agreement in 1956, there were 55,156 sewing machines shipped in. Ten years ago five American companies were manufacturing sewing machines in the United States. Today there is only one.

In 1938 less than 1,200 dozen cotton shirts were imported. In 1956 the number exceeded 1 1/4 million dozen. One big American camera company has quit manufacturing parts and accessories and is now shipping them in from Germany.

In 1938 there was less than 3 million square feet of plywood shipped into the United States. In 1956 there was more than 708 million square feet shipped in.

In 1956, 173,851 autos were shipped into the United States. In 1957, 259,343 autos were shipped in.

A long list of other imports could be given that have suffered the same fate.

General Motors, he says, is manufacturing cars in Europe and shipping them into the United States. Studebaker now distributes for German-made Mercedes. A Los Angeles manufacturer of ceramic dinnerware has become the U.S. distributor for its Japanese competitor. He says many of the modern foreign factories to which American jobs are now being exported have been built and equipped with American foreign-aid money. In other words, he says: What is being done by these 37 nations known as GATT, who meet in Geneva, Switzerland, is that they are administering a worldwide job-sharing distributing system of international trade regulations at the expense of American industry, American workmen, and American taxpayers. The results of the operation of the reciprocal trade agreements are alone

sufficient to bring on a depression in this country in both loss of employment and loss in production of wealth. The Democrats and Republicans think we can spend ourselves back into prosperity when a recession occurs and they are putting the Government in business at the expense of private business.

Perhaps one of the most outrageous of all the wrongs heaped upon the people of the United States in further centralization of power in Washington has been the creation of dozens and dozens of Federal administrative agencies, giving to them the power to adopt rules and regulations of said agencies which have the same force and effect of laws so long as they are pertinent to the purposes for which the agency was created and within the powers vested in them.

Despotic bureaucratic rule

A splendid example of such a situation is the Agricultural Adjustment Act under the administration of the Secretary of Agriculture. This legislation gives to the Secretary of Agriculture practically the power of life and death over the farmers of this Nation. (Read the editorial on this subject in the November 8 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.)

Dan Smoot in his report of August 11, 1958, detailed the method of operation in the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in a case in Michigan, one in Texas, another in Indiana, and another in Ohio. The pattern is the same. Investigators go onto the farm, measure the acreage planted to wheat, cotton, or whatever the crop may be, determine the quota he is entitled to under the act, if one has not been already established, determine the excess acreage and fix the penalty or fine, and the committee known as the Agricultural Stabilization Committee notifies him of the amount of the fine imposed and demands payment. There is no escape from the penalty imposed. Mr. Smoot says the regulation that provides that a farmer who has less than 15 acres in cultivation, has no voice in whether the program shall be kept in force or abandoned, has disfranchised 90 percent of the farmers of the United States in the referendum vote and leaves its determination in the hands of the big farmers. They make money by not growing crops. There are 20 million farmers in the United States and only 200,000 can vote under the restrictions imposed. The act since 1954 is compulsory on all farmers whether they want it or not. The declared purpose of the act was to reduce the surplus of the crop grown.

Specifically as it applies to wheat, the Government claims that the excessive production of wheat was depressing prices. The purported object was to grow less wheat and receive better prices. The fact is that there is and was no wheat surplus and has never been. He said while American farmers are paying fines for growing too much wheat we are importing wheat to relieve the wheat shortage; that America was once the world's largest wheat exporting Nation, and that governmental meddling has priced our wheat out of the world market. In Ohio, a large wheat- and corn-growing State, the head of a large milling company of Mansfield, Ohio, told a farm association in June 1956 he had already exhausted the supply of wheat from all the counties in its normal trade area in Ohio; that never before in 40 years had there been such a shortage of wheat in Ohio, when during that very year over 200 Ohio farmers had been fined for growing wheat on their own farms. This applies to cotton and other crops as well.

Exorbitant taxes

We are now exacting of our citizens income and other taxes to meet exorbitant budgets, billions of which are willfully wasted. Nothing is being done to correct it although the Hoover Committee has twice pointed the way.

Other billions are being given away even to Russian satellites. This too is without constitutional authority. Neither of the branches of the Federal Government makes any attempt to function within constitutional limitations. The Supreme Court is by judicial fiat gradually repealing the 10th amendment in violation of its plain provision. Congress has by legislation invited the courts to enlarge its constitutional power to regulate interstate commerce. The effect of all the things I have mentioned is to centralize all power in the Federal Government. The next step is dictatorship.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have never believed anything more sincerely in my life than that the collapse of constitutional government is inevitable in this country if present trends continue. The officials in the higher echelons of government have repudiated the principal concept upon which our Government was founded and the creature has become master of the creator. Already bureaucratic despotic rule is in evidence in the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as above stated and in the income tax administration agency. Whatever states rights are left are being rapidly lost. We are aiding in this process by calling on the Federal Government for aid for everything we seek to do. It is historically true that the centralization of all power in a government is the last step preceding national decay. A dictatorship then becomes inevitable. When that happens the Russian coal fields of Siberia will be thrown wide open to American citizens, "from whose bourne no traveler returns."

Please let us through the conservative thinkers of both national parties try to preserve America. This can only be done by demanding an adherence to the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence and in the Federal Constitution, and an abiding faith in God.

The Activity of Unions in Politics Is Going To Compel Business To Do Same for Self-Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Rockford, Ill., Morning Star, entitled "The Activity of Unions in Politics Is Going To Compel Business To Do Same for Self-Protection":

Unless corporations make politics an essential part of their business, they are going to find it increasingly difficult to do business at all. Thomas R. Reid, director of Ford Motor Co.'s civic affairs office, said Monday in an address at Los Angeles, Calif.

Addressing the general management conference of the American Management Association, Mr. Reid said that the competition to influence the legislative climate is the most critical of all problems facing American businessmen in the next few years.

"This fact of life goes beyond business and affects every citizen," he said. "Right now completely representative government is in danger."

The Ford official urged that businessmen take immediate steps to establish positive political action programs. He said that em-

ployers and managers have shunned politics and consequently have allowed other elements to have more than a proportionate share in forming all legislation.

Mr. Reid emphasized that when he spoke of a "program for business," he was not advocating that business "line up the whole support of the corporations behind one political party as labor's support has been given to the other."

He said he was strongly opposed to the practice of partisan-power politics by either unions or corporations. Any attempts to tie one party exclusively to one group of interests, he continued, can only lead to the breakup of representative government.

Mr. Reid told members of the conference that some persons feel that political action on the part of business "will simply consist of the corporations using their money and influence to strengthen one party."

"I do not think that corporations have any right to use their stockholders' money in this way," he explained, "any more than I believe that unions have a moral right to use their members' money."

"This kind of division would ruin our two-party system, and none of us can afford that disaster."

He said he believed that the most effective political action that corporations or individuals could take was to strengthen the whole system of representative government, not to try to capture a party.

"The corporation should express its opinion—pro or con—publicly and clearly on those public issues at all levels of government in which it has an interest," he declared. "It should take positions on legislation having impact on its operations and state them. The corporation has every right to be active in governmental relations. Anything that affects its business becomes its business."

"However, the corporation has no business in politics as a corporation. Its responsibility as a corporate citizen is to encourage its members of management and its employees to participate voluntarily as individual citizens in the political party of their choice."

"It is time to admit that public affairs are a business problem," Mr. Reid said. "Ford Motor Co. has pioneered among large companies in recognizing this and is doing something about it," he said.

He urged other businessmen to begin planning now for the November 1960 elections and outlined a month-by-month timetable of political activity.

Mr. Reid said any business could adapt the following major points of its timetable to their own organization:

1. Study the impact of government and politics on business and what can be done about it.
2. Organize within corporations for effective action on governmental, legislative, and political matters.
3. Speak out on public issues.
4. Compile and issue to members of management and employees a digest of votes of Congressmen and State legislators on key business issues.
5. Get acquainted with Senators, Congressmen, and State legislators.
6. Recruit employees to work with the party of their choice.
7. Train members of management in practical politics.
8. Get people to register to vote.
9. Declare company policy encouraging political participation in the party of the employee's choice.
10. Conduct year-round activity instead of last-minute campaign efforts.

"Such a program," Mr. Reid said, "will result in a net gain in business action to improve the governmental and political climate in the United States."

Voluntary Retirement Savings Plans for Self-Employed Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today again introduced legislation to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement savings plans for self-employed individuals. This legislation, which is similar to the measure which I introduced last session and identical with the bill that was passed by the House of Representatives on July 29, 1958, would permit self-employed individuals to take a current deduction for a limited amount of income invested in certain types of retirement annuity or trust. The investments would be treated as ordinary income when actually received in later years. This legislation is intended to achieve a greater equality of tax treatment between self-employed persons and employees.

Under present law, a corporation can deduct from taxes money put into a qualified employee pension plan and the employee is not taxed on this money until he actually receives the retirement income in later years.

When this provision was made in our tax law in 1942, the millions of self-employed persons were apparently overlooked. These self-employed citizens are denied this opportunity to defer taxes on retirement savings.

This legislation would generally apply to persons who are subject to the tax on self-employment income—for social-security purposes. This would include doctors, barbers, druggists, farmers, undertakers, lawyers, accountants, and other self-employed persons.

The bill would permit self-employed persons to take a deduction for a limited amount of income which they voluntarily place into a restricted retirement plan. This deduction is in general limited to 10 percent of net income from self-employment, but not to exceed \$2,500 in any one taxable year and it may not exceed \$50,000, during the lifetime of the self-employed person.

If an individual is over 50 years of age on the effective date of the proposed act, the limitation on the annual deduction is increased by one-tenth for each year that his age exceeds 50. For example, if he is age 60, the annual limit on his deduction would be 20 percent of income, but not over \$5,000. No deduction is allowed for any year beginning after the taxpayer attains age 70.

That the present tax law discriminates against the self-employed is not denied.

Can this discrimination be morally perpetuated indefinitely when a just and economical revision of the law is available?

If tax deferment is economically sound for the employed, then why is it not equally sound and just for the self-employed?

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House gave their answer to these questions on July 29, 1958, by overwhelmingly passing legislation similar to that which I introduce. I sincerely hope that this Congress will pass such legislation early in this session.

Need to Supplement Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, during last week I joined with Senators RANDOLPH and BYRD of West Virginia in introducing legislation to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to use \$200 million to purchase foods to supplement the surplus commodities now being distributed to needy citizens.

This legislation is of particular interest to West Virginia, Mr. Speaker. Our State is in the unfortunate position of having 306,000 people dependent upon these surplus commodities for their food supply. At present, only butter, flour, meal, rice and dried milk are available for distribution.

The unfortunate families of West Virginia and the rest of the Nation who must, because of no fault of their own, rely upon this food supply, are not getting anywhere near an adequate diet. The West Virginia Department of Health has stated that the diet, as now constituted, provides only 26 percent of the needed calories, 36 percent of the necessary protein and 46 percent of the required calcium.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture should be in a position to purchase other foods as they become available to supplement this diet. At present, he does not have such authority. The legislation I introduced will give it to him.

The plight of these 306,000 West Virginians, dependent upon surplus Government-owned farm commodities for their food supply, emphasizes the need for a program to assist distressed economic areas such as West Virginia.

The providing of food, as essential as it is in the present emergency, is at best only a stopgap measure. What is needed is a program to attract industries which will provide jobs for these people. We are all familiar with the story of how employment in coal mines and on railroads has declined steadily in recent years. These men must be given new opportunities.

Congress is going to pass legislation in this field. The legislation would provide loans and grants for the economic rehabilitation of distressed areas. The jobs such a program would create will make surplus food programs unnecessary in the long run.

But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we should at least provide a subsistence diet for people who are forced to depend upon surplus commodities for food for their families.

The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States Is Proud of Its Accomplishments in the Field of Amateur Sports as a Member of the Sports Committee of the People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a lot of credit is due the officials of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, and especially its foreign relations committee, for its many activities in the field of amateur sports as its contribution to the people-to-people program designed to encourage international relations and promote peace and good will among the nations of the world.

The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, which is the national governing body of 19 sports in the United States, has been carrying out the people-to-people idea for more than 40 years. During that time this organization has sent many thousands of track athletes, swimmers, boxers, wrestlers, weight lifters, basketball, and other teams to all parts of the world and have brought many hundreds of foreign athletes to this country. In the year of 1958 the AAU sent more than 300 athletes to over 30 different countries, including visits to several countries behind the Iron Curtain.

To get some idea as to the extent of the AAU's activities as a member of the sports committee of the people-to-people program, I am inserting herewith a copy of the annual report of the organization's foreign relations committee, which is self-explanatory:

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

To the Amateur Athletic Union:

Starting with the British Empire—U.S.A. track and field match on December 5 in Sydney, Australia, following the Olympic games in Melbourne in which the United States was victorious, American athletes competed on five continents during the following 10 months, bringing fame to themselves and honor to the AAU and the United States.

Six different sports were represented by nearly 300 athletes on their jaunts around the globe. Track and field led in the number of athletes and trips. As a result of their outstanding performances in the Olympic games, our track and field athletes have been very much in demand.

The match between the athletes of the London athletic clubs and those of the New York clubs at the White City Stadium, London, July 19-20 and another meet in Manchester on July 24, resulted in our sending more track and field athletes abroad this year than ever before, except possibly in an Olympic year. With the approval of the sponsors, we selected the so-called New York team from among the best athletes of eastern Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, New York, and Massachusetts and the London clubs drew their talent from a 100-mile radius from London. The match was won by the New York team with a 94-point score to London's 61 points.

In addition to the team which competed in this match, five other American teams showed their talents in Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy, and Rumania.

Our girls basketball team won the world's championship in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, early in November defeating the Soviet Union in the finals by a score of 51-48. They went through the tournament with but one defeat and that was at the hands of Czechoslovakia early in the tournament. Twelve countries had teams in the tournament. Because of lack of funds, we had about given up hope of being represented in this important championship, but at the last minute the father of one of the girls chipped in \$2,000 which made the trip possible.

A five-man wrestling team competed successfully in Japan.

We were represented in the World's Bobsled Championships in St. Moritz, Switzerland, by two teams in the two and four man events, one team making the trip from the United States and another the military team made up of representatives of the Armed Forces in Europe.

A seven girl synchronized swimming team plus two male divers toured Japan and exhibited at many of the United States military bases for the entertainment of U.S. troops stationed in the Orient.

Betty Becker Finkston, manager and chaperoned two divers—Jeanne Stunyo and Don Harper to Buenos Aires, Argentina, for a series of exhibitions there in March.

Arthur O'Connor, track coach at Fordham University, was selected by the AAU to accompany his former star, 800-meter Olympic champion, Tom Courtney on a 18-day tour of South Africa.

The Denver Chicago Truckers basketball team played a series of games in Argentina between August 17 and September 15, winning eight matches and losing just one.

The last U.S. team to compete abroad was the U.S. weightlifters who competed in the World's Weightlifting Championships at Teheran, Iran, November 5-14. Like our women's basketball team, we experienced considerable difficulty in raising the necessary funds to defray this team's expenses. It could not have left the United States except for the willingness of Clarence Johnson, chairman of the National AAU weightlifting committee, to pay the \$2,500 balance on the transportation costs to enable the team to make the trip.

Bobby Clotworthy, the Olympic diver accepted Australia's invitation to appear in a number of swimming meets following the Olympic games. He also accepted an invitation to engage in a number of diving exhibitions in Chile as a representative of the State Department.

Rafer Johnson of the University of California at Los Angeles, was selected for a tour under the sponsorship of the State Department and he visited Italy, Yugoslavia, Belgian Congo, Israel, and Pakistan between July 14 and August 13. The tours of both Clotworthy and Johnson were highly successful. Both athletes were very popular wherever they visited and proved excellent good will ambassadors for the United States.

Some 50 American athletes traveled to Israel to participate in the Maccabiah games from September 15 to 24, competing in track and field, swimming, and basketball.

The traffic in athletes was not all away from the United States. A wrestling team from Japan visited the United States early this year and competed in a series of wrestling matches all across the United States, including the national AAU wrestling championship at Waynesburg, Pa.

Dawn Fraser and Lorraine Crapp, Australia's famous swimmers and Olympic champions, with Mrs. Dorothy Quinton as their manager and chaperone, accepted our invitation to compete in Honolulu, Oklahoma

City, Houston, Tex., and San Francisco. At Houston they competed in our national AAU swimming championships for women. Miss Fraser won the 110-yard freestyle event and Miss Crapp won the 440-yard freestyle event. These girls were very popular and won the hearts of the Americans with whom they came in contact. They were not only great champions but were leaders in sportsmanship and made many friends for Australia during their visit in the United States.

The international boxing tournament held in Seattle, Wash., August 1, 2, and 3, attracted entries from Japan, China, Mexico, Canada, Cuba, and Hawaii.

A team of seven Greek-American track athletes toured Greece from July 31 to August 24. The team received a tumultuous welcome by the Greek people. They participated in exhibitions in Athens, northern Greece, the Balkans, and had a dual meet with Austria.

Merger of Manufacturers Trust Co. and Bankers Trust Co. Would Have Most Serious Competitive Implications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, last week I wrote to the Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, calling their attention to the grave competitive implications of the proposed merger of Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co., both of New York City.

In these letters I pointed out that this consolidation, following on the heels of the Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal, would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in New York City; spur further bank mergers in the city; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on the entire banking structure of the city and State.

The banking system of New York City, is already highly concentrated to the point where the four largest banks in the city control over 60 percent of the city's banking assets. Manufacturers Trust is now the third largest in the city with over \$3 billion of total assets, while Bankers Trust is the city's sixth largest bank having total assets in excess of \$2.8 billion. Merger of these two institutions would mean that almost 70 percent of the total assets of New York City's banks would be concentrated in the hands of four financial houses.

I pointed out that although there are now approximately 54 banks serving the city area, the new entity resulting from the consolidation would have assets almost double the combined total assets of 44 of the city's banks.

It is no less significant that Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust are in substantial competition with each other in the so-called retail banking field. Manufacturers Trust, with 114 branches

in New York City, already has the most extensive retail banking system in the city. Adding the 45 branches of Bankers Trust would only serve to increase the dominance of the new institution in this phase of the city's banking business and further restrict the freedom of choice of depositors and borrowers alike.

In addition to these considerations, I indicated that the present size of Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust has been accomplished in large part through absorption of other banking houses. Manufacturers Trust Co., for example, since its organization in 1905, has absorbed no less than 81 banks together with their branches, all in the greater New York area. The Bankers Trust Co. also has been taking over other banks at a rapid rate, especially in the last several years. Since 1950 the Bankers Trust Co. has absorbed such substantial banks as the Public National Bank & Trust Co. of New York, the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

In the context of the merger history of these two institutions the present merger proposal appears as but another step toward larger size and greater dominance in the New York City market area.

In my letter to Assistant Attorney General Hansen in charge of the Antitrust Division, I said in part:

Bank mergers, whether accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions, are . . . circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize, or monopolization of trade or commerce. . . . Establishing a Sherman act violation hardly presents insuperable problems.

In this connection, I think it is highly significant that since 1950 there has been a total of 1,232 bank mergers, of which 1,059 took place in the period from 1953 to 1958. Despite this great number of bank consolidations which is concentrating control of the Nation's banks into fewer and fewer hands, the Antitrust Division has never once invoked the provisions of the Sherman act against a bank merger. I am at a complete loss to understand this extraordinary record of inaction.

In respect to the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals, I trust that the situation will change and that the Department will finally execute the provisions of the Sherman Act promptly, vigorously and effectively. This is particularly important since each of these mergers on its face would apparently result in a substantial lessening of competition as between the acquiring and acquired institutions. Thus, Guaranty Trust and J. P. Morgan are seemingly in vigorous and substantial competition with each other in the wholesale banking business, while Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust compete with each other substantially in the retail banking field. In both cases, this competition would be entirely lost should the merger plan be accomplished.

The chairman of the board of J. P. Morgan last week has been quoted as saying that the Department of Justice inquiries about the merger with Guaranty were apparently routine. If this accurately reflects the nature of the Department's inquiries, that would be a most serious reflection on the Department's willingness to enforce the provisions of the Sherman Act impartially and

vigorously. A token investigation conducted for appearances' sake would be worse than no investigation at all. Moreover, I hope that in dealing with these two merger proposals the Department will carefully avoid pursuing the course it followed in 1955 in connection with Chase-Bank of Manhattan merger.

In my letter to Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, I stated, among other things:

The statutory structure requires that State member banks be placed on an equality with national banks in respect to branches and that since national banks must obtain approval of the Comptroller of the Currency of branches acquired through merger, State member banks of the Federal Reserve System are necessarily subject to the same condition. Thus the Board has made it plain that in determining whether or not it will approve the establishment by a bank of branches acquired through merger, it is bound by the same terms and conditions and the same limitations and restrictions as are applicable to branches of national banks. For that reason, the Board has stated that it is required, like the Comptroller of the Currency, to consider the effect of the merger on competition.

It follows, in these circumstances, that it is incumbent on the Board to use the same competitive test as that which the Comptroller of the Currency has stated he follows. In this connection I would point out that the Comptroller of the Currency has made it clear that before granting merger approval, he will determine whether the effect of the transaction in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; that he will determine, in short, whether the transaction is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act.

In view of the competitive test set forth above, it is difficult to ascertain how the Board could grant approval of the branch applications which will be here involved.

More than that, the consequences of the contemplated transaction are so far-reaching as to make it imperative that the Board conduct public hearings on the record so that all the facts be brought out and all interested parties be given an opportunity to be heard. I think it fundamental that matters of this importance not be left to informal private determination. The public interest involved here is too great for that.

My letter to the New York State superintendent of banks pointed out the necessity of careful investigation of this transaction in order to determine whether its effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. It also emphasized the importance of public hearings on the record.

I further indicated that it was essential for each of the three agencies involved to have close consultation with each other particularly with respect to the competitive phases of the merger proposal.

Finally, each agency was requested to furnish to the Antitrust Subcommittee answers to a series of questions dealing with the competitive factors that are involved.

Attached are copies of my letters to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the New York State superintendent of banks.

JANUARY 23, 1959.

SUPERINTENDENT OF BANKS,
State of New York Banking Department,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been directed to a proposed merger of the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co., both of New York City. This transaction, which would require your approval, presents on its face grave competitive implications. Following on the heels of the Guaranty Trust merger proposal, there is little doubt that its consummation would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in New York City; spur further bank mergers in the city; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on the entire banking structure of the city and State. I think it entirely probable that approval of a Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust consolidation would bring banking monopoly in our State much closer into being.

As you know, the banking system of New York City is already highly concentrated to the point where the four largest banks in the city control over 60 percent of the city's banking assets. In this connection it will be noted that Manufacturers Trust is now the third largest in the city with over \$3 billion of total assets, while Bankers Trust is the city's sixth largest bank having total assets in excess of \$2.8 billion. Merger of these two institutions would mean that almost 70 percent of the total assets of New York City's banks would be concentrated in the hands of four financial houses. This, I think you will agree, would be a matter of the most serious concern.

Furthermore, although there are now approximately 54 banks serving the city area, I would emphasize that the new entity resulting from the consolidation would have assets almost double the combined total assets of 44 of the city's banks.

No less significant, Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust are in substantial competition with each other in the so-called retail banking field. Indeed, Manufacturers, with 114 branches in New York City, already has the most extensive retail banking system in the city. Adding the 45 branches of Bankers Trust, would only serve to increase the dominance of the new institution in this phase of the city's banking business and further restrict the freedom of choice of depositors and borrowers alike.

It must be borne in mind that the present proposal, like that of Guaranty Trust and Morgan, does not involve a situation where a small, inadequately financed or managed bank, suffering or falling behind in the competitive race, seeks by merging to form a big, integrated institution able to compete on equal terms. On the contrary, each of the banks involved here is a gigantic, efficient, and vigorously competing institution well able independently to serve the banking needs of its respective clients. In fact, it is evident that the proposed consolidation is primarily the outgrowth of a deliberate effort on the part of the parties to expand their banking facilities, add to their capital and depositors, and, in general, increase their overall financial strength in the economy. Nor can it be overlooked that the present size of Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust has been accomplished in large part through absorption of other banking houses. Manufacturers Trust Co., for example, since its organization in 1905, has absorbed no less than 81 banks together with their branches, all in the Greater New York area.

The Bankers Trust Co. also has been taking over other banks at a rapid rate, especially in the last several years. In fact, since 1950, the Bankers Trust Co. has absorbed such substantial banks as the Public National Bank & Trust Co. of New York, the Title Guaranty & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commer-

cial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

In the context of the merger history of these two institutions, the present merger proposal appears as but another step toward larger size and greater dominance in the New York City market area.

You will recall that on December 19, 1958, I wrote to your office with respect to the proposed merger involving the Guaranty Trust Co. and J. P. Morgan & Co. In that communication I pointed out that your predecessor had testified before our Antitrust Subcommittee in 1955:

"It has been my policy as superintendent of banks of the State of New York to follow the spirit of the Celler Antimerger Act in determining whether or not to approve mergers of banks that come within my jurisdiction. That is to say, if after analysis of all facts, I find that the effect of a proposed bank merger may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to monopoly in any locality, I will unhesitatingly withhold approval."

The Comptroller of the Currency of the United States has likewise made it clear that his policy is the same—that before granting merger approval, he will determine whether the effect of the transaction in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; that he will determine, in short, whether the transaction is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act. Thus, in a letter to me dated March 14, 1955, the Comptroller of the Currency stated in part:

"In determining whether the approval of this office will be given to any merger or consolidation, the Comptroller considers, among other things, how the proposed merger will affect the particular banks involved, the soundness of the national banking system, and the convenience and needs of the community concerned. There may be a technical question as to the specific application of section 7 of the Clayton Act to these mergers. However, it has been the practice of the Comptroller before giving his approval to determine whether the effect of the merger, 'in any section of the country . . . may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.'"

Again in March 1957, the Comptroller testified before the Antitrust Subcommittee as follows:

"COUNSEL. Is it your practice . . . not to approve any bank merger where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly?"

"MR. GIDNEY. I say, that has been our practice. We have not approved any where it could be."

"COUNSEL. That is your practice?"

"MR. GIDNEY. We have not approved where it could be shown."

If competition in the banking field in New York City is to be preserved, it is, of course, vitally important that your office adhere to this policy in scrutinizing both the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals. Furthermore, in applying that policy, it is equally important that the purpose of the Congress in passing the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act be kept carefully in mind. In this respect, as I indicated in my previous letter of December 19, 1958, the decision of Judge Weinfeld in the Bethlehem-Youngstown merger case is extremely relevant. Also in my previous letter, I observed that Judge Weinfeld in that decision had pointed out that the precise purpose of the Celler-Kefauver Act was to limit future increases in the level of economic concentration resulting from corporate mergers in order to block resulting monopolistic tendencies in their incipency. The report of our House Judiciary Committee on this legislation emphasizes that a merger would come under

the statutory ban when its effect "may be a significant reduction in the vigor of competition, even though this effect may not be so far reaching as to amount to a combination in restraint of trade, create a monopoly, or constitute an attempt to monopolize. Such an effect may arise in various ways such as elimination in whole or in material part of the competitive activity of an enterprise which has been a substantial factor in competition, increase in the relative size of the enterprise making the acquisition to such a point that its advantage over its competitors threatens to be decisive, undue reduction in the number of competing enterprises, or establishment of relationships between buyers and sellers which deprive their rivals of a fair opportunity to compete."

In connection with the present transaction you will note that in the Bethlehem-Youngstown case the court rejected a contention, which undoubtedly will be made here, that the merger of the two companies would result in increased competition with the largest concern in the field. Apposite is the court's statement that to allow the merger would set in motion "a chain of reaction of further mergers by the other but less powerful companies in the . . . industry . . . [reaching] a point of more intense concentration in an industry already highly concentrated."

The considerations in the Bethlehem-Youngstown situation apply with even greater force to the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposal. More than that, the consequences of this contemplated transaction are so far-reaching as to make it imperative that your office conduct public hearings on the record so that all the facts be brought out and all interested parties be given an opportunity to be heard. I think it fundamental that matters of this importance not be left to informal, private determination. The public interest involved here is too great for that.

I point out also that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is the executive agency possessing the greatest expertise with respect to application of the standards of the Celler-Kefauver Act. Consequently, it would seem essential that your office seek the advice of the Antitrust Division, if there is to be an informed judgment concerning the competitive phases of the transactions.

In all the circumstances, I would greatly appreciate your advising our Antitrust Subcommittee as soon as possible as to whether or not your office contemplates following the spirit of the Celler-Kefauver Act in determining whether or not to approve the proposed Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger and the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger.

With respect to the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposal, I should also appreciate your advising our Antitrust Subcommittee:

1. Whether or not your office is undertaking an investigation of this transaction;
2. The nature of such investigation;
3. Whether or not your office is consulting with the Antitrust Division with respect to the competitive phases of this transaction;
4. The nature of such consultation;
5. Whether or not your office proposes to hold hearings with respect to this transaction;
6. In the event hearings are not held, the reasons therefor.

Finally, you will recall that included in my letter of December 19 was a series of questions relating to the Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal. Would you undertake to provide answers to these questions at your earliest convenience?

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, Chairman.

JANUARY 26, 1959.

HON. WILLIAM MCCHESENEY MARTIN, JR.,
Chairman of the Board of Governors,
Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention has been directed to a proposed merger of the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co., both of New York City. This transaction presents on its face grave competitive implications. Following on the heels of the Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal, there is little doubt that its consummation would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in New York City; spur a further wave of bank mergers in the city; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on the entire banking structure of the city and State.

As you know, the banking system of New York City is already highly concentrated to the point where the four largest banks in the city control over 60 percent of the city's banking assets. In this connection, it will be noted that Manufacturers Trust is now the third largest in the city with over \$3 billion of total assets, while Bankers Trust is the city's sixth largest bank having total assets in excess of \$2.8 billion. Merger of these two institutions would mean that almost 70 percent of the total assets of New York City's banks would be concentrated in the hands of four financial houses.

Furthermore, although there are now approximately 54 banks serving the city area, I would emphasize that the new entity resulting from the consolidation would have assets almost double the combined total assets of 44 of the city's banks.

It is clear that this transaction cannot be completed except with approval of the Federal Reserve Board which, as you have previously advised me, has jurisdiction over the establishment by the continuing bank of branches at locations of former offices of the absorbed institution. Indeed, the Board, as you recall, has recently pointed out in *Old Kent Bank and Trust Company v. The Federal Reserve System* (D. Col., C. A. No. 1993-58) that the necessity for Board approval of branches acquired through merger is required by the Federal statutes dealing with supervision and regulation of the banking industry. The Board's position, as indicated in that case, is that the statutory structure requires that State member banks be placed on an equality with national banks in respect to branches and that since national banks must obtain approval of the Comptroller of the Currency of branches acquired through merger, State member banks of the Federal Reserve System are necessarily subject to the same condition. Thus the Board has made it plain that in determining whether or not it will approve the establishment by a bank of branches acquired through merger, it is bound by the same terms and conditions and the same limitations and restrictions as are applicable to branches of national banks. For that reason, the Board has stated that it is required, like the Comptroller of the Currency, to consider the effect of the merger on competition.

It follows, in these circumstances, that it is incumbent on the Board to use the same competitive test as that which the Comptroller of the Currency has stated he follows. In this connection I would point out that the Comptroller of the Currency has made it clear that before granting merger approval, he will determine whether the effect of the transaction in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; that he will determine, in short, whether the transaction is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act. For example, in a letter to me dated March 14, 1955, the Comptroller of the Currency stated in part:

"In determining whether the approval of this office will be given to any merger or consolidation, the Comptroller considers, among other things, how the proposed merger will affect the particular banks involved, the soundness of the national banking system, and the convenience and needs of the community concerned. There may be a technical question as to the specific application of section 7 of the Clayton Act to these mergers. However, it has been the practice of the Comptroller before giving his approval to determine whether the effect of the merger, 'in any section of the country * * * may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.'"

Again, in March 1957, the Comptroller testified before the Antitrust Subcommittee as follows:

"COUNSEL. Is it your practice * * * not to approve any bank merger where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly?"

"MR. GIDNEY. I say, that has been our practice. We have not approved any where it could be.

"COUNSEL. That is your practice?"

"MR. GIDNEY. We have not approved where it could be shown."

Against this background I note that Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust are in substantial competition with each other in the so-called retail branch banking field. Indeed, Manufacturers, with 114 branches in New York City, already has the most extensive retail banking system in the city. Adding the 45 branches of Bankers Trust, would only serve to increase the dominance of the new institution in this phase of the city's banking business and further restrict the freedom of choice of depositors and borrowers alike.

In view of the competitive test set forth above, it is difficult to ascertain how the board could grant approval of the branch applications which will be here involved.

Beyond that, it is clear that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is the executive agency possessing the greatest expertise with respect to application of the above competitive standards in view of its prosecution of cases under the Celler-Kefauver Act. Consequently, it would seem essential that the board seek the advice of the Antitrust Division, if there is to be an informed judgment concerning the competitive phase of the transaction.

Also, since the transaction is subject to approval by the New York State Superintendent of Banks, and since the avowed policy of the superintendent is to follow the competitive test specified above, it would seem essential for the board to maintain close and continuous liaison with the bank superintendent particularly in respect to competitive aspects.

More than that, the consequences of the contemplated transaction are so far reaching as to make it imperative that the Board conduct public hearings on the record so that all the facts be brought out and all interested parties be given an opportunity to be heard. I think it fundamental that matters of this importance not be left to informal private determination. The public interest involved here is too great for that.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I would greatly appreciate your advising our Antitrust Subcommittee as soon as possible as to the competitive test the Board will follow and whether or not the Board will disapprove this transaction if it finds that its effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. I should also appreciate your advising our subcommittee:

First. Whether or not the Board is undertaking an investigation of this transaction;

Second. The nature of such investigation;

Third. Whether or not the Board will consult with the Antitrust Division and the New York State Superintendent of Banks with re-

spect to the competitive phases of this transaction;

Fourth. Whether or not the Board proposes to hold hearings with respect to this transaction.

Finally, many of the above factors are equally applicable with respect to the proposed Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal. Therefore, it would be appreciated if the Board answer each of the above questions as they relate to that proposed transaction.

I am enclosing for the Board's information copies of letters I have sent to the Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 26, 1959.

HON. VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JUDGE HANSEN: My attention has been directed to a proposed merger of the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co., both of New York City. This transaction presents on its face grave competitive implications. Following on the heels of the Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal, there is little doubt that its consummation would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in New York City; spur further bank mergers in the city; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on the entire banking structure of the city and State. I think it entirely probable that a Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust consolidation would bring banking monopoly in New York State much closer into being.

The banking system of New York City is already highly concentrated to the point where the four largest banks in the city control over 60 percent of the city's banking assets. In this connection, it will be noted that Manufacturers Trust is now the third largest in the city with over \$3 billion of total assets, while Bankers Trust is the city's sixth largest bank having total assets in excess of \$2.8 billion. Merger of these two institutions would mean that almost 70 percent of the total assets of New York City's banks would be concentrated in the hands of four financial houses. This, I think you will agree, would be a matter of the most serious concern.

Furthermore, although there are now approximately 54 banks serving the city area, I would emphasize that the new entity resulting from the consolidation would have assets almost double the combined total assets of 44 of the city's banks.

No less significant, Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust are in substantial competition with each other in the so-called retail banking field. Indeed, Manufacturers, with 114 branches in New York City, already has the most extensive retail banking system in the city. Adding the 45 branches of Bankers Trust would only serve to increase the dominance of the new institution in this phase of the city's banking business and further restrict the freedom of choice of depositors and borrowers alike.

It must be borne in mind that the present proposal, like that of Guaranty Trust and Morgan, does not involve a situation where a small, inadequately financed or managed bank, suffering or falling behind in the competitive race, seeks by merging to form a big, integrated institution able to compete on equal terms. On the contrary, each of the banks involved here is a gigantic, efficient, and vigorously competing institution well able independently to serve the banking needs of its respective clients. In fact, it is evident that the proposed consolidation is primarily the outgrowth of a deliber-

ate effort on part of the parties to expand their banking facilities, add to their capital and depositors, and, in general, increase their overall financial strength in the economy. Nor can it be overlooked that the present size of Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust has been accomplished in large part through absorption of other banking houses. Manufacturers Trust Co., for example, since its organization in 1905, has absorbed no less than 81 banks together with their branches, all in the Greater New York area.

The Bankers Trust Co. also has been taking over other banks at a rapid rate, especially in the last several years. In fact, since 1950, the Bankers Trust Co. has absorbed such substantial banks as the Public National Bank & Trust Co. of New York, the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

In the context of the merger history of these two institutions, the present merger proposal appears as but another step toward larger size and greater dominance in the New York City market area.

Further demonstrating the effect this and the Guaranty Trust-Morgan proposal will have on the banking structure, the president of the Manufacturers Trust Co. was quoted last week as saying: "The merger discussions were spurred by news of the Morgan-Guaranty combine. . . . I know of no bank in New York that hasn't had conversations formal or informal with other banks over the possibility of a merger." Business Week of January 10, 1959, had this to say: "New York bankers predict that if and when [this] merger goes through, a series of competitive realignments will result that won't end until a new balance of power is established among New York banks."

I am quite aware that these two merger proposals may involve an acquisition of assets and that, should this be the case, section 7 of the Clayton Act would not be applicable. However, I am equally aware—as I am sure the Department of Justice is—that bank mergers, whether accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions, are also circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize, or monopolization of trade or commerce. Illegality under the Sherman Act is established by proof that the merger has actually resulted in an unreasonable lessening of competition. It is true that such proof is more difficult than the Clayton Act test which requires only a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition. Nevertheless, establishing a Sherman Act violation hardly presents insuperable problems.

In this connection, I think it is highly significant that since 1950 there has been a total of 1,232 bank mergers, of which 1,059 took place in the period from 1953 to 1958. Despite this great number of bank consolidations which is concentrating, control of the Nation's banks into fewer and fewer hands, the Antitrust Division has never once invoked the provisions of the Sherman Act against a bank merger. I am at a complete loss to understand this extraordinary record of inaction.

In respect to the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals, I trust that the situation will change and that the Department will finally execute the provisions of the Sherman Act promptly, vigorously, and effectively. This is particularly important since each of these mergers on its face would apparently result in a substantial lessening of competition as between the acquiring and acquired institutions. Thus, Guaranty Trust and J. P. Morgan are seemingly in vigorous and substantial competition with

each other in the wholesale banking business, while Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust compete with each other substantially in the retail banking field. In both cases, this competition would be entirely lost should the merger plan be accomplished.

The chairman of the board of J. P. Morgan last week has been quoted as saying that the Department of Justice inquiries about the merger with Guaranty were apparently routine. If this accurately reflects the nature of the Department's inquiries, that would be a most serious reflection on the Department's willingness to enforce the provisions of the Sherman Act impartially and vigorously. A token investigation conducted for appearance's sake would be worse than no investigation at all. Moreover, I hope that in dealing with these two merger proposals the Department will carefully avoid pursuing the course it followed in 1955 in connection with the Chase-Bank of Manhattan merger.

There is a further consideration. As you know, both of the merger proposals will require the approval of the New York State Superintendent of Banks and the Federal Reserve Board. In considering these transactions these agencies should, for reasons which I have set forth in the letters which are enclosed, consider whether the merger's effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. This competitive test is the same as the standards set forth in section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act. For that reason, it would appear imperative that the Antitrust Division present its views on the competitive phases of these transactions to the Superintendent of Banks and to the Federal Reserve Board. As you know, it would not be a novel departure for the Division to present its views on the competitive aspects of a bank merger to a bank supervisory agency. This is evidenced by your letter to me dated March 20, 1957. It is also evidenced by the Department's intervention before the Federal Reserve Board on the application by the First National City Bank of New York to form a holding company to acquire the County Trust Company of Westchester. In view of the competitive implication of each of the two current bank merger proposals, I think you will agree that it is of even greater importance here for the Department to present its views to the bank supervisory agencies. On the other hand, should the Department fail to act, "in its overall responsibility for section 7's enforcement—outside of the banking area—(the) Department would be bound by bank merger precedents (it) had no voice in picking or shaping."

In light of the foregoing considerations, I will appreciate your furnishing the following information to our Antitrust Subcommittee as soon as possible with respect to the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals:

1. Whether the Department of Justice is presently undertaking a Sherman Act investigation of each of these proposals;
 2. Whether or not each of these investigations is or is not routine;
 3. Whether or not the Department of Justice is consulting with the New York State Superintendent of Banks and the Federal Reserve Board with respect to the competitive phases of these transactions;
 4. The nature of such consultations.
- Finally, I am enclosing for your information copies of letters I have sent to the New York State Superintendent of Banks and to the Federal Reserve Board concerning the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposal.

Sincerely yours,
EMANUEL CELLER, Chairman.

Flood Control Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the people of my congressional district, as everyone knows who has read the newspapers in the past several weeks, have been hit by a devastating flood. Rather than bemoaning their fate, they have pitched in as individuals to clean up after the flood, to rebuild and restore the buildings and land laid waste.

Knowing them as I do, I knew that they would respond in this way—by doing everything, individually, they could do to restore life to normal and to make the countryside as beautiful and well kept as it was before.

Yet, the people are not forgetting the tragic flood. They are discussing it, and its causes. This, too, could be expected. It is, I think, a tribute to them, as thoughtful men and women in the United States and as good citizens, to strive to find out what happened, what was not done that should have been done, and what ought to be done to prevent future damage in future potentially dangerous flood periods.

As a public official, I have striven to develop and to hold the idea and the attitude that I do not know everything. I have stated before, and I meant it sincerely, as I state now, namely, that I covet the thinking of the people in my district about every problem which affects them and impinges upon public questions.

I respect their advice and counsel. I strive in every way to get the viewpoints of many, diverse individuals, for I realize that everyone, if he will contribute what he can to our problems, can help to solve or assuage our public problems.

Robert Burton said: "A dwarf, standing on the shoulders of a giant, may see farther than the giant himself."

I feel, in a way, that the combined intelligence of the people of my district constitutes a lot of wisdom. Figuratively speaking, I want to stand on their shoulders and, using their combined knowledge, strive to see a little farther into the distance, in order to help them. But I can help them only to the extent they express themselves freely and that I learn of the thoughts they are thinking.

Relative to our flood, Mr. Speaker, a number of fine citizens have expressed their thoughts and observations in various ways. Because I feel that each of the following news clippings, either letters to the editor or news columns are pertinent to the problems my district faces in making sure we are not the victims again of a disastrous flood, I am inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A letter to the editor of the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, written by D. F. Ridenour, and published on January 29, 1959.

Two columns by George McConnell, farm planner and Wayne Burkhardt, County Agent, published in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News on January 29, and January 30, 1959, respectively:

[From the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, Jan. 29, 1959]

PEOPLE'S FORUM

EDITOR, THE NEWS:

The first time I realized we were having a flood I drove up to the east side of Knox Lake to see if the water was high there. I thought some of you people would be interested in what I found.

The two creeks that come into the lake there were all over the lowland and pouring over the new road about four feet deep for at least one-eighth of a mile. Ice a foot thick was lodged on the trees turned up edgewise and holding the water back. That country looked like the Atlantic Ocean.

I became alarmed about the dam so drove down the west end of the lake and the ice was not broken at all and the water was about normal.

If this lake had not been there Mount Vernon would have had at least 2 feet more of water. This was at noon Wednesday. Knox Lake was not built for flood control but it really saved Mount Vernon this time.

D. F. RIDENOUR.

[From the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, Jan. 29, 1959]

DRY DAMS SUGGESTED AS SOLUTION OF FLOOD PROBLEM HERE

(By George McConnell)

There has been much written and said about what could and should be done to prevent a recurrence of the flood of January 21, in Knox County. Certainly no one wants it to happen again. Many people have offered ideas that are worth considering.

It seems obvious that channel clearing is needed. The dikes need repairing and perhaps relocated. Apparently the Corps of Engineers has a plan to take care of this need, although it has not yet been made public. This may offer the lowest sections of Mount Vernon a measure of protection. Cooperation with the Corps of Engineers would seem to be the quickest way to protect the most people and property at the lowest cost to local government.

First, Congress must appropriate the necessary funds and the Public Works Agency must approve the proposals made by the Corps of Engineers.

The official Soil Conservation Service notes of water level at the B. & O. bridge at Mount Vernon are most interesting. The record of the floodwater rise went like this: 8:15-9:15, 1.5 feet; 9:15-10:25, 1.7 feet; 10:25-noon, 1.5 feet; noon-1, 1.4 feet; 1-2:45, 1.9 feet; 2:45-3:15, 2 feet; 3:15-3:35, 2.4 feet; 3:35-4:20, 2.4 feet; 4:20-4:35, same flood crest; 4:35-4:50, 0.1 down; 4:50-5:15, 0.1 down.

The rise was about 1.5 feet per hour till noon, then about 0.4 foot per hour till 2:45. It was during this period that the water spread out in the west end of town and rose more slowly because it was covering more and more land.

Then between 2:45 and 3:15 the floodwater level rose exactly 2 feet in just one-half hour, in spite of the fact that the water was still spreading out. The rise (of 0.8 foot) and spread continued for about another hour cresting between 4:15 and 4:35 p.m. The local Soil Conservation Service personnel searched for 5 days for an answer to this behavior. We saw the abrupt rise. Many people reported a wall of water from 3 to 6 feet high coming down the river.

The SCS figures prove that there was a sharp rise. The only explanation that seems worth considering is the big pool of floodwater that gathered in the north end of

Fredericktown. It finally broke over the railroads opposite the Edwards sheet-metal plant about 11:30 a.m. The big blocks of ice may have dammed the 9-foot culvert under the railroad there also. Plenty of them are big enough. Certainly it must have cut loose abruptly. At any rate it temporarily detained the water. The heaviest rain shower at Mount Vernon came after 3:30. Rain may have been heaviest at Fredericktown earlier in the afternoon.

The North Fork of the Kokosing River falls about 80 feet in the 8 miles by river to the viaduct in Mount Vernon. It seems logical that the water from the temporary detention structure at the upper end of Fredericktown could have reached Mount Vernon at about 3 p.m. as the figures indicate. The next question is just how much water was stored, temporarily, in the upper end of Fredericktown. A quick look at the area early this week indicates that it may have been about 1,000 acre-feet. That is an average of 4 feet, over 250 acres of land or the equivalent of less than a 2-foot rise in Knox Lake. In a dry dam, that would be regarded as a good sized body of water.

If the above assumptions are correct, and we feel that they are, then this demonstrates how valuable upstream dry dams could be. With several thousand acre-feet of flood storage the damage could have been nearly, if not entirely, eliminated in Mount Vernon and Fredericktown.

[From the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News, Jan. 29, 1959]

FLOOD PREVENTION IS EXPENSIVE, FLOODS ARE EVEN MORE SO

(By George McConnell)

Flood prevention is expensive, but floods are much more expensive. Provisions have been made under Federal and State law for part of the cost to be paid by the Federal Government.

It will still cost local government a considerable amount for the protection needed. We understand that the local government will have to provide easements, rights-of-way and in some cases buy land and pay to get utilities moved. All this will be needed so it can't happen here again.

Channel improvements along the Kokosing and pumping stations in Mount Vernon will help give some protection, but they will not do the whole job. Dry Creek has repeatedly gone on a rampage.

County Engineer Warren Veatch had done excellent work on the Dry Creek channel, but it continues to roar out of its banks from time to time. It is apparent that upstream protection is also needed to substantially slow down the fast flowing runoff from the watershed of Dry Creek.

Future damage in the north end of Fredericktown cannot be averted by channel work alone. The water will have to be controlled before it reaches Fredericktown.

Knox County losses have not been limited to the densely settled urban areas and to roads and bridges, although they suffered the most. Many farmers in the bottom lands also sustained heavy losses. Our preliminary estimate of fence damage is 100 miles washed out. The cost of rebuilding these fences will average about \$1,000 per mile. There is probably another 100 miles of fence that is badly damaged but can be put back for an average of about \$400 per mile.

There have been few reports of flood damage in any of the towns downstream from the Muskingum Conservancy District dams. They have not had serious damage. The topography of the land above Mount Vernon on the Kokosing does not lend itself to big flood control dams such as the Mohawk dry dam. Maybe we are lucky at that. The river bottoms that would be flooded are the most productive land we have.

There are, we are sure, scores of sites where small dry dams could be built on many of

the branch streams and their tributaries. In many instances these small dams would flood only woodland and pasture land. This would do little, if any, damage. This time of year and in early spring when most floods occur it would do no damage even to crops that might be temporarily flooded by such a dam since the water would be retarded for only a day or two. Retarding or slowing the water runoff for only a few hours before it reaches the main tributaries will sharply reduce the flooding in most instances of the larger streams below.

The worst flood hazard areas are in Oklahoma, Texas, and Nebraska. They have worked there under rainfall conditions much more severe than ours. They have had rains up to 9 inches in a single day and no damage. Dry dams have furnished flood protection there on watersheds similar to the Kokosing and they can do the same thing here.

We know of several locations where a properly located dam would benefit individual farmers on whose land they were built protecting his lower lying land as well as providing downstream protection. This protection would be in two ways. It would keep the lower land from being flooded and reduce the stream bank erosion. This would surely be true on many farms.

Small dams and other on-the-farm flood-control measures could be installed entirely with Federal flood-control funds, under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. If a farmer wanted water for livestock or irrigation in addition to providing flood storage he would have to pay a proportionate part of the cost. In almost all instances the farmer would still have full use of the land in addition to the flood control and other benefits that might accrue to him. He would also be benefiting all who lived downstream from him.

Adequate conservation practices would have to be applied upstream from any dry dam in order to avoid reducing its effectiveness by siltation. These conservation practices must be applied by the time the dam is built. The reasons are obvious. There are about 1,200 farms upstream from Mount Vernon. About 360 of these farms are upstream from Fredericktown. It is on these farms that our floods begin. That seems to be the most sensible place to start stopping our floods. It will require an understanding of the total values on the part of the farmers who live on these farms. The planning and building of structures will take a lot of time and study. There are many agencies of the county, State, and Federal Government that are able and willing to cooperate in getting the job done. They can and will work closely together to help us solve our problems here if we ask them for that help. More than 887 small watersheds like ours all over the United States have asked for and are getting planning help under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. We can too. Floods are much too expensive, when they can be prevented.

Chance for Labor Cleanup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial

from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star of January 29, 1959:

CHANCE FOR LABOR CLEANUP

Congress, with its large majority of Democratic Members friendly to the cause of organized labor, has an opportunity this year to clear away some of the abuses which have given certain sections of the labor organization a bad name.

It has before it now two proposals. One is the spineless bill sponsored by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, which is similar to the legislation passed by the Senate last year and which really will do little toward routing the racketeering bosses from some of the labor unions.

The other is the program presented by President Eisenhower, which also won't accomplish everything which needs to be done but which would go a long way toward providing protection against racket picketing in cases where no labor dispute is involved.

There are rumors to the effect that a third and stronger bill will be presented by Senator McCLELLAN, who, as chairman of the Senate Labor Racketeering Committee, knows as much as anyone just what is needed to clean up labor.

Certainly the Kennedy bill will not do the job. It obviously was drafted with a primary objective of doing nothing which might offend the labor bosses. It has all the earmarks of the work of a man who is trying to line up strong support for an effort to win a presidential nomination.

The Eisenhower program, whatever its shortcomings, tries to bring racket picketing under control. That section of the bill is desperately needed. Secondary boycotts and racket picketing inflict severe damage on people who are not directly involved in labor disputes and they must be curtailed.

Congress now has its choice. It either can go along with the hollow pretense of adopting the Kennedy bill or it can draft the more workable legislation which bitter experience has shown is the country's need.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of January 31, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JANUARY 31, 1959.

The President's labor message to Congress contained various commendable provisions to remedy labor leaders' abuses and excesses, suggesting: (1) Unions to file annual public reports concerning financial transactions with the Secretary of Labor; (2) filing of union constitutions and bylaws; (3) keeping of proper records, open to the government and union members; (4) proper administration of union funds; (5) the right of secret ballot by union members; (6) imposition of criminal penalties for violations of the law (bribery, embezzlement, records destruction, false entries, etc.); (7) prevention of secondary boycotts; (8) recognition of coercion or blackmail picketing as illegal.

These legislative requirements are tougher than the Democrat bill of last year and the newly introduced Democrat bill of this year, but at best they comprise a minimum labor

law. What we need, in addition, is a law to put labor unions under the antitrust law and subject to all the laws which govern our citizens (not above and beyond the law as labor unions are at present). Such a law is urgently needed to protect union members themselves from their own leaders.

A comprehensive tax reform bill is another urgent Federal legislative need. The progressive confiscatory tax, never intended by the originators of our Nation's income tax, is killing incentive and drying up risk capital. When incentive goes, free enterprise will die. When risk capital becomes scarce, Government loans enter the scene. In both cases, socialism blooms while the heavy-laden taxpayer gives up property and loses freedom. To a degree this is the United States' situation today. To whatever degree we are encouraging socialism by tax burdens, at the expense of personal freedom and free enterprise, we must alter the income tax law. Yet such alteration in the closely-knit Government-business relationship must necessarily be accomplished gradually, with maximum foresight and planning. The changes effected must not disrupt business nor inflate or weaken our currency through deficit spending, as a result of precipitously reduced income to Government.

So I joined others in sponsoring the bipartisan tax reform and reduction bill known as the Herlong-Baker bill. The bill provides: (1) A gradually reduced individual and corporate income tax rate over a 5-year period (individual—lowest bracket down from 20 to 15 percent; highest—91 to 47 percent; corporate, 1 percent per year); (2) a more realistic depreciation rate; (3) decreased estate and gift taxes; (4) deferral of capital gains tax until taxpayer disinvests. At the end of the 5-year period further tax changes could be made to remove the tax burden and stimulate economic growth. The loss of Government income, which always must be considered in tax cuts, would be more than offset by business growth which in turn provides more tax revenues. This seemingly contradictory anomaly has been established by earlier tax cuts providing the wisdom and incentive of such action. So it is that by preserving incentive and building risk capital, we can surpass any Russian effort (no matter how great) that is based on government tyranny. If we try to emulate Russia by government regulation, control, and confiscatory progressive taxation, which is Russia's blueprint for destroying free enterprise societies, we just commit suicide. Unfortunately, many citizens and some Congressmen, as I see it, do not even recognize the danger, much less the solution to the problem. This tax bill provides a solution, it seems to me.

Controversial subjects now being discussed here for legislative attention, in addition to tax and labor reform, include agriculture, housing, airports, depressed areas and school construction—all requiring more Federal money, more stipulated Federal terms, more Federal control—at the expense of local and State jurisdiction and the balanced budget.

As we embark legislatively in a new Congress, I think the time has come for both political parties to state their principles. Surely, Members of Congress should know and adhere to a basic concept of the role that Federal Government should play in our lives—rather than competitively bidding for votes, or entering name-calling contests, solely on the strength of a name—Republican or Democrat—without a basic definition of principles. It is my hope that in the days ahead, members of both parties will stay with basic American concepts in defining the Constitution, and will decide legislative issues with an eye to the strictly limited role assigned the Federal Government by the Constitution, thus preserving States rights and the importance of the individual citizen.

"A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government" (Thomas Jefferson, inaugural address, March 4, 1801).

Carol Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article by Paul Robinson, which appeared in the Waycross Journal-Herald, of Waycross, Ga., on December 31, 1958, concerning Carol Wise, a native Ware County girl, who has just recorded her first gospel hymns. I am very proud of this outstanding artist who resides in my congressional district in Georgia and would like others to know of her achievements and her courage, despite her physical handicap. Her dedication to God's work and her faith in Him is an inspiration to all who know her.

The article follows:

CAROL WISE, NATIVE WARE COUNTY GIRL, RECORDS HYMNS

(By Paul Robinson)

Endowed with what is called one of the finest singing voices in Georgia, a native Ware County girl has just recorded her first gospel hymns.

Carol Wise, daughter of Mrs. Lois Wise and granddaughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Hancock, now has the first copies of her recording, entitled "He's Everywhere," and "How Great Thou Art."

The recordings were cut under Miss Wise's own label. Accompanists for the vocal solos were R. G. "Gene" Hancock, an uncle of the singer, playing the electric organ, and Miss Wanda Hill at the piano. A Springfield, Mo., firm cut the records.

Miss Wise is a graduate of Wacona High School and studied voice 1 year under Clayton Logan at Valdosta State College. Her ambition is to continue voice training. Meanwhile, she is biding her time.

AN UNUSUAL GIRL

A chat with friends of Miss Wise reveals that Waycross' newest recording star is an unusual young lady.

Carol Wise has what friends describe as an unexcelled faith. Her faith is exemplified in her daily life and the type of songs which she recorded, one observer stated.

It is said by acquaintances that her charming manner endears her to all with whom she comes in contact. To know her is to love her, is what many friends say of this petite brunette.

One close friend said, "Carol simply glows with love for family and friends. Her devoted family rejoices in her amazing attitude and accomplishments."

Another said, "She is unusual in that a physical handicap has not embittered her nor hindered the development of talent and personality. She has no qualms about being dealt a cruel blow by fate."

SINGS WITH MEANING

All who have heard Carol sing proclaim the clarity and tone of her voice as being just great. When she sings, her listeners say they feel immediately she means every word of the gospel hymns.

"To hear her crystal-clear voice ring out when she sings 'He's Everywhere,' would tug at the heartstrings of even the staunchest unbeliever," was the way one admirer described her singing.

"I see Him in a baby's smile." Quoting these words from one of the hymns, the friend of Miss Wise said though the young lady might never see the glory of a sunrise or the beauty of a sunset, when she sings the lyrics to "He's Everywhere," you know by the earnestness of her voice and the peaceful expression that she knows her God is everywhere.

Her admirers say Carol's song is made more touching by the knowledge that, though she says she sees Him—everywhere, it is only through faith that she knows He's there.

For Carol has retinitis pigmentosa, an eye disease that doctors say is incurable. The disease causes progressive blindness and Carol's handicap is in the advanced stages.

But the courageous youngster wants no pity. She aspires to a singing career, hoping to prevent being a burden to her family. All her hosts of admirers feel that her charm and talent should assure the plucky lass of this.

Readers who would like further information on the records mentioned here may contact Carol Wise in care of J. E. Hancock, Route 4, Waycross.

What They Don't Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following column by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in a recent edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald:

WHAT THEY DON'T SAY

(By Joseph Alsop)

In public and in private, the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are now pouring the usual floods of soothing sirup about America's defense posture.

This year's soothing sirup differs in several respects from the sirup of earlier years, however. For instance, it has a higher content of outright untruth. Even the President indulged in flat misstatement of facts, though no doubt unwittingly, when he told his press conference that "our missile program is going forward as rapidly as possible."

But what makes the 1959 vintage of soothing sirup really memorable is not so much the untruth that is included, but all the harsh, disagreeable, indigestible facts that are left out. As a really superb illustration of how to compound soothing sirup by the method of omission, consider the diversified means of delivery argument used before the Senate Armed Services Committee by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Nathan Twining, and also used elsewhere by Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy.

Even by making the most transparently overoptimistic estimates of Soviet progress, the Secretary and the General could not

absolutely wish away the Soviet lead in intercontinental ballistic missiles. Secretary McElroy has actually admitted that we are conceding the Soviets a 3-to-1 lead in ICBM's by 1962, and in reality we are almost certainly doing far worse than Secretary McElroy admits. But Twining and McElroy argue that the Soviet ICBM lead will be counterbalanced by our diversified means of delivery.

On the debit side of the balance sheet, in other words, Twining and McElroy write down just Soviet ICBM's, and on the credit side they write down our much smaller number of American ICBM's, plus our Strategic Air Command, plus the intermediate range missile squadrons we are sending to our allies, and so on and on. According to Twining and McElroy, the results ought to satisfy everyone.

In the Senate hearings, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, therefore asked General Twining how many IRBM's the Soviets would have among their own diversified means of delivery. Fantastically enough, Twining replied that he really did not know and would have to look into the matter. But the answer to the Senator's question is plain. The Soviets must be assumed to have, already in operational squadrons or soon going into operation squadrons, between 600 and 1,000 IRBM's to cover the Strategic Air Command's bases in Europe and the Mediterranean, plus enough more to cover SAC's Pacific bases.

The facts that demand this assumption are of all sorts. One is the regular Soviet IRBM testing rate—15 a month, fired off as though by clockwork—which clearly implies test firings to train operational IRBM squadrons. Another related fact is the identification of whole Soviet IRBM trains, including specially designed cars to serve as launching pads. Still another fact is the enormous number of Soviet IRBM tests that were identified in the earlier period, before we had even tested one IRBM at full range.

The plain truth is that the Soviet IRBM lead is vastly greater than the Soviet ICBM lead. Secretary of Defense McElroy has not been allowed to count the Soviet IRBM's on a special guided tour, so he can say he is not positive the Soviets have any that are operational. But it is worse than playing Russian roulette with the intelligence estimates, if American policy is not squarely on the assumption that the Soviets now have or will soon have the kind of IRBM capability outlined above. And this powerful Soviet IRBM capability is simply omitted from the balance sheet!

Meanwhile, the mere 8 squadrons of 120 IRBM's that this country will eventually send to Britain and elsewhere are put down on the balance sheet's credit side. And the fact is omitted that our allies will absolutely control the use of these American IRBM's. The whole striking power of SAC is also put down on the credit side. And the further fact is omitted that SAC's striking power can be reduced by at least 50 and perhaps 60 percent by a surprise attack by the Soviet IRBM's on SAC's overseas bases. Thus the balance sheet is cooked in the most flagrant manner.

The question remains why such men as Twining and McElroy are first willing to delude themselves and then willing to delude the public by cooking the balance sheet. The answer lies in the administration's conviction that it is better not to look hard facts in the face, because the richest country in the world really cannot afford to defend itself. As General Twining has gloomily remarked, "Irresponsible spending for military hardware" (for which read "spending to meet the Soviet challenge") could result in our losing, without ever firing a shot, the very things we now fight for.

Professional Gossips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a sermon given by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, at the sixth annual journalists' mass, celebrated at Our Lady of the Railways Chapel, Boston, Mass., on January 25, 1959.

In his remarks about and warning of "professional gossips," Cardinal Cushing well said:

Newspapers are made for men by men and unless they help to make all men better, then they are truly without significant purpose.

The above-mentioned follows:

PRESS WARNED OF PROFESSIONAL GOSSIPS—CARDINAL CUSHING PRESIDES AT MASS FOR JOURNALISTS

(Following is the address of Richard Cardinal Cushing at the sixth annual journalists' mass, Our Lady of the Railways chapel, South Station, Boston. The mass for the press was offered on Sunday, January 25, 1959, at 4 p.m., in anticipation of the feast of St. Francis de Sales, patron of journalists, January 29.)

This is the sixth annual mass for the press and each year I have been happy to preside at the ceremonies and to offer some observations on the work of the journalistic profession.

My first duty is to say a word of thanks, even in informal fashion, to the working press of Boston for their services during these last few months, when I found myself, like the rockets of the scientists, launched into the unknown world of fame and glory by becoming a Cardinal. No one knows better than you how little my disposition is in accord with such special dignities and how little inclined am I to elevated decorum of any kind. Many of you have followed me into the hospitals and prisons, you have seen me happy with the aged and the poor, you know my affection for the little ones, afflicted and undeveloped—in short, you know me, and I like to think that more than most others you understand me.

Because of this particular relationship that I have seen formed between the working press and a bishop going about trying to do good, I am especially happy to be here this afternoon. Since that October day on which good Pope John announced my name as a member of the College of Cardinals you have hardly been able to give your typewriters a rest. So many kind words came my way that I blushed to pick up the papers, so many pictures that I hurried over the pages. There were many pious exaggerations too in the midst of the excitement, but they were the product of an excess of goodwill in my regard. At this time it is enough to say that I understand the good motives that inspired your many efforts and that I am grateful for it all, even when your generous phrases ran on ahead of the reality.

The press of Boston, as I see it, has a unique flavor like the city itself. I have often described Boston as a big city and a small town. This is at once its character and its charm. It is true also of its press. Rolling off the big city editions of the newspapers, now with two of America's newest and most modern plants, the papers of Bos-

ton stand on a level with the great papers of the other large cities of the country. At the same time they have a quality of their own, the subtle, small-town quality of being interested in people. This is more significant than we may realize at first for it expresses a kind of philosophy of journalism, even if only in an unconscious fashion.

Newspaper very often concern themselves almost exclusively with events and in our times events are happening so quickly as to be easily the preoccupation of editors. From Quemoey to Berlin, from Little Rock to Anchorage, from Cape Canaveral to the moon, and in these last weeks almost to the sun—in every part of the world and beyond it the day's news brings us new events and new accomplishments. Sometimes it is possible for us to forget that the center of the world is still man, that history is the story of man, and civilization the product of his genius. News is significant principally as it affects man, and any record of the day which leaves out the human element or merely touches it lightly distorts the true values of our existence.

In this connection I have been thinking recently of the young lady reporter who took herself to prison rather than reveal certain sources of information used in her column. I suppose it is natural to feel a certain sense of chivalry in her regard—she suffered, according to her claims, in order to protect the position of another. From this point of view, even if her action was ill-advised, she has demonstrated a certain strength of character. There are added circumstances, of course, which color the incident and all of them are important for those who wish to make a judgment in her regard.

For my part, I will leave it to those more learned in the law than myself to pass a definitive decision on the celebrated case; in a conflict of rights such as this one, there are many aspects of the case to be studied and the claims of justice move in many directions. For myself, I would prefer to comment on a matter which stands at the source of the incident itself and has been little discussed, but deserves some consideration from us all.

The original item of news which began the controversy and raised so many questions was, in a simple everyday phrase, a bit of gossip. Normally, we do not take seriously the problem of gossip; we think of it generally as something associated with elderly ladies gathered about a tea table and with men having nothing else to do. For the most part it is fair to say that gossip is harmless. It is clear, however, that it can become dangerous, and indeed immoral, when it touches the good name and reputation of others. This does not mean merely that we should be careful not to tell lies about our neighbors, but that in certain cases we cannot even tell the truth, if such a revelation will destroy a reputation and serve no just purpose. These principles we have learned in our youth and so we know the moral evil of detraction which reveals a damaging truth about another, as well as calumny, which reports a lie about another.

Now for several decades we have had growing up in the newspaper world a whole batch of writers who must be termed professional gossips. Things were bad enough when the only gossips we had around were the back-fence variety and other amateur forms; it has become intolerable now that the whole business has gone professional with newspaper writers making a living out of it, and in some cases, I dare say, a fortune out of it. Of course, I know that much of these columns is made up of items of a pleasant and happy nature, and I know that there are some columnists who show good taste and restraint in discussing the lives of celebrities.

But I also know that there are some who handle the lives of their neighbors with no

sense of values at all and with no respect for reputations. In little, staccato lines they feed the hungry public the evil food of malicious gossip; they quietly destroy their subjects and just as quietly poison their readers.

Fortunately, this is something quite rare in our city; when we encounter it, it is likely to be something introduced from some other area. At the same time we must take every precaution against its increase either locally or nationally. Gossip of the kind I refer to is essentially unkind, and it caters only to the instinct of curiosity in man, the busy-body tendency which lurks beneath the surface of the best of us and looks for opportunities to be satisfied. Moreover, gossip is also unjust, for it nearly always damages the reputation of others and takes away from them their good name or the remnants of their proper esteem in the community. It might also be noted that gossip has a very debilitating effect on the character of those who make a practice of indulging in it. It is the product of small minds and it encourages small-mindedness.

All of us can remember reading in the masthead of the New York Times the famous legend, "All the News That's Fit To Print." This is a very old text but some reflection on it might put a good deal of sense into our thinking on situations like the one we have been referring to. A newspaper is a free enterprise; it sets out to find the news and to give it to the public. At the same time, every editor and, indeed, every reporter knows that he cannot print all the news; he must select and reject, and he must have a formula for preferring the one and setting the other aside. There is, in plain terms, some news fit to print and there is some news that is not fit to print. A good publisher and a good editor know how to make the distinction between the one and the other.

Some people speak a great deal about the so-called right to know. This is a very precious idea and it lies at the heart of the democratic society as we know it. The public has a right to know many things about the conduct of government, the state of society, as well as any and all the public events which make up a passing day. At the same time there are many things that are not public property; we just do not have the right to know everything about everybody.

It has never been a rule of good journalism that we have a right to print everything we can find out about everyone in the world. Alongside the concept of right to know we must set the principle of fit to print. Beside the ingenuity of the reporter who finds out hidden facts we must be sure to encourage the restraint of the editor who knows which ones will serve legitimate interests and which will unjustly bring damage to others.

The newspaper is not an irrational machine into which we can carelessly throw the news, and let the results fall where they may. Newspapers are run by newsmen and that is why they must be answerable, as man is answerable, to laws higher than themselves.

Perhaps the reason why papers in Boston do not often fall in this regard can be found in the quality I mentioned earlier, the fact that they are human enough to be interested in people. We know that newspapers are a kind of daily textbook in the education of the readers, that minds are informed and personalities affected by their reading. This places a high community responsibility on the newsmen of a city, for they can be said to set the human climate of the areas they serve.

If papers are edited in a manner that recognizes human dignity, that encourages what is best in man instead of exploiting what is worst in man, this will be reflected in the community. Your work certainly

helps to make Boston a happy place in which to live.

In this sense, then, that it will always be a place where people are important, Boston will always be a small town; I sincerely hope so. In other ways, of course, we must all work together to make it a more prosperous big city, although we must never proceed at the expense of those human factors which give it its special quality. Boston can be bigger, its facilities can expand and new ones be developed; Boston can be richer, its business life can grow and its investments mount; Boston can be newer, its old buildings can be torn down and new ones replace them—all of this can happen and in some measure must happen. But the authentic spirit of Boston can remain unchanged even while the city moves on to new greatness.

I know that you appreciate your role in the life of the city and I know too that, with remarkable consistency, you are faithful to it. My purpose this afternoon is to encourage you to continue this fidelity in the days ahead. Keep before you the thought of man himself as the center of your work; do not permit situations and events to smother the true value of things so that the human factor becomes merely one more among many.

There are matters far more important than putting out big papers or vast numbers of papers; you must be certain to put out good papers which do not wither the spirit of those who write them or those who read them. Newspapers are made for men by men and unless they help to make all men better, then they are truly without significant purpose. The focus you take in every day's work can make the difference, and it is the difference between success and failure.

Need of Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I took office on January 7. Today is January 30. That is 23 days I have held office, representing a great constituency in the 17th District of Ohio.

In that brief period, the people of my district—and many other parts of Ohio and other adjacent States—have suffered a devastating flood.

On January 22 I made a personal tour of the devastated area to see for myself the extent of the damage and to alleviate in every possible way, personally or officially, the suffering of my people. Knox County has been the home of my family for generations. I have thousands of friends there. I had an opportunity to talk to the mayors and other elected officials of towns and cities in my district. I am happy to say that, in spite of the emergency situation, the two persons in the district I had chosen to be on my staff were available and ready to go to work at once. They were Mrs. Nona Darling of Lucas, Ohio and Emmett Guthrie of Coshocton. Mrs. Darling is my district secretary and Mr. Guthrie is my district liaison officer.

Although there was no chance for them to be paid for some of the work they might be called upon to do, at least during January, I am happy to report

that both of them offered to pitch in and to work without thought of themselves.

My district, Mr. Speaker, has many problems. They were not all born on the day I took office on January 7—22 days ago. In my campaign, I pointed to many of our problems, as a district and as a nation.

I would like for my people to realize that I am here striving to represent them—all of them—all of the time, except during those rare occasions, and I hope they will be very rare, when a crisis in my district calls me home to be with them, to render such aid as I can and to learn more about it in order to serve them better.

I would also like for them to know that I welcome their viewpoints on all issues. It is not necessary that these viewpoints parallel my own. All of us are in varying degrees of knowledge and understanding about problems of all kinds—local problems, State problems, national problems, international problems. There are many fine citizens who have different economic interests. What is pleasant and profitable to one group may seem most unpleasant and definitely costly to another group. I feel it is my duty, indeed, it is my pleasure to learn of all the viewpoints possible represented among the many diverse individuals in my district. We are proud of our people in the 17th District and of their determination and ability to think for themselves. This is their right and I want to make it clear on my 23d day here that I want the views of all the people in my district who want to express their views to me. I also am happy to read in the newspapers the views of our finest citizens, about pressing, immediate problems, as well as their view about long-range problems.

Among the many fine citizens of my district, Mr. Speaker, is F. B. Herendeen, of Fredericktown. I know Mr. Herendeen and I respect his views and admire his unusual style of writing. I am asking that a copy of his letter to the editor which he recently sent to the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. When a gentleman of his caliber takes the time to write a thoughtful letter to the editor, it behooves us all to read it and to ponder the thoughts he has written:

FREDERICKTOWN, OHIO,
January 25, 1959.

EDITOR, THE NEWS:

Now that most of us have the top mud washed off, the furnace back in working order and our nerves tranquilized, we are wondering just what happened and what we can do about it.

How could the engineers in one State make so many blunders in just one small community as have been made in this, the Fredericktown section. We must be the focal point for engineering incompetency. Surely they couldn't make as many in each community. There just ain't that many engineers in Ohio.

First, there is the poorly designed and constructed Smith curve, where many lives have been sacrificed. Recently the State has spent a few dollars to erect sufficient signs and in a measure correct the construction.

Then, there are the double curves at the south side of Fredericktown. Fortunately

the property damage has been the major destruction.

The design and construction of Leaky Dam at Knox Lake cost the taxpayers thousands of dollars and for 2 years placed an awful threat to lives of residents and property downstream. This was breached, as were several others, and a dam was built that we hope is safe.

The muddling and blundering of the cave-in on North Main St. here is another. Right now, water has to run uphill to get to the culvert and the sidewalk is useless after a rain unless you risk the splash from passing vehicles.

But the daddy of them all, the prize of engineering stupidity is the concrete bridge on Route 13 just north of Fredericktown. This should concern Mount Vernon and all points down the Kokosing. This bridge dam (or dam bridge) caught the floodwaters in April 1948 and caused the north end of Fredericktown to be inundated. The damage was not so extensive and fewer people were harmed, so it did not attract much attention. Actually it was an advantage to Mount Vernon as it held back the crest.

This barrier to the natural watercourse has done it again and this time the disastrous results are not localized. In my humble opinion, that is the real cause of the flooded dikes and the breakthrough in Mount Vernon.

Here is the situation: Sixty years ago the B. & O. built a bridge across the Kokosing. Evidently, the railroad engineers studied the rainfall, area drained, rate of flow, topography, etc., and put in a bridge about 200 feet wide with one pier and sufficient clearance. That took care of the big flood of 1913. A little 5-foot driveway dike kept the water out of Fredericktown.

When Route 13 was relocated west of the railroad, some 30 years ago, the present concrete bridge was built. This bridge is 150 feet (not 200) long, there are two piers (one additional) and the clearance was lowered by about 2½ feet. The State engineers apparently ignored the precedent set by the railroad engineers with their bridge about 100 feet downstream. Either for the sake of economy or lack of ability and knowledge they narrowed the width and dropped the bridge, thus reducing the opening by a wide and critical margin. The water is no respecter of State engineering procedure so it just keeps rolling along—right down Route 13 to spread over the north end of Fredericktown. When that section was overflowed, the next lower ground was over the railroad back to the channel. The break through the railroad came at 11:30 a.m., Wednesday, causing a wall or crest of water estimated at 3 to 6 feet, to start down the Kokosing for Mount Vernon. Of course, the once adequate dike could not stand that. It just overflowed and caused all the misery and damage. The engineering of the High Street bridge is another matter and certainly deserves some deep study by others than State engineers.

Since the crisis has passed, what are we going to do? Be pacified by the visits of the governor and Congressman or unite in an effort to get a correction. Let's see whether the visits were for vote-getting window dressing or a sincere effort to correct the situation. Time will tell.

A suggested remedy should follow a criticism. In 1948, the writer reported the flood situation and the highway department surveyors verified the figures given above, but like most complaints, the buck was passed and nothing was done to correct it. So few votes were affected that they could do better spending elsewhere.

This last catastrophe affects 300 people, directly, in Fredericktown, 3,000 directly and 15,000 indirectly in Mount Vernon. How much more will we have to tolerate before

the lethargic officials act? Let's strike while the iron is hot.

Let's demand that they raise the bridge by at least three feet, add another span, build a dike to protect Fredericktown, and then clean out the channel under and below the bridge. Stubs of the construction piling are still under the bridge to catch and hold debris. The gravel people have ruthlessly dug and piled the dirt with no concern for the rights, safety, or welfare of our community or for the general appearance of the neighborhood. This has not helped the situation.

Here is a chance for action. The chamber of commerce, business and professional men, manufacturers, unions, lodges, service clubs, and other interested organizations (and aren't we all interested?). Our alert mayors now have the attention of the politicians; the way is open for action—let's push it. Nero fiddle while Rome burned.

F. B. HERENDEN.

Tortoise and Hare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., which appeared in the New York Times on January 29, 1959:

TORTOISE AND HARE—SLOW PACE OF U.S. ECONOMIC GROWTH SUGGESTS THAT SOVIET MAY WIN RACE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 28.—Nikita S. Khrushchev predicted yesterday that economic growth in the Soviet Union over the next 7 years would come to about 8.6 percent a year. Judging from recent performance, he may not be far wrong. Mr. Khrushchev said this compared with an annual rate of growth in the United States of 2 percent. He was being unnecessarily kind. Since the end of the Korean war, the annual economic growth of this country—after correcting for higher prices—has averaged less than 1.5 percent.

The experts are deeply divided on the two most obvious questions:

Why has the slowdown in growth occurred?

What ought to be done about it?

Economic growth is usually measured by the increase in the real gross national product, or total output of goods and services, after allowing for price changes. Growth comes about because the labor force grows each year and because, with the aid of machinery, each worker's productivity—his output for each hour worked—also increases each year.

NORMAL RATE AT LEAST 3 PERCENT

The rate of growth has varied widely during United States history, but by almost any test the recent experience has been disappointing. There have been periods—1947-53 was one—when growth in real terms came to 5 percent a year or more. Almost no expert puts normal, achievable growth at less than 3 percent a year, and many think it should be more.

Practically everybody favors a high rate of economic growth. It improves living standards. It supplies more and more revenue to governments at all levels, without raising

tax rates, to do the many things that governments now must do and in the future will have to do even more. But how do we get it?

"We" in this case clearly means mainly the Federal Government.

CAUSE AND CURE DEBATED

The arguments range over the cause of the recent slowdown and what should be done now.

All sides concede that the main reason for the decline in the average rate of growth over the last 6 years has been that this period saw two recessions, during which the economy went down rather than up. All sides also agree that the rate of growth in the long run will depend on the rate of increase in plant and equipment (national capital), plus the rate of increase in our technical skills and inventiveness.

But after that, the disagreements begin.

Some say far greater Federal spending is essential to speed up the rate of growth. Others say the exact opposite: that the best prescription for growth is lower spending and hence lower taxes, which would supply more investment capital.

Some think the present situation calls for budget deficits; others believe large surpluses are the right medicine.

Some say high interest rates and tight money greatly deter growth and are mainly to blame for our recent slowdown. Others say high interest rates increase savings and thus help growth, and also help growth by checking inflation.

ROLE OF INFLATION ARGUED

Some say a little inflation is probably the price that must be paid for more rapid growth. Others say that toleration of even a creeping inflation will result in uneven growth, and less growth in the long run, with more frequent "busts" or recessions following inflationary booms.

Some say that growth can best be stimulated by tax relief aimed at encouraging more investment in plant and equipment. Others say the reverse: that the best stimulus would be to cut taxes for low-income groups, thus increasing demand and inducing businessmen to expand.

Some say higher wages are essential to spur the rate of growth. Others, with equal conviction, say that greater profits are the key.

All of these differences are fundamental. The differing viewpoints are held by non-extremists on both side. And meanwhile growth has practically ground to a halt.

This year, to be sure, will see a pickup in the rate. That always happens after a slump ends. But the period that has greatly disturbed experts of practically all viewpoints is the prosperous period of 1956-57.

Following the typically rapid growth of the post-recession year of 1955, growth in 1956 was only 2.4 percent and in 1957 it was 1.1 percent. Why? Until the experts—let alone the politicians—come to some agreement on the answer, Mr. Khrushchev may make good his boast about catching up to the United States by 1970.

More About Airlift's Importance to Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been evidenced in the

remarks I made a few days ago about evaluation of the need for an adequate, fast airlift as part of our defense system. By way of further information I have asked that the article by Donald W. Douglas, Jr., president of the Douglas Aircraft Co., which appeared in the May-June, 1958, issue of National Defense Transportation Journal be reproduced here. Mr. Douglas' article describing what airlift is and how it fits in the defense picture reads as follows:

LET'S LOOK AT AIRLIFT

(By Donald W. Douglas, Jr., president, Douglas Aircraft Co.)

It is often said that the Sputniks were a boon to the United States because they awakened us to a dangerous situation and forced us to take a hard look at ourselves. In recent months this critical reexamination has focused on missiles, basic research, the country's educational system, and the conquest of outer space. This is all to the good and should continue. But preparedness is compounded of many things, and we must be careful that our concern is not confined to more spectacular items at the expense of equally vital factors in national security.

We accept as axiomatic that this country's world position depends in large measure on the military capability we possess in support of our diplomatic actions. It is no less true that military strength must be supported by an effective and swiftly responsive logistics system.

Today this means airlift. Failure to understand this, and act accordingly, could be an Achilles heel.

Airlift is a component of preparedness that is equally effective in cold and hot warfare. During World War II air transport helped link the farflung forces of the United Nations. The most dramatic example, perhaps, is the famous "Over the Hump" airlift in southeast Asia which, for a long time, was virtually the only link between China and her allies. Since V-J Day, airlift has demonstrated its indispensability in the Korean war, in cold-war situations like the Berlin airlift, the evacuation of Hungarian refugees, and the rapid transfer of United Nations troops to the Suez area in late 1956.

Airlift also made possible the construction of the DEW Line radar network along the shores of the Arctic Ocean. It speeded completion of Thule, the vital Strategic Air Command base in northern Greenland. Without it U.S. scientists could not have wintered at the South Pole for scientific work in connection with the International Geophysical Year.

There are other aspects of a complete logistics system that we tend to overlook. In support of its commitments to NATO, and its Mutual Defense Assistance Pacts with 43 nations, the United States maintains deterrent forces in many distant locales. This requires the continuous movement overseas of an enormous quantity of supplies—something on the order of 16 million tons annually—a small but critical portion of which moves by air. The stationing of intermediate range ballistic missiles at foreign bases will soon increase the problem of keeping these forces at a high level of combat readiness. No taxpayer needs to be told of the burden this imposes on the national economy.

Airlift can ease that burden. Shipping by air reduces almost to the vanishing point the quantities of an item that must be bought just to "fill the pipeline," and permits drastic reduction of inventories as well. For example, when the U.S. Air Force began shipping J-57 replacement engines by air, it found that its requirement was reduced by about 2,000, a saving of \$337 million. Similarly, use of air shipment enabled the Air

Force's European command to save \$500 million in its service operations and achieve a 14-percent increase in effectiveness while doing it.

Air shipment saves in other ways, too. Packaging is simplified and in some cases eliminated; warehousing is reduced because inventories can be lower; and finally, items are usually handled less, so that the possibility of damage in transit is lessened. It is a startling but proved fact that airlift can pay for itself in savings.

Even more important than economy, however, is the military importance of airlift. We have seen how quickly airlift can react to cold war emergencies. This same rapid reaction time will be essential in meeting the outbreak of hostilities anywhere in the world. Many competent observers believe that limited, so-called brush-fire conflicts, rather than an all-out nuclear holocaust, are likely to confront us in the years ahead. It is obviously impractical to keep adequate forces at all points of possible trouble. With airlift we can quickly move forces to places where they are needed, and perhaps insure that the conflagration does not spread.

The Soviets, because they operate on internal lines of communications, enjoy a built-in logistical advantage. Despite the vastness of their country, supply routes are much shorter than those we must maintain in support of forces all around the Soviet Union's periphery. There is only one way to match and possibly surpass the Communists' capacity—the use of airlift.

Like any transportation system, airlift requires terminal facilities, fuel supplies and a good route system. All are available in adequate measure today. For more than a decade the U.S. Military Air Transport Service has been giving logistical support to U.S. deterrent forces around the globe, as well as standing ready to evacuate Americans from sensitive areas or engage in mercy missions. MATS, like the civil airlines that fly allied flags, is a living symbol of free world unity.

What, then, is lacking? What is there to be concerned about?

The answer can be given in one word: aircraft. The need for airlift is clear, and the system to support it already exists. But the aircraft fleet—in being and potential—is not adequate. Short-sightedness, parading in the guise of economy, has hobbled our airlift system by condemning it to operate with aircraft which lack the range, speed, and payload capability demanded by modern cargoes, both military and commercial.

In some cases, reciprocating engine aircraft are employed beyond their economic service life, so that even our present limited airlift is not functioning with the efficiency we should expect.

The question is not one of numbers alone. Ten years ago we mustered a large fleet of military and commercial planes and met, with outstanding success, the challenge of the Berlin blockade. The need then was to move many relatively small packages less than 300 miles. Two years later the Korean conflict created an entirely different kind of problem: moving men and material long distances over water. The same aircraft could be used, and perforce were, but at the cost of a severe restriction in payload. They made a valiant showing, but the fact is that Korea was a lesson in the lack of proper airlift preparedness. And today, a decade after the Berlin Airlift, many of the aircraft that did yeoman service then are still used by the Air Force and civil airlines.

Aircraft types as well as numbers must figure in any assessment of airlift potential. Thus, while some 350 of the more than 2,000 aircraft in the U.S. airline inventory are part of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, approximately half are passenger planes. The primary military need is for cargo lift.

Full mobilization of this Reserve, likely only in the event of total war, would require about 60 days and cut our civil airlift by

half. Moreover, since these are mostly medium-range aircraft, their effectiveness for overseas operation would be very limited. As things now stand, therefore, mobilizing our Civil Reserve Air Fleet would provide only an inadequate supplement to the military cargo lift, and at the expense of crippling civil aviation service when it might be needed most.

Emphasis on airlift is justified, and indeed essential at this time, because of the ever-accelerating advance in weapon technology, accompanied always by rising costs. The most conspicuous example, of course, is that of missiles. These are simply too expensive to buy and stock in quantity as we once did with guns and tanks and even aircraft. Large missile inventories would be prohibitively expensive and create attractive targets for enemy attack or sabotage. In a technological sense they would be unwise, since new developments continuously make most of our weapons obsolete almost as soon as they reach mass production.

With airlift, however, missile preparedness can be militarily sound and economically sensible. High speed mobility, by air, can keep a reasonable number of weapons available for use wherever and whenever needed.

There is another immediate factor that is sometimes overlooked. The intermediate range ballistic missile will precede its intercontinental sisters into service by many months, and even when ICBM's are available the IRBM will continue to play an important role for us and for our allies. The significant thing about the IRBM is that it is not intended to be fired from this continent. Under a united defense system, bases must, and it now seems certain will be developed. Airlift is the only effective means to support such bases.

The Soviets have recognized the importance of airlift and are moving ahead of us rapidly in this field. Russia has developed at least six new turbine-powered transport types, and her aircraft fleet appears to cover the spectrum of airlift requirements. Included are high-speed jet personnel carriers, long-range heavy cargo transports, and short-range cargo aircraft that can operate from rough terrain. While some of these aircraft are employed for commercial service, all are unmistakably intended for speedy conversion to military use. Many of these Soviet craft are already familiar in European skies and one, the 70-passenger TU-104, has been flown to the United States.

Our own effort is in marked contrast to that of the Communists. Against their four turbine-powered cargo transports we can muster only two, the Lockheed C-130 and Douglas C-124, and the work capability of their aircraft is superior to ours. In the personnel carrier field the Soviets have two turbine-powered types; we have none. U.S. airlines have ordered large numbers of jet transports, some of which will be assigned to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. But today there is not a single modern jet personnel transport in the Air Force inventory. The KC-135 jet is a tanker plane, and is restricted to Strategic Air Command missions.

This adds up to a substantial Soviet lead in the development of airlift. There is no technological barrier to our overcoming this advantage; we need only accord airlift the priority consideration it requires. Normally, years of design, development and testing precede the introduction of a new transport plane into service. We should, right now, be working actively on new types that would go into service in the mid-1960's. For the more immediate future, we are fortunate in having several modern commercial designs that could easily be modified to meet current military needs.

Developing large, new transport aircraft is an expensive business involving hundreds of millions of dollars. For the military services, as well as for civil airlines, this presents a serious problem. Several means to

finance the airlift we need have been proposed: leasing portions of our military fleet for commercial use, fast tax writeoffs for airlines that buy new transports and assign them to the reserve fleet; granting of military airlift contracts to civil airlines as a stimulus to their purchase of new equipment.

The blunt truth is, however, that the costs of developing prototype aircraft and tooling up for production must be borne by Government. The financial magnitude of the task is now beyond the capability of private industry. This is a hard fact that the Congress, the administration, and all of us had better face if we want the United States to hold its own along the world's skyways.

There is a well-established precedent for this kind of support. In the last two decades for compelling reasons of national security, the Government has supported the American merchant marine with both ship construction and operating subsidies. For equally valid reasons, this same principle can now be applied to cargo airlift. In the case of cargo airlift, however, the savings to Government made possible by air transport will more than compensate for the initial investment. Airlift, as I have said, pays for itself.

If Government provides this initial financial boost, freight or cargo aircraft can then be priced within reach of commercial operators.

Developing a full-bodied sky cargo system, as well as providing the military with adequate transport aircraft, would be a tonic for the national economy. To visualize an economy in which air cargo plays a major role is to perceive the future. We need desperately men of such vision and imagination—in Government, business, and the military—who will act now to insure American leadership in the years ahead. The Soviets, it is clear, are moving in the direction of large-scale air cargo transport. We can do no less, and indeed must strive to surpass them.

Every plane and every dollar invested in the development of a peacetime air cargo system is paid-up insurance against a wartime emergency. Another war is likely to come too suddenly and its decisive phases be too brief to permit our placing much reliance on Reserves that take time to mobilize. Forces in being, both combat and logistical, will be the blue chips for both sides.

One need not peer into the future to see how a true air cargo system could weigh heavily in a sudden war situation. Think what air cargo might have done for General MacArthur's embattled forces in the Philippines after Pearl Harbor. Or how, in the Korean situation, an effective airlift could have saved lives by minimizing the effects of a serious ammunition shortage—a shortage, incidentally, made all the worse because filling the pipeline of a slow, earthbound logistics system was in itself a gigantic task.

There are no insuperable obstacles to creating an adequate airlift for this country, and there are many compelling reasons, both military and commercial, for getting on with the job as quickly as possible. This is the inescapable conclusion for anyone who troubles to take a hard look at the problem.

U.S. Coal Is Dealt an Unfair Blow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ord, I include herewith an editorial entitled "U.S. Coal Is Dealt an Unfair Blow," which appeared in the January 30, 1959, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

U.S. COAL IS DEALT AN UNFAIR BLOW

A stiff new West German tariff of \$4.76 a ton on imports of U.S. coal is being vigorously protested, and the National Coal Association, which lends for the industry in Washington and elsewhere, this week urged the State Department to protest the German levy most vigorously.

No Hopkins County coal is exported to Germany, but for the industry as a whole the German action is a sharp blow. Involved, jobwise, are work for several thousand miners, for unnumbered railroad people, and for others whose jobs are related to the getting out of coal for the German market, transporting it to ports, loading it aboard ship, and transporting it across the Atlantic.

All in all, the effect is much larger than a casual observer might think.

Tom Pickett NCA executive vice president, described the damage in a letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in which he said:

"This arbitrary, unilateral action will effectively deprive the United States of about 60 percent of its largest overseas market for bituminous coal."

Further, Mr. Pickett pointed out that this is only the latest damage done the coal industry in the field of international relations. Pickett asserted that in the name of free trade and international friendship we have seen coal's normal markets on the Atlantic coast submerged by an ever-increasing tide of imported residual fuel oil.

Pickett asserted that in spite of the heavy damage to the coal industry, our own Government has failed to stem this tide of oil, and said the State Department has had an important voice in this refusal to act.

The West German Cabinet last week approved the new tariff on all but the first 3,500,000 tons of U.S. coal to be imported this year. Last year West Germany imported 9,500,000 tons of bituminous coal from our country.

Since the quota is retroactive to January 1, the 3,500,000-ton mark will be reached by May, leaving the rest of the year's shipments from America subject to a duty of \$4.76 per ton, which practically equals the price of coal at American mines.

Pickett said another thing which irks American taxpayers, including the coal industry and its thousands of workers, is the fact that the United States has furnished West Germany more than \$13 billion in foreign aid since 1948, much of which went to rebuild the German coal industry.

"The hand that fed West Germany has now been bitten," he said.

Fishbait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the Record a bright and vivid article by Mary Van Rensselaer Thayer concerning the House's able major-domo, William M. Miller. Without minimizing the emphasis the article places on Fishbait's service to new Mem-

bers, it is fair to say that he is equally invaluable to those of us who have served here for a number of years.

Why do we continue to confer the ignominious title of "Doorkeeper" upon an important official under whom serve some hundreds of employees and who has responsibility for the housekeeping operations of the House of Representatives? This seems an especially appropriate question, in view of the efficiency with which the duties are performed by the present incumbent.

Ever hear of a fishbait special? Sandwich? Seafood cocktail? Some curious adjunct to piscatorial sport? Not at all!

It's an initiation ritual set up for newly elected Democratic Representatives by "Fishbait" Miller.

But who's Fishbait?

Why, he's the House of Representatives majority Doorkeeper, who likewise functions as House crier, housekeeper, and Emily Post.

Fishbait, who toiled under the Capitol Dome 27 years, has been majority or minority Doorkeeper since 1947, and during that time has demonstrated the niceties of congressmanship to thousands of fledglings. This autumn, thanks to the Democratic landslide, he's shepherding a record 63—there are 19 new Republicans chaperoned by House minority Doorkeeper Tom Kenna— and, as usual, he has shown them the ropes in nine easy stages.

How does a "fishbait special" operate?

Preliminarywise, "Fishbait" gets to know his future charges before they're elected. On even (election) years when Congress adjourns, "Fishbait," 50-year-old Chief Page Turner Robertson and Charles Hackney, Assistant Director of the House Telephone, scoot over to the National Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

Ohio's Representative MIKE KIRWAN was last year's chairman and the "savvy" trio functioned as his glorified office boys throughout the campaign. By election night, "Fishbait" knows the Democratic candidates from A to Z.

A week or so after battle, victors trickle into the Doorkeeper's office, ripe for the "Fishbait Special."

"Fishbait" welcomes them with courtly Mississippi charm in his green-carpeted, gilt-mirrored suite. Then, he personally conducts them on a leisurely tour.

Here are the "fishbait special" ports-of-call:

First, the stationery room where the Congressman-elect pens a facsimile signature as pattern for his mailing frank. Second stop is chez Emmanuel Ridgell, the House Office Building Superintendent. Mr. Ridgell explains the office situation, asks the newcomer to draw a metal disk from a box. The disk number determines priority on the office space list. Then, the Superintendent "shooes" them off to inspect a sample suite.

Afterward, the Doorman takes his new Congressman visiting.

They drop into the Speaker's office to meet Mr. Sam's administrative assistant, John Holton, then call on assistants to the House Parliamentarian.

Next, the freshman legislator is introduced to Joe Metzger, the Parliamentarian's secretary, an important "guy" to know, because he stopwatches the minutes allowed for House oratory.

Last on the list is Lewis Deschler, the Parliamentarian who's been interpreting the rules for 30 years. Deschler sets the newcomer in the right groove by giving a 5- to 10-minute briefing on House procedure.

Next, the Congressman gets down to practical business.

Ralph Roberts, the House Clerk, reminds him to file a campaign expenditures accounting and keep his certificate of election handy.

Harry Livingston, Disbursing Office Chief, follows along, explaining that a Congressman may hire up to eight clerks, secretaries, stenographers (most settle for five or six) on a \$17,500 allowance, though none can be paid more than \$7,000 annually.

And now comes the big moment when the happy Congressman is put on the payroll. He's in. It's Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., the House Sergeant at Arms, who turns the trick.

As a "Fishbait" special finale, the new legislator is told the Capitol facts of life.

This is no birds, bees, and flowers stuff but a shrewd warning by Ken Harding, executive secretary of the National Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

Harding hands his visitor a list of experienced office workers employed by former Congressmen. He emphasizes that a knowledgeable staff keeps a Congressman in office, while an inexperienced office force may ruin reelection chances.

The tour done, "Fishbait" and his gow sophisticated charge return to base.

But what of "Fishbait" himself? How come a doorkeeper is so important that he's constantly consulted by congressional VIPs and draws a cosy \$18,150 annually?

It's because his job is important. It was set up during the first session of our First Congress. It's an elective office; Congressmen do the voting and the election of Doorkeeper and other House factotums is legalized in the first resolution of each new Congress.

The job's purpose, according to the incumbent, is to take care of all the chores. The chores are something and under "Fishbait's" direction 250 to 300 employees handle them. They include House pages, working doormen and 40 custodians who keep the vast House spotless.

"Fishbait" also supervises three barber-shops; the document and folding rooms, and a snack bar in both Democratic and Republican cloakrooms.

The part of his job "Fishbait" enjoys most is announcing each group of VIP guests at joint congressional sessions.

He belts out "The President of the United States," with such resonance that radio men leap back from their microphones.

Practically no one knows "Fishbait's" real name (it's William M. Miller) and he even campaigns under his nickname. He acquired his compelling moniker in a curious way. As a 15-year-old, he weighed a trifling 75 pounds and, hailing from a small Mississippi town on the Gulf of Mexico, he spent much time on the waterfront. Because of his smallness he was called an assortment of names—"Alligatorbait," "Garbait," "Crab-bait," "Shrimpbait"—but "Fishbait" finally stuck.

Now he's a sizable chunk of man.

How did he get that way? "I've been feeding at the public trough a long time," he says with a grin, "and besides I married a registered nurse."

Airmen of the Greenville Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, our soldiers, sailors, and airmen have a first responsibility of performing their mission as servicemen. I think as a whole that they have a good record as citizens of the communities in which their bases are located. This is espe-

cially true at the Greenville Air Force Base at Greenville, Miss.

I am sure a major part of the credit for the fine record of good relations between the airmen at the Greenville Air Force Base and the citizens of the surrounding territory is due to the fine leadership of Col. Jasper N. Bell and the preceding base commanders as well as the local civic leaders who helped to establish liaison with the base.

There are many instances of the contributions which the airmen at the Greenville Air Force Base have made as good citizens of the city of Greenville, but I would like to mention at least four with which I am familiar. This story can best be told by clippings from the Clarksdale Press Register and the Greenville Delta Democrat Times, which follow:

BASE FOLK AMONG FINEST CITIZENS OF GREENVILLE

To the Editor:

This concerns relationships between the airbase and civilian personnel of the city of Greenville. In the past too many of us have regarded the Air Force as transients instead of citizens of our community. In my opinion, this is not true.

I would like to use, for an illustration, S. Sgt. Richard F. Gray, of Headquarters Squadron Section Wing. Sergeant Gray overheard a conversation between Mrs. Azar and myself regarding two destitute families in our city. Sergeant Gray went back to the airbase, took the matter up with his associates, and brought in a quantity of groceries and clothing. This was to some families that he had never seen. I don't know who all contributed to this, but I do know that it cost them a considerable sum of money and effort.

Colonel Bell says that we should be proud of our Champion Air Base. I would like to say that I am not only proud of our Champion Air Base, but I am also very proud to live in a community with people like Sergeant Gray and his associates.

H. A. IRVINE,

Veterans Service Officer, Beppo-Arnold Knowles Post, American Legion.

BRAVERY AND HUMANITY

It's good to live in a world where a sergeant will rush into the children's ward of a burning hospital time and again, disregarding the personal danger, to help evacuate helpless youngsters.

And it's good to live in a world where a captain will streak across the State in a jet and back in less than an hour and a half, with officials at each end bending their efforts to speed a life-saving serum to a child who might otherwise die.

Both these rewarding stories were told this week. The first incident brought a much-deserved Soldiers' Medal for heroism beyond the call of duty to a Lelander, S. Sgt. William V. Carpenter.

The second one brought life to young Stanton Horne, 13, of Inverness, who lay critically ill in the King's Daughters Hospital, thanks to Capt. John C. Carson, III, and a multitude of others.

That the immediate plight of one small 13-year-old could throw the hospital medical staff, the Red Cross, the county sheriff's office, and two Air Force bases into high-gear action to save his life is something to make one proud to be an American.

BOLIVAR COUNTY HOUSEWIFE FINDS THERE ARE MANY WHO ARE WILLING TO HELP HER IN CRUCIAL FIGHT

SHELBY.—Mrs. Carl Savage, a farm housewife who lives between Shelby and Perthshire, has been given 61 pints of blood by

transfusion and continues to require it at the rate of a pint a week.

Yet she is fairly active, supervising the cooking and housework at her home. She doesn't look too strong, as might be imagined of a woman of 137 pounds who now weighs 92, but she is putting up a gallant fight against cancer.

She has even shown recent improvement, gaining 7 pounds in the last few weeks.

The encouragement Mrs. Savage has received from friends and relatives of Shelby, Perthshire, Gunnison, Cleveland, and other towns in north delta counties is illustrated by the many contributions of blood made on her behalf.

Mrs. Savage received her first blood transfusion September 19, 1957.

She underwent her first operation for cancer in January 1951. Another operation was required in July 1956.

An estimated 100 people have contributed blood for Mrs. Savage, including several friends of a brother, Maurice Powell, coach and junior high principal at Belzoni.

However after nearly all donors near her home had given blood, the Reverend J. Bradley Pope, pastor of the First Baptist Church at Shelby, wrote Congressman FRANK E. SMITH requesting help in locating servicemen in the area.

Representative SMITH wired Col. Jasper N. Bell, commanding officer of the Greenville Air Force Base, and the senior chaplain at the naval air station at Millington, for assistance.

Within 4 days of Pope's appeal to SMITH, the assistance of servicemen at both stations had been offered. Greenville responded first as Colonel Bell wired back that arrangements had been completed to furnish blood for Mrs. Savage as needed.

"Blood will be drawn by base hospital personnel from volunteer donors and shipped as required," the colonel said. "Thirteen have already volunteered and more anticipated as the need arises."

Two pints of blood are given Mrs. Savage every 2 weeks, with her last transfusion coming Friday.

Her gratitude liberally covers all the many donors who have helped her. While there is no end in sight of the blood she will need, there appears the same infinity of people ready to keep her in ample supply.

Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club Honors Former Mayor Charles N. Loveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader-Evening News of January 8, 1959:

KIWANIS CITE CHARLES N. LOVELAND

In awarding a citation for outstanding community service to Charles Noyes Loveland at a dinner in Hotel Sterling tonight, Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club is taking cognizance of a career spanning six memorable decades he helped to shape. Today at 86, he is cast in the role of elder statesman, a local version of Herbert Hoover, whom he resembles in so many respects.

An attorney by profession and member of a colonial family with its roots deep in the soil of Connecticut, this native son followed the advice of Dr. Russell Conwell and found his Acres of Diamonds amid familiar scenes. As he heads for the century mark, he is able to look back, with satisfaction, on a life of service, studded with achievement and garnished with modesty.

It was back in 1894 that Wilkes-Barre first heard of Charles Loveland as a public benefactor. Fresh out of Yale University and only 22 years of age, he was studying law in the office of the late Henry Fuller when he organized the Boys' Club in the 14th ward. It was an auspicious start and a happy omen, for young men usually have their minds on other subjects when they are in the early twenties. But Charles Loveland was a stimulating exception to the rule.

Admitted to the bar of Luzerne County where he was to distinguish himself subsequently in civil practice, he answered the call of his country 2 years later when the Spanish-American War was declared. Back in civilian life, he plunged into a round of activities, lending a hand to such institutions and worthy causes as Georgetown Settlement, the children's guidance movement, Playground and Recreation Association, Wilkes-Barre General Hospital, Sutton Home for Men, Community Chest, and First Presbyterian Church.

It was inevitable that a man of his background and idealism should be induced to enter politics. It was as a member of city council and mayor of Wilkes-Barre that he was to make one of his most impressive contributions to the public welfare. He also served as solicitor to the board of education in Wilkes-Barre and to Laurel Run where he maintained a summer home.

This recital does not pretend to encompass the entire record of his activities, but to touch only on a few of the highlights. But it is enough to furnish an insight into the character of the man Kiwanis will acclaim tonight.

To be singled out for service by an organization, dedicated to service, is a rare distinction indeed and a fitting tribute to one who has given consistently of his time and talents to the betterment of Greater Wilkes-Barre over so long a period.

Charles N. Loveland, public servant and good citizen, is a worthy recipient of this honor, conferred only once before and, on that occasion, on William Sword, whose name in this decade has become a household word by virtue of his contribution to the rehabilitation of the city and its environs.

In saluting Mr. Loveland, the Times-Leader Evening News also would like to commend Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club for maintaining so high a standard in its 1959 selection for this civic recognition.

Reimbursement of the State of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the Record, under leave to extend my remarks, a memorandum dated June 5, 1958, in regard to H.R. 10443, 85th Congress, introduced by me. This memorandum was prepared for the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, at his request, for use at the hearings on that bill. I have re-

introduced the same bill, H.R. 827, of the present 86th Congress:

In order to provide for reimbursement of the expenditures of the various States in responding to requisitions for troops, Congress passed an act approved July 27, 1861, 12 Stat. 276, as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay to the governor of any State, or to his duly authorized agents, the costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by such State for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting its troops employed in aiding to suppress the present insurrection against the United States, to be settled upon proper vouchers, to be filed and passed upon by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury."

By resolution approved March 8, 1862, 12 Stat. 615, to assure prospective as well as retroactive application of this statute, Congress provided: "That the said act shall be construed to apply to expenses incurred as well after as before the date of the approval thereof."

Congress also provided by joint resolution approved March 19, 1862, 12 Stat. 616, as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That if any State during the present rebellion shall make any appropriation to pay the volunteers of that State, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept the same, and cause it to be applied by the paymaster general to the payments designated by the legislative act making the appropriation, in the same manner as if appropriated by act of Congress; and also to make any regulations that may be necessary for the disbursement and proper application of such funds to the specific purpose for which they may be appropriated by the several States."

The following regulations pertaining to reimbursement of the expenditures of the States were promulgated by Secretary of the Treasury Chase:

"8. Bounties or donations to men, or their families, to induce men to volunteer, will not be recognized. Such bounties as may be authorized by law will be paid by the United States directly to the men authorized to receive them. Voluntary contributions, either by States or local corporations or by individuals, in aid of families of volunteers, etc., constitute no charge against the United States, and will not be refunded."

Congress viewed this legislation as sufficient authority to reimburse California for bounties and extra pay (see House report, pp. 46, 48, 49):

"It is not apparent how the requirements shown in section 8 of these rules necessarily flow from and are in accord with the intent of the act of Congress.

"If it is to be inferred from the interpretation put upon this act by the Secretary of the Treasury that the expenditures were not proper if they constituted bounties . . . such a conclusion cannot really follow from anything in the act itself . . ."

"The expenditure made by the State of California . . . was not a bounty in any proper sense.

"Had it not been for this particular paragraph 8 of the so-called Chase regulations, so narrowly interpreted, the legislation enacted by Congress on July 27, 1861, would have been sufficient long ago to have enabled the Secretary of the Treasury to have settled the requests for reimbursement on behalf of the State of California.

"It is only upon such a technicality presented under the so-called Chase regulations, narrowing and limiting the plain intent of

the act of 1861, that up to the present the State of California remains unreimbursed.

"Congress . . . swept aside this technical construction of the act of 1861 under the Chase regulations, which the Army officers themselves stated were unjust and inequitable to apply thereto."

The California Soldiers' Relief Fund was insufficient to cover all claims filed by its enlisted volunteers, and the California Legislature by an act approved March 31, 1866, Statutes of California, 1865-66, at 640, appropriated the additional sum of \$550,000 for the payment of the claims of California volunteers accrued or to accrue under the provisions of the act of April 27, 1863, and the State treasurer was authorized and required to transfer that amount from the general fund to the soldiers' relief fund.

By an act approved March 31, 1866, Statutes of California, 1865-66, at 604, the California Legislature provided that the remainder of extra pay claims after the exhaustion of the additional appropriation of \$550,000 should be paid out of the soldiers' bounty fund which was created by the legislation hereinafter referred to in finding No. 32.

EXTRA PAY TO VOLUNTEERS

Pursuant to said acts, the State of California expended the principal amount of \$1,459,270.21 as extra pay to the California volunteers for their services in the United States Army. In addition, California expended \$3,000 to print the relief or extra pay bonds.

By April 1864, the time was approaching when the enlistments of many volunteers raised in California in the early part of the war would expire. The California volunteers in the United States Army were occupying important stations throughout the Far West, and it was obvious that it was a matter of necessity to retain them in the service by reenlistment or to replace them with new recruits. Despite the provision for extra pay, it was difficult to obtain sufficient enlistments to meet the additional calls made on California by the Federal authorities.

The probability existed that unless volunteer enlistments increased, the national draft would have to be applied in California as it had been in the East. The threat of the draft failed to stimulate enlistments.

By an act approved April 4, 1864, Statutes of California, 1863-64, at 486, the California Legislature granted every soldier who should thereafter enlist as a California volunteer in the United States Army for 3 years, or during the war, a bounty of \$160 in addition to any other pay or bounties to which the soldier might otherwise be entitled. To encourage reenlistments, it was further provided that a bounty of \$140 be paid to every veteran soldier who had served more than 6 months in the United States Army, either honorably discharged therefrom or then serving therein, who reenlisted in any unit organized as a part of any quota of California.

To pay the bounties, the California Legislature created the soldiers' bounty fund by appropriating \$2 million to be raised by issuance of bonds bearing interest at the rate of 7 percent per annum, redeemable July 1, 1884.

BOUNTY PAYMENTS TO VOLUNTEERS

The bounty payments made by the State of California pursuant to said act, amounted to the principal sum of \$900,839.50.

INTEREST PAID ON EXTRA PAY AND BOUNTY INDEBTEDNESS

The interest paid by the State of California acts of April 27, 1863, and April 4, 1864, on the original relief (extra pay) and bounty bonds, issued pursuant to the California Acts of April 27, 1863, and April 4, 1864, to the date of their redemption or conversion at times prior to July 1, 1889, amounted to \$302,364.60 on the relief bonds,

and \$366,206.26 on the bounty bonds, or a total of \$668,570.86.

By an act approved April 2, 1870, Statutes of California, 1869-70, at 646, the California Legislature authorized the issuance of bonds known as the State funded debt bonds of 1873, to bear interest at the reduced rate of 6 percent per annum, for the purpose of liquidating and refinancing the funded indebtedness of the State. Pursuant to said act, and on January 2, 1873, various new bonds were exchanged for relief bonds to the extent of \$239,500, and for bounty bonds to the extent of \$605,000. Thereafter and until July 1, 1889, the State of California paid interest on such new bonds in the sum of \$233,025 on the converted relief indebtedness and in the amount of \$598,950 on the converted bounty indebtedness or a total of \$831,975.

The total interest payments to July 1, 1889, on the relief and bounty indebtedness amounted to the sum of \$1,500,545.86.

After July 1, 1889, and until July 2, 1945, when all of the State funded debt bonds of 1873 were redeemed, the State of California paid interest on the new bonds issued in exchange for the original relief and bounty bonds, to the extent of \$789,693.34 on the relief indebtedness, and in the sum of \$2,032,900.85 on the bounty indebtedness, or a total of \$2,822,594.19.

The total interest paid by the State of California on all bonds covering the indebtedness incurred to finance the extra pay and bounty payments amount to \$4,323,140.05.

By an act approved May 27, 1902 (32 Stat. 207, 235), Congress provided that the claim of the State of Nevada be reopened and reexamined by the Secretary of the Treasury. As authorized thereby, the Secretary transmitted the claim to the Court of Claims for determination of disputed questions of law. In its opinion of March 14, 1910 (45 C. Cts. 254, at 271-86), the court upheld the Chase regulations and decided that Nevada could not recover bounties paid to officers for securing enlistments, extra pay provided to the Nevada volunteers, or interest paid on moneys borrowed for those purposes.

Thereafter, by an act approved March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 2378), Congress authorized by direct appropriation the payment of such claims of the State of Nevada.

CERTIFICATION BY THE TREASURER OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Exhibit A

Amount expended in recruiting California volunteers.....	\$24,260.00
Amount expended in payment of adjutant general, etc.....	38,083.17
Amount expended in organizing volunteers.....	5,639.34
Amount expended in pay of volunteer officers.....	23,277.34
Amount expended in extra pay to enlisted men of California volunteers.....	1,459,270.21
Amount expended in bounty to enlisted men.....	900,839.50
Total expenses of volunteers.....	2,451,369.56
Amount expended in payment of interest on moneys borrowed to carry out the provisions of laws of the State of California enacted Apr. 27, 1863, and Apr. 4, 1864.....	1,500,545.86
Aggregate expenses incurred on account of volunteers, principal, and interest.....	3,951,915.42
Amount expended on account of militia.....	468,976.54
Grand total of expenses on account of volunteers and militia.....	4,420,891.96

Exhibit B

Interest paid on moneys borrowed through the sale of State bonds issued under acts of Legislature of California approved Apr. 27, 1863 and April 2, 1870; (period of interest payments, July 1, 1889-Sept. 25, 1950); ¹ aggregate.....	\$789,693.34
Interest paid on moneys borrowed through the sale of State bonds issued under acts of Legislature of California approved Apr. 4, 1864 and Apr. 2, 1870 (period of interest payments, July 1, 1889-Sept. 25, 1950); ¹ aggregate.....	2,032,900.85
Discount on sale of State bonds issued under acts of Legislature of California approved Apr. 27, 1863, Mar. 18, 1864, Mar. 31, 1866, appropriating \$1,459,270.21 for pay of troops; loss.....	100,512.00
Discount on sale of State bonds issued under acts of Legislature of California approved Apr. 4, 1864, appropriating \$900,839.50 for pay of troops (recruits and reenlistment); loss.....	217,510.00
Total loss on account of discounts at which original bonds were sold and on account of the discount at which new bonds were given in exchange for original bonds.....	318,022.00
Recapitulation	
Volunteers and militia, expenditures and advances.....	\$4,420,891.96
Discounts on sales and exchanges of State bonds.....	318,022.00
Interest paid on moneys borrowed through sale of State bonds, July 1, 1889-Sept. 25, 1950 ¹	2,822,594.19
Amount repaid by the United States since July 1, 1889.....	None
Final balance due State of California.....	7,561,508.15

¹ All actual interest payments ceased on July 2, 1945, being the date of redemption of all bonds affecting this matter, therefore above calculations reflect actual interest payments to July 2, 1945.

The Honorable and Logical Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, last week, as we know, there was introduced in both bodies of the Congress a joint resolution for an amendment of the Constitution to reaffirm the rights of the States and local governments to administer their school systems. This resolution has been received with great interest not only in the Congress but throughout the Nation. Among the significant comments on this resolution have been editorials in the Nashville Banner, the Nashville Tennessean, and the Wash-

ington Post. Under unanimous consent, I include these editorials in the Appendix of the Record. The editorials follow: [From the Nashville Banner, Jan. 28, 1959] RIGHT, SENATOR TALMADGE: AS CONSTITUTION PROVIDES, LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

In his proposed constitutional amendment to fix, beyond any question, the area of public school authority, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE goes to the heart of the school issue.

The stipulation sought is neither segregation nor integration; it provides simply that administrative controls shall be vested in the hands of the individual States and their subdivisions—which means that the decision would be made there and not in any blanket decree handed down by Washington or a five-man majority of the Supreme Court.

Further, he proposes that this decision of where the controls belong be submitted to the people of the United States and rendered by them. Congress should need no reminder that Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; and no consent has been given to divest the States of the authority and rights in question.

The seven Southern Senators joining Senator TALMADGE in this step to codify by formal action a principle that was honored until the judicial trespass of 1954 occurred, do not stand alone in challenging that departure from the constitutional concept, or in insisting that an issue of such magnitude is for the people to decide. Not only other Southern Congressmen, but Constitution-minded lawmakers of other regions, must see the merit of it.

It is, as the author of this amendment declares, a way to avert the unparalleled catastrophe of widespread school closings.

It is not the first suggestion to settle by the constitutional method the question of where these controls shall remain.

Eighteen months ago, on July 30, 1957, the Banner proposed the following amendment: "The public school system of these United States is the property of the States individually, and subject in all particulars exclusively to State and local jurisdiction."

The accompanying editorial declared the belief that that stipulation belongs as the 23d amendment to the United States Constitution, and that a resolution to that effect calling for such amendment should be drawn by Congress for immediate submission to the people.

It would, the Banner said, "Define beyond doubt and arbitrary evasion, an area of authority historically reserved until—wholly without precedent, constitutional warrant, or legislative assent—the Supreme Court divested State and local governments of that jurisdiction."

It was further emphasized that the amendment would in no sense bar integration of schools where that is the wish of the States. They would have that right, exactly as they have had it all along.

The Talmadge resolution goes no less to the heart of the matter, providing equally the right of the people to decide for themselves, State by State.

Actually it would incorporate in the Constitution—as an unarguable safeguard—the point of law already validated 10 times in the legislation extending statehood, the latest case being Alaska.

The Banner repeats, the American people are confronted by a question demanding answer now. Congress is aware, surely, of a responsibility to the electorate in a matter thus far evading the sanction of legislative enactment.

For the sake of principle and security in a primary realm of concern to every right-thinking citizen, the amendment proposed is needed. It would provide effective and adequate guarantee of school stewardship where

it belongs, where historically it has resided, but where right now it is increasingly endangered.

Senator TALMADGE and his cosponsors have furnished a means of redress. It should be swiftly adopted by Congress, and submitted to the people of 49 States to decide for themselves.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Jan. 28, 1959]

COURT'S CRITICS OPEN EYES TO HIGHER POWER AT LAST

Southern Senators who propose a constitutional amendment which would assure States and their subdivisions full control of education—and thus override the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court—are now getting down to fundamentals.

The amendment as introduced by Senator TALMADGE of Georgia would declare that "nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny the residents thereof (meaning the States) the right to determine for themselves" the manner of administering the schools.

As far as the sponsors are concerned, this is a segregation amendment which comes close on the heels of new court blows to the theory of massive resistance to the present law.

Whether the Talmadge plan, cosponsored by Senator HARRY F. BYRD and six others, will ever get approval of two-thirds of both Houses and ratification by three-fourths of the States is a matter of speculation. The odds would seem to be against it.

But in advancing the plan with such vigor, the backers have gone far towards undermining their claim that the Nation is at the mercy of nine capricious men on the Supreme Court or, as Mr. TALMADGE puts it, "the whims of whatever five men happen to constitute a majority of the Court."

Reference is made to the disruptive laws applying to every school in the Nation. But the fact remains that rulings of the Court with which the American citizenship is not in sympathy are always subject to change by ordered processes.

New members have been added to the high Court since 1954, but they too have shown their concurrence in the historic ruling of that year.

Coupling the new development with the recent State and Federal court decisions in Virginia which have left that State floundering for a way out, those who are pledged to fight integration to the last now show awareness of the fact that the Supreme Court is always answerable to the people and their representatives.

Espousal of a constitutional change, in the opinion of this newspaper, has always been the logical course for those opposed to the integration ruling.

By inference, Mr. TALMADGE and his associates are saying that they are willing to leave the issue up to the Nation as a whole, which is certainly an entirely new approach. Perhaps they believe that sentiment against the Court has been built up to a point where there is a real chance of success.

Changing the Constitution as it applies to public schools would inevitably bring about the abrogation of other clauses of that document which have had traditional acceptance. Such a change can cause controversy and debate, and the guess is that it will.

In any case, however, a step has been taken to apply the yardstick of public opinion to the integration rulings of the courts—and especially the Supreme Court—with full assurance that decisions of lawmakers and citizens will prevail, as they should in this democracy. That is the reasoned way.

Earlier acceptance of this course would have prevented the futile fight over inter-

position and the succession of other court rebuffs which culminated last week in a double rejection of Virginia's segregation laws.

The Federal court said that Virginia cannot by State action close schools in some communities and keep them open in others; that it cannot by local action close some schools in a community and keep others open in that same community.

And the State supreme court decreed that Virginia cannot close public schools—except temporarily—without amending the State constitution, which requires a State system of public education. In addition, it cannot withhold State funds from a school, even though it becomes racially mixed; it cannot establish State control over school funds raised by local taxes, take control of schools from local boards and vest the control in the Governor, or use funds withheld from local schools to finance payment of tuition grants to pupils for use in attending segregated schools.

Considering these developments in Virginia, which was supposed to be showing the rest of the South how to evade the 1954 ruling, it is not surprising that a broader and more direct approach to the whole question at last has won favor.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1959]

THE HONORABLE WAY

Senator TALMADGE and seven southern colleagues have chosen an altogether proper and dignified means of registering their disagreement with the Supreme Court school desegregation decision. In a commendably moderate speech Mr. TALMADGE has proposed a constitutional amendment to establish the exclusive right of the States to determine the manner of administration of schools. In his preamble the Georgia Senator speaks of the terrible tragedy of the closing of a public school system, and adds that "the American concept of universal education, more than any other factor, is responsible for the greatness which this Nation has achieved."

Especially notable is Mr. TALMADGE's recognition that the Supreme Court decision "is an accomplished fact which will remain so until it either is reversed by the Court itself or is nullified or modified by Congress or the people." Of course, Congress has no power to nullify or modify a Supreme Court decision on a basic constitutional question. Mr. TALMADGE speaks, however, of his dedication to seeking reversal of the decision "by every lawful means." This comes close to an acknowledgment that the decision is the supreme law of the land.

We hope that Mr. TALMADGE is wrong when he says that the overwhelming majority of people in the South will neither accept nor submit to the forced implementation of that decision—for the Court has indicated many means of gradual adjustment. And we have no thought that if the amendment is put to a vote either in Congress or among the State legislatures requisite majorities will elect to overrule the Supreme Court in its interpretation of the 14th amendment.

Nevertheless, this is the honorable way for those who disagree with the Court decision to make their case—to seek to amend the Constitution through the established process. If they should win two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the State legislatures to their cause, no one could reasonably object. The obverse of this situation, of course, is that if they should fail, their obligation to respect the decision would become even clearer. At any rate, Mr. TALMADGE has sought to raise consideration of the problem to a legal plane from the muck of defiance and closed schools.

Dr. Adolph Stone Describes Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of States is proceeding to Europe this week to discuss the problem and much more will be heard in months to come about the controversial city of Berlin. The Journal of Geography for November 1958, carried an interesting article about the city by Dr. Adolf Stone which provides considerable data helpful in understanding the situation there. Dr. Stone's article follows:

BERLIN¹

(By Adolf Stone)

"Berlin is the most interesting city in Europe." This statement refers to a paradox unequalled any place else in the world. The capital of defeated Germany under the 1945 Potsdam Agreement became a joint trust of the then four Allied Powers, the United States of America, France, Great Britain, and the U.S.S.R., whereas all other German lands were divided into four occupation zones. Since the Red army took over all German territories east of the Elbe River, Berlin became a political island surrounded on all sides by what the West calls the Soviet Zone and what the East has designated as the German Democratic Republic.

The events following this partition are well known. The cooperation between the three western allies and the U.S.S.R. came to an end in 1948. A Soviet attempt to swallow Berlin by cutting all roads and all communications was met by the historic airlift, or better air-bridge, as the Germans called it. For 11 months, from June 1948 to May 1949, more than 2 million Berliners were kept alive by air missions of peace. When the blockade ended on May 12, 1949, two worlds began to consolidate in a space of only 338.3 square miles, one patterned after American democracy and the other after Russian communism. Berlin today is the most interesting city in Europe because it is an outpost of the West in a Red sea.

LOCATION

Two factors account for the rise of Berlin: (1) Its geographical location; and (2) the history of the Hohenzollern dynasty. The city lies about half way between the Elbe and the Oder, the two important waterways which open Central Europe to North Sea and Baltic Sea traffic (fig. 2).

The original town was at a crossing point of a large west-east glacial depression. Swamps, lakes, and small rivers, such as the Havel and the Spree, still marks the path of the retreating ice and stretch all the way to the 700-mile long Elbe and the 500-mile long Oder. Thus, a combination of central location and of navigation facilities to the open sea are natural growth factors in this city of several harbor basins and of famous water sport facilities.

Bodies of water are so frequent, even in the metropolitan area, that a surprising 20 percent of Berlin is still in parks, each spreading around one, or several, water-filled depressions. Best known as the Grunewald (Green Forest) and the Tiergarten (Game

Garden). The few driftpiles, none exceeding 350 feet, in this flatland of sands and marshes became so prominent that they are reflected in district names, such as Kreuzberg and Schoeneberg (berg meaning mountain).

Climatic charts, too, show that Berlin is a meeting place, namely of continental influences from the East and of maritime influences from the West. There is much irregularity in the length of summer and winter. Temperatures climb as high as 85° F. in July and fall to 15° F. in January. Annual precipitation is around 30 inches with considerable snowfall in winter. Berliners consider their climate the invigorating variety. It might be pointed out that even in the densely populated center rift, air pollution is only slight due to ample winds.

GROWTH

Berlin was named in 1307 after its feudal lord Albrecht, the Bear. The city's symbol ever since is the Bear displayed on city seal and flag, also on all products made in this city of the bear.

Growth, thereafter, came step by step. The bridge trail of the Hohenzollern Kurfuerst (Prince elector) to his hunting lodge, for instance, is now the fashionable boulevard Kurfuerstendamm. What was the property of a princess developed into one of Berlin's largest districts, Charlottenburg. A Friedrich (Frederic), like in Friedrich Strasse, became king and thereafter turned the place into his royal capital. Finally, Chancellor Bismarck proclaimed his King Wilhelm (William) in 1871 the new German emperor. With this act, Berlin took a seat among the great centers of the world and words from the Wilhelm-Strasse were as much listened to as those of Downing Street or Pennsylvania Avenue. Unfortunately, the imperial government of this second Reich paid less heed to city planning than to the building of the two pillars of a unified Germany, the civil service and the army.

To take care of the ever-swelling population, a conglomerate of unsightly apartment houses and streets grew up. Historic homes in the old center gave way to new office and business structures and Berlin's core area became known officially as "the city." The Nazis with their coordination of party and government brought new armies of functionaries and with them more "city" construction. Berlin's population in 1943 had reached 4,489,000 and Hitler's chief of construction and armament, Albert Speer, prepared it for a ten million hub of central Europe's highways, railroads and airlines.

THE PIECES

Then came the catastrophe. The unfortunate, but under the circumstances unavoidable, allied air bombardments of 1943-45 were followed by the fury of Hitler's last ditch fight in the streets of Berlin. German officials claim that the Red army, after achieving victory, in the months of uncontested rule from May to July 1945, continued the destruction and also dismantled 70 percent of the city's industrial installations.

In July 1945, the already mentioned four-power military government took charge of a city of ruins. The 2,807,000 remaining Berliners, after evacuees and casualties, literally dug out from the rubble. Clearing and salvage teams, among them many women, were the first signs of new life and the most needed tools and machines were put together in a manner in which American boys build engines out of junked parts.

With the Allied Kommandantura as the highest echelon, each ally was, and still is, responsible for one sector of the city. Southwestern Berlin, an area of 81 square miles, is under U.S. guardianship. In 1949, the three Western allies began to consolidate their total area of 184.5 square miles into a free Berlin, while the 153.8 square miles of Soviet sector under the catching

name, "Democratic Berlin," was being integrated into communistic East Germany. West and East now are in such proximity that in some instances a street is policed by communists while the houses facing this street are under Western control with Western policemen walking their beat from basement to basement.

The unfortunate city has more governments than any other place in the world and everything exists in duplicate from public utilities to fire departments, and from mail to street cleaning. No telephone connects East and West Berlin and the only joint operation is the sewage system. Yet, commuting within the total area of Berlin is still possible except for customs and currency control at the sector boundaries.

In spite of confusion and treaty restrictions the three Western allies managed to guide free Berlin to self-government. The combined West sector is now governed by a freely elected senate. A proportional number of senate seats are still open for delegates, of the East sector if, and whenever, the Soviets allow free balloting. West Berlin has also been proclaimed a land (state) since West Germany is a Federation of Laender. However, Berlin's delegates to the Federal parliament (Bundestag) have only a voice and no vote. All Federal legislation requires separate legislative processing in Berlin. Thus, free Berlin is federated with West Germany, but full integration must wait until the "Limitations of Allied Authorities" are removed. This is the often referred to difference between Berlin's de facto and de jure status. This respect of the West for treaties coupled with Berlin's present geography makes the restoration of its political functions at least temporarily impossible. That Berlin some day will again be the capital (Hauptstadt) of 67 million Germans is vouches in the new West Berlin constitution. But, while the West can offer only a promise, the East simply moved the communistic government of East Germany into its Berlin sector. In order to avoid misunderstanding, the West does not identify this government with Berlin but only with the suburb in which it resides, Pankow.

ECONOMIC STRUGGLE

Berlin's economic recovery is impressive but somewhat slower than that of West Germany. The obvious reasons are (1) a long lasting blockade; (2) the island location; and (3) the split of a prewar economic unit. Fortunately, the west as well as the east considers the area a "show window" for their respective economic strength. Therefore, Government aid in the form of loans, outright grants, priorities, and preference rates lubricates progress in both camps. Posters on construction projects in West Berlin display the United States and the German colors announcing that the work is financed by GARIOA (Government Aid and Relief in Occupied Areas).

The problem of rubble disposal was solved in an ingenious manner. Manmade mountains of junk were simply landscaped, thus giving Berlin additional recreation areas. The new apartment houses and commercial structures are of the modern skyscraper variety which, at least, is not worse than Wilhelmian or Goering architecture. Up to 1957, 120,000 dwellings had been reconstructed in West Berlin against a total loss of 300,000.

Prewar Berlin was not only the German capital but also the country's leading trade center and largest industrial producer. Thus a large pool of skilled labor and management was available to be put to work. Already in 1945 most of these talents gave a clear vote of confidence in the west by gathering in the west sectors. This made up for the disadvantage that most prewar industrial sites were east of the new boundaries. As in the field of politics, duplication was frequently

¹ The author wishes to express his grateful appreciation for the contribution of much unpublished information by the (1) Free University of Berlin, Institute of Geography, (2) U.S. mission, Berlin-Dahlem.

Necessary. For instance, West Berlin was plunged into darkness when the Soviets staged their walkout in 1948. Machines for power production had to be airlifted. Today, a new steampower plant produces sufficient electricity, but a lack of switching facilities occasionally brings hours of paralysis to entire districts. As of 1957, close to 1 million West Berliners were again gainfully employed and about 100,000 listed as unemployed. The constant flow of refugees from the East makes reduction of the latter figure very difficult. Imports into West Berlin, also proportionally declining, still exceed exports, with meats and dairy products leading the list. The precarious food situation is underlined by the fact that the people maintain victory gardens throughout the metropolitan area. Other essential imports are industrial raw materials and coal, the city's major source of energy.

Since almost all the needed goods come from West Germany, a long haul through communistic territory represents the lifeline of this outpost of the West. Transportation is two-thirds by truck with rail and water carriers sharing the remainder.

Four industries account for the bulk of exported goods: (1) Electrical products come from the world-famous plants of A.E.G., Siemens, Telefunken, Osram; (2) machines are shipped from the assembly lines of Bor-sig and Schwartzkopf, and machine tools from Adrema and Rotaprint; (3) optical instruments from Zeiss-Ikon and from Oskania are known everywhere; (4) chemical industries achieved world repute with the pharmaceutical products of Schering and with Europe's answer to nylon, called perlon. Others are clothing, beer (Berliner Kindel), chocolate (Sarotti), and pianos (Bechstein). It seems reasonable that the same carriers, which bring imports to the city, take the readymade goods out on the same politically precarious roads. While West Germany is West Berlin's most important customer, a U.S. instigated Berlin marketing council and an annual industrial fair boost the city's exports to other Europeans as well as to Latin America and to the United States.

Berlin's biggest problem that seemingly cannot be solved pending a summit conference is transportation. Logically, but also unfortunately, railroads, including Berlin's interurban trains are communistically operated. This rail hub of prewar Central Europe has now only one major terminal, which of course is the Ost (East) bahnhof. Within the city, streetcars and buses stop at the sector boundary, while the subways go through under special agreements. Traffic to and from Berlin is restricted to only a few gaps in the Iron Curtain which the Soviets agreed to keep open, some canals, four highways and a 20-mile-wide air corridor. Since ground transportation is constantly harassed, Berliners like Americans take to the air. Tempelhof airport, the island's gateway to the world, is getting too small for the ever-increasing two-way flow of Berliners and their friends.

Possibly counteracting anxiety over a shoestring lifeline as the basis of everybody's livelihood is a renaissance in culture. West Berlin has again many theaters, an opera house and a central library which is an American contribution and, therefore, named the American Memorial Library. There are two schools of university rank, the Technical Institute in Charlottenburg and the Free University in the former village of Dahlem and grouped around the new Henry Ford Hall. Dahlem, also an end station in the urban transportation system, seems to be developing into the new culture center. Latest display of the Dahlem Museum is the world famous head of Nefertite.

EAST BERLIN

Little dependable material is available on East Berlin's economic recovery. Several unpleasant lawsuits show that East Berlin

products are sold in neutral countries under the same prewar tradenames which the West tries to revive. The basic issue seems to be whether the name goes with the original factory site or with the producing company. The state-owned East Berlin industries produce the same type of goods in which West Berlin excels, namely, electrical equipment, machines, and optical instruments. Leading customers are the countries of the communistic bloc, and also neutral nations. The quality of East Berlin's technical products is good. Textiles, especially clothing, on the other hand are definitely inferior. In addition, many items such as fuel, are still rationed. Of course there is no unemployment recorded in a socialized economy. But, actual purchasing power is reduced by rationing, complete lack of many items, and mainly by the poor quality of the articles used in daily living. Most amazing, but also revealing, is the continued food rationing and the complete disappearance of foods, such as potatoes, from the market from time to time. This, in spite of the fact that East Berlin geographically is part of East Germany and that East Germany always has been the traditional farm area of prewar Germany.

Constructionwise, the much proclaimed showpiece of the Communists is the mile-long Stalin allee, a Moscow style district with 2,200 flats, all in eight to nine story apartment houses with shops, movies, and restaurants on the ground floors. The retail center, with all stores completely nationalized in the H. O. Handels (trade) Organization, is the Alexanderplatz. Nearby is the restored old city hall, now headquarters of the communistic city administration. Other communistic additions are a palatial Soviet embassy, some gymnasia and similar mass assembly facilities.

Much disputed is the Marx-Engels Platz, a huge parade ground like Moscow's Red Square, for which the former Imperial palace had to give way. A stupendous Russian War Memorial in Berlin-Treptow and the Red Army monument at the edge of the boundary line, but on Western territory, complete the picture of mostly ruins interspersed with some life. The guards at this monument and at the prison for top war criminals, located in West Berlin-Spandau, are the only armed Russian soldiers, anywhere in the world, permitted to stand on Western soil.

EAST MEETS WEST

East and West now face each other in the center of the city which, as the location of Hitler's last resistance, became one huge field of dead rubble. Most of it is now under Russian control with the remainder in the British sector. To every Berliner this area around the symbolic Brandenburg Gate is synonymous with the much desired political functions. Both sides talk much about reconstruction of this historic central district, but so far very little has been done. East of the Brandenburg Gate, Berlin's avenue of parades, Unter den Linden, has been replanted with several hundred Linden trees and work is proceeding on the Gate itself. West of it, and in free Berlin, the restoration of the Reichstag is still in the blueprint stage. Further west, the Tiergarten Park is filled again with 1 million young trees. Part of it, the English Garden, is a gift of the British people. The West's most ambitious undertaking halfway close to the center is the reconstruction of the Hansa district. Here, grasping a unique opportunity, architects of many countries have each designed his own version of modern living quarters, shops, and churches. The entire 8,000 flat project is handled as an International Architectural Exhibit.

Standing on the main east-west thoroughfare, famous Potsdamer Square, even the casual observer can see why so many have defected from the east via the Berlin escape

hatch. Whereas the east side of the square is dead rubble, the west side is covered with wooden stalls and a veritable carnival of all imaginable merchandise. Anybody can buy anything in West Berlin and, in spite of an unfavorable currency exchange, East Berliners have become ingenious at smuggling.

At the root of this western superiority lies an American inspired reform of the West Germany currency, which included West Berlin. Now the international exchange rate is one west mark (DM) for four east marks. To avoid hardships, special provisions have been made for West Berliners who work in the east sector and vice versa. Official Exchange Bureaus in West Berlin permit unrestricted spending of east marks in free Berlin. The east sector, on the other hand, accepts west marks only at the unrealistic rate of one to one and prohibits the import of east marks to all but the holders of communistic identification cards.

THE PEOPLE

A large share of the credit for the city's rise from the ashes goes to the people of Berlin. With 3,400,000 inhabitants in 1957—2,200,000 in the west and 1,200,000 in the east—the city is still 1 million short of the 1943 population figure. But almost the entire increase of 600,000 people since 1945 has been in West Berlin, whereas in the east sector, the influx of administrative personnel is equaled by the exodus of mostly young people. The free Berliner's confidence in his city's present, as well as in its future, is shown everywhere in the crowded sidewalk cafes, in stores, factories and at the ballot box.

American aid for this Mecca of freedom totals about 1 billion dollars. Since the money comes from sales of surplus foods in Germany, it is no direct burden on the U.S. taxpayer. These mutual security funds are strictly loans with the provision that payments are to be reinvested. So far \$150 million have been repaid. From the economic, and from every other point of view, the American citizen could have made no sounder investment anywhere in the world.

Address by Hon. Richard M. Simpson at
73d Annual Meeting of the American
Tariff League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and conscientious Members of this body was the recent recipient of an annual award by one of America's oldest business organizations. On October 29, 1958, the American Tariff League awarded its annual scroll of honor to Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania.

We are all aware, I am sure, of Congressman SIMPSON's consistent devotion to the maintenance of a strong and prosperous America and his almost prophetic concern with the problems that occur in the economic area. He has been an active proponent of all measures directed toward a stable industrial base for our country. He has for years devoted his energies to the creation of a sound, equitable taxation

system and has just as vigorously opposed the perpetuation of unsound fiscal policies.

On the occasion of the Tariff League award, Mr. SIMPSON delivered an address, since reprinted in *Vital Speeches of the Day*, calling attention to the new crises ahead in world trade. I heartily recommend this speech to all Members as a portion of what we can expect in the days and years ahead.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the league's award as well as the text of his address. They follow:

THE AMERICAN TARIFF LEAGUE ANNUAL SCROLL OF HONOR, 1958

The American Tariff League, Inc., at its 73d annual meeting salutes the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, U.S. Representative from the 18th Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, who has served continuously, beginning with the 75th Congress in 1937, in the interest of a sound, strong, and prosperous United States of America.

Representative SIMPSON has devoted his legislative energies to the perfecting of his country's foreign trade and tax laws in ways that would assure the growth of a dynamic economy and would prevent the corrosive effect of unsound fiscal policies. His high position on the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the friendly respect in which he is held by his fellow House Members of all parties have combined to make his voice important in Government councils. In addition, his own party in the House has demonstrated its regard and confidence in Representative SIMPSON by entrusting to him for several years the leadership in their political campaign efforts.

Representative SIMPSON in the last four Congresses has courageously lent his name and prestige, and gave unstintingly of his efforts, to legislation designed to afford adequate safeguards to American industry faced with injury due to the workings of our foreign trade policy. As a result, these safeguards now have an assured place in our laws.

In respect and appreciation for his great services to the American economy, and with its best wishes for his future, expanding role in legislative and Government affairs, The American Tariff League, Inc., on October 29, 1958, unanimously resolves that this scroll of honor be presented to Representative SIMPSON.

WORLD TRADE: NEW CRISES AHEAD

(Talk by Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON at 73d annual meeting of American Tariff League)

I thank you sincerely for this splendid award—and for the singular honor of your friendship.

Your sincere good will is reassuring, particularly to one so fresh from the heat of congressional controversy.

It is always reassuring to see again that Americans really care, that they are truly interested in wise government, and in the people they send to Washington to serve their highest and most honorable interests.

As you well know, many of us differ as to just what these honorable interests are.

Are they, for example, best served by yielding a large measure of sovereign economic authority to a multinational body, in which our voice is only one of many?

Are they best served by inviting American manufacturers to take their capital and machines and jobs to other shores, as the most effective way to meet and beat the competition for the home market here?

And are they best served by inviting others to invade the world's most productive economy on terms that are clearly harmful to

many of our industries and workers, terms lacking minimum wage guarantees, child labor prohibitions, and beyond the purview of our antitrust laws?

I don't think so. I know you don't think so. I know many other Americans don't think so.

I know something else, and that is that in the years just ahead a great many more Americans are going to find that they don't think so, either.

Far from being resolved in 1958, as some would have you believe, the great issues of international trade will intensify. Many critical decisions remain to be made in capitals around the world.

Foreign trade, moreover, is quite likely to occupy a prominent position on the agenda of the 86th Congress. Let me recount a few of the reasons why.

Issue No. 1 concerns a legal interpretation of Executive authority under the Trade Agreements Act. The Customs Court of New York has seriously challenged the supposed discretion of the Executive to modify recommendations of the Tariff Commission as he sees fit.

If this ruling is upheld, the Executive will be required either to accept or reject Tariff Commission findings as they stand, and he will be required to act within the time limit specified for these cases by Congress.

This issue may have to be resolved by legislation. If the Customs Court decision is sustained by higher tribunals, legislation is the likely recourse for those who seek to maintain Executive freewheeling in trade policy.

But no matter how the litigation ends, the case already has crystallized doubts in the minds of many, doubts which may be thoroughly explored and discussed in the next Congress.

Issue No. 2 calls up again the question of OTC, the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. Has the idea really been discarded by its advocates? Have they really found a way to reach the same goal by detouring around Congress, as the press has suggested?

This speculation grows out of what was said—and not said—by a leading United States delegate to the latest meeting of GATT. He said the United States was amenable to creating "stronger permanent delegations" to GATT in Geneva, presumably so that these delegations might assume duties previously foreseen for OTC. But he did not mention OTC.

This is still a subject of raw speculation. Those in a position to know the answers have remained silent. Meanwhile, the trial balloon is aloft, waiting to be pushed one way or the other by public opinion.

I need not remind you that two Congresses have rejected the principles of OTC. My conviction is that Congress will continue to reject OTC, camouflaged or otherwise.

Now, Issue No. 3. And that is GATT itself, to which I have been a delegate. In my opinion, it is showing signs of wear and tear. Today it is challenged by a trading concept, the European Common Market, which is a contradiction of its basic principles.

There is talk of a watchdog committee to protect the interests of GATT's non-European members doing business in the Common Market. At the same time there is talk of new Common Market agreements elsewhere in the world.

The question is, where does the American manufacturer fit in? Equally important, where does the American workingman fit in?

A few weeks ago, at a meeting here in New York, the president of a large corporation told a group of chemical producers that only one course is open to American industry, and that is to establish plants in Western Europe.

He said this was the only way that American companies could compete in the Common Market and its system of "monopolistic free enterprise," to quote his own words.

Then, just last week, a spokesman for the State Department said the same thing. And that is particularly ironic, since it was by the same source that we were assured only recently that the Trade Agreements Act would strengthen our bargaining hand and prevent just such a situation.

There are other ironies attached to GATT. You probably noticed that the British delegate accused us of "bad behavior" in our trading policies. He was particularly incensed by the Administration's lead-zinc quota, and, as usual, he rebuked us for continuing a system of agricultural quotas which serve to stabilize our domestic farm market and safeguard the standard of living of our farm population.

He said the United States should take the lead in chopping down trade barriers and fostering the flow of goods between nations.

On the other hand, when it was believed that large profits were waiting behind the Iron Curtain for those who would come and get them, American leadership and considerations of Free World defense were shunted aside by these same allies.

Over our objections, the controls on strategic shipments to the Communists were peeled back at the insistence of merchants in Britain and other Western countries.

It boils down to this:

When it comes to sacrifice, the United States is exhorted by Sir David Eccles, Chief of the British Board of Trade, to furnish the momentum.

When it comes to opportunity even the dubious opportunity of doing business with international warlords, the United States is asked not to stand in the way of progress.

We are used to this, of course. As acknowledged leader of the Free World, and as the pillar of Free World security, perhaps it is no more than right that we should give more than we expect to receive.

The fact is, we have accepted this burden of self-sacrifice, at tremendous cost to our citizens and our economy, even while attempting to disguise it as "reciprocity."

These are simply a few of the issues, the unsettled questions, facing us in the field of foreign commerce. There are others—the Soviet economic offensive, for example.

That the Soviets can severely disrupt world markets at their pleasure has been proven to us all. By dumping tin and aluminum on a large scale, the Communist provoked market upheavals that brought hardship to large and small nations alike.

In fact, these tactics proved so successful that they have been adopted by the Chinese Communists who are flooding the Far East with slave-labor goods, to the distress of Japan and other countries.

Both Houses of Congress, through their respective Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees, will, I expect, investigate this problem in the next session.

Policies bearing on United States private investment abroad will be studied by a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Furthermore, the new Congress will be watching for signs that changes in the Trade Agreements Act of 1958 are accomplishing what they set out to do; namely, to provide a greater measure of stability and equality for domestic industries and workers vulnerable to excessive imports.

I realize you were not satisfied when Congress enacted this law. I was not satisfied, either, because several improvements that we worked for were rebuffed.

But in perspective we must recognize that important gains were made.

For the first time in a quarter of a century Congress holds statutory powers to review Executive decisions in escape clause

cases. These powers are not easily invoked—yet they are a long step in the right direction.

In addition, peril point procedures were tightened up. The range of relief available under the escape clause was broadened. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization was given greater authority to curb trade practices harmful to national security.

Obviously, these are not cure-all measures. Important gains, yes, as far as they go. And certainly they reflect credit not only on the 85th Congress, but on the American Tariff League and other responsible groups and individuals whose support was essential and decisive.

Yet you know and I know the struggle is far from over. In view of the long list of imponderables confronting our policymakers, and the long list of unresolved issues, you might say the struggle has hardly begun.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of continued vigilance—on the part of America's industries, American labor, American consumers; and on the part of those they select to encourage a healthy, expanding economy by intelligent governmental action.

The need for responsible participation in a vital public issue is still strong. Already we are witnessing new currents of alarm among industries once unconcerned by this issue.

This underscores my belief that more and more industries, more and more workers, more and more Americans in all walks of life will be sharing our concern in the years just ahead.

Again, I thank you for this generous award, for your warm hospitality, and for inviting this expression of a firm and mutual faith.

Legislation Clarifying and Overcoming Certain Supreme Court Decisions Is Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the fourth in a series of bills to clarify or overcome Supreme Court decisions in some of the more aggravating cases, specifically including bills dealing with the Mallory, Sullivan, Yates, and Nelson cases.

I have previously introduced H.R. 491 dealing with the redefinition of the term "organize" which was necessitated by the Yates decision which ruled, in effect, that it is legal to organize Communist cells with the avowed purpose of teaching and preaching the overthrow of the Government of the United States. This bill passed the House unanimously on final passage but failed in the Senate during the last session.

I also introduced H.R. 438 dealing with the Mallory case which had the effect of permitting a confessed Negro rapist to go free in Washington, D.C., by ruling his confession as inadmissible solely because the accused was held for 7½ hours between his arrest and arraignment—with no elements of coercion whatsoever present. My bill would make such admissions admissible in evidence.

In addition, I introduced H.R. 492 dealing with the Nelson case which invalidated the Pennsylvania State anti-sedition statute simply because the Federal Smith act, the antisedition statute, was enacted on a national basis, and despite the fact that nowhere did it state that it was the intention of Congress that the Federal act should supersede or preempt the State statute on the same subject matter. My bill would prevent such implied preemption by the Supreme Court in the future and is similar to H.R. 3 introduced by Mr. SMITH of Virginia.

Today, I introduced the fourth bill, dealing with the Sullivan case in which the Court ruled that gamblers could deduct from their income tax expenses incurred in carrying out their illegal operations, which, together with the Mallory case, gives the criminal licenses to commit crimes by stymieing law enforcement efforts. My bill would eliminate this deduction.

It is my fervent hope that this Congress will more readily accept its responsibility in these fields of fighting communism and strengthening our criminal law enforcement than did the 85th Congress which failed to enact any of the first three bills, the fourth resulting from a subsequent ruling of the Court. As the ranking minority Member in the 86th Congress of the Special Subcommittee on Supreme Court Decisions, of the Judiciary Committee, a subcommittee that did much fine and constructive work in this field, it is my hope that our efforts will bear fruit this session.

American Public Opinion and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, with so much evidence these days of superficial thinking and action relative to international communism, it is refreshing and heartening to receive an unsolicited and sensible appraisal of the Communist threat from a rank and file citizen.

Recently, I received such a communication from a constituent of mine in the Third District of Michigan, Mr. William Sweeney, of Hillsdale, Mich.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this letter from Mr. Sweeney:

HILLSDALE, MICH., January 23, 1959.

DEAR Mr. JOHANSEN: One may wonder what the strange relationship developing between Red communism and American public opinion portends.

The wise poet, Alexander Pope, may have given the most revealing insight into that relationship:

"Vice is a monster of so frightful a mien
As to be hated, needs to be seen;
Yet seen too often, familiar with her face
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

Accepting the assumption that communism is a great vice, many puzzling

things become more clear. To name but a few: The willingness of communism to make use of the lesser vices when expedient, the similarity of Red slavery and white slavery, the spirit of clandestine conspiracy, the arrogance and impudence of its leaders, and its fever of hatred when rebuked by religious opposition.

Americans seem to be now in danger of entering into that second stage—that of pity in which our quasi-intellectuals entered long ago.

This "pity" would seem to be an emotional experience, perhaps a psychological mystery having to do with an affinity or merging of spirit.

This assumption would also serve to explain why realistic men whose work brings them into contact with organized vice or unlawful rackets have a better understanding of communism than do many bemused university professors.

It also provides or suggests the logical reasoning back of the present strategy of Russian communism toward America.

This strategy would appear to be a program of familiarity, of togetherness. They are saying, in effect, "Have pity on us poor Russians; we need so much from you; we are trying so hard to be prosperous and unafraid like you; we need your understanding—have pity."

What is our answer? Our answer is unbelievable, but a matter of record. Our prospective presidential aspirants journey to Moscow for an understanding, which they must feel is necessary before they can announce their intentions.

Congress, by compelling a break in diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia, could counter this strategy and prevent the possibility of America taking that last and final step cited by Pope, that of embracement of communism.

But Congress may no longer have the will and courage to do this.

There are three facts concerning communism that seldom, if ever, are brought to the attention of the average American:

First, there is no warrantee from past world history that America could not fall victim to communism.

Second, triumphant world communism would look with favor upon the resettlement of two or more hundred million land-hungry people from Asia into North America.

Third, militant communism has acquired a near perfect psychological understanding of the American mass mind by patient investigation over a period of 40 years.

The amazing success of their massive controlled experiment upon 7,000 American prisoners of war in Korea alone gives the Communists a blueprint for action against the younger generation of Americans, if, indeed, it would not be effective against all Americans.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SWEENEY.

Public Housing for the Aged: A First for Toledo, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, with congressional hearings underway on the far-reaching housing bills which have been introduced in both the House and the Senate, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues a recent de-

velopment in Toledo, Ohio, which is especially timely and significant.

The Toledo Metropolitan Housing Authority, having long ago recognized the need for low-cost public housing for our senior citizens, recently opened the first public housing development completed with Federal assistance, designed exclusively for elderly persons.

The immediate and great success of this project, known as A. Gideon Spieker Terrace, has led me to the conclusion that this type of housing should be included as part of the total public housing program for the country.

I should like to briefly describe the Spieker Terrace project.

The project consists of 50 dwelling units in 10 buildings—44 one-bedroom apartments for families and 6 efficiency apartments for single persons.

Persons living in the project are 65 years of age or older and are living on small incomes derived mainly from pensions.

The buildings are single story, brick veneer, ranch-style. They are especially designed to make life easier for the elderly, all walks being ramped to eliminate the hazards of steps to accommodate wheelchair users. The walks are all surfaced with rough concrete to prevent slipperiness.

The project is located on 2.64 acres of land adjacent to another public housing project of 384 units, occupied mostly by younger families with children. It is within two blocks of a regularly scheduled busline and near stores and shopping facilities. It is also near churches of various faiths and public recreation facilities.

A community building of 1,000 square feet is located in the center of the project and includes facilities for movies, game and hobby rooms, meeting rooms, and a general lounge.

There are two laundry rooms in the project with free washing and drying facilities.

During the designing and construction of the project every consideration was given not only to convenience for the elderly residents but for their safety.

Each fireproof unit is equipped with an electric range, an electric refrigerator, individual gas-fired space and water heaters, a bathtub with a built-in seat and wall-mounted handrail, as well as an emergency buzzer system for summoning help. There are electrical outlets on every wall to eliminate the need for hazardous electrical extension cords. The doors are extra wide to allow wheelchairs easy passage and, to protect pension checks from vandals, each unit has a special wall slot for mail delivery.

The estimated overall cost of this project is \$606,830—a per unit cost of \$12,136. Of the total cost, planning costs amounted to \$39,871.

Annual interest on borrowed funds for the project amounts to \$17,816.

Actual site acquisition, survey, construction, and installation of equipment amounted to \$535,573, or a per unit cost of \$10,711.

In view of the fact that the families who reside in this project are recipients of meager incomes—old-age pensions, social security, and other types of retirement benefits—the management operation of the project has been combined with the larger project adjacent to it to allow costs to be prorated on a unit count basis for both projects.

Although the management experience of this project is, as yet, limited, the financial balance is estimated at \$35 per month average rental and \$26 per month operating cost, leaving an anticipated net of \$9 per month per unit.

The housing authority has estimated the operating cost probably will be much lower than the figures quoted since the project is much better constructed than other projects on which the estimate is based.

The tenant selection office for the dwelling units in the Spieker Terrace project has reported a waiting list of more than 100 eligible applicants.

The need continues to grow for such units as this because of the accelerated rate of retirement of persons who are able to care for their physical needs but whose incomes are restricted.

At this point I should like to include the following article from the Toledo Blade of Sunday, December 21, 1958, dealing with the reaction of the elderly residents of Spieker Terrace to the project:

GOLDEN AGERS PUT PERSONAL STAMP ON NEW HOMES—EXPERIENCE TOTALS NEARLY 4,000 YEARS

(By Elsie McKay Cram)

Spieker Terrace is less than 3 months old. But already this haven for senior citizens is as invitingly friendly as that mythical grandmother's house "over the river and through the woods."

And that's to be expected. For in it live 60 men and women whose combined homemaking experience totals nearly 4,000 years.

They are, in a sense, the elite of the city's retirees. From among hundreds of applicants, they were selected to become the pioneer residents of Toledo's first public housing for the aged.

"They're a wonderful group," said McClinton Nunn, Toledo Metropolitan Housing Authority director.

"And this is a wonderful place" appears to be the unanimous appraisal of the residents about their new domain.

LITTLE THINGS ADDED

Helping make this homelike atmosphere are not only the scientifically planned details built in by TMHA, but the little things added by the occupants.

The Christmas tree and lighted wreaths in the windows at Apartment 400, for example. They help make it home for Mr. and Mrs. William Pechikos.

So do the religious pictures on the walls, brought along to Spieker Terrace when the couple moved in last October.

Mrs. Pechikos sometimes is crippled with sickness, and climbing stairs is hard for her. Hence, she likes the one-floor plan of their apartment. The kitchen, too, is compact, requiring no wasted steps.

The master of the household, still a husky, active fellow at 75, is more enthusiastic than his wife about the apartment. He has only one complaint. He misses pattering around. Everything is so new, there's nothing to keep a Mr. Fix-It busy.

SUGGESTS GARDENS

Mr. Pechikos hopes that in any future senior citizens housing projects, TMHA plans will find room on the site for some small gardens.

"Not a big garden," he explained, "just a place where a fellow could keep busy putting in a few flowers and vegetables."

Down the road a bit, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Black have found their apartment a god-send, as Mrs. Black expressed it.

They came from a seven-room, two-story house in West Toledo, and possibly could afford more than the \$52 a month rent they are now paying for their present one-bedroom quarters.

But Mr. Black is confined to a wheelchair as a result of a stroke. Before moving to Spieker Terrace, the couple were separated 8 months—he living in a rest home and she with a son. Both are in their seventies.

In some respects, the new apartment is just about perfect for the Blacks. It has no stairways, and the doors are wide, making it easy for Mr. Black to negotiate his wheelchair.

RAMPS FROM DOORS

Mrs. Black can push him outside for a stroll with ease, for the front and back doors have ramps leading to sidewalks.

In some respects, said Mrs. Black, the apartment could be improved. She suggested sliding instead of swinging doors on cupboards and utility rooms. There is little space in the pullman-like kitchens, and the doors, when open, tend to interfere with one another.

"But don't think I'm complaining," she hastened to add.

Mr. and Mrs. Leo Lassond are another couple tickled, as they said, to be chosen for Spieker Terrace. They lived in a second-story apartment before, where access to out-of-doors was down a long hallway and a flight of stairs.

Mrs. Lassond has a serious heart condition. As a result, she seldom got outside. Now, the curb is only a few steps away, and she gets out for a drive now and then.

The bathroom in her new home is extra special, Mrs. Lassond said, because it has a tub with a wall grip bar that makes it easy for her to take a bath.

Mr. Lassond is a retired factory worker who has discovered, due to his wife's health, that he can turn out as sparkling a family wash as any of the girls who use the community laundry room.

AUTOMATIC LAUNDRY

The automatic washers and driers, he explained, are just around the corner from his apartment, and can be used free of charge.

In the midst of the 50-unit project are six efficiency apartments, all occupied by persons living alone. Frances Smith moved into one of them 10 days ago. She pays \$27 a month and says she couldn't beat it anywhere in the city.

For the \$27, she has a large combination living-bedroom, kitchen with stove, refrigerator and plenty of cupboards, a linen closet and large clothes closet, and a buzzer arrangement in case she needs to summon help from neighbors. The rent includes all utilities, and the tenant has control over the thermostat.

Miss Smith was one of the founders of the Women's Advertising Club of Toledo, and formerly ran the public stenographic service in the Secor Hotel. With that busy background, she finds her new surroundings a bit quiet.

But, she said, she's about to take a new lease on life and start developing some hobbies in the new community recreation building just across the court from her apartment.

The Truth About the British Ambassador's Complaint Involving Contracts and the National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have drawn to the attention of Mr. Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the unreasonableness of the complaint by the British Ambassador insisting that since they are able to undersell the manufacturers of electrical goods due to their low income to the workers, that we should grant them the contracts anyway—even at the cost of unemployment to between 500 and 1,000 electrical workers.

I am hoping Mr. Hoegh will consult with our own Government instead of taking the dictates of a foreign government when he asks for advice in the placing of orders:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1959.

The Honorable LEO A. HOEGH,
Director of the Office of Civil and Defense
Mobilization, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is my hope that the petitions submitted to you by the national security committee and the transformer section of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association and by the General Electric Company regarding the threatened impairment of national security as a result of imports of large hydraulic turbine generators, large transformers and large electrical circuit breakers will be considered and decided entirely within the letter and spirit of the criteria expressed by Congress in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. I have noted the recent news stories and press comments which were published following your decision recommending that the hydraulic turbines for the Greers Ferry Dam in Arkansas be purchased from the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., on national security grounds, instead from the English Electric Company which submitted the low bid. I have also noted that the British Ambassador promptly protested to the State Department that it is "a strange form of trade liberalization" to invite foreigners to bid and then tell them that the low foreign bid will not be accepted because of the national security interests of the United States.

In my opinion it is strange that the British Ambassador has so little regard for a decision of our Government regarding the national security interests of the United States. Last year when Congress was considering the Trade Agreements Act several representatives of foreign trade interests argued that the United States should not adopt a policy of restricting imports which threaten our national security. The foreigners, who naturally want unrestricted access to American markets, argued that such restrictions would be contrary to "liberal trade" policies. Congress rejected these arguments, and wrote into law specific criteria for protecting our national security interests when threatened by imports. I suppose it is the British Ambassador's duty to make a special plea for a British manufacturer who wants to sell his good to a United States Government agency. On the other hand, I hope you will regard it as your duty to carry out the policies of the United

States, as prescribed by Congress and approved by the President last year.

As Secretary of State Dulles observed a few days ago, the United States is not the only country making certain exceptions and qualifications to the general principle of liberal trade. In fact, I believe the foreign trade policies of the United States are far more liberal than those of Great Britain.

I urge that the pending petitions dealing with the threats to our national security interests from imports of heavy electrical equipment be resolved not according to the desires of foreign suppliers and foreign governments, but in keeping with criteria set forth in the provisions of section 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.

Furthermore, I want to urge that your decision on these petitions be made as promptly as possible. The petitions deal with problems of national security, but inevitably the economic welfare of the employees in the heavy electrical industry is also involved. We need a realistic Government policy to guide our Government procurement and we need it soon.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER J. HOLLAND,
Member of Congress.

The Biggest Carnival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of January 31, 1959:

THE BIGGEST CARNIVAL

The biggest and best frolic of them all is here, as the people of the city and surrounding territory, outstate Minnesota and visitors from over the Nation gather for the opening of the St. Paul winter carnival of 1959. This occasion makes St. Paul the winter entertainment capital of the Nation, proves that winter sports and contests are as popular as those of any traditional vacation season.

The old theme of the carnival, the warfare between Boreas, king of the north wind, and Vulcan, the fire king, will be unfolded once more as new generations of visitors, along with the older ones, thrill to the colorful drama of this festival of lights, this realistic drama based on legend and mythology. The audacity of Vulcan and his fellow conspirators is not limited to Boreas and his followers, however, for the fire king cares nothing of what people think of him, knowing well that he will eventually overcome the good-natured winter king, put his court to flight and seize his throne. But spectacular events attend the struggle between these titans before the warfare is over.

The parade of Saturday, led by Capt. Richard B. Laning, commanding officer of the atomic submarine *Seawolf*, during its 60-day submerged run last fall, is an early highlight of the festival, when gorgeous floats representing the area's industry, trade, culture, and history, pass through the streets. The torchlight parade, the earlier version of the first pageant, will perhaps draw even a greater attendance. The two parades' attractions vary from the antics of the clowns and other entertainers to the solemn reminders of the past and the bravery of the pioneers who founded the present State and city.

The coronations of both King Boreas XXIII and the carnival princess are occasions of

lights, music and gaiety. Outstanding entertainment is presented in the auditorium. Talent, professional and local, will be on hand during the entire course of the carnival. St. Paul Musicians Association, Local 30, will again donate the services of its members for performances during the festival. Verne Rooney's orchestra will play for Boreas' coronation, and Ray Komischke's group for a high school dance in Hotel St. Paul Saturday after the parade.

The great outdoors, however, is the chief arena for those who have come primarily to participate in the winter sports or to constitute the galleries for these events. Skating, fishing for prizes, skiing contests, dog races are on the agenda at this yearly assembly. Outdoor square dancing is offered in a blocked off area of a downtown street. Toboggan sliding at the State Capitol grounds is provided as in other years. And for those who are interested in prizes, there is the treasure chest hunt sponsored by the St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press.

The time is here for the major national sports and entertainment feature of the winter season. The success of the gathering may partially depend on the weather—on whether Boreas can summon sufficient snow to give the setting its usual luster and magic. But the spirit is what counts. It has always been merry at carnival time, a bubbling over of good nature in the games and amusements of our invigorating climate.

"Repaying the Federal Government Through Taxes on Their Increased Incomes"—Missouri Veterans' Education Director Urges GI Educational Benefits for Younger Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the tremendous good accomplished for the entire country, as well as for the young men and women who received the benefits directly, as a result of the educational opportunities provided under the World War II GI bill of rights and the Korean war GI bill.

Educational benefits have not been provided for veterans who entered the service after February 1, 1955, although many bills have been introduced since then to revive this very successful program of educational and vocational training.

Paul S. Smelser, director of veterans' education for the Missouri Department of Education, recently wrote me a very interesting letter on this subject, pointing out, among other things, that the veterans who participated in the previous programs have "attained professional, educational, and vocational objectives that have increased their ability to contribute to the economy, the general welfare, and the defense of our Nation. They have acquired greater earning power, and they are now repaying the Federal Government through taxes on their increased incomes. There is every reason to believe that the cost of an

extension of these programs would be repaid in the same manner."

Mr. Speaker, the letter from which I have quoted is worth reading, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Jefferson City, Mo., January 26, 1959.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: An increasing number of Missouri veterans are inquiring about the possibility of legislation that would provide education and training assistance for them. As you know, these men and women who entered the military service since February 1, 1955, have been denied the assistance granted to veterans by Public Law 550, 82d Congress. We believe that legislation to extend similar educational benefits to these veterans is worthy of careful consideration.

The interruption of the education of these men and women because of their service in the Armed Forces has resulted in a great loss to them individually. It has also resulted in a great loss to this State and to this Nation. These losses can be partially or fully restored by the enactment of an adequate educational and vocational assistance act.

The education and training assistance programs that have been granted to veterans since World War II have paid generous dividends. The veterans who participated in these programs have attained professional, educational, and vocational objectives that have increased their ability to contribute to the economy, the general welfare, and the defense of our Nation. They have acquired greater earning power, and they are now repaying the Federal Government through taxes on their increased incomes. There is every reason to believe that the cost of an extension of these programs would be repaid in the same manner.

We have been informed that several bills are being introduced that would grant educational and vocational assistance to veterans for so long as compulsory military service is required. We respectfully request your careful consideration of these bills.

Please let us know if we can be of help to you at any time in furnishing you with information regarding education and veterans in Missouri.

Sincerely,

PAUL S. SMELSER,
Director, Veterans Education.

Luzerne County (Pa.) Medical Society Honors Five Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader Evening-News of January 13, 1959:

In honoring Dr. Charles Shafer of Kingston, Dr. Peter Mayock of Wilkes-Barre, Dr. M. C. Rumbaugh of Kingston and Dr. George Baskett of Montana, formerly of Retreat, for more than 50 years of service each to the public, and Dr. A. W. Grover of Kingston as the General Practitioner of the Year, the Luzerne County Medical Society voices the sentiments of the commu-

nity. Greater Wilkes-Barre shares medicine's high regard for these men as citizens and neighbors as well as in their professional capacity.

So many honors have come to Dr. Shafer in the course of his long career that it is like gilding the lily to add to the list. A native of Williamsport, a World War veteran and a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, Dr. Shafer has held such offices as president of the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States, chairman of the Pennsylvania Board of Medical Education and Licensure, president of the Luzerne County Medical Society, president of the Kingston Board of Health, director, staff president and chief surgeon of Nesbitt Memorial Hospital and chairman of the Wyoming Valley Chapter of the American Red Cross. He has served as president of Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis and commander of Black Diamond Post of the American Legion and has been a prominent figure in the Masons and other fraternal bodies. It is an amazing record for an individual to compile.

Dr. Mayock, a native of Miners Mills and a resident of Wilkes-Barre, by coincidence, launched his career in Kingston in 1909. A nationally known urologist, he holds fellowships in the American College of Surgeons and the American Urological Society. He also is a diplomate of the American Board of Urology. Apart from his specialty that has brought him such renown in the profession and outside it, Dr. Mayock is known widely for his contributions to the field of social hygiene where he is credited with a great deal of pioneering. As first chief of the State Genito-Urinary Clinic, he led the successful fight locally against syphilis and other social diseases, giving Wilkes-Barre the lowest incidence of any city in Pennsylvania. He also served as chief of the urological department at Mercy Hospital and consultant at other institutions. It would be difficult to estimate the indebtedness of the community to him for service beyond the call of duty.

Dr. Rumbaugh, a native of Thompsonstown and a veteran of the First World War, came to Kingston in 1911 after preparing for teaching and business careers and actually entering the employ of the Lackawanna Steel Co. at Buffalo. The steel industry's loss was medicine's gain, for he has been an outstanding member of the profession which has conferred on him its highest honors. He not only is a member of the International College of Surgeons, but its board of examiners in general surgery, and the board of qualifications of specialists in surgery have designated him a certified fellow. He also is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons. Dr. Rumbaugh has been chief of surgery at Wilkes-Barre General Hospital and founder of the clinic that bears his name. Friends know and respect him also as a trustee of the Methodist church and teacher of a men's Bible class, an extracurricular activity that provides an index to his character.

The inclusion of Dr. Baskett on the list of members of the profession to be honored recalls his service at Retreat State Hospital where he was superintendent for 22 years and where his wife, Dr. Olive Baskett, was a member of the staff. The bridge, crossing the river at Retreat, is one of the many monuments to his zeal and foresight. Dr. Baskett devoted his entire career to institutional work, being identified with the State Mental Hospital Service of Minnesota before coming to Pennsylvania. Dr. Baskett's professional skill was matched by his enthusiasm and his candor. Dr. Baskett through the years gave unstintingly of himself to the phase of medicine to which he dedicated his life.

Dr. Grover, who will be honored as the practitioner of the year, also qualifies for recognition as a veteran physician and sur-

geon. A native of Hobbie, he came to the West Side 60 years ago and is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons. He is a past president of the Luzerne County Medical Society and is a director of Nesbitt Memorial Hospital as well as a member of the staff since it was organized in 1912. He also has served on the staff of Wilkes-Barre General Hospital and as director of postgraduate work offered by the Pennsylvania Medical Society. He is widely known for his extracurricular activities, particularly for his long service on the board of education in Kingston both as a member and president. He also was identified with the draft boards in both world wars.

In brief, these are the records of the men to be honored at the annual dinner of the medical society at Hotel Sterling on January 21. They are impressive, to say the least.

Sound and Specific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, since January 12, 1959, when the Honorable Michael V. DiSalle took office as Governor of the State of Ohio, it has become apparent that a new era of vigorous leadership has commenced in Ohio's affairs. Governor DiSalle has pledged to increase Ohio's economic expansion and at the same time take care of the genuine needs of its citizens. He proposes to undertake this program with no new tax burdens. In his vigorous program, Governor DiSalle has the solid support of the citizens of the State.

The following editorials indicate the widespread appreciation of the Governor's program:

[From the Cleveland Press, Jan. 28, 1959]

SOUND AND SPECIFIC

In his first major policy statement since he took over as Governor, Mike DiSalle made it clear that (1) he's not soft on labor racketeering and (2) he's not a wild spender. DiSalle punched up these points in his message to the legislature with special emphasis and for a special reason.

His opponents spread plenty of scare stories during the campaign about how DiSalle would take his orders from the labor bosses, and spend the State into ruin.

This is a standard line, including the drawing of a gloomy parallel with Michigan, where some of these frightful things have actually happened under a Democratic administration.

So DiSalle naturally was anxious to dispel any lingering doubts about where he stands, and how he intends to run the State.

But his comments went reassuringly beyond vague statements of principle.

On labor racketeering, he urged State laws to trap the crooks and hoodlums who've wormed their way into the labor movement.

This is a refreshingly direct approach to a responsibility which less courageous State politicians have been happy to push off on the Federal Government.

On money, the governor realistically concluded that the State is in a pinch. He'll deal with financial problems more thoroughly next week.

But meanwhile, he specifically (and wisely) ruled out a State income tax.

One of Ohio's best selling points in attracting new industry is that it doesn't have an income tax.

And cities like Cleveland which have resisted the temptation to adopt this deceptively easy way to gather in more money can make full and persuasive use of the argument.

DiSalle's comments on these two subjects not only answer his critics, but give further promise of an administration that will offer fresh vigor and fresh ideas, liberally sprinkled with courage and commonsense.

[From the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star]

DISALLE AND THE CITIES

Governor DiSalle talked sense about city-State relationships and problems in his message to the legislature.

The Governor noted the current interest in adoption of a State income tax, then put his foot down squarely on the idea. If the State did turn to this tax, which it has a right to impose under the constitution, the levy would be too disruptive, in the Governor's view, of the balance in the tax field.

The Governor, whose home city of Toledo was the first in the State to use the payroll (income) levy, is aware of the chaos that would result if the major municipalities were suddenly forced to abandon this tax. Even though the State is under constitutional edict to return half of income tax revenues to local governments, the consequences would be serious to all municipal budget-makers.

The Governor's second point is a corollary to the first. Local governments have complained justly from year back that the legislature had the unhappy habit of loading them with new duties, then letting the local officials worry about finding the money.

"We must either give the (local governments) the right and authority to finance their own governments, or to spell out the services rendered by local governments on behalf of the State as a whole," the executive said.

The meaning of this language is plain. It should not be misunderstood even by some of the veteran legislators who look upon State-collected taxes as private State money to be doled out frugally to hat-in-hand mayors.

[From the Columbus Citizen, Jan. 28, 1959]

DISALLE'S PROGRAM

Governor DiSalle pledges:

"We will demonstrate beyond a scintilla of doubt that efforts have been and will be made to eliminate duplication, waste and extravagance, and that the sums of the financial program are those required to take care of the genuine needs of Ohio. . . ."

"It is our intention to proceed with a minimum of imposition on our citizens and the continuance of the conditions which have made Ohio's industrial climate the envy of many of its sister States."

With these prefacing statements, the new Governor spelled out to the legislature his program for the next 4 years—a commonsense, practical program that if accomplished will bring reforms sorely needed by the taxpayer public for many, many years.

In his program, that could become a monument to him if carried out, the round-the-clock working Governor recognizes the State's perilous financial condition.

And he promises that the program "will be minimal in the need for funds and these funds can be considered in the nature of investments which will produce returns that will help spread and meet these costs as far as the future is concerned."

DiSalle sets out concrete proposals that can be accomplished only by his department heads and the Ohio legislature working as a team.

Among them are:

Increase Ohio's economic expansion.

An aggressive policy to combat the long-neglected water and air pollution.

Encouragement of labor and management to settle their differences without resorting to strikes.

Break up labor racketeering.

Provide for payment of supplemental unemployment benefits.

Reorganize workmen's compensation procedure for better benefits to people hurt on the job.

Put the highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis instead of spending millions for needless interest payments.

Reform the utility laws to give the consumer a better break.

Create a civil rights commission for the protection of all persons. Overhaul the stumbling mental hygiene system.

Establish old-age pensions on a basis of practicality instead of rigid, artificial ceilings.

Reestablish the relationship between local governments and the State.

Strengthen the criminal code with the intent of bringing the big shots to bay instead of the small fry.

Abolish capital punishment.

Fewer and better-paid State employees, more efficiency.

Some of these proposals will be bitterly fought. Some of them will be lost.

Whether the earnest, sincere Governor can accomplish his goal in the main is a matter for time to tell.

The taxpayers wish him well on the huge task he has outlined.

Editorial Freedom for the Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Broadcasters Association recently adopted unanimously a statement dealing with the very important subject of editorial freedom for the broadcaster. Since this is a subject which interests all of us, I include it here under leave to extend my remarks:

Whereas an editorial or editorializing as defined by dictionary is as follows:

Editorial: An article as in a newspaper presenting the opinion or comment of the periodical; an article in a newspaper, explicitly stating opinions of the editor or publisher.

Editorializing: To set forth one's position or opinion on some subject in, or as if in, an editorial; to express editorial opinions into (a newspaper article, etc.); and

Whereas from a practical standpoint in a definition of an editorial the broadcaster assumes the role of a newspaper publisher; and

Whereas actually since only ownership of the firm or corporation holding the license is responsible to the FCC in case of failure to live up to the responsibility of a broadcaster under the terms of its license, therefore, the owner of the firm or corporation must be the one responsible for editorial policy through its agents or otherwise; and

Whereas by certain utterances of FCC commissioners and important persons in the broadcast industry, station operators are continually urged to editorialize; to estab-

lish and maintain regular editorial broadcasts and policies; and

Whereas by the very nature of an editorial, the great preponderance of editorials should be advocating or setting forth the station's position for or against a certain subject matter; and

Whereas by certain utterances of the FCC in the past, it has been said in substance that " . . . the licensee must follow a reasonable standard of fairness in the presentation of the issues in the controversy" (and to this we agree) but—

Whereas the Commission has also said " . . . that he has an affirmative duty to seek out, aid and encourage the broadcast of opposing views by responsible persons" (and to this we disagree).

This dictum, while sounding good in substance, is unsound and impractical. If carried to the strict letter and interpretation, this makes practically impossible an editorial policy of force and effect; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of the Illinois Broadcasters Association that the burden of seeking out and encouraging the broadcast of opposing views by responsible persons puts an undue hardship on the broadcaster for the reason that (1) in many instances there is no organized opposition of responsible person in the area in which the broadcaster operates willing to oppose the broadcaster's editorial point of view; and (2) the burden on the broadcaster of determining that the person applying for time to present the opposite point of view is a responsible person is an unnecessary and unrealistic position in which to put the broadcaster; and (3) that should the broadcaster determine that the applicant is not a responsible person, such person requesting the time could go into court claiming damages, requiring the broadcaster to prove irresponsibility, all of which complicates the matter of editorializing to such a degree that it makes it impractical and unrealistic for a broadcaster to entertain and pursue a serious editorial policy in conformance to present Commission rules, lest his license and livelihood be placed in jeopardy; and

Whereas practically any person who has the funds to do so can buy time from the broadcaster to say most anything he desires subject to legal limits and FCC rules, yet it is illogical that the broadcaster himself is not presently under responsibility to go seek out and sell an ad to someone else to present another point of view, nor can he present such view himself; and

Whereas from a practical standpoint, anybody but the broadcaster can have his opinion published under the strict legal interpretation of the present rules; and

Whereas the broadcaster is in danger of violating a rule of the Commission unless, when he expresses an opinion he must affirmatively seek out a "responsible" someone to express an opposite point of view; and

Whereas in Illinois today, there are several important issues before the voters involving the subjects of education, hospitalization, welfare, and judicial reform, all of which the broadcaster should be free to explain and take a position without fear of the FCC or the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the NAB, representing the broadcast industry, be hereby urged and requested by unanimous vote of the Illinois Broadcasters Association to appoint a representative industry committee to confer with the FCC, as well as with Members of Congress and other Federal Government officials in an endeavor to get established a commonsense editorial policy for broadcasters in substance as follows:

"That so long as the broadcaster follows a reasonable standard of fairness in the presentation of an editorial or an issue that

the broadcaster may approve or oppose by editorial; and

"So long as the editorial is designated an editorial or opinion of the broadcaster, both before and after the editorial; and

"That when such editorial is so defined, it shall not be necessary for the broadcaster to affirmatively seek out a responsible person to present the other point of view, but when opposition desires to be heard either in writing, properly identified, or by personal appearance, it shall be the duty and obligation of the broadcaster to provide equal time and facilities for such opposing views."

The Andrija Artukovic Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 29, 1955, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech of mine entitled "The Persecution of Andrija Artukovic." This was followed by an article written by Rev. M. D. Forrest, M.S.C., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, 1958, volume 104, page 99, involving the same subject. Again, on August 25, 1958, page A7763, there appeared an additional article by Reverend Forrest. On the same date, at page A7843, I inserted a letter which I had written to the Honorable J. M. Swing, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which resulted in the correction of misinformation given to the public by that Department. Now I am asking unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the decision of the Federal District Court in Los Angeles disposing of the extradition proceedings brought by the Government of Yugoslavia against Andrija Artukovic which completely exonerates him of the charges made by that Government, beginning with rule of probable cause:

The Supreme Court of the United States in *Collins v. Loisel*, 259 U.S. 956, laid down the rule to be followed in extradition cases. That Court said:

"It is not the function of the committing magistrate in foreign extradition proceedings to determine whether or not the accused is guilty, but merely to decide whether or not there is competent evidence which, according to the law of the surrendering State, would justify his apprehension and commitment for trial if the crime had been committed in that State."

The law to be applied is therefore the laws of California. See for example, *Cleugh v. Strakosch*, 9 Cir. 1940, 109 F. 2d 330, 333; *Charlton v. Kelly*, 1913, 229 U.S. 447, 457, 33 Sup. Ct. 945, 57 L. Ed. 1274; *Curreri v. Vice*, 9 Cir. 1935, 77 F. 2d 130.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Cleugh v. Strakosch*, supra, said:

"The phrase 'sufficient cause' in sections 871 and 872 of the Penal Code, means reasonable or probable cause. This appears in section 1487 of the same code, which provides that where 'a party has been committed on a criminal charge without reasonable or probable cause, he shall be released on habeas corpus. . . . Evidence showing reasonable or probable cause to believe the accused guilty is sufficient' (citing cases).

The district court of appeals of California in *Ex Parte Martinez*, 98 P. 2d 528, held:

"The term 'sufficient cause' within the statute providing that a defendant can only be held to answer when it appears from the evidence that there is sufficient cause to believe that defendant committed offenses charged, means the same as 'reasonable and probable cause,' and hence a commitment based entirely on hearsay or incompetent evidence is unauthorized" (citing 7 Cal. Jr., sec. 120, p. 984).

Therefore, it becomes a question of fact in this case whether the evidence presented is sufficient to show reasonable and probable cause to believe that the defendant is guilty of at least one count of the amended complaint in extradition. Inasmuch as it is a question of fact in each case no useful purpose would be served by citing and quoting from cases determining that fact under other evidence. It is so elemental that where evidence is taken in any proceeding the weight to be given the evidence is for the finder of fact that citation of authorities is unnecessary.

Murder is a crime in both Yugoslavia and the United States. The definition of murder is substantially the same in both sovereigns. Section 187 of the California Penal Code defines murder as "the unlawful killing of a human being, with malice aforethought." Both Yugoslavia and California make one a principal if he commits the offense directly or aids, abets, advises, or encourages the commission of the crime. Murder is a crime coming within the provisions of the treaty as a basis for extradition.

Absolutely no evidence was presented that the defendant himself committed murder. The complainant relies entirely upon their evidence that members of the Ustasha committed murders upon orders from the defendant. There is no necessity to review all of the evidence in this opinion. Only portions will be referred to for illustrative purposes.

The Ustasha at one time was a political party in Croatia. They ardently supported an ideology of a separate state for the Croats. When political parties were abolished in Yugoslavia the Ustasha continued to function secretly and when the Germans and Italians commenced invasion of Yugoslavia during World War II came out into the open and proclaimed an independent State of Croatia.

On April 15, 1941, one Eugen Kvaternik was appointed by Dr. Ante Pavelic, the "Poglavnik" or "head man" of the independent State of Croatia, as Ustasha Commissioner for Public Order and Security in Zagreb with directions that all organs of police, gendarmerie, etc., must execute his commands and orders and act in compliance with his instructions.

On April 16, 1941, there was published in the *Narodne Novine*, the official paper in the independent State of Croatia, an order of the Poglavnik appointing the defendant commissioner of the entire public security and internal administration. The following day on April 17, 1941, the order appointing defendant Minister of Internal Affairs was published.

A number of changes were made in the ordinances and decrees as to the internal functions of the Ustasha. At one time the Ustasha was accountable only to the Poglavnik. At other times it was placed under the Minister of Internal Affairs. At all times Eugen Kvaternik remained at the head of the Ustasha. Mr. Kvaternik was a very ambitious man.

The Poglavnik by ordinance at one time required compulsory sojourn in collective and working camps of any persons dangerous to the public order and security or who might menace the peace and tranquility of the Croatian nation. The Ustasha was authorized to establish the camps and to

determine who was to be interned with no appeal or complaint to any court. These ordinances provided for the internment of the entire family of anyone coming within the ordinance. Even before the issuance of such ordinance people were being interned by the Ustasha in Croatia.

The evidence is conflicting as to the orders made with reference to the Serbs, Jews, and gypsies. Some of the orders were for internment and deportation. Some of the evidence shows alleged verbal orders for the killing of the enemies of the Independent State of Croatia.

It was common practice during World War II to intern anyone who was even suspected to be an enemy or possible enemy of the government in power. Our own Government saw fit to intern all Japanese on the west coast, men, women, and children of all ages, immediately following Pearl Harbor.

The evidence is convincing that the ones named in the complaint with committing the murders called on the head of the Ustasha, Mr. Kvaternik, in Zagreb, on many occasions. The evidence is light that the defendant met with these men.

All of the evidence presented by the complainant is in narrative form. The affidavits were signed by the affiants but very evidently are not in their words. They are someone's conclusion as to what the testimony covered. A layman is often prone to sign anything presented if prepared by a court, an attorney or notary public without proper regard to its accuracy.

The same language appears time after time in the affidavits. The words "so-called Independent State of Croatia" appears in affidavit after affidavit. I doubt very much that this could be a coincidence.

There was no opportunity for this court to observe the demeanor or possible motives of these witnesses. I do not have even the words of the witnesses to judge their meaning or whether the answers were induced by the questions asked. I am presented with someone else's conclusion of what the testimony was. This is very unreliable evidence which can be given little weight.

Much of the evidence presented by the complainant is hearsay. Hearsay evidence, under decisions of the higher courts, may be admissible in extradition cases but the weight to be given the evidence is for the committing magistrate. For example many of the affiants stated they knew a certain individual was dead because it was well known in the village; or because so-and-so told him or because "he was taken away and I never saw him again."

It is also apparent that the affidavits were drawn to incite passion and prejudice. They constantly refer to children of tender years, newborn babes, aged persons, cruel and inhuman treatment, and so forth. If a murder is committed the age or sex of the victim should make no difference in the action taken. This evidence may have been offered to show it was not a political offense which is one of the defendant's affirmative defenses. This subject will be covered later.

The complainant attempts to lend credence to the affidavits by showing that they were taken in a court with a judge presiding. An examiner or investigating officer was present to conduct the examination with a registrar or recorder to report the proceedings. But the testimony of the witness is not furnished. In only a couple of instances is a question and answer given. The evidence on behalf of the complainant resolves itself into *ex parte* affidavits.

The defendant presented live witnesses who were subjected to vigorous cross-examination. In certain instances the live witnesses testified that the affiants were not telling the truth. No attempt was made to rebut this evidence. The complainant presented no rebuttal witnesses nor asked for time to secure rebuttal evidence. The live

witnesses were in the United States and under no fear, inducement, or compulsion to testify falsely. History indicates this might not have been true in Yugoslavia at the time the evidence was taken.

One must also keep in mind that the events to which the witnesses testified took place at least 10 years before the testimony was taken. The passage of time tends to reduce the weight which may be given to evidence. Some of the affidavits must be eliminated from consideration because the affiants testified to matters of which they could not possibly have personal knowledge. Many of these affidavits testified that certain people were loaded on trucks or railway cars, taken to such and such a camp and there killed. They could not know where they were taken or what happened to them. Such testimony stretches the credulity to the breaking point.

Most of the affidavits state that the ones committing the atrocities were Ustasha. Sometimes they were well-known members of the Ustasha. Sometimes they were in Ustasha uniform. Sometimes they were Ustasha in Moslem attire. Sometimes they were Ustasha wearing a fez. Sometimes they were Ustasha in ordinary attire. But always they were Ustasha.

No evidence was given as to how the Ustasha could be identified. They apparently wore no brands or means of identification. They were of no special color or distinguishing characteristics. One might try to identify a Democrat or a Republican by their appearance, but it certainly would not be reliable enough to act upon in any important matter.

Some of the complainant's witnesses testified they called on the defendant with reference to the treatment of the Serbs, Jews, and Gypsies. Some of defendant's witnesses testified they also called upon the defendant. Again the evidence is in irreconcilable conflict. The complainant's witnesses testified the defendant told them his orders were being obeyed. The defendant's witnesses testified that the defendant told them to see the man upstairs, Mr. Kvaternik, that there was nothing he could do. Where does the truth lie? I believe the live witnesses when they said the defendant told them there was nothing he could do. Mr. Kvaternik was theoretically under the Minister of Internal Affairs during part of the period involved. I am convinced that in fact Mr. Kvaternik was taking orders from no one.

The pro forma use of the name of a minister in such orders and decrees does not meet the quantum of proof necessary to show reasonable and probable cause to believe the minister is guilty of participating in crimes committed by others in his department. To so hold would probably result in failure to find any candidate who would accept the responsibilities of such a position if he was going to be held to answer for crimes committed by his underlings without more definite proof that they were acting under his orders. Such proof is lacking in this case.

I am cognizant of the proof necessary to hold a defendant for extradition. In *Gluckman v. Henkel* (221 U.S. 508, 522, 55 L. Ed. 830, 31 S. Ct. 704), the Supreme Court said:

"It is common in extradition cases to attempt to bring to bear all of the factitious niceties of a criminal trial at common law. But it is a waste of time. For while, of course, a man is not to be sent from the country merely upon demand or surmise, yet if there is presented in somewhat untechnical form according to our ideas, such reasonable ground to suppose him guilty as to make it proper that he should be tried, good faith to the demanding government requires his surrender. . . ."

And in *Fernandez v. Phillips* (268 U.S. 311, 312, 69 L. Ed. 970, 972, 45 S. Ct. 542), Mr. Justice Holmes, speaking for the Supreme Court, said:

"Competent evidence to establish reasonable grounds is not necessarily evidence competent to convict. . . ."

I am convinced that Mr. Kvaternik usurped all powers over the Ustasha and that the defendant had little or none. Mr. Kvaternik even aspired to be Poglavnik and did anything he thought necessary to assert his power and gain his ambitions.

Upon consideration of all the evidence presented and the authorities cited by both parties I can reach but one conclusion. The complainant has not shown by sufficient competent evidence that there is reasonable or probable cause to believe the defendant guilty of any of the crimes charged. I hope I do not live to see the day when a person will be held to answer for a crime in either the California or U.S. courts upon such evidence as was presented in this case on behalf of the complainant. It would be mere speculation or surmise to find the acts charged were done upon orders from the defendant.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES—POLITICAL OFFENSE

It is probably unnecessary for me to determine any affirmative defenses in view of my findings on probable cause. However, the issue was presented and the parties are entitled to my findings.

One of defendant's affirmative defenses is that the crimes, if any, are political in nature and not extraditable under the treaty. I do not deem it necessary in this case to go into the question of extradition for so-called war crimes.

Article VI of the treaty involved provides: "A fugitive criminal shall not be surrendered if the offense in respect of which his surrender is demanded be of a political character, or if he proves that the requisition for his surrender has, in fact, been made with a view to try or punish him for an offense of a political character."

"Political character" or political offense has not been too satisfactorily defined. Generally speaking it is an offense against the Government itself or incident to political uprisings. It is not a political offense because the crime was committed by a politician. The crime must be incidental to and form a part of political disturbances. It must be in furtherance of one side or another of a bona fide struggle for political power.

The evidence presented, as well as historical facts of which I can take judicial notice, proves that for years the peoples of the Balkans were in disagreement. Without any elections or choice of the Croats following World War I Croatia was made part of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. This government was controlled by the Serbs which imposed tremendous burdens upon the Croats. The Croats wanted an independent government or at least representation in the Sabor or Parliament. In 1928 Croatia held an election and elected delegates to the House of Parliament in Belgrade. Upon their arrival the Serbian leader of the House proceeded to shoot the delegates. Civil war nearly ensued and in 1929 King Alexander dissolved all political parties. The Croats never forgot their ideal of an independent state and when the Germans and Italians invaded Yugoslavia during World War II they had their first opportunity to set up their own government.

On April 10, 1941, the Croatian leaders declared their independence and started to establish their own government. This was opposed by the Serbians and others and civil strife was rampant.

The leaders of the Independent State of Croatia called upon the Croats to support the new government and took what steps it considered necessary to further its struggle for political power. The evidence disclosed that some villages, where the new government was unable to furnish protection, established their own militia for self-protection. Bands from the new government

would come in and take control only to be ousted by bands from their opponents. Some villages changed hands several times a day. These bands were not organized armed forces but in many instances ordinary civilians. Many lives were taken. Fractions of the Chetniks and Partisans were doing everything they could to defeat the aims of the new government.

Conditions were such that even the complainant's own witnesses referred to the occupation by Italian troops as a "liberation." It was better to be under the control of the organized troops of Italy than continue the internal strife.

Complainant contends I must ignore completely the findings of Judge Hall and the opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals on the question of whether the crimes charged are of a political nature. The Supreme Court of the United States vacated the judgment of the Court of Appeals and remanded the case for a hearing under section 3184. Undoubtedly these decisions are not binding upon me as they have been vacated. However, they certainly are entitled to my consideration and are persuasive as far as the question of law is concerned.

In my opinion the order of the Supreme Court means nothing more than that the question of whether the crimes charged are of a political character cannot be determined upon habeas corpus but must be determined at a hearing under section 3184.

The Supreme Court in *Ornelas v. Ruiz* (161 U.S. 502, 509), stated that whether the crime charged is of a political character is " . . . a question of mixed law and fact, but chiefly of fact."

I hereby adopt the opinion of the U.S. court of appeals in *Karadzole et al v. Artukovic*, supra, and the findings of Judge Hall in the habeas corpus action as my opinion and findings insofar as the question of law is concerned.

From the evidence presented I find as a fact that the crimes charged in all counts of the amended complaint are political in character.

JURISDICTION

No question has been raised as to my jurisdiction to hear and determine this extradition matter. I hereby take judicial notice of the order of the district court appointing me as U.S. commissioner for this district which includes the power to conduct hearings where persons are sought to be extradited by foreign governments, and to do all acts and things which may be necessary in connection therewith, and as more particularly described in section 3184, title 18, United States Code.

IDENTITY OF DEFENDANT

No contention has been made that the defendant before me is not the Andrija Artukovic named in the amended complaint on extradition. The evidence presented conclusively proves that the defendant before me is the person named in the amended complaint.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I

That I have jurisdiction to hear and determine this case.

II

That the defendant before me is the person named in the amended complaint on extradition.

III

That the complainant has not proven by sufficient competent evidence that there is reasonable and probable cause to believe the defendant guilty of any of the crimes charged in the amended complaint on extradition.

IV

That the crimes charged in the amended complaint on extradition are of a political character and under article VI of the treaty are not extraditable.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I

That the demand of the complainant for the surrender of the defendant should be denied for failure to prove by sufficient competent evidence that there is reasonable and probable cause to believe the defendant guilty of any of the charges in the amended complaint on extradition.

II

That the crime charged in the amended complaint on extradition are of a political character and the surrender of the defendant should be denied.

ORDER

It is hereby ordered, adjudged, and declared that the demand of the complainant for the surrender of the defendant is denied and the bail bond of the defendant in the habeas corpus action should be exonerated.

Dated at Los Angeles, Calif., this 15th day of January A.D. 1959.

THEODORE HOCKE,
U.S. Commissioner.

More Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at a time when several million of workers and their families are in distress and great need, the Eisenhower Administration continues to push curtailment policies and bitterly opposes legislation to alleviate this suffering or to reverse the backward economic trend.

Under the guise of economy, the President and White House advisers continue to push policies that result in the tragic waste of real wealth that comes with idle men, idle factories, and in lost educational opportunities and public health and welfare services.

This may create the better business climate envisioned by White House and NAM visionaries, but in addition to bringing widespread human suffering it is leading the Nation toward disaster.

Mr. Speaker, the question of jobs and the narrow, blind, and selfish policies of White House advisers and the NAM is vividly portrayed in an editorial in the current issue of "The Machinist."

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith this editorial on "More Jobs."

MORE JOBS

Respectfully, of course, we'd like to suggest that President Eisenhower crate up the economic theorists now working at the White House and ship them to the National Association of Manufacturers—collect.

The current crew of White House theorists is as woolly as they come. In our opinion, they don't know the first thing about the American system or what makes it prosperous.

Obviously, their learning comes from books written at least a half century ago and not from events. They may have read the words, but they don't get the message. The NAM News may be their bible, but they lack the simple instinct for economic survival that saves most businessmen and union members.

The White House theorists have discovered that business must make a profit to survive. But they haven't the foggiest idea of what it takes to keep our shops and factories busy.

They have read that our population is expanding, that the labor force is growing, that we need more and more jobs. But they don't know what creates jobs.

The theorists say the basic factor is high profits, profits that can be used to build new factories and buy new machine tools. That was true a half century ago when the big problem was production. Today profits are only part of the picture. Today business cannot or will not expand its plants or create new jobs unless and until the demand for its products increase. Today the big problem is selling what we produce.

Last year's recession wasn't caused by any lack of production. Men weren't laid off because we didn't have enough factories or enough machine tools. We had a recession last year because the customers didn't have the money to buy all the goods we were producing. The customers ran short of purchasing power.

Anybody who knows anything about the American system knows that unless the American people have the money in their pockets to buy the goods, the factories lay off and the farmers take a licking.

Yet, on the advice of economic theorists and a few financiers who lack that instinct for self-preservation, the President is saying we should go easy on wage increases; he is talking about tax loopholes to raise profits.

Union members had better negotiate more purchasing power or we'll soon have another recession that'll make last year's look like prosperity.

Caution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the February 2, 1959, issue of Newsweek:

CAUTION

Although most U.S. papers splashed the trial story on page 1, many editors who watched did so with misgivings. The Chicago Sun-Times executive editor, Larry Fanning, who had turned down a Castro invitation to his paper, explained: "No one is saying that the guys who went down there can be bought, but somehow the context is all wrong for a newspaperman. The implication is that you are being bought whether or not that is true." Like many other editors, Fanning felt that coverage of Castro had been inadequate long before the trials started. "The night before Batista fled," Fanning recalled, "both UPI and AP put out word that the Castro forces had been crushed. We were completely misled. We're hoping the copy we're getting now is a fair representation."

Some on-the-spot observers sincerely believed that stories of Castro's executions had been overstressed at the expense of news about the gains he has made for his country. "The executions," said Look magazine's foreign editor William Attwood, "are what prevented riots; nothing else could have done that. When the Hungarian Freedom Fighters began killing policemen in 1956, they were praised by everybody. When Castro does the same thing, he's cursed."

Back in New York, Herbert L. Matthews, the New York Times man who had secured

an exclusive three-part interview with Castro in 1957, remarked:

"In all my 36 years of newspaper work, I have never seen a worse job of journalism than the coverage of the Cuban revolution during the last 3 weeks. All you saw in most papers was how many people Castro shot. The real picture of a country under Batista's brutal dictatorship was not made clear."

At the weekend, despite criticism of the Sports Arena trials, Castro announced that they would begin again this week after he returned from a 3-day trip to Caracas, where he helped celebrate the first anniversary of the overthrow of Venezuelan dictator Marcos Pérez Jiménez.

Castro's toll in his first 24 days in power: 253 executions, 100 acquittals.

One for the Road—Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a group of outstanding citizens of the city of San Diego, Calif., have joined in the past several months in a move which is typical of the very fine and dedicated public spirit of our community. What these good friends of mine have done is very well set forth in a feature article published in the December, 1958, issue of the National Business Woman, the magazine of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. I have had the good fortune to assist these ladies in clearing some of the hurdles they faced in forming the Crossroads Home. Crossroads is performing an invaluable service to the southwestern corner of the United States. I am proud to pass on this information to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

With your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

ONE FOR THE ROAD—BACK

(By Peggy L. Penney)

Last December 24, a desperately ill young woman sat disconsolately in a bus depot in San Diego, Calif., facing the unpleasant prospect of Christmas in jail. This young woman's illness was alcoholism; her only relief alcoholic oblivion. In her battered purse was 50 cents—enough to buy one drink at the nearest bar. Surely bar friends would supply the rest. Then, inevitably, jail. She didn't really want that drink, or the others, but her body cried out in helpless torment. What else was there? She had no home, no hope, no one to help.

Idly she glanced at a discarded newspaper on the bench beside her. A headline caught her attention. Eagerly she read the story of a new home for homeless women alcoholics. It changed her life. Someone did care. She spent a dime of that last half dollar to call Crossroads Home. A month later she was able to leave Crossroads with renewed spirit, friends, a job, clothes, and help in her continuing battle against her disease—alcoholism.

This young woman, ill and at the crossroads of her life, found hope and help on the road back because a San Diego research attorney named Bernice Morris was deeply concerned over the fate of the homeless alcoholic women who roamed the city.

Bernice Morris, past president of the National of San Diego's BPW Club is founder of Crossroads Home. The home is a monument to her leadership, for wholeheartedly into its cause went not only her own BPW club but a list of other organizations reading like a bluebook of clubdom contributed time, money, materials and furnishings: Zonta, Pilot, Soroptomist, American Association of University Women, California Association of Cosmetologists, American Association of Women Accountants, American Pen Women, Medical Secretaries' Association, Visiting Nurse Association, Opti-Mrs., Kiwanis-Annex, Federated Women's Clubs and the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

Alcoholics are not all skid row failures or social riffraff. Alcoholism is a disease. It is not selective in its targets. It is no respecter of persons. Professional women, housewives, mothers, society matrons—any woman whose body chemistry cannot assimilate alcohol normally is a potential victim of our greatest national killer—alcoholism. The ratio of women alcoholics is more than 1 out of 3.

Armed with these grim facts, Miss Morris called together a group of friends in April 1957, in a community endeavor to cope with a community problem. In the group of 10 were 6 recovered alcoholics—men and women—respected members of the community with years of sobriety behind them. Within a month these business and professional men and women had formed Crossroads Foundation; within 9 months they opened the pleasant two-storied residence on San Diego's Fifth Avenue known as Crossroads Home.

In leading Crossroads Foundation into action Miss Morris said, "I felt that it was the duty of the community to care for persons suffering with the disease of alcoholism just as much as it is to care for those afflicted with tuberculosis or who are homeless."

The foundation's first discovery was that there was no place for a woman alcoholic to stay during the time it took her to recover. A few charitable organizations gave help for a few days at a time and there were organizations to give help to their recovery, but no home or haven; no provision for clothing and food. These necessities were given top priority on the foundation's program.

Two founder's committees—finance and housing—were appointed. Within a few months a pencil-slim budget of \$3,200 was obtained from businesses, organizations, and individuals, of this, \$400 was paid for rent and \$500 for necessary carpenter work. Pressed by the need for economy, the house committee gratefully accepted the helping hands of the business, professional, and club women of San Diego.

Some women dooned blue jeans to help with the painting; others took up needles to make slipcovers, curtains, and draperies. Artists and decorators lent their talents freely to color-coordinate the rooms. The result in a pleasant, homelike atmosphere—a far cry from the barren jails, State institutions, and cheap rooming houses so many of Crossroads' guests have known.

Crossroads Home, newly decorated and freshly painted in a labor of love, opened its doors to its first two homeless women on Christmas Eve 1957. In its short period of operation, it has offered 33 women an opportunity to take their first steps on the road back—all but 4 of them are still sober.

The work so nobly begun by the business, professional, and club women of San Diego didn't stop with Crossroads' opening. More join forces each month to see that these women have the best possible chance to succeed.

For example, a clothing committee collects, sorts, and cleans donated clothing to give each Crossroads' guest a recent ward-

robe. A girl or woman just out of jail isn't likely to have much more than the clothes on her back. In soliciting clothing the committee urges, "Give us something you would be caught dead in. In other words, we want our residents to go out into the world when they begin their new life, looking like businesswomen."

A welfare committee of businesswomen consults with the girl and her sponsor regarding her job possibilities. If training is indicated, they endeavor to secure it for her. One BPW club has earmarked its contribution to be used in furtherance of its project "Employment of the Mature Woman," with the money expended for carfare, brush-up courses, and in the case of one "over 40" woman, such a useful adjunct to job hunting as a set of false teeth.

An advisory board of 12 women—all of whom are recovered alcoholics—works with the residents counseling and advising them.

Each girl has a sponsor, a recovered alcoholic, who understands her problems. The sponsor calls her girl at least once a day, invites her to meetings of recovered alcoholics, and is consulted by the trustees and welfare committees on all matters involving her.

As a further contribution to each girl's peace of mind, Attorney Morris tries to straighten out some of the problems. It is here that her legal training is of special value. Are creditors hounding the girl? Attorney Morris talks with the creditor. If the debt is an unjust one, the creditor is advised to "lay off;" the girl to "forget it." If the claim is bona fide, the creditor (with the girl's permission) is advised that she is seriously ill with alcoholism. If she recovers, the debt will be paid; if she continues drinking, he probably won't get his money anyway. Attorney Morris asks bluntly, "Why not give her a chance?" Most creditors cooperate.

Residents come from all walks of life. Some are college graduates, nurses, technicians, office workers, waitresses, factory workers. Most have seen jail from the inside. All have one common bond—a sincere desire to stop drinking. In their new, if temporary, home they quickly find friends, understanding, and help. No woman is ever turned out to find her troubled way alone. She is helped to a job, a pleasant place to live, and her new friends never slacken their interest in her welfare.

One woman, nearing 60, had been in and out of jail so often in 28 years of residence in the city that her only friends were among the jail matrons. This woman, after finding the road back at Crossroads, is now living in a boardinghouse run by a new-found friend and sponsor, a recovered alcoholic.

Perhaps the true meaning of Crossroads can best be expressed by the guests. Here in halting, heartwarming words is what Crossroads means to one newcomer whose poignant history of arrest and confinement is typical: " * * * I have been in Alcoholics Anonymous and at Crossroads for 5 days and I know everything is going to be all right now because it's a wonderful place and a gift from God. God still loves me and everyone here loves me like a sister and I love them the same. I finally found what I have been searching for. I didn't know alcohol was a disease. I thought I was no good and had almost given up hope. I won't say that I'll never take another drink. I just hope and pray that I don't."

The road back can be a long one, and while it is paved with good intentions, they are not enough; it needs sympathetic, helping hands. Through Crossroads Foundation and Crossroads Home, the business, professional, and club women of San Diego are extending that helping hand to offer the homeless alcoholic women of San Diego one for the road * * * back.

Holly Product Saved Sub's Polar Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all of us are very proud and elated at the remarkable accomplishments of our Navy's atomic submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a \$135 purchase by the Navy from a small manufacturing plant in my own home district of Oakland County, Mich., which made this possible. The owner of this firm, Mr. Fred D. Barton, of Holly, Mich., has made an indirect, but nevertheless valuable, contribution to our Nation's defense and prestige.

The following account appeared in the January 23, 1959, issue of the *Flint Journal*:

HOLLY PRODUCT SAVED SUB'S POLAR TRIP

(By Harold R. Gerace)

If it hadn't been for \$135 worth of stop-leak concoction—made in Flint area for auto radiators—the atomic submarine *Nautilus* wouldn't have made its epic voyage under the North Pole last August.

A leak in the condenser threatened to halt the voyage under the icecap by the \$100 million vessel.

The stuff that succeeded, when all other efforts to stop the leak failed, is prepared and bottled in Holly at Bar's Products Supply, Inc., 720 Rose Street. Bar's is a contraction of Barton's.

Owner of the firm is Fred D. Barton, who got into the stop-leak business by mixing water, soluble oil and a little household ginger.

He never dreamed that years later his modernized, patented product would make him the atomic age counterpart of the legendary Dutch boy who saved the town by using his finger to plug the leak in the dike.

Barton's radiator stop-leak is known the world over and is sold under a variety of brand names. It is used on six to seven million cars annually.

Comdr. William R. Anderson, skipper of the *Nautilus*, tells about the stop-leak treatment of the nuclear submarine in his book, "Nautilus 90 North." It is the story of the first voyage under the North Pole.

The *Nautilus* was in the Pacific en route to the Pole when the condenser developed a tiny leak. Salt water was seeping into the steam of the propulsion plan. This condition would corrode it if allowed to continue. The leak could not be found when the *Nautilus* was placed in drydock in Seattle.

In desperation, lest the polar trip be canceled, Commander Anderson ordered the crew to try the automobile stop-leak. At first the crewmen didn't know whether he was fooling. He finally convinced them he was dead earnest.

Barton treasures a Government purchase order for 75 quarts of radiator stop-leak to be consigned to the *Nautilus*. It cost \$1.80 a quart, or \$135.

"Incredible as it may see," Commander Anderson writes, "the stop-leak treatment worked. Wherever it was, the leak was plugged. Neither in Seattle, nor later would this problem arise again."

Barton has been the guest of the skipper of the *Nautilus* and was toured the submarine. He donated \$1,000 to the recreation fund of the *Nautilus*.

The 51-year-old Barton once conducted a school to train salesmen. Its success caused him to go out of business.

His F&I Training School was in San Francisco. The letters meant "Focus & Impulse."

"All my graduates seemed to get high-salaried jobs," Barton recalled. "I guess I wasn't charging enough for the course. So I closed up the school to try for a high-paying job."

A ruddy-faced heavy-set individual whose 206 pounds are distributed on a 5-foot 10½-inch frame, Barton, in his gravel-throated voice, likes to expound his philosophy of the rights of individuals and small business.

He practices what he preaches, too. He has just taken on a giant chemical company in a suit to collect \$33 million in a case involving his product. He also recently organized the RIS Foundation and endowed it with \$50,000 to assist students studying for business careers. The initials "RIS" stand for the "right of the individual to sell."

Nearing completion is Barton's dream house. It is near his factory in an area he has named Holly Wood Acres. The house has five baths and will have a swimming pool.

Barton is a native of Saginaw and was graduated from Saginaw High School.

He spent many years in California. After he closed up his salesmen's school, he sought a job with an oil company. It was then that he became interested in automobiles.

In the backyard of his home, he mixed water-soluble oil with water and bottled and sold it as a rust-preventive for automobile radiators. As Barton tells it, he began wondering about adding something to his product that would also stop radiator leaks. He began experimenting with household items his wife had on hand. He isn't sure just why he tried ginger, but he did and it worked.

In trying to mix a better stop-leak, he finally came up with the roots of certain plants. His formula now is protected by patents. Virtually all new cars are treated with his product before they leave the factory. Buick is one of his big customers.

Plugging the leak in the *Nautilus* was probably the most spectacular feat of Barton's product, but it was by no means the first.

In 1950 his stop-leak saved a huge irrigation project from closing down. A ditch-digging shovel that scoops up 20 yards of dirt at a time and has the weird name of Walking Monaghan sprung a leak in its engine. The shovel, which "walks" as it progresses in digging, was the key machine for the entire project and hundreds of jobs were threatened.

In the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia, the swimming events nearly came to a halt when the pool developed a leak. Again Barton's concoction fixed the trouble.

While he enjoys dwelling on the success of his product, Barton can remember the uncertainties encountered when he was starting out. Someone wanted to know if his stop-leak would be effective under compression—around the water jacket of an engine valve, for instance.

"You got rocks in your head?" he asked. "How could something like that withstand compression?"

After thinking about it, Barton quietly gave it a try and, to his amazement, found it did stop leaks under compression.

Since then he has never made the mistake of underestimating his product.

He got into the stop-leak business in 1947 and moved to Holly in 1954. He wanted to get back to Michigan. He now operates another plant, Fret, Inc., in Shortsville, N.Y.

The name Fret again shows Barton's fascination for abbreviations. The word is an acronym—a combination of the first two letters in his name, Fred, and his wife's, Ethel.

The Bartons have two daughters, Mrs. William Fies, Redwood City, Calif., and Barbara Beth, a student nurse at the University of Michigan.

"No son," he mournfully comments. "That's the tragedy."

Warren County, Ind., Farm Program Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received an exceptionally interesting report setting out in some detail the results of a farm program survey conducted by an energetic, nonpartisan group of approximately 30 Warren County, Ind., farmers.

I was particularly impressed with the survey report, which was brought to my attention by Mr. Warren C. Wright of Williamsport, Ind., because of the specifically-mentioned unbiased composition of the survey group itself. The group's roster included individuals of both major political affiliations, as well as large and small farmers.

As I told Secretary of Agriculture Benson, in a letter covering the survey's transmittal to him for his analysis, there is considerable merit to the contention of the Warren County group that the farmer be given an opportunity to vote on the type of farm program with which he must comply.

I am, and I feel sure anyone even relatively close to this country's agricultural economy is, entirely sympathetic with the farmer's efforts to increase his income to full parity thus attaining an equality of purchasing power, while decreasing the production of surplus farm commodities, with the ultimate goal of eliminating Government subsidies.

Although the administrative costs of such a program as proposed by the Warren County, Ind., survey group might slightly exceed current costs, this small increase in operational expenditures would be more than offset, in the long run, by the reduction, if not the removal, of tremendous quantities of grain now in storage, thereby saving the taxpayer astronomically high annual storage costs and contributing to the eventual elimination of subsidies.

The Warren County, Ind., farm program proposals follows:

WARREN COUNTY FARM PROGRAM

The following tentative farm program was discussed, developed, and written by a group of approximately 25 to 30 Warren County, Ind., farmers with no political affiliation, organized backing, or outside influence for the purpose of conducting a survey to determine what type of a farm program, we as Warren County farmers most desire of the three general types (high price supports with rigid controls, flexible sup-

ports, or present program, or no program at all).

In order to conduct the survey, the following program was formulated:

TENTATIVE FARM PROGRAM

The purpose of this program is to increase our income to full parity in order that we might as farmers have equality of purchasing power, while decreasing production of commodities now in surplus, and to eliminate government subsidies and hand-outs.

(a) Full parity support price on all feed grains and certain crops such as corn, soybeans, wheat, grain sorghums, barley, oats, rye, etc. This could apply to any crop or crops in any area.

Full parity being approximately \$1.75 for corn, \$3 for beans, \$2.40 for wheat, \$2.60 per hundredweight for grain sorghum, 87 cents per bushel for oats, \$1.33 per bushel for barley, \$1.57 per bushel for rye, etc.

Compulsory acreage allotments shall be established on all farms in the United States that produce any crop that has a price support. These allotments shall be given only to those farms having grown such crops in one or more of the past 3 years. These allotments shall be established for each crop on any farm by the following method:

A percentage of total tillable crop acre base shall be established for each crop in any area by using a 10-year land use history of that crop in its area.

The national need for each crop would be determined and a certain percentage would be deducted from, or added to, the land use history base of all areas. Each farm within its land use area would then have the same percentage of its tillable crop acres in any given crop, as every other farm in that area. This eliminates the unfairness that has always been present and helps, rather than hinders, the farmer that has been using good farming practices.

This system for allotting acres could be applied to any crop grown in the United States and would eliminate the shifting of overproduction of crops from one area to another.

The total allotted acres for any crop in the United States should be set low enough (without any floor on acres) to just produce our national and foreign needs, or even cut into the surplus, if it exists, for the next 2 or 3 years.

A 2 months' supply, or whatever deemed necessary, of these supported crops, should be established as a national reserve commodity to be used in case of emergency, such as war, drought, floods, etc.

The penalty for exceeding the acres shall be set at: Overage acres X average area yield X support price, with the option of destroying the overage acres of crop before harvest.

(b) Twenty percent, or whatever percentage deemed necessary, of the tillable crop acres of each farm having a crop allotment shall be put in a soil building program free of Government payment.

The penalty for not complying with the soil building part of this program shall be: The number of acres not in compliance X average area yield X support price of highest priced crop of that area.

(c) A levy of five cents per allotted acres to be used for new uses and better markets of all allotted farm crops.

(d) The last and probably the most important part of this program is to give the farmer a chance to vote on the type of program he most desires among the three general types (high price supports with compulsory allotments, flexible price supports with little or no allotments, or no farm program at all).

This program along with a ballot and a self-addressed stamped envelope was sent out to fourteen hundred farmers in Warren

County (tenants, landlords and farm managers who farmed, owned or managed fifteen acres or more), with the following results:

Four hundred sixty nine were voted and returned and counted at a public meeting; 48 percent voted for the high support compulsory acreage allotment or above program; 33 percent voted for the no program; 19 percent voted for the present program. This survey was taken in February 1958.

It was our hope that by developing a program and taking a survey that, we could determine what the farmers of Warren County really wanted in the way of a farm program. We felt that we were successful in that 35 percent of the ballots were voted and returned. The fact that 48 percent of the votes were for a program that has some teeth in it was also very significant because, this survey was taken in a county that has a very strong Farm Bureau organization (all but 2 of the 25 to 30 farmers who developed the program are Farm Bureau members) which is opposed to a high support, compulsory program.

A survey was also taken in Pike-Steuben Township Farm Bureau of Warren County. One hundred and sixty ballots were sent out, 64 or 40 percent were voted and returned with the following results: 13.9 percent voted for Farm Bureau program (support at 90 percent of average market price for last 3 years with no allotments); 67.4 percent for full parity with compulsory allotments; none for flexible price supports; 18.6 percent for no program at all.

It is our feeling that if this new program was adopted this would still be a big administrative job, but the total cost would be far less than storing huge quantities of grain year after year. The only way to solve the farm problem is to control production the same as every other business does that manufactures a product to sell.

The big thing that is bothering most farmers is the fact that they don't have the opportunity to vote to determine the type of farm programs they most desire. That, if nothing else, is something that certainly could be rectified.

The recent corn referendum was an example of sidestepping of the issues and was an insult to the intelligence of the average farmer. There was nothing on the ballot but a choice between an unworkable program and one that will make the situation even worse. I sat on the election board (corn referendum) and, of the few farmers that did vote, practically every one expressed his dissatisfaction in no uncertain terms.

WARREN COUNTY SURVEY GROUP.

George Christopher: He Served the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following fine editorial on our late colleague, the Honorable George H. Christopher, of Missouri, appeared in the January 30, 1959, edition of the Kansas City Daily News-Press:

GEORGE CHRISTOPHER: HE SERVED THE PEOPLE

It's hard to believe that Congressman George H. Christopher is gone. The leathery visaged Shakespeare quoting man of the soil served well the people he knew best—the

farmer and the working man who comprised the majority of his constituents.

Because farming is often a complicated business in this day and age, Congressman Christopher could also grasp the problems arising for the businessman, especially the small businessman.

As a Democrat he always found the time to lend his services and presence to any party group or gathering, no matter how large or how small. It was this common touch, this willingness to serve all the people and the party he represented, that endeared him to so many, and paved the way to victory for him when the chips were down.

Always a fighter, he overcame the handicap of an amputated leg to make a strong and successful bid for reelection.

In a way it was fitting that his life should end after passing the biblical mark of three score and ten, for he was a God-fearing man and knew the Good Book and lived by its principles.

For George Christopher the end came in the Capital City of the Nation he loved.

His body is now interred where his heart forever was—in Bates County, among the people he loved.

An Honor to a Great Wisconsin Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished editor, well-known throughout the country for his continued and outspoken efforts in the interest of the economic, political, and social welfare of the people, has now been honored for his dedicated service to, and perpetuation of, the ideals, heritage, and culture of Norway.

King Olav V of Norway has bestowed the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav upon William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times.

Mr. Evjue, in the progressive traditions which he saw grow under the personal guidance of the late Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., and his sons, and which he has nurtured through his persistent editorial leadership, is held in high regard by the people of the State of Wisconsin and the Nation for his dedicated opposition to the forces of concentrated wealth. Now he has received a highly deserved recognition for his fidelity to the heritage and culture of Norway, passed on to him by his parents who immigrated to Wisconsin from Norway. It is for this loyalty that King Olav V has conferred the rare honor upon this leading citizen of Wisconsin.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article describing in detail the honor conferred upon Mr. Evjue, which appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis.:

WILLIAM T. EVJUE AWARDED TOP HONOR BY NORWAY KING

William T. Evjue, 920 Castle place, editor and publisher of the Capital Times, has been

awarded the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav by King Olav V of Norway.

Evjue was notified of the award, given for furthering Norwegian ideals, heritage, and culture in this country, Tuesday in a letter from the Norwegian consul in Chicago, Ill., Helge Akre.

Evjue said Tuesday that he had been invited to receive the award and accompanying citation at the Norwegian consulate in Chicago at his convenience but had not decided when he would do so.

The award is the highest Norwegian honor which can be awarded to an American civilian. It includes the St. Olav Medal and a citation signed by the King.

No specific reasons for the award were cited in the letter of notification and Evjue said Tuesday that it came as a complete surprise to him. His intense interest in his Norwegian heritage and Norwegian-American activities in this country are well known, however.

The award will be the second time that Evjue has been honored by the Norwegian Government. During the early years of World War II, he was cited for his work as State chairman of the Norwegian Relief Committee which raised money to be sent to Norway for the relief of citizens of the war-stricken country.

Evjue becomes the third State resident to be given the St. Olav Medal. In 1940, Einar Haugen, chairman of the department of Scandinavian studies at the University of Wisconsin, was presented with the award after serving as a visiting professor at the University of Norway in 1938.

The late Gov. Albert G. Schmedeman also received the award during World War I for his service as U.S. Minister to Norway.

King Olav V, who conferred the honor upon Evjue, is no stranger to Madison. He visited here in 1939, while still Crown Prince, was awarded an honorary doctor of law degree by the university, addressed the legislature, and was entertained at the Madison club in a gala event by the late Gov. Julius Heil.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include the following letter which I recently received from Tullius Brady of Brookhaven, Miss.:

DEAR MR. JENSEN: Sir, I wish to thank you for your remarks of January 9, published on page A33 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is such a tragedy that there are so few of you, too few, I fear, to save us from destruction.

Sincerely,

TULLIUS BRADY.

P.S.—This, too, should be put in the RECORD, just to keep it straight that someone knew a long time ago this would happen.

Words of Webster in eulogy of George Washington, who said: "If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests."

"It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again! Like the Coliseum and Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and a melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."—Daniel Webster's Eulogy of Washington."

A Budget, "Political" and How

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members and the country at large will digest this editorial which appeared in the February 2 issue of Life magazine. The writer did a great service for our country in presenting this and I hope everyone reads it and understands it:

A BUDGET, "POLITICAL" AND HOW

The budget for fiscal 1960 which the President submitted last week is already the hottest issue between him and Congress. Democratic Senate Leader LYNDON JOHNSON immediately termed it a "propaganda budget" which was designed to "create a political issue for 1960." JOHNSON was grossly unfair to the President. Nevertheless the wily Texan said a mouthful.

If the Republicans stand with the President, and the Democrats behave in their normal spendthrift manner, the voting issue before the American people in 1960 will be clear and sharp. That issue will be the value of the dollar. The purpose of the President's budget is to protect the dollar. LYNDON JOHNSON and SAM RAYBURN will have to watch their step if they do not want to subvert the dollar, which is the first step to subverting the country. Any Congressman who does not actually favor inflation (or higher taxes) must either support this budget or try to cut in. Instead of which, leading Democrats are attacking it as too small, with epithets like "skinflint."

A "skinflint" budget? It is the largest peacetime budget in U.S. history. It is barely balanced (at \$77 billion) in a year which, in Ike's own words, is "expected to be the most prosperous of our history." It is as full of economic waste as the Nation can afford.

The men who made this budget assume an increase of more than \$30 billion in this year's gross national product, from which they figure to get \$9 billion more in Federal revenues at present tax rates. The men who made the budget achieve balance by cuts of \$3.8 billion below the current rate of spending. But so far from slashing any major Federal programs, they have merely

taken advantage of the expiration of certain nonrecurring expenses of fiscal fifty-nine, such as the soil bank, Federal unemployment payments, and the antirecession Housing Act. Our greatest economic scandal, farm subsidies, remains virtually untouched.

The Eisenhower budget meets all the basic civilian needs of a prosperous U.S. economy, with a big bet on continued expansion. It is a typically Republican bet, that a free economy will do its own expanding if Federal policy gives it half a chance. Democrats argue that this rich country can afford the many extra public services, from dams and public housing to subsidized consumption and easy money, for which any imaginative politician can pretend to hear a public demand. Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve, answers that argument with this question: "Since Americans clearly can afford these expenditures, why don't they pay for them?" The only way we can pay for more Government services than we are getting is through higher taxes. Either that—or inflation and ruination.

The Republicans think taxes are high enough now, if not too high. In his state of the Union message, Eisenhower declared his next objective after securing a balanced budget: a thorough revision of the tax structure, to remove inequities and to enhance incentives for all Americans. In short, a downward revision. In these fly-now-pay-later days, it may seem an old-fashioned order of business to deny ourselves public services now so as to have more real income later. But it is also the honest order. The tax revision Eisenhower promises depends on a stable dollar. A nation incapable of balancing its budget in the most prosperous years in its history would be a nation incapable of self-government.

Such are the issues raised by this Eisenhower budget. It makes fiscal integrity a political issue. Congressmen who support this budget will be doing the minimum necessary for a sound dollar. Congressmen who vote additions without voting equal cuts or new taxes must be deemed irresponsible. If Republicans and Democrats divide along that line, the Republican chances in 1960 will look very much better than in 1958.

The Most Brazen Attempt at Propaganda Ever Devised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times and other newspapers last week carried news accounts of an exhibit of Russian-made scientific equipment set up at meetings of the American Physical Society and the American Association of Physics Teachers at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City. The purpose of this exhibit was to promote the sale to American schools of such Soviet-made equipment as microscopes, electronic equipment, projectors, and other apparatus for use in our classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, in passing the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Congress declared:

The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands

that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of the Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques, development from complex scientific principles. It depends as well on the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge.

This act was designed to make appropriations of some \$70 million annually over a 4-year period to State education agencies for the acquisition of equipment to teach sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

It is a sobering challenge.

It must be met head on. We cannot afford to be second best in this educational race with Russia.

To meet it, we will need the best talents of American educators, the best talents of American manufacturers, and the enthusiastic cooperation of our schoolchildren and college students.

This is a project for the whole United States.

Its seriousness is shown by the fact that no sooner had the ink dried on this new law than the Russians began figuring ways to take advantage of it—for Russia.

And—in typical Red fashion—they've really moved right in on us. They want to show us how to teach our youngsters. They want to show us with made in Russia scientific equipment which they are anxious to sell to American school boards, State educational agencies, and colleges at a much lower cost than American-produced equipment.

This is the most brazen attempt at propaganda ever devised. The Russians hope to reach our youth during their most impressionable years. They hope to convince them—by setting up made in Russia equipment in our classrooms—that Russia is the world's No. 1 scientific power.

How can we convince our youngsters that America is the greatest of all nations—that our scientists are the world's best—that our manufacturers produce products that are the envy of the world—if we place Russian microscopes, electronic equipment, and other devices in their physics lab classes?

Sure, the Russian-made equipment is cheaper. Even with the heavy duty the Russians must pay their equipment can be sold at lower prices than American-made goods. Do I have to tell you why? The Russian equipment is made by slave labor or other workers in Government-run factories. In fact, I am sure that the Reds would be glad to provide these wonderful propaganda gimmicks for free if we would let them. They realize, of course, that to give it to us for free would make it a truly propaganda vehicle but by selling it to us they are bringing in this propaganda weapon under the guise of commercial business.

There is no question among the educators and scientists with whom I have talked that our equipment is far superior to the Russian equipment. But that is not the point. This is just another Russian move—another Russian big step—to propagandize us. We hope that American educators will have more sense than to fall for this obvious device.

A Bill To Impose a Tax Upon Savings and Loan Associations and Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a bill to equalize a taxpaying situation in our economy and at the same time provide revenue to the Federal Treasury, which is similar to the bill I introduced in the last Congress with the exception that I have deleted the portion that limited the amount savings and loan institutions could pay out in dividends and receive a tax credit.

The following is the same explanation I made of the bill at the time I originally introduced it. However, before setting it out I want to make it clear that my purpose in introducing a specific bill was and still is to have something specific for the Ways and Means Committee to consider. In suggesting that the 12 percent tax reserve fund be changed to 5 percent I am wedded to no figure. If hearings developed the fact that more than 5 percent is required I would be interested in using that figure. Certainly savings and loan and mutual banks are entitled to some differential which reflects their actual needs for reserve accounts to insure the safety of their investors. On the other hand, that figure should be realistic as should all differentials placed in our tax code. All differentials need periodic review lest through changed circumstances or merely through added experience we find that what we thought was a differential actually is a preferential.

I do not share the concern of certain people in the mutual bank and savings and loan field that equalizing the tax burden between savings institutions places a tax on thrift. Quite the contrary, it should encourage thrift by making the institutions which appeal to the people to save on a more equally competitive basis. The entire issue should be what will make the Federal tax laws neutral as between competitive thrift institutions. Differences between types of institutions should be reflected in the tax laws where the differences make a competitive difference. If the differential is too large it becomes a preference; if too small it becomes a burden. I want the amount of tax free credit funds to be neither a preference nor a burden. Two way of equalizing.

This bill would impose a tax upon savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. It is motivated by no lack of appreciation for the economic service being performed by these institutions. Quite the contrary. As a member of the board of directors for 17 years of the oldest savings and loan institution in Missouri, I am deeply concerned about

their economic welfare and want them to continue performing the service they do perform for our society. I am satisfied that placing them on a basis of nearer equality as opposed to preference, with other savings institutions will actually redound to their economic health. Wherever possible we should remove subsidies in our economy whether they are in the nature of direct subsidies or indirect subsidies through tax benefits or other devices.

Savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks were specifically exempt from the payment of Federal income taxes until 1951. In that year the Congress revoked their tax-exempt status and put them on a taxpaying basis. While this amendment was in the Senate, however, a provision was added which permits a savings and loan association or mutual savings bank to retain, as a deductible reserve for bad debts, any and all earnings as long as the reserves of the association do not exceed 12 percent of all withdrawable accounts. As a result of this provision, which was enacted into law, practically all savings and loan associations and most mutual savings banks are able to retain all their earned income without paying and Federal income tax thereon.

It was obviously the intent of the Congress, in removing the tax-exempt status of these organizations, to put them on a taxpaying basis. That intent was not fulfilled as a result of the tax formula which was adopted. The ineffectiveness of this formula is quite evident by comparing their reserves when the tax law was passed with those of a recent date. At the end of 1951 the capital structure of the members of the Home Loan Bank System—representing 95 percent of the assets of all associations—was 8.2 percent of their outstanding shares, which then totaled \$15,025,505,000. Earnings in 1951 were \$540,260,000. On December 31, 1955, with earnings of \$1,190,865,000, and outstanding shares of \$30.813 million—an increase of \$15,800 million—their capital structure was approximately 7.5 percent of outstanding shares. Thus, it is evident that after years of tremendous prosperity, they are getting no closer to being required to pay any Federal income tax.

Section 593(2) of the Internal Revenue Code should be amended so that it will no longer permit practically all savings and loan associations and most mutual savings banks to escape the payment of all income taxes. Since most State laws relating to State chartered building and loan associations provide for a reserve equal to from 3 to 5 percent of withdrawable accounts, it seems that a reserve of that amount would be adequate. At the present time the reserve of most commercial banks is less than 1 percent. In order, then, to put savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks on a taxpaying basis, the suggested bill provides that the amount of tax-free reserve funds that can be accumulated be limited to 5 percent instead of 12 percent of withdrawable accounts.

Russian Chrome Ore to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues are undoubtedly aware, a major U.S. producer of ferroalloys recently acquired 80,000 tons of Russian chrome ore. Commenting on this transaction, the E&MJ Metal and Mineral Markets, in their October 30, 1958, issue, stated that the United States has "no significant amount of chrome ore—it is clearly a have-not nation in this respect."

Mr. Speaker, it is true that chrome deposits in this country are not as large as those existing in several other countries. However, it is quite untrue to contend that the United States is a have-not nation with respect to chrome ore. Our present have-not position has nothing to do with a lack of deposits—it only results from the lack of a sound domestic mining program. It is for this reason that I have diligently worked for the enactment of such a program and am hopeful that one will be enacted promptly during the 86th Congress.

Commenting on the E&MJ Metal and Mineral Markets article, the November 1958 issue of the Ore-Bin, published by the Oregon State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, made some interesting statements which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues. Consequently, I ask permission to include this article in the Record:

RUSSIAN CHROME ORE TO UNITED STATES

The E & MJ Metal and Mineral Markets, issue of October 30, 1958, states:

"Russian chrome ore, 80,000 tons of it, is being acquired by a major U.S. producer of ferroalloys. The same firm bought perhaps a third as much last year. On both occasions a Canadian broker arranged the business.

"The transaction is probably better described as a barter arrangement. An amount of steel equal in value to the chrome ore is being taken by the Canadian broker for shipment to the U.S.S.R. A major U.S. steel manufacturer may have had more interests in arranging the transaction than the ore consumer. The steel company has probably assured the ferrochrome manufacturer it will take any of the ferro the latter cannot sell.

"Though the ore is scheduled to go to Canada, shipping arrangements for some of it may provide for alternative U.S. destinations. The ore is standard Russian ore—good grade but with considerable amount of fines.

"Doubtless chrome ore suppliers and their governments will express displeasure at acceptance by U.S. firms of Russian ore. Some Americans take the position that since the U.S. has no significant amount of chrome ore—it is clearly a have-not country in this respect, and chrome ore is an important product to the steel industry here, it is to the advantage of the United States to take all it can get from the U.S.S.R. It might appear that it conserves the limited Western supply. Turkish chrome ore representatives have been saying Turkish good grade ore is becoming scarcer and that what was

a few years ago considered only passable ore is now considered high grade; they suggest this will continue. They have claimed prices must rise because of this growing scarcity of good ore. In the past year Turkish asking prices have dropped very little in spite of the drastic drop in sales.

"The claim probably will be made the Russian sales are really calculated to destroy the western chrome ore industry. Some chrome ore suppliers point out that the U.S.S.R. was once a major supplier of chrome and manganese ore to the U.S. and some years ago stopped selling here—a part of the U.S.S.R.'s economic warfare. No one doubts the U.S.S.R. will engage in economic or any other form of warfare that suits its purpose. But there is no doubt it also has the more usual motive—to export in order to import.

"Since the U.S.S.R. is taking an equal value of steel, and since the steelmaker here appears to be as interested in the steel market as the ferromaker is in getting the ore, any claim of economic warfare may be hard to prove. Doubtless when negotiations were going on the sale of perhaps \$3.5 million of steel looked to be most beneficial to the U.S. economy and steel industry. Certainly U.S. firms can be expected to compete with the rest of the Western World in getting foreign business, including with Russia. They have been put to considerable disadvantage by the slowness with which the U.S. Government has implemented the COCOM agreements, announced August 15, to drop the Western embargo on the export of hundreds of products to the U.S.S.R.

"It is most impractical to export products to the Iron Curtain areas without importing from them; if U.S. firms are going to get a significant amount of that business they will have to import from them also."

How familiar these arguments sound to the West's mining industry. Following World War II we were characterized as a "have not" nation in various materials, including tungsten, petroleum, cobalt, columbium-tantalum, uranium, and quicksilver—to name a few. Now we have many of these commodities "running out of our ears." That "have not" is a matter of price has been demonstrated time and again.

Another slant on the subject is furnished by the Wall Street Journal in its commodity letter of November 18, 1958. Here pitfalls of trading with Russia are touched upon. Sales of aluminum and platinum have been carefully timed by Russia to disrupt the markets, according to U.S. producers. Russia trades arms for cotton and then dumps the cotton on world markets. Now it is rumored that Russia plans to dump Chinese tea.

Perhaps the barter of American steel for Russian chrome, as described above, benefits the steel producer in this instance, but such a deal puts another nail in the coffin of the domestic chrome industry and therefore is difficult to reconcile with the common good.

The Institute of International Education Presents an Award for Distinguished Service to the People of Burns, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday evening, January 30, at a dinner at the Mayflower Hotel in Wash-

ington, D.C., the Institute of International Education celebrated its 40th birthday anniversary. The highlight of the event was the granting of awards to organizations, institutions, and individuals that have made unusual contributions to the understanding among nations.

Among the recipients chosen by the institute is the town of Burns, Kans. This award is granted because of the unusual service of the town of Burns, Kans., in developing international understanding. The award was made by Vice President Nixon. Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Grimwood, of Burns, accepted the award. It is an honor to include in the RECORD the citation as well as the reply of Mrs. Grimwood. The town of Burns is in the Fourth District of Kansas. Mr. and Mrs. Grimwood are among its leading citizens:

CITATION FOR A U.S. COMMUNITY

To the people of Burns, Kans., who have created a home away from home for foreign students from all parts of the world, the Institute of International Education presents its award for distinguished service.

In the midst of farmlands and oilfields, isolated from the stream of world traffic, this town of 310 people has proved that international exchange is not the sole privilege of metropolitan cities. Since 1954, young men and women of very race, creed and color have been welcomed into the homes of the Burns farmer, the cabinetmaker, the minister, the businessman and the teacher. A foreign student aptly characterized the distinctive character of the town when he said, "Burns is on the way to and from everywhere."

The Burns program, organized by the Women's Society of the Methodist Church, began on Thanksgiving, 1954. The first foreign visitors were 10 students from the University of Kansas, 140 miles away. Not only did they return, but they brought with them friends from campuses across the country. They came on Christmas, New Year's, Mother's Day, Easter, the Fourth of July, and during the summer—just as American students come home for college vacations.

In 5 years 77 students from 37 countries—Hindus, Moslems, Christians and Buddhists—have come to Burns, not once but many times. If the city of Washington, with a population of 800,000, had opened its homes on a comparable scale, we would have had 192,000 guests from abroad here during that time. As one overseas guest said, "Burns is the smallest U.S. community with the biggest foreign diplomatic service in the world."

The students came back to Burns because they did not feel like visitors. They had gained the feeling of belonging to a family—a rare gift to any man or woman thousands of miles from his own country. These students have become a part of the life of Burns. They drive combines and tractors in the wheat fields, milk cows in local dairies, help to cook meals and dress the children, and some even teach Sunday-school classes. They have shared the joys and sorrows of this small town, taking part in its weddings, baptisms, and funerals.

One foreign student on her return home described the impact of her Burns experience: "When I close my eyes a little bit I see the Grimwood house with the chain of Christmas lights in front, and my look wanders around: I see Burns Plaza, the Methodist and Catholic churches, the Nelson's, the Lohrentz's, the Funke's and Notz's, the Brenzikofer's, the Warkentine's, and all the other houses and farms. And it is good to know

that you are all there instead of in a big city, where life and people are changing so terribly fast. I see you picking up your mail at the post office—there must be a lot of foreign mail—and going to the grocery and filling station. Really, I haven't lost a bit of all this, because they are my most and best cherished memories. It is a great accomplishment, what you have done. We never can pay back all of you. It never can be compared with the organized dinners and club and church meetings where in the long run a foreign student felt a little bit like a peacock in a zoo. You gave us part of you, by sharing your everyday life with us."

To the citizens of Burns, the descendants of pioneers, who have understood so well that friendship is not a gesture but a real sharing of everyday life, the Institute of International Education presents its distinguished service award.

The award will be accepted by Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Grimwood of Burns, Kans.

RESPONSE OF MRS. E. D. GRIMWOOD

This evening you have presented to our community of Burns the highest honor which can be received by a group of citizens active in extending hospitality to students from other lands.

As we accept this citation we would like to share it with other Kansas communities which have taken an active part in the student exchange program.

We feel that the award is not limited to Kansans, but it is being shared by the many students who have been in our homes, students who are now living in many areas throughout the world. Above all, we would mention the first 10 foreign students who came to Burns. Not only were they at home with us, but they made us feel at home with them. They encouraged the participating families with the warmth of their response to our hospitality and with many letters of appreciation which followed their first visit to Burns.

One of the first letters which we received was from an Italian school teacher who said, "When I come back to Italy and I will speak about America, I always think Burns, and I am sure all my friends will like Burns. I can never forget the lesson, wonderful lesson, that you gave me: You invited in your home the Catholic priest and the Methodist minister, and they looked very well together. This one, for us intolerant European and Asiatic people, was the best lesson of tolerance."

One of the six students who spent Christmas Eve 1954 in Burns said it was impossible to be homesick when she went to church and recognized the postmaster and his assistant, a rancher in whose home she had been a guest, her host's baby sitter and she even knew the priest.

It is not unusual for a Burmese to see his first snowfall in Burns; a German lawyer to assist his host in cutting fireplace wood; a doctor in economics from Pakistan and a Venezuelan engineer to freeze ice cream for a party; a Methodist host to be welcomed as a visitor in the Mennonite church with his guest—a Quaker from Kenya; or for a Swiss student to take her fellow Europeans to town to meet her friend, Mr. Hammann, the harness maker.

Families who have been hosts to students, other than those named in the citation, are the Don Parrishes, Mark Millers, Fred Oiberdings, James Benjamins, and Rev. Robert Peters.

Tuesday, just before our departure for Washington, a Burns hostess shared with me a letter which she had just received. It was written by a Japanese teacher who, together with her husband, had visited our community for the only time less than 2 months ago. She wrote: "Thank you so much for your letter which made me homesick for

Burns. How I wish to visit your home again (before I leave for Japan) but since things are so rushing it looks very doubtful. I hope you will write me and tell me all about your lovely home and about life in Burns so that I can remember Burns as if I visited there often."

We, in Burns, have made no new discovery . . . but we have experienced an age-old reality: When people can live together in the atmosphere of a home there are no barriers of race, creed or nationality. One of our students wrote from Switzerland this Christmas: "This sharing of your everyday life with us is certainly one of the finest accomplishments in a foreign students program. I wish some Russians could come some day and experience the same. And many more of them" . . . then we would not need to be afraid of a war."

Our hands are small . . . because they are few. But, when linked with God's hand they have become big and we have been thrilled to share in a bit of His plan for world peace.

If we could be granted one prayer this evening it would be that many additional communities the size of Burns, Kans., would also share in this plan which could eventually bring peace to our world.

Mr. Vice President, to you and to the Institute of International Education, we say, "Thank you, from the depths of our hearts."

St. Louis Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men Opposes Recognition of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles J. Malloy, social action chairman of the St. Louis Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men, has forwarded to me a resolution adopted by the council, and also by the National Council of Catholic Men, dealing with the question of recognition of Red China. I think this merits the attention of the House and I am submitting it for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Most Rev. Joseph E. Ritter, S.T.D., is episcopal chairman of the St. Louis Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men. J. Stuart MacLellan is president. The Rev. Clarence D. White is spiritual moderator, and the Rev. John P. Cradick is assistant spiritual moderator.

The resolution referred to, as adopted by the executive committee of the National Council of Catholic Men and also by the St. Louis Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men, is as follows:

OPPOSING RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

We have noted in recent days that certain groups and individuals have expressed favorable policies and opinions in regard to the recognition of Red China by the United States and the admission of Red China to the UN.

The National Council of Catholic Men wishes to record once again its strong opposition to such recognition and admission of Red China. It also opposes any steps which might lead in this direction.

The passing of time has only served to underscore again and again that Red China by its policies and action is opposed to the principles of the United Nations and the United States.

Sophisticated technicalities and secular philosophies cannot be used to rationalize the facts of international life as related to Red China.

These facts are known to the people of the United States.

War, religious, and secular persecution, the violation of human rights are not credentials acceptable for recognition by either the UN or the United States.

We respectfully call upon the Congress of the United States to reaffirm the joint resolution of the 84th Congress on this matter.

We Bitterly Oppose Raise in Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, since the new budget recommendations were made 2 weeks ago, there has been considerable publicity in the press concerning the proposal to raise the Federal tax on gasoline in order to meet the mounting costs of the Federal highway program.

When this program was before the Congress several years ago, I opposed it because I felt at that time, and still feel, that this would be just another example of Federal assumption of power in the States and that it would ultimately cost the American people far more than its supporters led us to believe. I believe that roadbuilding, like so many other things, can best be handled by the States and I am opposed to raising gasoline taxes further.

Typical of the objections I have had brought to my attention is that contained in a fine editorial in the Hopewell News of Hopewell, Va., edited by Mr. A. Robbins, Jr.

Mr. Robbins is a sound believer in States rights and in the necessity of maintaining a strong fiscal economy. He advocates a commonsense approach to the problems of our people and is a firm believer in self-reliance rather than the present-day tendency to run to the Federal Government to meet our needs. I wholeheartedly concur in his feelings.

Given the situation we now face, I feel the suggestions he makes are worthy of attention and I would like to include the editorial herein with my remarks:

WE BITTERLY OPPOSE RAISE IN FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX

There was one item in the President's budget message with which we violently disagree. That was his proposal to increase the Federal tax on gasoline by 1½ cents.

This has no bearing on balancing the budget, because the money would go into the separate fund being used to construct the huge new System of Interstate Highways.

Due in considerable measure to the hard work of our own Senator HARRY F. BYRD this new highway system was set up sepa-

rately, outside the Federal budget, supposedly on a pay-as-you-go basis. It had the Federal taxes on gasoline, oils, tires, etc., assigned to it and this was supposed to pay the Federal Government's share of the system.

But, due to rising costs, the special highway fund is going into the red during the next fiscal year, if construction continues at the present rate. So the President calls upon the Congress to raise the Federal gasoline tax from 3 to 4½ cents per gallon.

ANOTHER SIDE

There is another side to the coin, of which we here in Virginia are very conscious. In spite of the fact that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads is supposed to pay 90 percent of the cost of these interstate super-highways, the extra costs to the various State highway departments, above the actual 10 percent of the construction costs, have put such a burden on many of them that they are going into the red, if they meet all the Federal matching terms and still keep up their own primary and secondary highways.

The Virginia Highway Department estimates that it will need an additional \$25 million in the next tax years if it is to continue to match the Federal interstate highway money and meet all of its other obligations on our primary and secondary highways.

Governor Almond has hinted that it might be necessary to ask the next general assembly to increase the Virginia gasoline tax 1 or 1½ cents per gallon to meet this situation.

If the Federal tax went to 4½ cents and the State tax to 7½ cents, that would make a total tax load of 12 cents on every gallon of gasoline that we burn. That is too much. It is not fair to the average motorists to force them to pay such a high tax on gasoline.

As we have stated before, we would rather see the Virginia tax hiked one penny, if that is necessary to take care of the pressing needs of our State highway department, than to see the Federal tax increased at all. As a matter of fact we have always felt that the Federal Government should have left the taxing of gasoline entirely to the States.

ONE SOLUTION

In any event, there is apparently only one solution to this situation, without raising taxes and that is to spread out the Federal Interstate highway program over a longer period of years.

Even then, it might be necessary to increase the State tax on gasoline 1 cent per gallon. We would oppose any greater increase and we bitterly oppose any increase in the Federal tax.

If you think as we do, that speeding up this huge Federal program is not worth paying more Federal gasoline tax for, then we urge you to write to our Representative and our Senators:

Representative WATKINS M. ABBITT, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

And if you feel strongly about it also write to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, The White House, Washington, D.C. He won't see the letter, but if enough protests descend on The White House it will make an impression.

We feel that the automobile has been made the goat for taxes long enough. When you buy a new car there are a minimum of some \$600 in Federal taxes in the purchase price. And the Federal Government goes right ahead taxing tires, oil, gasoline, etc. Then we have the State gasoline taxes, license plates, drivers license, property tax, etc.

It is time that automobile owners put a stop to it. We don't think that a few years delay in completing the huge new Federal Interstate Highways is going to hurt anything. It won't affect most of us one way or the other. But if they put another increase on the gas tax you know very well we'll never get rid of it.

The Balanced Budget—Administration's Answer to Soviet ICBM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent article appeared in the Friday, January 9, 1959, issue of the Kansas City-St. Joseph Register:

THE BALANCED BUDGET—ADMINISTRATION'S ANSWER TO SOVIET ICBM

(By Norma Krause Herzfeld)

In spite of sputniks and congressional pressures and various reports and cries of mortal danger, President Eisenhower continues to be more interested in achieving a balanced budget than in providing adequate military defenses against Russian armed might. The public has long since been shut out of the great debate on U.S. military security, and secrecy and deliberate misrepresentation have made it increasingly difficult for the press to dig up the facts.

Nevertheless, it is quite possible, according to all available indications, that the United States has already lost the cold war. And if it hasn't already lost it, and no drastic changes are made in the present go-slow, little-bit-of-everything, business-as-usual defense policies, the United States seems bent on losing it in the next few years.

Those who take this grim view are contemptuously tagged "Cassandras" and hooted down as prophets of gloom and doom. There is little they can do to prove their case because, although the cold war can be lost today, the unthinkable tragic results will not show up for 5 or 10 years. In the meantime, life goes comfortably on.

The first and most obvious indication of inadequacy, of course, comes in the amount of money spent on defenses. The U.S. defense budget was cut from \$43.7 billion in 1953 to \$38.5 billion by 1957. The same week Russia's sputnik hit the skies, Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson held his farewell press conference and expressed satisfaction that all the economies he had effected would achieve his aim of a \$38-billion defense budget. Congress, too, indulged in a budget-cutting orgy in 1957.

But although the administration was able to sit on information on Soviet H-bomb developments and air capabilities, and attempted to quash reports of successful Soviet ICBM tests, it was not able to hide sputniks from the American people. The sputniks, which they could see quite plainly at stated intervals, alarmed them.

The administration set out to reassure them, with the President planning a series of speeches, characteristically of the "chins up" rather than the "chips down" variety. After only two of these vague speeches, the President had a stroke and the whole project was quietly dropped. But a couple of tiny Explorer satellites and even a Vanguard satellite aloft seem to have convinced most Americans that things were all right after all. The only indications that they are still

beset with some deep fears and suspicions have been the elections, when to be a Republican has been the kiss of death.

The top-secret Gaither report, which was turned in to the administration in November 1957, gave a more-than-grim picture of U.S. defenses vis-a-vis Russia, according to all reliable stories concerning it. It recommended that defense spending be increased from the then current \$38.5 billion by \$8 billion annually, to a total of \$46.5 billion a year. It also recommended that another \$5 billion be spent annually on civil-defense shelters, up to a total of \$22 billion. The subsequent Rockefeller report recommended substantial increases in defense spending, running to at least \$3 billion more annually until 1965.

Almost all the non-Pentagon witnesses at the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee hearings which ended last January declared that the U.S. defense effort was too little, too slow, and certainly needed a bigger budget. At a follow-up hearing of the Senate subcommittee in July, Pentagon officials admitted that the United States has no defense or even any prospect of defense against Soviet ICBMs; that the United States can't even move one fully equipped combat division overseas by airlift; that there has been no increase in aircraft deliveries.

In the meantime Gen. James Gavin, Army Chief of Research and Development, who had told the subcommittee that he had "watched the deterioration of our military forces with increased concern," was hounded out of his job for talking too frankly. Trevor Gardner, a similarly frustrated victim of administration defense policy, had resigned in 1956 as Assistant Air Force Secretary to protest the slow pace of U.S. missile development.

These voices were joined with those of other "Cassandras," including Senators SYMINGTON and KENNEDY, former Air Force Secretary Thomas Finletter, the journalistic team of Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and a handful of newspapers and magazines.

The administration has ballyhooed such diversions as non-stop jet tanker flights and atomic sub journeys under the Polar icecap, and has even gone so far as to vastly exaggerate the significance of the recent Atlas satellite success in relation to Russian achievements. But the fact remains that the current defense budget is only \$40.8 billion, and the administration would like to cut that.

If one makes allowances for inflation and the phenomenon of dollar depreciation in procurement and research, which could increase all costs by possibly 3 percent annually, the defense budget needs an increase of approximately \$1 billion annually just to keep it where it was in 1957 when it had been pared to the bone.

Senator SYMINGTON pointed out to Defense Secretary McElroy last July that "the total amount of money that has been asked for since the first sputnik on October 4, for acceleration over previous programs is a great deal less than the depreciation in the value of the dollar in the same period."

With regard to U.S. limited-war power, the administration is currently slashing military manpower by 75,000, bringing the Armed Forces down to their pre-Korean war level. The Army needs a \$15-billion modernization program, mostly outside its present budget.

The token landings in Lebanon last summer strained the whole U.S. airlift system and took too long to accomplish. Arabs, at first shocked, were later amused by some of the obsolete equipment U.S. troops carried.

As to major war capabilities, the deterrent power of the Strategic Air Command is growing weaker rather than stronger. The administration has refused to speed up vital Polaris and Minuteman missile programs

and has frozen funds voted by Congress for this. Many experts now predict a "gap" in U.S. defenses from 1960 until 1963 or later, when Soviet capabilities for nuclear attack will far outstrip U.S. defenses and retaliatory power, leaving the U.S. completely vulnerable not only to political and economic blackmail but military disaster.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON queried Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, last July about this gap. "Are you satisfied," he asked, "that we will have adequate countermeasures by the time the Soviet missile capability reaches its height?" Twining replied, "Well, we hope so. I wouldn't want to say 'Yes' to that one."

Nevertheless, the Budget Bureau remains the top-priority U.S. weapon and it gave orders for 1960 budget makers in defense, as well as in every other Government program, to cut spending. President Eisenhower continues to remain the captive of the balanced-budget-above-all-else philosophy of his former Treasury Secretary George Humphrey.

When the sputniks made their appearance, Humphrey, in contrast to most other administration officials admitted that they were a "real danger." What he meant by "danger," however, was that the American public might get excited about them and demand more action to keep up with Russia, regardless of the cost.

Above all the administration ballyhoo, two things stand out:

1. Most experienced and savvy observers here, expert in their particular fields in the Government, say privately that the United States is not doing enough in these respective fields to overtake or to keep ahead of the Russians.

2. The American people are being told on the highest authority that the United States cannot afford to spend more money in all these fields without going bankrupt.

If both of these things are true, we have already lost the cold war.

Federal Excise Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE BROCK

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 11

Whereas since the enactment in 1919 of the first State gasoline tax, this levy has been historically and rightfully a State tax, and

Whereas the gasoline tax has traditionally provided the major portion of the funds needed by the States to construct and maintain their highway systems, and

Whereas in 1932, the Federal Government also imposed an excise tax on gasoline, as a temporary, emergency, revenue-producing measure, and

Whereas the expressed, and reaffirmed, intent of Congress to vacate this tax field has not been carried out, and

Whereas instead, the original Federal excise on gasoline has been continued and increased by 200 percent, and

Whereas the mounting Federal tax on this product threatens to preempt this legitimate tax source belonging by priority and equity to the States, and

Whereas further increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate would lead to serious restriction upon the ability of the States to

secure funds for needed highway improvements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled:

1. That the 69th session of the Nebraska Legislature does respectfully record its opposition to any further increase in the present Federal excise tax on gasoline.

2. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the office of the President of the United States and to the Members of the House of Representatives and of the U.S. Senate from Nebraska, and to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate.

DWIGHT W. BURNET,
President of the Legislature.
HUGO F. SAE,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Poison in Your Water—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Record an article from the Twin Falls, Idaho, Times-News describing the situation in the Columbia, Snake, and Yakima River Basins to show that poison, pollution, and filth in our waters is not limited to any one part of the country. This is just one more reason for a vigorous Federal program to clean up the lakes and streams and waters of our beloved country:

WASHINGTON AREA TOLD COLUMBIA RIVER CONTAMINATED, BUT SNAKE RIVER WORSE

PASCO, WASH., July 16.—The water wonderland of the Tri-City area is "buggy."

Benton-Franklin district health officers don't want to cause people to shun the rivers but they can't declare them safe for swimming.

The Columbia is contaminated; the Snake is worse; and the Yakima is worse still. The degree of contamination fluctuates daily and according to seasons, the condition of the sewage treatment plants, and other factors.

A 6 weeks' survey to check bacteria count in the Columbia is under way by the health department. The check will show the population of potential disease-causing organisms in the water.

Dr. Vernon Michael, district health officer, stated a great deal of sewage flows into the river despite sewage disposal plants, plus industrial pollution and bacteria from other sources.

For instance, the sewage disposal plants of Richland, Kennewick and Pasco all meet requirements but they have different degrees to proficiency. Kennewick and Pasco plants give primary treatment and Richland a more complete treatment of the effluence. But in all plants a certain amount of bacteria is carried into the river despite chlorination. The amount varies.

Columbia River water always contains this bacteria. The extent of diffusion depends on the amount of it, riverflow and certain other factors such as lagoons, etc.

Dudley Beall, sanitarian, said today the Yakima River is polluted with animal refuse, sewage and perhaps conditions outside the health district jurisdiction.

The Snake River contains more bacteria than the Columbia. This is believed due to animal refuse.

Dr. Michael said the 6 weeks test will determine bacteria count and try to find its sources. He added that many known germs come from runoff and sewage. Sometimes raw sewage flows into the river when a treatment plant breaks down, he stated.

"Because of these facts it is difficult to judge the pollution of the river from day to day," Dr. Michael said.

More and more people are using the rivers. Beaches and parks are being formed. The health department doesn't want to be a killjoy but the fact is that the river just isn't safe for swimming.

Some may swim for years and not be affected because of immunity, health, amount of water ingested. Others may get sick right away. Principal diseases would be intestinal such as dysentery.

The health department says: "They're swimming at their own risk. We feel the river is more contaminated today than ever."

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had an opportunity, along with a number of my colleagues, to discuss the problem of management of the public debt with Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Anderson.

Naturally, the subject of inflationary pressures played a prominent part in our discussion. At that time, I expressed the opinion that the United States, wealthiest country in the world today, should not place itself in an economic strait-jacket because of fear of inflation.

For this reason, I include two amusing, but penetrating columns, the first of which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on January 26, 1959.

The second column was included in the January 29 edition of the Washington Evening Star.

[From the Boston Daily Globe, Jan. 26, 1959]

THE QUEEN TELLS ALICE ABOUT INFLATION

(By John Harriman)

Bugbear: A kind of imaginary goblin or specter, used to excite needless fear, as in children.

"Well," said Alice, "I've never been able to understand all this talk about inflation we've been hearing lately. What is it anyway?"

The Queen of Hearts smiled tolerantly. "Inflation, my dear child, is too much money chasing too few goods, and this makes prices go up."

"Oh," said Alice, as the Mad Hatter laughed in a kind of growling way in his throat. He, you see, being a sort of an economist, knew better.

WHY THE MAD HATTER LAUGHED

From where the Mad Hatter was standing he could see all the great factories of Wonderland—not going full blast as the Mad Hatter would have liked to see them, but rumbling along with plenty of idle capacity to spare. Really, the Queen of Hearts is quite an idiot, he thought.

But the Queen of Hearts was not quite as stupid as she seemed and after a quick

glance at the Mad Hatter's sneering countenance she went on: "Of course, child, there is another kind of inflation, or really two other kinds," she added lightly. "The push kind, which occurs when naughty labor leaders push up wages faster than productivity and then the kind that comes when the big companies of Wonderland raise prices because they are in a position to administer them."

"Is that second kind naughty too?" asked Alice.

"Certainly not," cried the Queen. "Big companies are never, never naughty. You ought to know that, child."

"Oh," said Alice meekly. She was very confused (and the Mad Hatter could see this, and he felt deeply for her). "But tell me, dear Queen. All the stocks you have bought for me; they have gone up a lot, haven't they?"

"They have. And they will go up further child and make you rich."

"Why?" asked Alice.

"Because we are having inflation; an inflation caused at the moment by the wage demands of wicked labor leaders."

"What I don't see," said Alice, screwing up her nose and frowning, "is why labor leaders are wicked or naughty if they are making me rich."

At this the Mad Hatter gave a great shout and threw himself on the ground, grasping his sides and rolling about with laughter. (Remember that he wasn't a regular economist and all the regular economists mistrusted him for his irreverence in never agreeing with them.)

THE QUEEN FINALLY MAKES HER POINT

"Child, pay attention to me—not that idiot," exclaimed the Queen. "You've missed the point. You own stocks because we're in an inflationary age, and nobody owns bonds and everybody owns stocks in an inflationary age. And besides, stocks can make you rich. Don't you want to be rich?"

"Of course," said Alice, simply, still staring at the Mad Hatter and wondering what on earth had got into him. "But, well just suppose that we aren't in an inflation—"

"Really, child," the Queen burst out. "If we weren't in an inflationary age, there would be no point in owning stocks, so we've got to be in an inflationary age. Can't you get that through your head?"

"Yes; I think I understand now," Alice replied thoughtfully.

"Well, it's about time," said the Queen. "You don't want to be ruined by inflation, do you?"

"Oh, no," said Alice.

The Mad Hatter was crying.

The Government of Wonderland announced on Friday that the cost-of-living index last month declined slightly to the level of last June—lower prices on food, automobiles, and clothing.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 29, 1959]

MILTON BERLE EXPLAINS INFLATION

(By Sylvia Porter)

Milton Berle was having a lot of fun with President Eisenhower's \$77 billion budget on his TV show recently. Suddenly, during his monologue came this:

"Inflation? That means your money today won't buy as much as it would have during the depression when you didn't have any."

My family howled—and I ran for pencil and paper to write it down. For he had put into focus a basic aspect of our country.

Why hasn't there been a great outcry against rising prices, swelling public support for measures that really would stop the wage-price spiral? Why don't average Americans feel as strongly as, say, former President Herbert Hoover that inflation is the most monstrous economic evil there is?

Why has grumbling about price rises not been translated into a crusade for price stability or at least, buyers' resistance?

Why is it that most union members are utterly unmoved when the experts try to explain that a \$10 pay rise doesn't mean anything if the cost of living goes up \$10 at the same time?

ANSWERS ARE OFFERED

The answer to the "why" lies behind Berle's wisecrack. Listen to what I heard as I checked the response to the remark.

From the head of a big Wall Street financial house—a millionaire thoroughly aware of what dollar fluctuation means:

"Oh, that's a beauty. I wish I'd heard him say it. Yes, in the thirties, I could have bought four suits for what one costs today, and I could have had a mansion in the suburbs for the asking. But I didn't buy the four suits and I didn't take over the mansion because I didn't have the courage to splurge. I won't say it in public, but I'll say it to you if you don't identify me. While I think what has been happening to the dollar is terrible, I personally am better off than I ever dreamed I'd be, and so is my family. I wouldn't turn the clock back for anything."

From a middle-aged housewife who lives with her husband, a junior executive in a New York commercial firm, in a small apartment near my home:

"I've always lived in this neighborhood, and I remember passing by the grocery once—it must have been in 1938 or 1939—and seeing the whole window filled with eggs. On impulse, I wanted to go in and buy up the whole display, but Jim's pay had just been cut 10 percent, we were trying to live on \$32.50 a week, and both kids were in high school and, well, I just stood and stared into the window. Now I buy in that grocery every day and I buy whatever I want. I don't like rising prices, but I'd rather pay more and have the money to buy than see prices cheaper and be worried again."

WIDOW NOT BADLY OFF

From an active member of the newspaper union in my office:

"Ha, I heard that show and I laughed, too. What does it mean to me? Well, during the depression I didn't have any money, so it didn't matter to me what things cost, because I couldn't buy them. Now my money buys less, but I have the money. Better off? Sure, I am. Did the union help? Of course it did, and I'm all for it."

From a widow, a friend of my mother's, who's living on insurance, social security, and income from a small investment portfolio:

"That's cute, and I know what he means. When Steve worked it out so I'd get \$250 a month from insurance I thought I'd live comfortably forever after. That dream is busted. But you know what's making up for it? My social security. And I've been making money on my stocks. I'm complaining, but I'm really not so badly off. Honestly."

Not until the majority of Americans feel they're being more hurt than helped by rising levels of wages and prices will the cry come, "Halt!"

Persistent Unemployment Needs Congress Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the serious problem of perma-

nent unemployment for millions of American workers is receiving considerable attention from well-informed writers and experts on social and economic questions.

In my own State and in my own district the plight of these unemployed and their families conflicts sharply with the President and White House theorists who continue to say that all is well and 1959 will be more prosperous than ever before.

I cannot agree with those who see a float of unemployment as necessary for their so-called better business climate. Nor can I understand the callous disregard of administration leaders for the intense human suffering that this condition breeds.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial writer of the Reading Times illustrates how increased productivity and automation permits record-breaking output with fewer and fewer workers.

He points to the responsibility of Congress to face this problem with positive action in calling for the enactment of the area redevelopment bill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith this editorial from last Saturday's issue of the Reading (Pa.) Times:

PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT NEEDS CONGRESS' ACTION

Writing in the New York Times last Sunday, A. H. Raskin, the Times' expert on labor and related subjects, had a most depressing story to tell.

In an article that was obviously well documented and written only after a tremendous volume of research, Mr. Raskin said in his leading paragraph: "Some of the country's major mass production centers are haunted by the prospect of permanent pools of jobless workers as a carryover from the recession."

The article, which was based on a survey by Times correspondents in 16 big industrial cities, stated that Detroit, the capital of the huge automobile industry has one-eighth of its work force idle at a time when the output of 1959 cars is climbing toward its peak. The steel and coal center, Pittsburgh, has twice as many unemployed as it had in the recession month of January 1958. In New York, 1 worker in every 13 is still jobless.

The article then presents a paradox: "Few of the areas surveyed appeared to be returning to normal in job opportunities with anything like the same speed they had exhibited in moving back toward full production."

Mr. Raskin and the men who gathered his material for him find several reasons for this. One is automation, in which machines take the place of men. Another is the decentralization of production. (More and more work is being shifted to assembly plants away from Detroit; more and more steel is being poured in mills away from Pittsburgh. The transfer in military emphasis from tanks to electronic devices, from aircraft to guided missiles, has caused a substantial reduction in requirements for industrial employment on defense programs.)

This is happening, the article states, in 16 big industrial cities. Can anyone believe it is not also happening in scores of smaller cities throughout the country? No one can so believe if he knows anything at all about what has happened to the basic textile industry—the manufacture of cotton, woolen, and synthetic cloth—in New England, for the aforesaid and for other reasons. Look at New Bedford. Look at Fall River. Look at Providence. Look at Biddeford-Sacco. Look at many another basic textile town. They are not ghost towns but they are the industrial

and economic skeletons of what they were a dozen years or so ago.

Look at what is happening just to the north of us, in Schuylkill, Luzerne, and Lackawanna Counties, the anthracite heart of America. There are also industrial ills, leading to great unemployment, in certain bituminous areas. Accordingly, we may be permitted to believe that many small and medium-sized cities are hit in proportion to the big 16 the Times writes about.

What to do? Well, President Eisenhower, just a few days before the election last November 4, vetoed an area redevelopment bill which would have placed millions of dollars at the disposal of areas which need to attract new plants in order to approach full employment. We said at the time that we believed that the veto was economically and socially unjustified.

On Tuesday Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, introduced another such bill, calling for a fund of nearly \$400 million in loans and grants from the Federal Government, for redevelopment purposes. We believe, in view of the Times' abundant documentation of the need for redevelopment, the need for many more jobs than now appear in the offing, that Senator DOUGLAS' bill should be passed without delay, as the previous bill was passed and that if Mr. Eisenhower once more vetoes it, it should be passed over his veto.

The States Are Something, Still

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, some months ago a constituent stopped me on the street back home and asked, "Don't the States have any rights any more?"

The question, and its implied protest, is, in my judgment, becoming increasingly pertinent and crucial. Moreover, it has a significant and most revealing historical precedent.

Back in 1867, as an aftermath of the tragic Civil War and as a part of the equally tragic Reconstruction era controversy, U.S. Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, was advocating consolidation of virtually all governmental powers in the National—that is, Federal—Government.

It is worth noting that his motive was to establish through the whole country absolute equality of civil and political rights.

Regarding Sumner's views, his biographer, Edward L. Pierce, writing in 1893, said:

Thoughtful students of the American system recognized, even at that period when national power was being pressed to its utmost verge in the interest of freedom, that Sumner's conception was one-sided. He admitted indeed the place of States in our system, as supplying opportunities for education and meeting local wants; but he treated them as conveniences rather than essential organs of national life, and his conception reduced them almost to the level of counties and towns—as if States, with equal representation in the Senate and with jurisdictions guarded by the Constitution against national interference, bore any real analogy to the municipal divisions of a State, which are useful for local administration but absolutely

subject, as to their sphere and even as to their existence, to legislative power.

Commenting on Sumner's views his own colleague from Massachusetts, Senator Henry Wilson, remarked critically after Sumner had lectured in Boston, "The States are something, still."

Today I wonder just how much longer Senator Wilson's statement can be made truthfully and accurately.

Item: Increasingly the Federal Government is establishing itself as the agency for "supplying opportunities for education and meeting local wants."

Item: Continually, and in more and more fields, States are finding their authority to legislate either sharply curtailed or specifically banned by decree of the U.S. Supreme Court. While the integration decision is the most spectacular and presently the most disturbing example, it is only one.

Item: Openly even Members of Congress are urging that there is every reason to use—the Federal tax system—in preference to State and local systems where the choice exists—which means progressive centralization and federalization of the tax-levying and revenue-dispensing function of Government.

Item: Recently a distinguished Federal judge—not from Michigan—confessed to me that the practical meaning of the 10th amendment—supposedly reserving broad and vital powers to the States—is becoming increasingly obscure and uncertain, a situation which he deplored.

Item: More and more it seems to me—as I stated this week on the floor of the House—we face the possible supreme irony and tragedy that, under the guise of creating alleged social rights, we will so centralize Government, so nullify the 10th amendment, and so weaken the responsibility, rights and powers of the States that the security of all rights and liberties of our citizens will be jeopardized by an all-powerful Government in Washington.

Are we really willing to reduce the sovereign States to the status of counties in a single, Federal superstate? I think not.

Social Security Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a group of bills which are intended to close up some significant holes in social security protection provided for our old people, our widows and children, and those of our workers who become disabled. In brief my proposals would:

First. Provide hospitalization benefits for individuals who (a) are eligible, or potentially eligible, for old-age benefits, (b) are the survivors or dependents of insured workers, or (c) are disabled;

Second. Reduce the retirement age from 62 to 55 for women and from 65 to 60 for men;

Third. Provide a more liberal definition of disability for both the cash payment program and the disability freeze;

Fourth. Eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to qualify for cash disability benefits;

Fifth. Raise the limit on outside earnings, without loss of benefit, from \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year;

Sixth. Clarify the law so that it is clear that social security benefits shall be exempt from all taxation;

Seventh. Increase the earnings base for tax and benefit purposes from \$4,800 to \$6,000 a year.

The most important area in which action is needed is in the provision of hospital care insurance for our older citizens. It is one of the unpleasant facts of our times that the age group which probably needs this type of insurance the most—elderly people over 65—finds itself in the position of being the least protected. Just over one-third of the people over 65 and one-sixth of the people over 75 have hospitalization of any sort.

Many private plans refuse to accept older people after they pass a specified age and drop members or raise rates as age increases. These practices seem to be the accepted method of avoiding adverse risks and holding down the premium rates. Moreover the plans which do not discriminate against the older subscriber—Blue Cross and others—are finding competition increasingly severe from those that do.

The bill which I have introduced provides a simple and straightforward remedy—a hospitalization benefit—to the present social security system. Under the bill anyone who would be entitled to receive old age, survivors, or disability insurance benefits, would also be eligible for up to 60 days of hospitalization in a semiprivate room in any calendar year. The cost would be paid directly to participating hospitals from the appropriate social security trust fund. A total of some 13 million persons—including the dependents and survivors of eligible workers—would be given this protection at the outset. The bill provides for utilization of qualified State agencies and private nonprofit organizations, and it preserves the right of each patient, upon referral by a licensed physician, to make his own choice of a hospital.

The insurance in the bill would include the usual services, drugs, and appliances furnished by a hospital—that is, bed and board and the nursing, laboratory, and ambulance services, use of operating room, staff services, and those other services, drugs, and appliances which are customarily furnished by the hospital to its bed patients. The insurance would not cover any medical or surgical care, except such as is generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care. It would not cover hospitalization in any tuberculosis or mental hospital or an institution which

furnishes primarily domiciliary or nursing care.

I also have reintroduced a bill to reduce the retirement age to 55 for women and 60 for men. Age 65 for retirement is an arbitrary figure which was established without any convincing social or economic reason. The healthy and vigorous, who are permitted to work, almost uniformly continue beyond the present age of 65. This is evidenced by the fact that the average age of retirement for men under the social security system is 68. On the other hand, many persons because of health, company compulsory retirement, automation, and other events beyond their control are forced off their lifetime jobs. Once the older worker is thus removed from the labor market, the difficulties in finding new employment are often insuperable. He is, then, in a very real sense, retired, yet must struggle through the interim years until he reaches the age specified in the Social Security Act.

The two amendments I propose to the disability provisions are a necessity if we are to have a meaningful program. The requirement of age 50 for disability benefits has no defense in reason. The worker who becomes disabled at age 45 is just as much in need of benefits as the worker aged 55.

Fully realizing that disability benefits will mean nothing to the man who cannot qualify for the strictly worded and strictly administered definition of disability in existing law—inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity—I urge the Congress to act speedily in adopting a more equitable provision. The definition I propose would be closer to those in the Civil Service and Railroad Retirement Acts and would allow the worker to qualify if he was unable to engage in a substantial gainful activity which is the same as or similar to the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such impairment. As the law is now administered it is a flat on your back proposition, and the social security definition is much more severe than in other Federal disability programs.

A liberalization of the so-called retirement test is another much-needed development. At a time when living costs are cutting deeply into the protection furnished by benefits—averaging around \$70 per month per retiree—the \$1,200 per year earnings limit makes a marginal existence mandatory and discourages attempts to better oneself. My proposal, to raise the annual earnings limitation to \$1,800, is a reasonable start in the solution of this perplexing problem.

As a means of protecting beneficiaries from possible State and local taxation of their meager benefits, I have introduced a bill which would make it clear that social security benefits are exempt from all taxation. At present the Federal Government does not tax such benefits, but this is the result of Treasury ruling rather than specific provision of law. Such an enactment would clarify this muddled situation at all levels of government.

Finally, I have introduced a bill which will raise the wage base for benefit and tax purposes from \$4,800 to \$6,000 a year. Last year Congress, in raising the wage base from \$4,200 to \$4,800 a year, took a step in the direction of bringing the earnings that are creditable for social security more nearly into line with the great increase in wages which has occurred in the past decade. But we did not go far enough. The original law in 1935, which used a \$3,000 wage base, covered all the wages of 97 percent of covered workers thereby implying that the program should cover all the wages of almost every American worker. If the full earnings of the same proportion of workers today were to be covered the wage base would have to be set at more than \$8,000. My proposal, to increase it to \$6,000 a year, is needed to help regain this lost ground and, incidentally, would provide a saving which would help to finance a part of the cost of the other improvements I am advocating.

I believe we have every reason to be proud of the evolution of our social security system. We should always remember, however, that the history of this legislation has been one of action, and the frontier of social security is not closed.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Mrs. Abraham Lincoln's Visit to New England in 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Mrs. Abraham Lincoln's Visit to New England in 1863," written by James Duane Squires, Ph. D., chairman of the department of social studies at Colby Junior College, in New London, N.H.

Mr. President, Dr. Squires is a distinguished historian and an authority on the life of Abraham Lincoln. His article was recently given at a meeting of the Lincoln Society in Boston, which is composed of men and women from the six New England States who have a deep interest in the life and activities of our 16th President.

Mr. President, in this year in which we honor the 150th anniversary of the birth of President Lincoln, I am happy to bring to the attention of the general public Dr. Squires' contribution to the ever-growing body of material covering Lincoln's life. This article by Dr. Squires is indeed a valuable addition.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make approximately 2½ pages of the Record, at a cost of \$182.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MRS. ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S VISIT TO NEW ENGLAND IN 1863

(By James Duane Squires, Ph. D.)

From the viewpoint of the historian the problems involved in this study have been numerous, interesting, and to some extent unsolvable. Although materials were examined in more than a dozen libraries and archival collections, including the Congressional Library, it was not possible to locate any written record of the trip by one of the participants. All that can be done, therefore, is to piece together a number of facts from a wide variety of sources, and to explore with diligence certain New England newspapers for the months of August and September 1863.

Despite these difficulties, however, the narrative of this journey by Mrs. Abraham Lincoln and her two sons to New England in 1863 is a most interesting one. It is well worth an effort at reconstruction in our day almost a century later. Let me suggest five reasons why. In the first place, it was the longest trip that Mrs. Lincoln ever took during her years in Washington. Secondly, it was one of those rare occasions when she traveled with her two sons. Thirdly, the communications exchanged between President Lincoln and his wife while she was away

testify convincingly to the warm affection and devotion which existed between them. Fourth, Mrs. Lincoln, while in New England, was in a rare and relaxed mood, perhaps the last time during the war that she exhibited her natural charm and happiness. She had emerged from the shroud of gloom which had covered her since Willie's death in 1862, and was not yet plunged into the new sorrows caused by the deaths of her favorite half-brother and her brother-in-law later in 1863. Finally, it was from this trip that Robert T. Lincoln developed his interest in Manchester, Vt., which led to his retirement there many years later.

The origins of the journey, I think, are clear enough. As we all are aware, Abraham Lincoln and his family during the war years spent most of the summer months in the Anderson Building at the Solder's Home in the environs of the capital city. They had moved there on July 1, 1863. The next morning, as Mrs. Lincoln was driving into the city, she was thrown from her carriage. In addition to bruises, she suffered head injuries which, as it turned out, healed slowly. On July 3, the President telegraphed Robert, who was having his final examinations at Harvard, that his mother's accident was not serious. But 8 days later he was disturbed about her, for on July 11 he telegraphed his eldest son, "Come to Washington." Three days later he wired again, "Why do I hear no more of you?" Robert was already nearing Washington, and later on the 14th he saw his parents.

This factor of Mrs. Lincoln's injury and slow recovery was the first reason for the trip that summer. Again, July and August in 1863 were excessively warm all along the Atlantic seaboard, and Mrs. Lincoln never thrived in the hot and humid weather of the capital city. In his recent book, Stanley Kimmell comments on the sickening heat and dirt of Washington in the summer of 1863. No wonder the kindly and thoughtful President wished to speed his wife's convalescence by getting her away to a more agreeable climate in northern New England.

A third factor involved Robert T. Lincoln. As a freshman at Harvard, in October 1860, Robert had visited the White Mountains and had deeply enjoyed the experience. He had been urging his mother to visit them ever since his own journey there. As Mrs. Elizabeth Grimsley's letters indicate, Mrs. Lincoln had been hoping to do this very thing ever since the spring of 1861. Moreover, Robert had just completed successfully his third year at Harvard College and would be 20 on August 1. What could be more natural for an affectionate mother like Mary Lincoln than to observe these two anniversaries with a trip with her sons?

One other aspect of Robert's relation to the trip was suggested by the astute John Hay in a memorandum to J. G. Nicolay, dated August 7, 1863:

"Bob and his mother have gone to the White Mountains. Bob was so shattered by the wedding of the idol of us all, the bright particular Teutonne, that he rushed madly off to sympathize with nature in her sternest aspects. They will be gone some time. The newspapers say the tycoon will join them after awhile. If so, he does not know it."

It is a little surprising that the meticulous Hay failed to mention the fact that Tad Lincoln accompanied his mother and elder brother on this search for nature in her sternest aspects.

Mrs. Lincoln and Tad were in New York by Tuesday, July 28, for the President telegraphed them there that Robert would join them the next day. Presumably the family group went to Boston on Thursday, July 30. This was Mrs. Lincoln's third trip to the capital city of Massachusetts since she had become the First Lady. She had been there on a 2-day visit in May 1861 with Mrs. Grimsley, and again for a longer stay in November 1862. She invariably stayed at the Revere House, a hotel not now in existence, but which then stood in Bowdoin Square on a site now occupied by a municipal fire station.

The Boston Daily Journal on the very day that Mrs. Lincoln and her sons arrived in that city, i.e., on July 30, put this headline on a news dispatch: "President Lincoln To Visit New England." The source for this incorrect statement was an unnamed Washington correspondent. The next day the Journal amplified its original report to read as follows:

"Mr. Lincoln contemplates making a short visit to the New England States during August, if his official duties will permit. He is sadly in need of a little relaxation. He will avoid all the fashionable places, and proceed quietly to the White Mountains, where he will meet Mrs. Lincoln and his eldest son."

Again, it is to be noted that there is no mention of Tad's presence in the party.

By Saturday, August 1, 1863, the Manchester Daily Mirror in New Hampshire had the story with some further embellishments:

"Mr. Lincoln contemplates making a short visit to the New England States during August, if his official duties will permit. He is sadly in need of a little relaxation. He will avoid all the fashionable places and proceed quietly to the White Mountains, and meet Mrs. Lincoln and his eldest son. The President will decline all receptions and ovations, but will go as a quiet citizen on a health-seeking tour."

Supplementing this, the New Hampshire Patriot, a newspaper not in sympathy with the national administration, at Concord rather sourly observed on Wednesday, August 5:

"'Father Abraham Coming.' It is stated that the President is coming to the White Mountains to cool off and rest. The Boston Post says he couldn't do better, and that the country can get along even if he is perched on the top of Mount Washington."

Gov. Joseph Gilmore, of New Hampshire, was a man well acquainted with what today we would call public relations, and he read his papers carefully. On Tuesday, August 4, he wrote the President:

"I see from the public prints that you are intending to spend a few weeks among the mountains of New Hampshire. May we not have the privilege of welcoming you to our State capital? I have no desire to subject you to speeches or parading you over our dusty streets in the boiling sun. But if you were to let me know a day or two before your arrival that you would spend a night at least in my house, the people would give you a spontaneous and informal ovation which would do your soul good."

To this friendly letter the President replied on Friday, August 7, as follows:

"MY DEAR GOVERNOR GILMORE: I thank you very heartily for your kind invitation to visit Concord and especially for the exceedingly cordial terms in which you have conveyed it. I very much regret that I cannot at present accept it. I am by no means certain that I

can leave Washington at all this summer. The exacting nature of my official duties renders it exceedingly improbable. I assure you, however, that I am nonetheless sincerely grateful for your kind intentions and for the expressions of personal good will contained in your letter. I am,

"Very truly yours,

"A. LINCOLN."

While this high-level correspondence was going forward, Mrs. Lincoln and her two sons left Boston on Saturday, August 1, and journeyed by rail to Alton Bay, N.H. From that point they took a steamer across Lake Winnepesaukee to Center Harbor on the northwest shore. This was the regular tourist entryway to the White Mountains in those years, traveled by thousands each season. Mrs. Lincoln and her sons, according to the *Manchester Daily Mirror*, spent Sunday, August 2, in Center Harbor. From that point on Monday the 3d they "staged it to Conway, where gentlemen from Boston put their private carriages at her disposal."

In a special dispatch to the *Boston Daily Journal*, published on August 8, but dated Tuesday, August 4 at the Kearsarge House in North Conway, that paper's New Hampshire correspondent wrote:

"Mrs. Abraham Lincoln and her two sons arrived here last evening from Center Harbor. Their party will leave here tomorrow morning for the Glen House and Tip Top House, Mount Washington, in a handsome turnout which has been especially detailed for their accommodation with an old and popular driver in charge. They will visit all points of interest on route. While at North Conway Mrs. Lincoln and family have been very courteously entertained at the Kearsarge House; gentlemen from Boston having their carriages with them have put them at the disposal of the Presidential party.

"Mrs. Lincoln has expressed herself more than delighted with the elegant and unobtrusive attention which the guests at North Conway have given her.

"The weather is beautiful and the company unusually large all through the mountains."

The Mount Washington carriage road, at that time the only method of riding up New Hampshire's loftiest peak, began at a point close to the Glen House, and ran upward along the east face of the mountain. It had been authorized by the State legislature of 1853, but had not been finished and opened for traffic until August 1861. It had proved to be a great tourist attraction and, now in its third season, was heavily patronized. On Thursday, August 6, Mrs. Lincoln and Robert joined the throng of tourists and drove to the Tip Top House. The *Boston Daily Journal* correspondent in his dispatch dated August 7, which he headed "Thanksgiving Day on Mt. Washington," wrote as follows:

"Yesterday—130 visitors came to Tip Top and in the crowd came Mrs. A. Lincoln and her son Robert. Mrs. Lincoln is a lady of medium size rather round favored and quite fleshy. She was dressed in a dark riding habit, dark bonnet and veil. She has a very fair, cheerful, smiling face, which does one good to look upon. She is quite light complexioned, has blue eyes and dark auburn hair, and on the whole, as might be expected of a President's wife, has a very agreeable way. Her son, Robert, is a dark complexioned lad of some 16 years.

"Today Mrs. Lincoln came up again from the Glen."

On this second visit Mrs. Lincoln delighted the Boston journalist by asking him to take down the mountain for immediate mailing to Washington a letter from herself to the President. What a pity that this letter has not survived.

The dispatch to the *Boston Daily Journal* which has just been quoted is worthy of note

for at least three reasons. First, it is one of the few complimentary descriptions of Mrs. Lincoln penned by a newspaper man after her crushing grief in her son, Willie's, death. No doubt its kind words about the First Lady reflected her true feelings that summer day on the top of Mount Washington; certainly at that moment the horror of war and the tensions of the Capital City seemed far away indeed. Second, this dispatch correctly notes that the President's Thanksgiving Day proclamation, dated July 15, 1863, but set for Thursday, August 6, was generally observed throughout the North. Third, the journalist gave a succinct description of Robert T. Lincoln, although he grossly underestimated the young man's age. Actually, Robert was not 16, but had just passed 20.

Although this particular correspondent failed to mention Tad Lincoln, the writer for the *Manchester (N.H.) Daily Mirror* was more explicit. In the issue of that paper for August 8, the following comment appears:

"Mrs. Abraham Lincoln and her two sons, Robert and Thomas, the latter about 10 years old, are creating quite a sensation in the mountain region."

Knowing the high spirits of the younger boy, we may surmise that it was he rather than his more dignified older brother who was creating the sensation.

It was while his family was in the White Mountains that the President on Saturday, August 8, wrote his charming and often-quoted letter to his wife, summing up the weekly grist of news from Washington, and containing the famous line: "Tell dear Tad that poor 'Nanny Goat' is lost, and Mrs. Cuthbert and I are in distress about it." This delightful letter is reproduced in full in Stefan Lorant's new book, "Lincoln: A Picture Story of His Life."

Just how and when the Presidential family left the White Mountains I have not been able to ascertain. They were still there as late as Tuesday, August 11. But on Thursday they were en route to Boston. The *Manchester Daily Mirror* in its issue for Friday, the 14th, stated that:

"Mrs. Lincoln and her two sons passed through here yesterday afternoon on their way home from the mountains, and stopped at the Revere House in Boston last night."

On the same day, Friday the 14th, the *Boston Daily Journal* reported that "Mrs. Lincoln and her two sons are at the Revere House on their return from the White Mountains."

A similar item appeared in the *Boston Evening Transcript* for the 14th, and on the 15th the *Boston Evening Traveller* noted that the President's wife and her two sons had spent the morning on a steamboat excursion in Boston Harbor.

Mrs. Lincoln never forget her pleasure in seeing the White Mountains in August 1863. Sixteen years later, in 1879, when she was far removed from her days as First Lady and in much anguish of spirit, she yet found the time and energy to write a long letter to her grandnephew, Lewis Baker. In this missive she urged him to take a vacation in New England, and especially to visit the Tip Top House on Mount Washington. So strongly did she wish him to do this that she offered to pay his vacation expenses for 4 weeks. It is proof of her happy memories of her own trip there in 1863 that Mrs. Lincoln recalled the exact name of the hotel on the mountain summit.

There is a little uncertainty about the return of the family group to Washington. The *Washington Star*, an evening newspaper, reported on Monday, August 17, that Robert Lincoln had reached the Capital City this morning. The dispatch stated that Mrs. Lincoln was staying on in New York. Tad is not mentioned in this story. It seems probable to me that the younger boy returned to Washington with his brother, while Mrs.

Lincoln remained in New York. The *New York Tribune* on Saturday, August 22, gave this news item:

"Mrs. Lincoln, who has been in the city a few days, paid a visit on Thursday to the French frigate, *La Guerriere*, where she was received with the honor due to her position, and with that courtesy characteristic of the French gentleman."

Whether she remained in New York after this appointment on the 20th, or went down to Washington, I am not positive, but the latter alternative seems to me unlikely.

At any rate, Mrs. Lincoln and Robert, accompanied by Mrs. Abner Doubleday, wife of the well-known Union general and a close friend of the First Lady, soon went back to New England once more. This time, probably at the suggestion of her hostess, the President's wife and son journeyed to Manchester, Vt. Arriving there on Monday, August 24, they registered in the Equinox House of that town, and remained there for a fortnight. The President's telegram to his wife, found in the "Collected Works," volume VI, under date of August 29, has been printed with an erroneous address, i.e., Manchester, N.H. The mistake must have been made in the secretariat of the Executive Mansion, for we may assume that the President knew where his wife was. His two subsequent telegrams to Mrs. Lincoln, assuring her that all was well in Washington, dated September 3 and September 6, respectively, are also in the "Collected Works," and are correctly addressed to Manchester, Vt.

Maj. General Doubleday joined his wife and her guests on Thursday, August 28. The *Manchester (Vt.) Journal* in its issue for Tuesday, September 8, observed:

"Mrs. Lincoln and her son, and General Doubleday and lady left town yesterday, after a stay of 2 weeks."

They went back to New York, from which point, no doubt, Robert left to begin his fourth year at Harvard. His mother, who was staying at the Fifth Avenue Hotel in New York, received in quick sequence three telegrams from the President, dated respectively September 20, September 21, and September 22, urging her to return. On September 24, the President wrote Mrs. Lincoln telling her of the terrible battle of Chickamauga and the death there of her Confederate brother-in-law, Ben Hardin Helm. It is my understanding that she went home at once after receiving this communication. She had been away almost 2 months.

There is existing manuscript evidence, however, to indicate how thoroughly Mrs. Lincoln had enjoyed her trip. In the Stone collection of Lincolniana at Boston University, one may read a personal letter from the First Lady to Franklin Orvis at Manchester, Vt. Mr. Orvis was the proprietor of the inn at which Mrs. Lincoln's party had stayed. Dated April 14, 1864, this hitherto uncited letter reads as follows:

"MR. FRANKLIN ORVIS,

"MY DEAR SIR: Illness alone has prevented my writing to you, to express my thanks and obligations to you, for the geological books and delightful maple sugar and molasses you so kindly sent. Since my charming visit to Manchester last summer, how frequently and gratefully your kindness has been remembered, and how often I have wished you would visit Washington, so that in a measure I could repay it. The only drawback to my pleasure was that my poor husband was not breathing the same delicious air we were. Our son Robert graduates about the 20th of June, and if his father can leave, consistent with his duties here, he will be present. If so, I shall feel quite tempted, if he can, to make a little flying visit to your Green Mountains. I am sure the pure air would be more refreshing even than it was to me. Please present my kindest regards to Mrs. Orvis, your good mother, and sisters, whilst I remain sincerely and gratefully your friend.

Mrs. LINCOLN."

So ended Mary Todd Lincoln's two-phase trip to New England in 1863. It was not her last visit to this area, for the next summer she and Tad again came to Boston and Cambridge, this time to attend Robert's class-day exercises at Harvard on June 24. Later that summer she and her sons were in Vermont once more, first at Rutland, then at Manchester. But this visit of 1864 is a story in itself, and another one.

The trip in 1863 which I have to describe in this paper, for the reasons given in the introduction, will always remain of deep interest to students of the Lincoln family. Aside from the wives of our Presidents who came from New England, Mrs. Lincoln, I believe, was the first First Lady to make an extended visit to this region. For that reason alone, if for no other, we are happy in the memory that hotels in three New England States 95 years ago last August carried on their guest registers the names Mary Todd Lincoln, Robert Todd Lincoln, Thomas Lincoln.

The Plight of New Jersey Commuters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Plight of Jersey Commuters," written by Tom Barrett, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 2, 1959. The article outlines the very real problems which New Jersey and surrounding States face in the efforts to maintain essential passenger service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLIGHT OF JERSEY COMMUTERS—FOR 70,000 WHO RIDE TRAINS, END OF LINE IS IN SIGHT

(By Tom Barrett)

The end of the line is in sight for nearly half of the 160,000 daily New Jersey commuters to New York City.

This is the nearly half—70,000 a day at latest count—who make the daily trek to Manhattan via the rail-tunnel or rail-ferry service of six major New Jersey railroads.

It includes the broker of Wall Street, the ad man of Madison Avenue, the secretary at Rockefeller Center, and the saleslady of Fifth Avenue, who call the Garden State home.

For 50 years, at least, it's been the railroads who have been on the defensive; the rates have been too high, the service erratic, the cars dirty. These are the perennial and standard complaints of commuters.

Now it's the railroads' turn to complain; the fares are too low; the public doesn't use the services available; the railroads are only quitting on customers who have been quitting on them.

The quitting customers are those who show an increasing preference to travel to and from New York by bus and private car. These are the people who represent the one-third drop in rail commuters in the past 10 years.

While the warning signs of the railroads have been flashing in deeper shades of red since the passage last summer of the National Transportation Act of 1958, the final red-over-red that will bring rail commuter service in New Jersey to a halt will still prove a shocker, railroad officials admit, unless some

authority—and it won't be the railroads themselves—comes up with a substitute system of transportation.

ROCKEFELLER URGING IMMEDIATE ACTION

The impending severance of the major transportation lifeline for New Jersey residents working in New York, is, in the words of Governor Rockefeller "an intolerable prospect for commuters."

The Governor warned:

"We all know what the problem is—dwindling commuter services which are threatened with extinction. We have passed the time for study. We have reached the time for action. We have passed the time for calling on Washington or someone else to solve the problem."

"Let's face it realistically ourselves and take the steps that have to be taken now to insure adequate, efficient, convenient commuter services for the residents of our great metropolitan areas."

The Governor hopes to take the first realistic step jointly with Governor Meyner of New Jersey and Governor Ribicoff of Connecticut following a meeting of the three next Tuesday with a transit solution high on the agenda.

PSC WANTS LINES RESTRAINED BY ICC

The critical element of time in the commuter crisis has been emphasized by the New York Public Service Commission in an appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission to use restraint in permitting railroads to pull out of commuter services pending an overall solution.

The National Transportation Act, favored by the Interstate Commerce Commission, has paved the way for railroads to give up services which seriously hamper their ability to operate in the black.

And to the New Jersey railroads, passenger service is in this category.

Take the cases of the Jersey Central Lines, which serves commuters in parts of Hudson, Union, Somerset, and Hunterdon Counties on one branch and those from Monmouth County (North Jersey Shore), Union (Elizabeth), and Hudson on another, and that of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, which does commuter business in Essex, Morris, Somerset, Bergen, and Passaic Counties.

In 1948, the Jersey Central carried 14,000 commuters and 4,000 other passengers a day to and from New York. The other passengers were those who rode during off-commuter hours between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. and after 7 p.m.

Today, the same line lists 10,000 commuters and 2,000 other passengers.

On the Lackawanna, the 28,000 daily commuters of 1948 have dwindled to less than 20,000 and the noncommuter from 11,300 to 6,900.

Despite sizable fare increases, 100 percent or more in many cases, and a cutback in operations, the Jersey Central today lists losses of \$3,253,000 a year in passenger operations; the Lackawanna \$3,629,000.

The financial troubles of these two roads are matched by other railroads in New Jersey—the Pennsylvania, Erie, West Shore Division of the New York Central, the Susquehanna, and the Hudson and Manhattan (Hudson Tubes).

When will the railroads finally call it quits on commuters?

The Lehigh Valley Railroad, down to a few hundred commuters, has already asked the ICC for permission to drop this service.

Earl T. Moore, president of the Jersey Central Lines, says in his case the request for the elimination of commuter service could be sudden.

"It may come in the form of 10-day notice that the railroad just can't carry on," he said in an interview.

Perry M. Shoemaker, president of the Lackawanna, said complete abandonment of commuter service, in his case, probably will be

preceded by a sharp cutback in existing service.

"We have already notified Governor Meyner we are making an abandonment study on our run from Summit to Gladstone, affecting about 2,000 daily riders. That's in an area of influential development but the passenger rail business just does not support the costs of the line," Mr. Shoemaker said.

RAILROADS BLAME TAXES AS EXCESSIVE

"We are also, by necessity, trimming operations on our Morristown line and if things keep going the way they are, we may find a way to cease all passenger runs at Newark and not continue into Hudson County," Mr. Shoemaker warned.

Governor Meyner was sought by the railroads last year as an intermediary with Hudson County municipalities which the railroads claim have levied an excessive tax burden.

The railroads, which asked a year's deferment in paying an \$18 million tax bill, were told by the Governor that no deferment was forthcoming.

As the Governor expressed the attitude of the municipalities:

"If the individual homeowner is assessed penalties when he doesn't pay on time, why shouldn't railroads get the same treatment?"

LINES SEE NO NEED TO RUN AT A LOSS

The threat to move out of Hudson County in a fight over high taxes imposed there would affect the Hoboken terminal of the Lackawanna which it shares jointly with the Erie Railroad. Passengers going to New York would then have to ride the last 10 miles or so by bus, Hudson Tubes or Pennsylvania Railroad.

As to whether the New Jersey railroads can go through with their abandonment threat in view of the long established sympathy of the New Jersey Public Utility Commission on behalf of the commuter, Mr. Shoemaker countered:

"While the State public utility commission, in practice and prior to the Transportation Act of 1958, has adopted a different attitude from ours, there is certainly no moral obligation and probably no legal one to furnish passenger and commuter service at a loss. Since the incurring of great losses is the only way of furnishing passenger and commuter service as demanded by the State in the past, the responsibility should be taken from our hands."

The position of the railroads was stated even more bluntly by Jersey Central's Mr. Moore, who said the railroads were no longer in a position to carry on the responsibility of commuter and other passenger services.

"Just to meet our costs, we would have to increase the present commuter fares by 90 percent," he said. "Should we lose any riders through attrition over the near doubling of fares, then we would be forced to raise the fares all over again."

"This would go on until we had no riders at all. Rail passenger service just can't pay for itself, especially if it is done by a taxpayer-private enterprise."

Definition of a Liberal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of the least understood situations today involves the proper interpretation of the term "conservative" and the term "liberal."

Mr. President, there was published in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, January 19, 1959, a very good editorial entitled, "Quote Liberal End Quote," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUOTE LIBERAL END QUOTE

One of our readers asks today why this newspaper puts quotation marks around the word "liberal" when it is used in a modern political sense.

Politically, the word "liberal" comes down to us from the British and the dictionary says that in this connotation the word means having tendency toward democratic or republican, as distinguished from monarchial or aristocratic forms—as liberal thinkers, liberal ideas in politics.

Today, however, a great many of the people who have appropriated this word for their political purposes don't fit this meaning. These liberals are not liberals at all; most of them believe not so much in the growth of individual freedom as in the growth of the state.

In fact the term "liberal" in politics today usually describes the most ancient type of reactionary, for people who believe in an all-powerful state are people who believe in the forms of government that resulted in enslaving men, not in freeing men. That's been true all along, whether the all-powerful state was that of the Caesars or the kings, or their more powerful present-day counterparts, the dictators.

Maybe it's also that we dislike having violence done to a fine, old honest word.

Now we haven't any right to tell people they can't use any word they want to describe—or to disguise—their activities or their intentions. But when something isn't what it seems to be, we think perhaps we ought to distinguish it from the real McCoy.

So we put quotes around it. Just as many newspapers do when they write about "Prince" Mike Romanoff.

Hawaii, With a Tradition of Freedom and Good Government, Deserves Statehood Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the mental picture which the mention of Hawaii often calls up is one of pineapples, palm trees, carefree islanders, and surfing at Waikiki. I feel we fail to see the real Hawaii—the Hawaii which I feel deserves statehood this year. I have coauthored a bill to grant statehood now.

The items mentioned in our mental picture figure prominently in Hawaii, of course, and are definite assets and good reasons to offer in support of my argument for statehood. Along with the fact that 6,423 square miles of land and 575,771 people would be added to our Union of States, I believe the intangible assets of Hawaii should also be considered.

The Hawaiian Islands have a stability of government and a record of protec-

tion of life and property in keeping with the highest traditions of American freedom and justice. They have had a stable government for more than 100 years, first a monarchy, then a republic, then a Territory. In the recent elections, 87 percent of the electorate cast their ballots. This is far above the national average.

The per capita income in Hawaii is ahead of 23 of our present States and Hawaiians pay more in taxes than the national average.

Mr. President, in further support of my arguments for Hawaiian statehood, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in my hometown paper, the Austin (Tex.) Statesman for Friday, January 30, 1959, under the heading "Statehood Owed Hawaii."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD OWED HAWAII

This country and both its political parties are obligated by sentiment and repeated promises to give statehood to Hawaii. There have been objections to this, usually on the claim that Hawaii has such a polyglot population that the national security might be jeopardized. Yet a Hawaiian battalion, made up of Japanese citizens, was the most decorated in World War II.

Another claim is that the Harry Bridges outfit would tie up the economy of Hawaii. This may be true. Bridges has done that in the past.

But unions have tied up the economy in this country too on various occasions. Strikes have shut down great industrial plants, airlines, newspapers, manufacturing concerns, and organizers right here in Texas in the Port Arthur case tied up a business district by morally illegal picketing of a large number of small firms whose workers they aspired to organize and control in a catchall New York union.

So that argument doesn't hold very well in the case of Hawaii. What does count is that if Alaska, a noncontiguous land area with a smaller population and larger land mass is found to be desirable as the 49th State, then Hawaii, with a smaller land mass and a large population, and by virtue of its strategic economic and political importance should not be left out in the cold. Simple justice demands it.

Bill To Let Gas Producers Gouge the Public Is up Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a new natural gas bill is in the House hopper, and, despite the fact that this measure, like its predecessors, is clearly against the interests of most sections of the country it will have the powerful support of House and Senate leaders.

The Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, February 1, contains an editorial which analyzes the new bill and assesses its chances. I ask unanimous consent, Mr.

President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL TO LET GAS PRODUCERS GOUGE THE PUBLIC IS UP AGAIN

The natural gas and oil interests are back as congressional supplicants again, seeking to remove Federal controls from the price of natural gas produced by so-called independent operators.

Again it is Representative HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who lends his powerful position to author the natural gas bill. The bill, H.R. 366, is in the House hopper and HARRIS means to get action.

This time the bill has some new twists—including changes meant to satisfy the coal lobby that surplus natural gas won't be dumped at low prices to large industrial users. The gas interests, as Representative DINGELL, Democrat of Michigan, points out, hope to pick up some 15-odd votes from coal areas with this provision.

Twice the natural gas bill has passed Congress and met Presidential vetoes—once by former President Truman and most recently by President Eisenhower, who was shocked by what he called arrogant lobbying. Last year the bill looked like a cinch until a letter turned up announcing a \$100 a plate dinner to be given by Representative MARTIN, Republican of Massachusetts, by the oil and gas interests. The letter contained an implication—unknown to MARTIN—that the affair was aimed at influencing votes. The revelation killed chances of passage.

It's too much to hope that the oil and gas interests will continue to be so arrogantly stupid right out in public. They can't keep making mistakes—or can they? The big hope is now that there are enough new men in Congress who would oppose the bill to prevent its passage. But don't let hopes get too high. The Senate and House leaders—Texans LYNDON JOHNSON and SAM RAYBURN—favor the bill.

And what they want they usually get.

Voting Rights for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Hawaii and the District," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 21, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed on the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII AND THE DISTRICT

As if there were some connection between the two, the President couples statehood for Hawaii and home rule for the District of Columbia in the same short breath. Recommending both in his budget message, he says that further delay in either would be unconscionable.

Hawaii was made a Territory in 1900. The Territorial form of government is the normal step preliminary to statehood, and Hawaii meets all reasonable standards for admit-

tance now as a full-fledged State. There is no good reason for further delay.

The same thing is not true concerning further delay in so-called home rule for the District of Columbia. Far from being unconscionable, further delay in home rule for the District would be highly desirable, especially if it led to abandonment of the idea that home rule means worthwhile voting rights. A semi-Territorial form of government for the District has previously been recommended by this administration as the form of home rule most likely to work in this Federal city. Something of the same sort was tried here briefly and abandoned 25 years before Hawaii even became a part of the United States. There is not much sense in trying it again.

What should be done is to give the people of this city voting representation in Congress and in the choice of President and Vice President of the United States. With such rights established, Congress and the President should work toward development of this city as the Capital of the United States and forget the play-acting diversion of some futile form of home rule, which would delay rather than hasten that desirable and readily attainable development.

Strange Bureaucratic Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has always been disturbing to read statements attributed to official State Department sources which undermine the policy of the Government in international affairs. Columnist Constantine Brown, in the Tuesday, January 27, 1959, edition of the *Evening Star*, comments on this unfortunate situation. He observes that South Korean President Syngman Rhee was depicted in a November story as being so weak physically that he could serve no real useful purpose as head of the Korean Government. Yet, in truth, Mr. Rhee, a gentleman whom I have known personally, and in whom I have the utmost respect, is in excellent condition—both physically and mentally. This reminds Mr. Brown of the treatment Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek received at the hands of some high officials in the State Department in the 1940's.

I ask unanimous consent that this column, entitled "Strange Bureaucratic Practices," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRANGE BUREAUCRATIC PRACTICES—ARTICLE ON HEALTH OF RHEE, ATTRIBUTED TO TOP U.S. PLANNERS, STIRS PROTEST

(By Constantine Brown)

There is something strange in the activities of our evergrowing bureaucracy which is supposed to follow the policies of the administration in office.

The taxpayers have been compelled to fork over since the end of the war close to \$100 billion for foreign aid in various forms. The principal reason why the American taxpayers' representatives (the Members of

Congress) have voted large sums year after year for this project was our effort to stem or roll back international communism which we recognized as the main danger to survival of the free world whose leader we have become.

When our Legislators approve substantial economic and military aid to countries like Yugoslavia and Poland, it is in the hope that somehow, some time, we may be able to detach them from the Moscow-Peking conspiracy aimed principally at the United States.

It is because of the fear of another international Communist aggression that we are building up, at the taxpayers' expense, in the Middle and Far East close allies such as the Turks, Iranians, Pakistanis, Filipinos, free Chinese, and South Koreans. Since the American taxpayers are digging into their pockets without much grumbling to "buy insurance for the American people," as Secretary Dulles has frequently stated, one would assume the high officials of the State Department would not purposely try to undermine the public's confidence in those Asian leaders who are most determined to fight international communism to the bitter end.

Last November a weekly magazine with a nationwide circulation printed a story to the effect that South Korean President Syngman Rhee's health had so deteriorated that he could serve no real useful purpose as head of the government. An official personality who had just returned from Seoul and had marveled at President Rhee's vigor (both physical and mental), wrote the editors a letter pointing out pleasantly the fallacy of the item printed in a highly reputable magazine and, to back his contention, inclosed a recent picture of Mr. Rhee. An official of the magazine answered very politely, explaining that "—our sources for the items published from Washington were top State Department planners and we were publishing their views. Our report was based on personal interviews and not rumors."

This is highly revealing. The State Department officials, like those of the Defense Department, are very secretive toward newspapers and newsmen in an unprecedented manner. An unauthorized official—that is one who has not been cleared by the department head—will not give a reporter even the time of day. What is not secret or confidential is at least restricted. Rumors about the health, habits and other personal things of heads of state, be they allied, neutral or hostile to us, are not easily pried from our top State Department planners unless there is a strong political-diplomatic reason for the leak.

For instance, during the war there were numerous leaks (mostly completely unfounded) about Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Gissima. The grapevine informed correspondents about their venality and that of the Kuomintang government; about the manner in which the Kuomintang was pocketing American financial assistance, and so on. On the other hand, the grapevine was extolling the high qualities and statesmanship of Mao Tze-tung, who was described as a great agrarian reformer.

But in those days there was a group of policymaking officials in the State Department in Washington and in Chungking (the wartime capital of China) who believed firmly that Chiang and his followers were millstones around our political neck. There were many in this country who were still very much confused over the actual objectives of our then Russian ally. This is no longer so. In the last 14 years the American people who wanted to open their eyes even slightly have seen the true face of international communism.

We know that the Communists across the 38th parallel are not agrarian reformers.

The policies of the succeeding administrations in this country since 1948 have clearly shown that the Communists are our only enemies. Hence, it appears unbelievable that high State Department officials should continue a policy of leaks about popularly elected heads of government in the Far East such as Mr. Rhee and Philippines President Garcia.

The Right To Work Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the right to work issue was fought out in several States last year. Around the country it is the general consensus that the issue is dead.

Mr. President, I disagree with that belief. I feel that in the very near future in one of our campaigns the major issue will be wrapped around the unbridled power of the union boss. Whether it will be called right to work, voluntary unionism, or whatever other form it may take, it will be represented by the philosophy behind the right to work movement.

Mr. President, there was published in the *Deseret News* of Salt Lake City on January 17, 1959, an editorial entitled "The Right To Work," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT TO WORK

Rather than accept the challenge to make membership in a union so desirable and worth while that employees want to join, some Utah union officials prefer to take the easy way—and men's freedom with it.

Through a bill introduced in the Utah House of Representatives Friday in their behalf to repeal Utah's right-to-work law, union leaders prefer to force employees to belong whether they want to or not. LaMar D. Gulbransen, president of the AFL-CIO, spokesman for the sponsoring labor groups, told reporters that the right-to-work bill has hindered union membership growth in the State.

This, if true—and no proof has yet been established—is admission that in and of itself union membership is not now attractive enough to appeal to all workers. The argument for voluntary membership—or nonmembership—is too obvious to need elaboration; it should be the right of free men to choose their own course of action.

Mr. Gulbransen's further argument that Utah's right-to-work law "has resulted in Utah's per capita income dropping in relation to other States" also bears some questioning. Utah's law became effective in May 1955. At that time, Utah manufacturing production workers were earning an average of \$76.63 per week (according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics). Three years later, May 1958, the same workers were earning an average of \$89.15, or \$12.52 more each week.

Manufacturing workers in the three Mountain States that have outlawed compulsory union membership have enjoyed a more rapid increase in their average weekly earnings than have workers in the five Mountain

States where union leaders were still permitted to force membership upon the workers during the same period.

The U.S. average increase in wages for the 3-year period was 7.5 percent. In States without right-to-work laws (Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming), the increase was 10.2 percent. In the States with right-to-work laws (Utah, Arizona, Nevada) the rate of increase was 14.4 percent. In Utah alone it was 16.3 percent, more than twice the national average rate of increase.

Labor's argument for compulsory membership rests on the assumption that the desirability of union membership is so unquestionable that those who refuse to accept it voluntarily must be required to do so. If this desirability is so unquestionable, why then do the union leaders need a compulsory bill?

Those whose faith in the infallibility of union leadership is less than complete certainly have the right as free American citizens to determine for themselves whether or not they want to belong. The deep question is: Do the unions exist for the members, or the members for the union?

Isn't the right to work one of the basic human rights which Government is bound to protect? Or is it restricted to union members? Or do nonmembers fall outside the human category?

Rather than work toward the repeal of Utah's right-to-work law, union officers ought to concentrate their efforts on trying to make membership so worthwhile that every employee can easily see the advantages and by his own free will join without being coerced into it by an arbitrary law.

James P. Preston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Like many of my colleagues, Mr. President, I was deeply saddened last week to learn of the death of Mr. James P. Preston, superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery for 35 years before his retirement in 1955.

Many of the outstanding accomplishments of this devoted Senate employee are recounted in an article appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 31, 1959.

In addition, he was known to many Senators for his many special courtesies. For example, one of my prized mementos is a miniature rocking chair fashioned by Mr. Preston, who was skilled in woodworking. For this piece Mr. Preston used pine wood from the stand erected on the east front of the Capitol for the inauguration of President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon in 1953.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article reviewing the life of Mr. Preston be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS GALLERY'S JIM PRESTON

(By Everard Munsey)

When Jim Preston retired from his post at the Senate in 1955, veteran Capitol Hill

reporters and lawmakers could scarcely accept the reality. It seemed James D. Preston had always been in the center of activities at the Senate and, indeed, he had been there for 58 busy years.

Mr. Preston, who died of pneumonia Thursday, was born on August 2, 1876, on C Street, within sight of the Capitol dome. Inheriting a taste for journalism from his father, Herbert A. Preston, longtime Washington correspondent of the New York Herald, he became associated with the Washington bureau of the Boston Journal and the Chicago Inter Ocean at the age of 14.

Covering the 1896 conventions for his papers, he reported the bolt of Republican delegates opposed to the adoption of the gold standard and William Jennings Bryan's famous "Cross of Gold" speech. When "General" Jacob Coxey's army marched on Washington the same year, Jim Preston was on the scene for a first hand story.

HEADED PRESS GALLERY

Then in 1897, Mr. Preston, not yet 21 years old, was elected superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery. Those were the days when Senators, elected by their legislatures, were hardly inclined to publicize their activities, except through their favorite reporter. Mr. Preston always remembered that the Senate resolution declaring war on Spain in 1898 was passed in an executive session, with press and public barred.

In the 35 years he spent as superintendent of the gallery, he became indispensable to reporters. He was in the center of all press information, telling from notes or memory what committees were meeting, the status of bills, and the situation in almost every matter involving the Senate. A physical change, as great as the change in attitude accompanying the institution of direct election of Senators, occurred during his tenure. The one old crank telephone was replaced by modern equipment while typewriters were introduced with rules and regulations for the gallery.

AIDED CONVENTION WRITERS

Jim Preston was also in virtual charge of the press section at the great national conventions during these years and earned the gratitude of correspondents for his diplomatic handling of seating and his arrangement of telegraph and hotel accommodations.

On his 20th anniversary as superintendent, members of the press gallery gave Mr. Preston an automobile in appreciation of his work.

In 1931, he left the press gallery, moving to the office of the Librarian of the Senate. There his poking around in old papers turned up some priceless historical documents, including several communications written by George Washington and the original Second Inaugural Address.

His interest in documents aroused, he paid his way to England, where he spent several months at the British Museum studying British methods of document preservation. In 1935 he became assistant administrative secretary at the National Archives and for 6 years directed work to centralize valuable Government-owned documents at the Archives. He also arranged exhibitions of the collection.

RETURNS TO SENATE

Longing for the Senate grew too strong, however. "The excitement of the place was in my blood and I couldn't get it out," he said, as he celebrated acquisition of the job of indexer of the Senate Journal. He returned to many of his old ways, to the delight of Capitol Hill reporters. Shortly after his return, he took charge of registration of Senate lobbyists.

Throughout his career at the Senate, Mr. Preston kept a running diary. Recorded there are the rules of the Senate, by the Republican triumvirate, Aldrich, of Rhode

Island, Hale, of Maine, and Allison, of Iowa, the arrival of LaFollett in 1906 and the Republican defection in the West and the consequent Democratic majority in 1912. He took that diary with him when he went to Hollywood in 1939 as technical adviser and bit actor in "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington."

As befitted his English ancestry, Mr. Preston was often mistaken for British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain—until he spoke. He once delighted President Roosevelt with an impersonation of Chamberlain at a Gridiron Club show. The President was also pleased by another work of Mr. Preston's a huge sphinx with a long cigarette holder which Mr. Preston made from dampened paper when the question of a third term was the biggest political riddle. Mr. Roosevelt took the sphinx to Hyde Park.

PROMOTED GOLF COURSE

Besides woodworking, which he did very skillfully, he loved golf and was a promoter of the Rock Creek Public Golf Course. He sponsored national public links tournaments and, during recess of Congress, assisted in the conduct of four national tournaments of the U.S. Golf Association.

He lived at 4724 15th street NW., for about 36 years, until entering the hospital several months ago.

He married Mary E. Sanford, daughter of a Baltimore ship captain, in 1902. Mrs. Preston now lives with her son, Edward H. Preston, in Lynbrook, N.Y. Mr. Preston also leaves a sister, Theodora C. Preston, of Washington.

University of California Receives International Education Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in these days of international tensions it is very gratifying to read of the work of organizations and individuals who are working constructively to improve understanding among nations. On January 30 the Institute of International Education cited the University of California for doing a distinguished job in developing a sound program of international educational exchange. Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president emeritus, accepted the award for his university, and I am proud to ask unanimous consent to have the text of the citation printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR A U.S. UNIVERSITY

To the University of California, a great cosmopolitan center of education on the shores of the Pacific, the Institute of International Education presents its award for distinguished service.

At the university a teaching staff of 5,300, both native sons and men from the great academic centers of the world, combines the excellence of scholarly tradition with the vigor of new inquiry, unrestricted by national boundaries. Here is a faculty which includes 6 winners of Nobel prizes, 59 members of the National Academy of Sciences, and in the aggregate the largest collection of Guggenheim fellows in the world.

Cal, a relatively young State university, demonstrates that in the United States a great institution is judged neither by its age nor by the fact that it is not located in the green hills of New England—but only by the standards of excellence it has achieved. Scholars from centuries-old academic centers of Europe and the Orient recognize that Cal in less than a hundred years has proved itself to be a strong, healthy, and prolific member of the international academic family.

Here, international education has flowered for half a century and more. Here, uncounted thousands of persons have come from abroad to earn degrees and to serve their countries on return. Their names include three former presidents of our sister republics—Mexico, Colombia, and Ecuador; Ministers of Agriculture in Egypt and Iraq; a Minister of Commerce in Pakistan; leading educators, doctors, administrators, in nearly every country and on every continent. Here are cultivated the habits of mind and spirit that helped to produce an educational system in the Philippines; a health service in Indonesia; an improved civil service in Italy; a Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and a host of statesmen, governors, and advisors in the council of nations.

From the University of California hundreds of American students have gone to other countries as winners of Rhodes, Fulbright, and other international scholarships.

At Berkeley, generations of foreign and American students have been drawn together by the strength and presence of a great international house in which men and women of every nation live constructively and creatively.

To dramatize the imaginative and creative contributions which the colleges and universities of the United States are making to the improvement of international understanding, the Institute of International Education presents its distinguished service award to the University of California.

Britain's Verdict on Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the alert Anderson (S.C.) Free Press of January 22, 1959, ably comments on the trend in Great Britain away from socialism, while pointing out that we in the United States are moving in the direction of the welfare state. Those among us who would continue in the direction of socialism should consider the results of the experiment in Great Britain before it is too late in this country to reverse the current trend.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Britain's Verdict on Socialism," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN'S VERDICT ON SOCIALISM

With the United States already well on the way toward a socialistic form of government, it would seem that recent developments in Great Britain should—even at this late date—make American citizens sit up and take notice of where we are heading and

what we can expect if we continue our present course.

According to a special report in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report, Britain's 13-year-old experiment in socialism is being written off as a failure, with private enterprise emerging stronger than ever. The report states that searching inquiries just completed by a parliamentary committee, by industrial and management organizations, and by individual experts show that the British public has soured on Government operation of basic industries. Even the Labor Party, which brought socialism to Britain, is reversing its stand.

Important facts which have emerged are as follows:

Efficiency in nationalized industries is shown to be considerably lower, over all, than in comparable private industries.

Costs are higher because managers of nationalized industries are not under pressure, as are private owners, to show a profit or even to make ends meet. Deficits are covered by huge Government subsidies.

Prices in most nationalized industries are kept artificially low by political pressure, bear no relationship to costs. The consumer gets stuck for higher taxes and inflationary financing that is required for subsidies.

Labor relations in nationalized industries turn out to be no better—and sometimes considerably worse—than in private industries, contrary to Labor Party expectations. The record of strikes and noncooperation between workers and management in the nationalized coal mines and transport industries is among the blackest in Britain.

Between 1946 and 1951, the Labor Party's program to make Britain a socialistic state took over, as public enterprise, coal, electricity, gas, rail and highway transport, steel, cable communications, the Bank of England, and civil aviation. Using coal as a case in point, the report reveals that \$1 billion has been poured into the mines since 1946 to modernize and maintain them; yet, despite this investment program and the recruitment of 11,000 additional miners, the British mines produced slightly less coal in 1957 than in 1951. The investment program for the mines has been termed a failure by a parliamentary committee that investigated the coal industry last year, and it warned that a second program now under way is also in jeopardy.

With a few rare exceptions, the nationalized coal industry has gone into the red in its current accounts year after year. During a 10-year period of scarcity and a sellers' market, the mines accumulated a \$75 million loss which had to be covered by Government subsidies in addition to the \$1 billion provided for a capital investment.

In fact, the promise made by the Labor Party that nationalized industries would, in time, stand on their own feet without Government subsidies—is proving unrealistic. Steel, an expanding industry, was nationalized for a brief period and then returned to private ownership. It provides a striking contrast to the declining coal industry. Steel production has increased from \$12.7 million tons in 1946 to 21.7 million in 1957. The steel industry has not only earned a profit but has financed a substantial part of its \$1.5 billion program of expansion from its own resources, while still managing to cut prices and pay its workers wages that are among the highest in British industry.

Of late, Britons who have been asking what's really wrong with nationalized industries have come up with some of the answers. The men who run Britain's nationalized industries are influenced more by political pressure than by commercial realities. Since the Government in power, whether Labor or Conservative, finds it expedient to keep both consumers and workers happy, it resists price

increases to appease the consumer and raises wages according to union demands to please the workers. By holding down prices while allowing wages to rise, the result has invariably been a loss at the end of the year.

Overstaffing, inefficiency, and waste are other reasons given for the failure of nationalized industries. In some instances, union pressure keeps two men on a job where only one is needed. The unions have resisted any efforts by management to drop unneeded workers and cut costs and, until recently, political considerations have prevented management from forcing a showdown.

To sum it up, after 13 years of living with it, Britain is ditching socialism as "old-fashioned" and impractical and turning back to private enterprise. But here in the United States, socialism, centralized government, or the welfare state—whichever we prefer to call it—is on the way up. The voices of our courageous and conservative leaders are raised in protest, but are lost in the increasing clamor for more government in business, more Federal subsidies.

If the citizens of the United States are not to heed the advice of their own countrymen who warn of the dangers ahead, are they also determined to ignore the facts as revealed by the experiences of other nations? Britain has written off its experiment in socialism as a failure. What further proof is needed?

Union Power Versus Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on the subject of the illegitimate power vested in union bosses an excellent editorial entitled, "Union Power Versus Public Interest," was published in the Wall Street Journal of January 29, 1959, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION POWER VERSUS PUBLIC INTEREST

The measure of any union reform proposal is how well it grapples with two issues: The protection of union members against unscrupulous union bosses, and the protection of the public against excessive union power.

The recommendations that President Eisenhower sent to Congress yesterday would deal effectively with the first issue, or at least would promise great improvement. By requiring public reports, proper records, secret ballots, criminal penalties for willful violations—in these and other ways the legislative proposals would go far to insure democratic and responsible union organization and to prevent the methods by which unions have been able to abuse their own membership.

But the second issue—the issue of union power—is the more basic, because it is untrammelled union power which threatens the entire public, including union members. The threat is not only the paralysis of whole industries, which has happened often enough, but potentially the paralysis of the whole economy and hence the whole Nation.

It has long been evident that one prime source of such dangerous power is the unions' specific exemption from the antitrust laws, which make such economic power im-

possible for any other group in our society. On this the President's message is silent; it makes no suggestion for removing the exemption.

That is not to say, however, that it does not try to come to grips with union power at all. In at least two important respects it would curb the application of the power.

One of these reforms would outlaw blackmail picketing, a practice whereby a union coerces an employer to recognize it, even though the employer has already recognized another union or the majority of employees don't want the coercing union. Plainly enough, this practice is not only gangsterism but also a bludgeon for a union to use to expand its power. Making it illegal would be, to say the least, a belated victory for elementary justice.

The other proposed reform in this connection would tighten the existing restrictions on secondary boycotts. As it is now, a union, the teamsters, for example—since this is one of their specialties—can put tremendous pressures on a concern with which it is having labor troubles; it can persuade individual truck drivers and members of other unions to boycott any firm doing business with the first concern. The union can also threaten another employer with labor trouble if he persists in doing business with the first firm—and that is often a very effective threat.

Such pressures are so effective, in fact, that they enable unions to extort hot cargo clauses from employers. These are provisions under which an employer agrees not to require his employees to handle goods from a firm having union difficulties. This, too, is a device much admired and used by the teamsters.

All these secondary boycott practices—which, incidentally, can be especially tough on smaller businesses—are a gross and obvious violation of individual rights; just as clearly they are blunt instruments for entrenching and widening a union's power.

Now it's being said in Washington that these remedies for blackmail, picketing, and secondary boycotts are too severe to win the approval of the present Congress, and that Congress will more likely take to the revived Kennedy bill. The latter, along with other glaring deficiencies, omits these two reforms.

That prospect may be true; certainly the problem of union power versus the public interest is a complex one, both politically and intrinsically. At least, however, the administration is indicating some routes to a solution; it is trying to show the public how vital is the public's interest.

Perhaps that will help Congress, too, to see the problem whole. We hope it will not wait until it is jolted by an event such as Teamster Boss Hoffa's achieving his dream of becoming king of all transport workers in the country. But, late or soon, Congress is going to have to face squarely and entirely the problem of overriding union power.

Unions and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorials from the New York Times of January 30, 1959, and the New York World Telegram and Sun of January 29, 1959, relating to the competing bills now before the Con-

gress designed to correct certain labor abuses and undemocratic practices followed by some unions. Both bills are designed to promote and protect the rights of individual union members within the union organization. However, reasonable men will differ when it comes to changes or additions to the National Labor Relations Act—Taft-Hartley Act—rather than proposals that have as their immediate objective greater democracy, honesty, and efficiency within the union structure. These editorials suggest the importance of considering these two areas separately from each other:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1959]

LABOR UNION REFORM BILLS

The overwhelming demand of the public, supported by the AFL-CIO, that dictation and corruption by union officials be outlawed in this country may now be thwarted again by partisan politics and irrelevant issues. Two competing measures are now before Congress, where there should be only one—and a bipartisan one at that. They are the Kennedy bill, cosponsored by 11 other Democratic Senators, and the bill introduced by Republican Senator GOLDWATER, based on the President's labor message to Congress.

But a striking feature of these bills is their wide agreement on ways to democratize and purify unions. Both require full reporting and disclosure, policed by the Secretary of Labor, on such matters as organization and governing procedures, financial operations and transactions that involve a conflict of interest. Both require the administration of union funds solely in the interests of the members, backed by punitive sanctions. Both call for a secret ballot, free of coercion, in periodic elections of officers; freedom to run for office, with a ban on the use of union funds to support any candidate, and minimum standards for trusteeships of local bodies. Incidentally, why not require a majority vote of all members involved to validate a strike?

Bipartisan support for a measure along these lines should not be too difficult to mobilize. The main trouble is that the two bills differ widely—both as to what is in them and what is left out—in such matters as picketing, secondary boycotts and the jurisdiction and operation of the National Labor Relations Board, which call for amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. And not only are the differences between the bill extremely hard to reconcile, but the problems they deal with are controversial in themselves—which intensifies the differences.

But, after all, these are matters that primarily involve the power and external relations of labor unions, not how they manage their own affairs. Doesn't this mean that amendments to the Taft-Hartley law should be made through a separate, and carefully considered, overall measure? They seem like excess baggage which might well be temporarily jettisoned now for the sake of reaching the main and immediate objective: Greater democracy, honesty and efficiency within American labor unions.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Jan. 29, 1959]

UNIONS AND THE LAW

Two of the big labor union reform bills now have been introduced in Congress—by the Eisenhower administration and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY. Another, being drafted by Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Rackets Committee, is yet to come.

The logical hope would be that Congress take the best of all three and thus produce a law which will clean up the abuses, the corruption and arrogance exposed by the

McClellan investigations. Both the Kennedy and the administration bills are aimed in this direction—the latter more so.

In one important respect, the Kennedy bill is remiss. It does not deal with secondary boycotts. While the Taft-Hartley law on the books since 1947 forbids secondary boycotts, the administration bill attempts to tighten this ban, which has been widely evaded. It deals specifically with threats, coercion and forcible restraint—the usual methods in secondary boycotts.

The two bills differ on what constitutes illegal picketing.

The administration measure would outlaw picketing in jurisdictional disputes, where the issues already have been settled legally or where the union cannot prove sufficient interest on the part of employees. The Kennedy bill would also outlaw blackmail picketing where a money payoff was the purpose.

Both types of picketing are immoral and ought to be outlawed.

There are other complex differences between these bills which must be studied in detail in the effort to give a fair shake to union members (as contrasted to union bosses) and to the public.

Any law which reaches in this direction is an improvement—and if Congress will stick to those two objectives, it not only will reduce the abuses revealed by the McClellan investigation, but will be doing the union movement a wholesome favor.

Health Insurance for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the welfare of our senior citizens has been, as it should be, a matter of growing concern in recent years, as their numbers have continued to mount in proportion to the population.

The maintenance of an adequate standard of living for senior people and of adequate housing and improved health and medical care facilities for this segment of our population, have been a matter of great concern to government, labor, and industry. Over the past 25 years each has done much to help in these worthwhile objectives.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House, I have long taken an interest in social security and other legislative proposals to provide more and deserved comfort and security for people in the later years of their lives. Industry and labor have worked together in the development of improved pension and retirement plans. For some years I have sponsored a bill to extend to the self-employed the same tax-deferred privileges enjoyed by approved and qualified employee pension plans. I have hopes that that bill, which last year passed the House by an overwhelming voice vote, will be enacted this session or, at the latest, during this Congress.

Unfortunately, progress assuring the 65-plus group adequate means with which to meet the burden of higher costs for medical care has not kept stride with other social welfare advances. Those

over 65, generally, have been unable to obtain health insurance coverage.

There are now about 15 million people of age 65, or more, in the United States—about 8.6 percent of the total population—and only about 6 million of these have hospital-surgical coverage. This coverage for the most part is under plans which they paid for prior to age 65 and which plans have advanced to permit retention of coverage after age 65.

It is, therefore, very encouraging to many to note the intensified efforts on the part of the insurance industry and the medical profession to solve this problem and to give to those over age 65 the opportunity of providing for their own medical care costs through private initiative.

The Continental Casualty Co., one of the Nation's largest insurance companies, has pioneered in this field and other insurers are following suit.

The Continental 65-plus policy, after being tested in several States, has recently been introduced in my home State of New York and in seven other Eastern States.

By successfully applying the principle of group insurance to individuals, Continental has found that it is possible to make available, without restriction, basic hospitalization and surgical insurance coverage to those age 65 plus.

This new plan admittedly is not a panacea. For this critical problem, it most certainly does represent a great and feasible stride forward in the expansion of voluntary health prepayment plans for those generally more in need of such protection, and, as such, merits the public recognition by those in government, industry, and labor who long have urged the encouragement of such worthwhile experiments. We shall see.

The Legacy of Dr. Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last Dr. Jonah B. Wise, the spiritual head of the Central Synagogue of New York, passed away. Rabbi Wise was known as an elder statesman of religion. He has been described as one of the most contributive and distinguished leaders of American Judaism of this generation. He was a leading exponent of interfaith cooperation.

Rabbi Wise was one of the founders of the United Jewish Appeal and served continuously as a national chairman of that organization from its founding until last year, when he was named honorary national chairman. It was under his leadership that the UJA was able to raise sufficient funds to help the oppressed and needy Jews throughout the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial which appeared in the New York Times of February 3:

THE LEGACY OF DR. WISE

There must be at least a million persons in the world whose unhappy lot has been ameliorated by the efforts of Dr. Jonah B. Wise, who was for so long the chairman of the United Jewish Appeal. There are other millions who have been inspired by his leadership in the effort to help refugees of all faiths. There are millions of his own co-religionists who looked to him for a special type of interpretation of religious thought. They, also, are his heirs.

We like to think, however, that his greatest contribution to our time was his understanding of the need to bring together persons of differing backgrounds of religious faith in a common cause of religious feeling and purpose. In this sense he was much more than an outstanding leader in his own faith. He was also a leader in the cause of better understanding among men.

Unions in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not wish to burden the RECORD with insertions all of the same character, but I realize the subject is of great interest to the American people. In the hope that editors around the country who read the RECORD may be encouraged by remarks of some of their brethren in the larger cities, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal touching on the subject of the illegitimate, unbridled power of union bosses, which is entitled "The Only Political Party."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ONLY POLITICAL PARTY

When George Meany recently said organized labor might some day have to set up its own political party, his remark was not taken very seriously even by other unionists.

That's natural, since labor already has its own party. In fact, some say that COPE—the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education—is the only political party in the United States today.

To be sure, this "party" works through the Democratic Party. But its effectiveness is no less for that. As a report from Washington in this newspaper today notes, 77 percent of the Senate candidates backed by COPE in the November voting were elected; in the much larger House, COPE's score was 62 percent.

And now, not surprisingly, the political bills are beginning to come due. Labor has a small army of lobbyists in Washington ready to oversee the enactment of the unions' legislative goals of lots more Federal spending for all kinds of socialistic purposes. They may not push everything at once, realizing that they can overdo their zeal and also that after 1960 they may have won the White House as well as much of Congress.

A revealing tactic in this connection is to press promptly for a weak union "reform" bill to forestall the possibility of a tough one; then, after 1960, they could hope to accomplish one of their important aims: The dismantling of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Well, we know of no legal objection to the unions having their own party or to lobbying for what they consider their legislative interests. All the same, we think the strategic and perhaps dominant position now occupied by the unions in Congress raises questions to which all the people ought to give some serious thought.

Is it right, from any point of view, for union members to have to pay for the support of their leaders' political candidates? That is what happens now, even though many members do not share their leaders' views. It is also the members' dues which finance the lobbyists working for legislation which not all of the members want.

Is it right for a large number of Senators and Representatives to be in the pockets of the unions? It may sound naive to say it, but, after all, these men are supposed to represent their whole constituencies, which they cannot conceivably do when their political life depends on organized labor. It would be an unhealthy development no matter what the group; it is especially so in the case of unions, with their heavy burden of collectivism and corruption.

Is it right for any group to enjoy political power vastly out of the proportion to its numbers? There are well over 170 million Americans, of whom some 15 million belong to unions. And very few of those are in a position to determine union policy or political strategy. It is perfectly plain that a tiny group of union leaders are well on the way to being able to dictate the policies of the U.S. Government.

The core of the labor problem in this country is too much power. It is power expressly granted by the law, and it is already the power to paralyze the national economy. From the excessive power comes the flagrant corruption, for if men are put above the law they are all too likely to act accordingly. On the economic power is based the tremendous political power. It is far too much power for any group to wield, far too much for the safety of the Nation.

These are not theories or formless fears. They are facts parading before our eyes today. We had better not delay deciding whether we really do want to have just this one political party.

Closing of Caven Point Army Terminal, Leonardo Ammunition Depot, and Curtailment of Activities at Bayonne Naval Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter received from Mr. Frank Murray, president of Local No. 1247 of International Longshoremen's Association Independent who states that the matter of closing the Caven Point Army Terminal in Jersey City, the Leonardo Ammunition Depot, and the curtailment of activities at the Bayonne Naval Base by the Department of Defense has created a desperate economic situation to longshoremen and allied craft industry of New Jersey and New York and requests a probe of the Defense Department. Since I am interested in the matter of employment in the port of New Jersey, especially as it

effects my constituency in the 14th Congressional District, I commend this letter to your attention:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S
ASSOCIATION INDEPENDENT,
Jersey City, N.J., January 27, 1959.
Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The longshore and allied craft industry of New Jersey and New York has felt a desperate economic pinch during the past several months. This has resulted from the closing of Cavan Point Army Terminal in Jersey City, the Leonardo Ammo Depot, and the curtailment of activity at the Bayonne Naval Base by the Department of Defense.

During the closing days of the last session of Congress, we, together with public officials of Jersey City and Hudson County and representatives of commerce and industry, contacted Members of the House, appealing to them for support in our fight to save the ports of New York and New Jersey from being sacked by the Defense Department.

Meetings were held in the Pentagon, telegrams were sent to the White House, the local press backed up our pleas but to no avail.

The Defense Department through the voices of Messrs. Frank Higgins and Courtney Johnson insisted that Cavan Point was closing for reasons of economy. That no cargo would be diverted from the port of New York. That it was a dunnage storage area.

We labeled these charges false. We now hereby request you as our Representative from New Jersey to launch a full-scale investigation of the Department of Defense.

We shall also invite your fellow Members from Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Richmond Counties to join with you in this request, inasmuch as many of their constituents have been affected when Staten Island was closed for economy.

On an enclosed sheet we submit a list of charges which we feel in justice should be answered to the hundreds of families of unemployed longshoremen. Many of these men have exhausted their unemployment benefits and are faced with the plight of being forced on relief roles.

We are requesting Messrs. GALLAGHER and DANIELS from the 13th and 14th Districts of New Jersey to serve as our chairmen and that they insert our charges into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr., has arranged a meeting to be held at the Pentagon, February 6 at 2 p.m., and has assured us that the matter will be brought up on the Senate floor.

We have full confidence that you will aid us in this fight and return to the ports of New Jersey and New York their just deserts.

Copies of this letter together with the statement of charges have been sent to all newspapers in the metropolitan area.

Very truly yours,
FRANK MURRAY.
[Enclosure: Statement of charges.]

CHARGES

We accuse the Department of Defense with a systematic sacking of ports of New Jersey and New York under the guise of economy. We accuse that military cargo has been channeled from New York in general, and into Philadelphia in particular.

We cite as examples the closing of piers in Staten Island, Leonardo Ammo Depot, Cavan Point, and curtailment of activity at the Bayonne naval base. We ask is the Brooklyn Army base to follow?

We state that the Defense Department has created a monopoly for the handling of thousands of tons of military cargo and

turned these shipments over to one firm, the Northern Metals Co. in Philadelphia.

We ask why 200 stevedoring firms in the New York harbor were not given an opportunity to bid on these military cargo contracts. But Northern Metals was awarded the contract without bidding.

We ask is it in the best interest of the Government to pay for storage, warehousing and rentals for 70 acres of land in Philadelphia when 365 acres of tax free, rent free property owned by the Army exists in Jersey City known as Cavan Point.

We ask is it wise economy for ships to have to sail 10 extra hours to reach ports in Europe from Philadelphia. Or to have to wait for proper tides before vessels can berth in the Northern Metals Docks, via the Delaware River.

We ask why a former commanding general of the New York Port of Embarkation resigned a high position from Northern Metals Co. We ask are there at present any high ranking former military officers on this company's payroll.

We ask why the same reason to close Staten Island was given to the public officials of the counties of Manhattan, Kings, and Richmond in 1954 and then to New Jersey officials in 1958.

We ask Presidential Assistant Wilfred S. Persons where have the millions of tons of military cargo which were handled at the closed piers shipped from during the years 1954 to 1958, inclusive, when he stated, "I have been advised that no cargo has been nor will be diverted from New York."

Finally we ask why Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy feels that any further meetings with New Jersey officials will serve no useful purpose.

A Mountain of Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial that appeared in the Boston Daily Globe, February 2, 1959, which is worthy of the consideration of the Members of the Congress:

A MOUNTAIN OF WHEAT

The farm problem in the United States today is best approached if one realizes that it is an instance of the machine throttling man, a social problem more than an agricultural one. Scientific farming has so increased the yield from the ever-diminishing amount of land give over to crops that we are slowly being suffocated under a mountain of wheat. In 1958, America harvested the greatest general crop ever from the smallest amount of land planted in any year since 1918.

In 1959, it has been estimated, the job of storing, managing and partially disbursing our food surpluses will cost us \$1 billion alone. Our budget item for price supports and stabilization of farm incomes will be \$5.4 billion. This is about 40 percent of the national farm income.

Meanwhile, the poor in Haiti riot for want of food, and well-to-do Brazil is tormented by a touch of famine. Even at home, anomaly rides the scene. About 1.5 million farm families in the United States have cash incomes of less than \$1,000 a year. Of the

many farms producing wheat, only a little more than half collect 90 percent of the Government subsidies.

The big corporation farm prospers. Some large farms produce crops for which there is no market, calculating their enterprise deliberately to make money through the parity payment system, worsening the Government's storage headache. Better the crop should be plowed under. Meanwhile, the family farm is being forced to the wall. The number of men on farms declines; and homes decay.

This is the situation that President Eisenhower's latest message on farm policy seeks to correct. Unfortunately many of its recommendations will be unacceptable to a majority of the Congress.

The farm situation has worsened under the Eisenhower Administration. The flexible prices supports, so praised by Secretary Benson, have not proved themselves to the point that the Democratic Members of Congress will be inclined to vote him the broad powers that the President has asked. Others will simply be unwilling to abandon the parity program based on the 1910-14 formula.

Yet it seems almost certain that some other formula must be found. The principal point to be seized in regard to the matter is that the parity program, rigidly linked to farm income levels of 1910-14, was devised to ensure production and now must be twisted to serve the opposite purpose of somehow combining with acreage control to fight overproduction. And this at a time when scientific agriculture has made a mockery of acreage control.

Perhaps the farm problem is insoluble. Whatever system is devised, absurdities creep in, which only means that times change, economies alter, and man progresses. What is needed is an approach which strives to set a balance and permits quick decision by Congress or speedy action by the Department of Agriculture to restore the balance when it starts to totter.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON says curtly that Congress will come up with a workable farm program that will not be conceived out of a desire to punish the farmer for the sins of the Agriculture Department. At least both sides see that the point of no return has been reached under the present system, and that something drastic must be done to restore and maintain a stable reciprocation of price and production in a broadening farm economy.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

British Turbines, Keep Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was broadcast over WDSU-TV and WDSU Radio on January 27, 1959:

BRITISH TURBINES, KEEP OUT

Representative HALE Boggs has criticized—with good reason—the way this country has just slammed the door on a British electrical company. The story is not one of fair play.

The United States, which has repeatedly urged its allies to emphasize trade, not aid, invited the British to bid on work for large hydroelectric projects in this country.

In this case, the British put in a bid on furnishing two turbines for a dam to be built in Arkansas. They went to all the expense and effort of surveys, blueprints, and estimates to put in their bid, even though they knew the odds were against them. The odds were unfavorable because, under our law, a foreign bidder has to bid 6 percent lower than an American company to win the contract. And if the American company happens to be in an area of substantial unemployment, the foreign company has to bid 12 percent lower.

Bidding on the turbines for the Arkansas dam, a British company managed to beat those odds. It bid 19 percent lower than the lowest American company—a difference of some \$300,000.

Then, some days after the bids were opened and the British bid turned out to be much the lowest, a Government agency in Washington ruled that the contract would go to an American company after all. The agency said that national security was involved, although, as Boags points out, the same office had said that this kind of machinery has no defense significance.

The original announcement, incidentally, that the contract would go to a Philadelphia firm, instead of to the British company, came from Republican Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania.

So, on our invitation, the British invested considerable time, effort, and money, to bid on this project. Then, after they put in the best bid, the contract went to an American company on a technicality—a sort of change of rules announced after the ball game was over.

The British are now hollering "We wuz robbed." Or, maybe being British, they're hollering "We were robbed."

However they're saying it, we can hardly deny it. This is no way for the United States to do business with an ally.

The Sixth Year Begins for the Monitor, Official Catholic Newspaper of the Diocese of Trenton, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Monitor, the official Catholic newspaper of the diocese of Trenton, N.J., is embarking on its sixth year of publication.

The fifth anniversary edition of this worthy newspaper was replete with reports of the widespread support the Monitor has received from the Roman Catholic community throughout Mercer and Burlington Counties. Indeed, the appreciation for the fine service the newspaper has performed has not been confined to members of Catholic congregations alone. Leaders of labor, business, and government have recognized that the invaluable information obtainable only in the Monitor of many of the varied affairs as well as the attitudes in the Catholic community has been of tremendous service not only to the members of the Catholic faith but to themselves as well.

No one can doubt that the official newspaper of the diocese has been su-

premely successful during its first 5 years, and the future of the Monitor is particularly promising now. Although its lay audience has been large, a drive is now underway for total support by the families of the diocese.

The Most Reverend George W. Ahr, the Bishop of Trenton, under whose auspices the Monitor was initiated, has sent an open letter on this circulation drive to everyone in the diocese. In his letter the bishop emphasized the value of the Monitor to the clergy and the laity alike through its dissemination of information to the people of the diocese.

Bishop Ahr declared that—

In the Monitor the diocese has a newspaper of which we can all be proud. But more than that it is an efficient aid to the bishop and priests in their difficult task of bringing to you a wider knowledge of things Catholic, a deeper understanding of your holy faith, a more vigorous development of your life of grace.

The sixth anniversary edition of the Monitor once again reminds the people of the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, of the great loss we all sustained with the tragic death of Msgr. Richard T. Crean in the fire which destroyed St. Mary's cathedral. The good monsignor somehow found a place in his incredibly crowded schedule to foster the development of the Monitor and its further service to our people, along with many other fine things for the benefit of the people of our diocese and our State of New Jersey. Once more, an otherwise glorious milestone in our history is saddened by the fact that Monsignor Crean cannot be with us to observe the growth of the Monitor as a spiritual and moral force throughout our religious and lay community.

Chief Robert V. Murray, Metropolitan
Police Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week a colleague of mine, who has just been assigned to the District of Columbia Committee, was quoted in the newspaper as stating that the Police Department of the District of Columbia is one of the worst in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the District of Columbia Committee for 12 years. I have observed the Police Department and believe that they have one of the most difficult police jobs of any city in the world and that they do one of the best jobs of any police force of any city.

Washington is certainly the crossroads of the world. The Capital of our Government is located here, as well as many foreign diplomats, and each of these groups cause a special police problem.

It is true that there is a high crime rate in Washington, but for sure the police do not cause the crimes.

I want to compliment the Washington Metropolitan Police Department and their chief, Robert V. Murray, and to include at this point a copy of a resolution adopted by the House District of Columbia Committee commending Chief Murray:

Whereas Chief of Police Robert V. Murray, of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, has rendered outstanding services to the Nation's Capital in the field of law enforcement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives hereby commends Chief of Police Robert V. Murray, of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, for the distinguished service he has rendered as the chief law-enforcement officer of the Nation's Capital, and the committee also commends and approves his administration of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

Resolved, That, the chairman of the committee is authorized to have prepared and to present to Chief of Police Robert V. Murray an appropriate replica of this resolution and to extend to him the sincere best wishes of the committee for continued success in his administration of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

JOHN L. McMILLAN, Chairman; JOHN DOWDY, HENRY O. TALLE, JOS. P. O'HARA, HOWARD W. SMITH, BILLY MATTHEWS, JAMES C. DAVIS, OREN HARRIS, JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., DEWITT HYDE, JOEL T. BROYHILL, A. L. MILLER, SID SIMPSON, JOE HOLT, ROY W. WIER, THOS. G. ABERNATHY, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, CARROLL KEARNS, KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, ABRAHAM MULTER, OLIN E. TEAGUE, JIM PATTERSON, JIMMY MORRISON.

2d Lt. George W. P. Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I inform my colleagues of the death of 2d Lt. George W. P. Walker, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Walker of 1103 East 34th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. Lieutenant Walker was in an aircraft accident in North Carolina while he was en route to Oakland, Calif., for overseas assignment.

Lieutenant Walker was my appointee to the U.S. Military Academy and when he was graduated from that institution in June of 1958, he stood No. 1 in his class. For the entire time he attended the Military Academy, he was carried on the dean's list.

Upon graduation, he was presented with the following awards:

For having the highest rating in mechanics of fluids, a portable typewriter, presented by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

For excellence in intercollegiate debating, a wristwatch presented by the Consul General of Switzerland.

As the No. 1 man in military topography, a wristwatch presented by the Daughters of the Union Veterans of the Civil War.

The Francis Vinton Greene Memorial, caliber .45 pistol, presented in the name of Mrs. Greene, for standing No. 1 in general order of merit for 4 years; a set of books presented by the American Bar Association for having the highest rating in law; a silver tray—called the Eisenhower award—presented by Mr. Charles P. McCormick of Baltimore, Md., for excellence in military psychology and leadership.

In addition to maintaining his very high military and academic standing while at the Academy, Cadet Walker was active in extracurricular activities, and during his last year held the rank of lieutenant in the Corps of Cadets.

The Nation has lost a potential outstanding military leader and the loss is indeed a great one. I was proud to have been his sponsor, and I join in grieving with his parents.

Balancing the \$40 Billion Defense Budget by Firing 17 Custodial Employees Under the Contracting-Out Subterfuge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, after months of effort—telephone calls, correspondence, further correspondence, and more telephone calls—I have finally obtained from the Department of Defense its explanation for the proposed dismissal of 17 longtime career employees in St. Louis and their replacement through the device of contracting-out the work they do.

These 17 men are in the custodial force at the Army Support Center in St. Louis. They have worked for the Government for from 7½ to 20 years. Many are veterans—this is the kind of work which is normally supposed to be reserved for veterans who qualify—and some are disabled veterans with 10-point preference under civil service.

I am now informed that by contracting-out their work to private enterprise, we are going to be well on our way to solving "the general funding situation within the Department of the Army" which has "required that stringent economy measures be imposed."

WHERE ARE THE ELUSIVE FIGURES ON ECONOMY?

Mr. Speaker, we all expect and demand that the Defense Department exercise strict economy. We all know that the greatest part—the overwhelming part—of the huge budget Congress has been asked to enact for the coming fiscal year represents expenditures of the Department of Defense. If we could save substantial sums in Defense Department ex-

penditures, we could almost certainly enjoy the luxury of cutting taxes, and certainly we could eliminate the nuisance excise taxes. So cutting Defense Department expenditures—if that is safe to do, in light of our defense needs—would be most acceptable to all of us.

But I have not been convinced that firing 17 longtime employees of the Army Support Center in St. Louis and turning over the work of these custodial employees to private enterprise on a contract basis, will put any significant crimp in a \$40 billion defense budget. Further than that, I cannot obtain—I have not been able as yet to obtain—any figures actually showing there would be any saving at all. The figures are elusive.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, my information is that the substitution of a private contract for the custodial work now done by these modestly paid civil service employees would actually cost the Government more rather than less for cleaning the installation in St. Louis.

CAREER GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SUMMARILY FIRED

In the meantime, these 17 employees, many of them up in years, face a bleak prospect in looking for other work. I have received very moving letters from some of the employees outlining their problem in finding other employment after, in some cases, a lifetime of working for the Federal Government in an unskilled or semiskilled capacity.

It was this situation, plus the difficulty in finding any clearcut evidence of savings to the Federal Government as a result of these dismissals, which led me to intervene in the case as soon as I learned in December that these men had been notified of their scheduled dismissal as of February 15, 1959.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I tried immediately to find out how the Government would accomplish any savings through the dismissal of these men, since the work they perform is going to be performed in any event—and by a private contractor who must not only pay prevailing wages but must make a profit in order to stay in business.

I said that the figures on possible savings are quite elusive. I am convinced, further, that if any such figures exist, they are, in fact, illusive.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations has sought the same figures. I am beginning to doubt that any such figures exist.

It appears to me that someone in the Department of the Army dreamed up a bright idea as to a way to get around personnel ceilings and make it appear through a subterfuge that the Army was cutting down on civilian employees. By firing employees and contracting out the work they do, the Army apparently can show a reduction in employment even though there is no corresponding reduction in expenses, and even though costs may actually be much higher.

If this is what has been happening, then I certainly think the responsible officials in the Department of Defense should crack down—and the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget should also intervene. And Congress, also, must look into this problem—

not because of 17 employees in St. Louis but because their situation seems to be part of a nationwide pattern.

MONTHLY REPORTS ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures issued its monthly report on Government employment for the month of December. It showed a slight cut of 2,943 in the number of Federal employees from the previous month's total of 2,351,824.

The Joint Committee added, Mr. Speaker—and to me this is most significant in view of the situation I have discovered in the Army Support Center in St. Louis—the Joint Committee added that the decrease in overall Government employment of 2,943 represented a cut of 3,930 civilian workers in the military departments against an increase of 987 in employees of the civilian agencies.

How many of the 3,930 civilian employees let go by the military were taken off the rolls only to have their work turned over to private contractors at a cost at least equal to, and probably higher, to the Government? That is the figure I would like to know about, Mr. Speaker.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE INVESTIGATING

In several instances in the past, Mr. Speaker, the military services—and particularly the Army—have been disclosed to have contracted for services through private enterprise in order to maintain a fictitious employee ceiling on total personnel. I am aware of the fact that the General Accounting Office has looked into several such instances, and has found the ceiling on employees cannot legally and properly be circumvented by farming out, on contract, work normally done by Government employees.

The General Accounting Office is currently conducting an inquiry into the proposed dismissals in St. Louis, and I sincerely hope it can establish the true facts. I have not been able to get those facts on specific costs or savings from the Army. In fairness, I might say that the Army informs me there are substantial reductions in direct costs obtainable through contracting out custodial work of this nature—and I will place that letter in the RECORD later in my remarks—but I have seen no figures to bear this out. And the information does not coincide with information I received elsewhere from sources I deem to be reliable.

EXCHANGES OF CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Speaker, I submit, in chronological order, some of the correspondence I have sent or received on this matter.

First, the letter I wrote to Secretary of Defense McElroy shortly after this matter was brought to my attention, and after I had made a series of preliminary inquiries by telephone:

[LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Third District, Missouri]

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 12, 1958.

Hon. NEIL H. McELROY,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have recently learned of a Department of Defense action

in St. Louis involving a group of faithful career Government employees, many of them with 10-point preference as disabled veterans. The whole situation smacks of shabby treatment and fiscal dishonesty. I am writing to you in the hope that you will not only correct this particular situation but see to it that any similar episodes occurring elsewhere are stopped.

In an apparent desire to reduce the number of civilian employees of the Department of Defense, someone in the Department dreamed up the idea of eliminating certain custodial positions and then placing out the work on a contract basis. As a result, a majority of the men now employed as laborers in the custodial department of the St. Louis Area Support Center have been notified their jobs will be eliminated February 15 and the work put out on contract. When I inquired about this I was informed that the orders had come from the 5th Army Headquarters, who got their orders from Washington, based on a determination to reduce the number of employees. So far as I can determine there will be absolutely no saving in costs and, in fact, operating costs may increase.

The men involved have been employed by the Federal Government for periods ranging from 7½ to 20 years. There are only a few of them involved and I can appreciate the fact that with all the worries that you have you may not have the opportunity to look into a matter involving perhaps 17 employees in an installation in St. Louis. Yet I think the principle involved here is important enough to justify the concern of everyone in the Department of Defense interested in preventing injustice to faithful, long-time employees and interested also in avoiding the presentation of a dishonest picture of "economies" in the Department.

May I have a report on this matter at your earliest convenience?

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District,
Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, since the monthly reports on Government employment issued by Senator BYRD's joint committee may well have been a factor in the Army's desire to contract out various types of work to private enterprise, and since I know the Senator from Virginia would want to make sure that the figures his committee issues reflect the true conditions of Government employment, I addressed the following letter to Senator BYRD in his capacity as chairman of the joint committee:

DECEMBER 12, 1958.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of
Nonessential Federal Expenditures, U.S.
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Each month the joint committee of which you are chairman issues reports on the number of Government employees and the increase or decrease in Government payrolls. This is useful information for the Congress to have and I am sure stimulates the executive department in seeking to hold employment in line.

May I respectfully point out, however, that in an attempt, apparently, to make its employment picture look better that it really is, the Department of Defense seems to have adopted a policy of discharging long-time, faithful, career Government employees and awarding this work on a contract basis to outside firms.

A situation of this kind has just been called to my attention at the Army's St. Louis Area Support Center, where a majority of the custodial staff—men with from 7½ to 20 years of service, including a number with 10-point preference as disabled veterans—

are to be discharged as of February 15th. I have checked and I have been informed that the Federal Government will not save any money by such a step but may, actually, pay out more than it presently does for this work.

Of course, by eliminating these jobs and others like them the Department of Defense presumably shows a better employment picture while hiding or disguising the cost of custodial work in other accounts or items of its budget.

I wonder if there is any way your committee can investigate this type of practice and see to it that the departments do not provide a misleading and totally dishonest picture of their employment costs by resorting to subterfuges of this kind, particularly when career Government employees are cast adrift after a lifetime of service.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District,
Missouri.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if the contracting out of custodial work was in fact a subterfuge to get around ceilings on personal services employment, and could cost the Government far more in the long run than retaining faithful employees in the work, it occurred to me that the President's chief budget officer, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, would want to look into the situation. Consequently, I addressed the following letter to Mr. Stans:

DECEMBER 12, 1958.

HON. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: May I call your attention to a situation in St. Louis which I think is reprehensible?

After a lifetime of service, a group of Federal employees on the custodial staff of the Army's St. Louis Support Center—all of them with from 7½ to 20 years service, some of them with 10-point veterans' preference—have received notice of discharge as of February 15. The work they have been performing is to be put out on contract to private firms. I am informed that there will be absolutely no saving to the Federal Government as a result of this step, although there will be great hardship on the individuals involved.

Could you give me the thoughts of the Bureau of the Budget on measures of this kind taken by individual agencies to carry out the orders of the President to cut down on employment, when the measures taken are subterfuges of this kind, saving no money whatsoever and perhaps costing more than the present system?

Does the Bureau of the Budget exercise any supervision or control over agencies putting out more and more of their work on a contract basis to private firms when there is absolutely no saving involved and when it actually costs the Government more in the long run?

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District,
Missouri.

Following, Mr. Speaker, is a reply I received from Senator BYRD, dated December 15:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF
NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES,
December 15, 1958.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I have your letter of December 12. I am very glad that you have

called this matter to my attention.

I share your concern over such a practice and I shall look into the matter thoroughly. With high regards and very best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense acknowledged my letter to the Secretary in a reply dated December 16, and indicated the Department of the Army would seriously study the allegations. That letter follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1958.
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is to acknowledge your letter to the Secretary of Defense dated December 12, 1958, in which you requested a report pertaining to certain personnel practices by the Army in the St. Louis Area Support Center. Secretary McElroy is out of the country on official business.

Your letter complained of elimination by the Army of certain custodial positions in order to reduce the number of civilian employees, and then allegedly having the same work effected by contractors. This is a matter within the purview and knowledge of the Department of the Army, and I have therefore taken the liberty of referring your letter to the Secretary of the Army for direct reply to you.

Please be assured that the allegations contained in your letter will be seriously studied, and investigated if necessary.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated. Sincerely yours,

CARLTON R. ADAMS,
Captain, USN, Deputy Assistant to the
Secretary (Legislative Affairs).

On the last day of the year, Mr. Speaker, the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Elmer B. Staats, responded to my letter of December 12 as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1958.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in response to your letter of December 12, 1958.

Administration policy, as expressed in Bureau of the Budget Bulletins 55-4 and 57-7, reads as follows:

"It is the general policy of the administration that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels. Exceptions to this policy shall be made by the head of an agency only where it is clearly demonstrated in each case that it is not in the public interest to procure such product or service from private enterprise."

Savings to the Government are not always apparent in action taken under this policy because comparisons of cost may not include all relevant costs of the agency production unit. Government and private accounting systems differ which makes comparison difficult, and because taxes paid by the private entrepreneur to Government may offset apparently higher costs.

Agencies are required to carry out actions under this policy in an orderly way. They have been directed to give adequate notice to the community and employees in advance of discontinuance or curtailment, and where necessary to assist employees in finding other employment.

Through such measures it is hoped that the inevitable dislocations which occur can be minimized to the end that a viable econ-

omy might be maintained and responsible Government promoted.

Please get in touch with us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Assistant Director.

BUDGET BUREAU SEES VIABLE ECONOMY IN FARMING OUT 17 CUSTODIAL JOBS TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Mr. Speaker, I read the letter from Mr. Staats with great interest—and a somewhat sinking feeling in the pit of my stomach. If I gather its drift correctly, we are to turn over to private enterprise all jobs now performed by Government employees except where it is clearly demonstrated in each case that it is not in the public interest to procure such product or service from private enterprise.

Under that approach, I am sure we could conceivably justify firing nearly everybody in Government except the Cabinet members and a few assistants. We could hire taxis instead of chauffeurs for the entire executive level of the executive department; we could farm out the Council of Economic Advisers to the Brookings Institution and the Budget Bureau to one of the big industrial management firms. We could assign Westinghouse or General Electric the task of administering the Atomic Energy Act; and we could fire a whole slew of generals, admirals, and Assistant Secretaries of Defense and farm out their work to corporations expressly formed for that kind of servicing operation.

This may be taking the thing far afield, Mr. Speaker, but the principle is the same. We are firing 17 janitors in St. Louis in order to shore up private enterprise, assure a viable economy and perhaps—we do not know for sure, but perhaps—save some money, perhaps, only by the fact that we will collect taxes on the private contractor doing the work these 17 men have performed.

Mr. Speaker, on January 20 the Army directed another interim letter to me on this matter, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1959.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in further reply to your inquiry pertaining to certain personnel practices by the Army in the St. Louis Area Support Center.

Please be advised that the investigation of this matter is continuing. Upon receipt of the necessary information you will be informed immediately.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. B. WALTERS,
Lieutenant Colonel, GS, Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

After nearly 2 more weeks of waiting, while the February 15 deadline for the dismissal of the custodial employees at St. Louis rapidly approached, and after a number of calls to find out what, if anything was happening on this, I have finally received the Army's reply to my letter of December 12.

This letter, dated today and hand-carried to me, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1959.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in reply to your recent inquiry regarding the proposed release of custodial laborers at the U.S. Army Support Center, St. Louis, Mo., and assignment of the custodial work on a contractual basis.

The general funding situation within the Department of the Army has required that stringent economy measures be imposed. Since, in many instances, the application of such measures has brought about a reduction in available manpower without a corresponding reduction in the amount of work to be performed, local commanders have been forced to explore every possible means for continuing their operations.

The St. Louis Support Center was faced with this problem when, approximately 7 months ago, it became necessary to assume the maintenance of additional office space in the Mart Building. At that time, due to budgetary limitations, space authorizations would not permit the employment of any additional personnel for the performance of this additional work and it was decided to contract for its performance.

Experience with this contract indicated that there were a number of advantages to the installation. First, a substantial reduction in direct cost has occurred, even though the contractor is paying prevailing union wages for such work. Second, the contractor furnishes all equipment and supplies, thus relieving the installation of the work involved in procuring, accounting for, and repairing numerous items of property not required for the conduct of its mission. Third, there has been a substantial reduction in the overhead required for supervision of the custodial work.

Further budgetary limitations have now required that the St. Louis Support Center seek additional means of carrying out its mission without jeopardizing essential operations. Such limitations were partially met by not filling 13 vacancies arising from personnel actions such as retirements, transfers, and resignations. In the light of earlier favorable experience with contract operations fully within fund limitations, it was decided to reduce the maintenance staff by 17 employees and to enter into an additional contract for the performance of this work.

Any action which causes the loss of loyal and experienced personnel is always regretted by the Department. You may be assured, however, that every effort is being extended by the center to find other employment for the employees involved. To date this action has resulted in the probable placement of three employees.

Thank you for your interest in this matter, and I hope that the information furnished will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

C. G. DODGE,
Brigadier General, GS, Deputy Chief
of Legislative Liaison.

MORE INVOLVED THAN 17 CUSTODIAL JOBS

Mr. Speaker, it is not very encouraging that in the period since early December until now—a period of 2 months since these 17 men were notified they were going to be let go—the Army's "every effort" in helping the men find other employment has resulted in "the probable placement of three employees."

That, more than anything else the Army and the other agencies involved have said, or omitted from saying, sums

up the cruelty of this whole high-handed episode.

It may seem a bit far-fetched for me to go into so much detail here today over the jobs of 17 custodial employees in an Army installation in St. Louis. But these are not 17 fence posts, or 17 desks, or 17 cases of floor wax. They are 17 long-time, career Government employees, in jobs normally reserved for and assigned to veterans, and some are disabled veterans. There are 17 families involved here. One of the men who wrote to me has 8 children—he is a 10-point disabled veteran with 22 months of overseas service to his credit and 16 months of service in the States in World War II.

Both the Disabled American Veterans and the American Legion have intervened in these dismissals because of the pattern and trend they reflect in disguising Government personnel costs by turning out career employees—frequently veterans—and replacing them through the private contract subterfuge.

I appreciate the interest other Members of the House have showed in this problem when I discussed it with them, and I appreciate the follow-up inquiries which several have made. I hope we can save these 17 jobs. But the principle involved here goes far beyond the 17 men involved. It goes to the heart of decency in personnel and fiscal policies in Government.

The Big Jump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

MR. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "The Big Jump," which appeared in the supplement with the first issue of Looking Ahead for 1959, a publication issued periodically by the Second Bank-State Street Trust Co. of Boston, Mass.

Since this subject is most timely, it may be of interest to my colleagues:

THE BIG JUMP

Probably your great-grandchildren will be told in school that the space age began in 1959—the year when earthlings made their first real contact with the moon.

But men have been going to the moon, in their imaginations, for 5,000 years—ever since Etana, the shepherd, went there on an eagle to complain to God about oppressive taxation in Babylon.

Science-fiction was written way back in the second century and parodied by Lucian, the Greek, in his "True History." Lucian's hero got to the moon by accident when his ship was carried aloft by a waterspout while sailing beyond the Pillars of Hercules, where almost anything could happen in those days. He found there a race of creatures who drank air and ate the smoke of roasting frogs.

During the Middle Ages life was too grim for fantasy, but in the 1600's speculation about space travel was renewed. Francis Godwin, Bishop of Hereford, in his "The

Man in the Moone, or a Discourse of a Voyage Thither," published in 1638, imagined a flock of geese as the prime mover. The birds were trained to follow a white sheet which, when manipulated as a yachtsman might handle a spinnaker, enabled the pilot to navigate. He reported that the inhabitants of the moon were a peace-loving people whose language could be written only in musical notes. In the same year another bishop, John Wilkins, wrote "The Discovery of a World in the Moon," a quasi-scientific discussion of the possibility of earth men living on the moon. In 1649 Cyrano de Bergerac, in his "Histoires Comiques," dreamed of rocket propulsion with the sun as a source of power.

Galileo could have told them that their tales were tall because he had a good look at the moon with his telescope in 1609, but the Inquisition soon silenced his heretical talk about a new conception of cosmography.

Probably the best-known yarn that has been spun about travel to the moon is Jules Verne's "From the Earth to the Moon," written in 1865. His crew was shot from a giant gun and circled the moon without landing. Verne was followed 5 years later by Boston's Edward Everett Hale, who wrote a serial story called "The Brick Moon," for the Atlantic Monthly. Dr. Hale seems to have been the first to imagine an artificial earth satellite.

John Jacob Astor made his contribution in 1894 with his "Journey to Other Worlds" and H. G. Wells, in 1901, in "The First Men in the Moon," imagined a material called cavorite that canceled the earth's gravity.

For the last 50 years we have been getting closer and closer to our nearest neighbor in the galaxy, but we are still earth bound. We are, as one scientist put it, like a potato bug in a sack of potatoes in the hold of a ship wondering what makes the ship go. But we will soon know more and you may be sure that such news as reaches us will be reported in Looking Ahead.

Why do we want to reach the moon? "Because," as a famous mountain climber once said, "it's there."

My True Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the RECORD today, an excellent speech which was made by Miss Pattie Ritter, of Jacksonville, Fla., on the subject of true security. It seems to me that the message of this young lady is one which all good Americans should profit by reading.

The speech follows:

My True Security

Exactly what is security? A feeling? An emotional state? It is these, but, also, it is an everyday feeling. Security is something that everyone must have to be a natural human being, not just in the United States, but all over the world. I must possess it in everything I attempt to do. Security exists everywhere, but in order for it to progress, everyone must believe in it.

We, the citizens of the United States of America, have known security from our first few moments on earth. We have found it in our homes, and in the love of our parents. Security starts in the home and is an influ-

ence on all of its surroundings. "The strength of a nation, especially that of a republican nation, is in the intelligent, well-ordered homes of the people." This quotation, taken from the "New Dictionary of Thoughts" could not be more true, but how few of us realize it. Most homes and parents are taken for granted. If they were suddenly taken away from us, only then would we realize how very fortunate we are.

There must be security in our homes. If it does not exist we are without the strength, the supporter of our Nation. There must be security in our Government. Ever since 1787 citizens have enjoyed a fair and secure Government. Without our Government, we are without the United States we all love. Security lies in all our privileges we enjoy as citizens of the United States of America. Our freedom of speech and of the press—being able to voice our views, our problems, our anticipations. Our freedom of education. Our country offers to us an education worth much more than a bike, a car, or pretty clothes, and it is up to us to take hold on this opportunity and make the most of it. Our freedom of religion—being able to attend the church of our choice, worshipping God in our own way. When I think of the many people all over the world who are not free to worship God in their churches on Sunday or any other day of the week, who have to hide their respect for our Almighty Creator, I feel so ashamed of myself for being too lazy to get out of bed and give 1 hour of my time to the Supreme Being, God, that has made me possible.

Yes; there is security in many things. I can live as I please and where I please. I can choose my own friends, elect the people I want to represent me in my Government. I can worship God in the church of my own choice and in my own way. I can attend a school provided for me and millions like me without obligation. I do not have to be afraid to voice my opinions or thoughts. I can go to sleep at night, knowing that my family and I are protected from harm.

What is my true security? It is the United of America, and all of its opportunities, lying before me like an open book. I am so lucky and proud to be able to say, this is my country. I belong to this country, and I will, until my death, cherish this unfailing gift that has been given to me.

The Late Judge Lloyd Herzka

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1958 Judge Lloyd Herzka was called to his eternal home. The entire Brooklyn citizenry was deeply grieved. He was one of Kings County's most promising citizens, dearly beloved, a loyal friend and true American.

When the Honorable John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, was honored at the Beth El annual dinner, he paid a special tribute to Judge Herzka in his speech, which I quote here:

Rabbi Halpern, Mrs. Herzka, Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, how can I possibly put into words all the thoughts that are in my heart at this moment.

Just let me say I am grateful. I am grateful to your chairman, Mr. Stark, and to Mr. Benne Katz for their kind and generous words of friendship.

I am grateful to the mayor of the city of New York who has given up an evening of much needed rest and relaxation so that he could be with me at one of the most important events in my life. And I feel honored indeed that Joe Sharkey and Judge Moss, two of my oldest friends, could be here to take part in these ceremonies.

Let me say that I am thrilled, and I am deeply moved by this beautiful expression of your sentiments.

Mixed with the pleasure of being here tonight, there is a considerable note of sadness. For anything that I have been able to do for Beth-El Hospital has only been a continuation of the great work started by the late Judge Lloyd I. Herzka.

For many years he was my assistant. He was a loyal and devoted friend, whose friendship I sadly miss.

If praise has been earned for any good works, then it is his praise, and I shall accept it for him and in his memory.

I will accept and I will treasure this gift only with the understanding that I serve as a symbol for Judge Herzka and for every one of you here who has worked so tirelessly for Beth-El Hospital.

If I have been privileged to give even a small part of myself to help in this great humanitarian work I feel well rewarded, for it has brought to me a kind of spiritual satisfaction which each one of us grows to cherish more and more as our age and wisdom increase.

You, the friends of Beth-El, have never sought and never will seek earthly reward for your charity, but if every the temptation comes to complain about the endless demands that works of charity make upon you, stop for a moment and ponder upon the message that is contained in a little poem which Lloyd Herzka used to like to quote:

"Go break to the hungry, sweet charity's bread.

For giving is living the angel said,
'Must I be giving again and again?'
The weary wondering question came,
'No!' said the angel piercing me through,
Just stop when the Lord stops giving to you."

And now let me thank you once again for this beautiful gift which Mrs. Cashmore and I will treasure.

Let me thank you, too, for the beautiful tribute that you have paid me here tonight. It will provide me with a memory to cherish the longest day that I live.

Responsibility Passes to Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., under date of January 21, 1959.

The editorial follows:

RESPONSIBILITY PASSES TO DEMOCRATS

President Eisenhower's official presentation of his \$77 billion budget to Congress initiates a measure that carries in it the

destiny of the value of the dollar. Indeed, it might be said that it carries in it a test of the moral character of the American people. As the wealthiest people the world has ever known, will they have the character to tax themselves to pay for what they can afford to have, or are they going to evade payment by borrowing for current expenses?

This new budget, which is the largest in the peacetime history of the country, might well be criticized as being too large. Yet it represents a compromise between two extremes of those who call themselves "liberals" and the others who call themselves "conservatives." Three-fifths of the total sum goes for national defense and security, which should convince doubters that more money than ever is being spent for such purposes.

Now that the President has done his duty, it is up to Congress to do its duty. Since Congress is controlled by the Democrats, the responsibility falls squarely on the shoulders of the Democrats. If they scorn the budget as too small, then they should provide new taxes to pay the bills. If they insist on spending more and more and borrowing to pay for current expenses, they will have initiated a precedent which will forecast a progressive depreciation of the purchasing power of the dollar.

The eyes of the world are upon the United States to see what happens. For years, and as a part of our foreign-aid program, we have insisted that other nations balance their budgets. If the Democrats fail to do this with our own budget, it should not be hard to realize that the prestige and the sincerity of the United States will sink to a new low.

What a spectacle it would be to see the wealthiest and most powerful Nation the world has ever known evade paying for what it can afford from current revenue.

Are the Democrats of Congress going to fail to meet this historic test?

Bloomington, Ind., an All-American City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that a city in my district, Bloomington, Ind., has been selected as one of the all-American cities by Look magazine and the National Municipal League. This is an honor extended to only 11 medium-sized cities throughout the Nation.

Bloomington is a city with which I have had a long and special association, and its achievements are always filled with meaning for me. It has truly been a second home to me since I first went there as a freshman at Indiana University in 1921, and worked at Wells' Cafe. Throughout the years I have had continued close contact with Bloomington. My wife is a professor at Indiana University and my son is a senior in the law school there.

I have lived in Morgan County, which is adjacent to Monroe County, of which Bloomington is the seat, all of my life, as has my family since 1822. The people of Bloomington are and always have been

representative of a friendly, kind, but rugged independence so typical of those living among the rolling hills of southern Indiana. I have known that Bloomington is an all-America city but I am glad to see it receive official recognition.

From long association I know the kind of teamwork which binds the citizens of Bloomington together in one successful civic enterprise after another. I have seen it exemplified in many instances, and I saw it again last fall when they made their presentation before the panel that selected this year's honor cities. I joined the delegation sent out to Colorado Springs, and after seeing first-hand their presentation I felt their selection was assured.

While I was happy to see Bloomington grow and become an increasingly important industrial center, I was fearful that this growth might destroy that friendly, helpful village atmosphere that has made Bloomington such a fine place in which to live and raise a family. But the true greatness of Bloomington is its ability, despite its growth and increasing importance, to remain the kind, friendly community that I knew years ago.

The same judgment applies to Indiana University. One cannot adequately discuss Bloomington without discussing the university, nor discuss the university without discussing Bloomington. Both have lived and grown together for about 140 years. Indiana University has steadily grown from a small but outstanding midwestern school to one of the largest universities in the country and, like Bloomington, it has retained its personal and friendly atmosphere, reflected in its interest in each student.

Perhaps the greatest thing that can be said of any city is that it is a fine place to live. You can certainly say that of Bloomington. It is most outstanding in livability.

Two Amendments To Be Offered to H.R. 2256

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following are two amendments which I propose to offer to the bill H.R. 2256, which I understand will come up for action on the floor tomorrow afternoon. I believe it will be difficult for the veterans to pay the high interest rates proposed in H.R. 2256:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2256, 86TH CONGRESS, AS REPORTED WITH A COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Section 2(a) of H.R. 2256, 86th Congress, as reported with a committee amendment, is amended by (1) striking the word "and" before "(2)" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and (2) by adding before the period at the end thereof the following: "and (3) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: 'In every case in which a loan is guaranteed under section 1810 and the interest rate is more than 4% per centum per annum, the Administrator is authorized

to pay out of appropriations directly to the veteran, during the period the property is owned and occupied by the veteran as his home, and at such intervals as he may prescribe by regulations, an amount representing the difference between the interest paid by the veteran on the loan at the rate actually charged, not exceeding the maximum rate chargeable hereunder at the time the loan was made, and the amount of interest that would have been paid had the rate been set at 4% per centum per annum.'

ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2256, 86TH CONGRESS, AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Amend section 2 of H.R. 2256 by adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'In every case in which the interest rate on the direct loan is more than 4% per centum per annum, the Administrator is authorized to pay out of appropriations directly to the veteran, during the period the property is owned and occupied by the veteran as his home, and at such intervals as the Administrator may prescribe by regulations, an amount representing the difference between the interest paid by the veteran on the loan at the rate actually charged and the amount of interest that would have been paid had the rate been set at 4% per centum per annum.'

Mr. Speaker, it is important to legislate additional money for GI loans. I feel the veterans fare better if they can secure loans under VA auspices.

COMPARISON OF GI LOANS AND FHA LOANS

There are certain definite advantages to GI loan financing over FHA financing from the viewpoint of the veteran borrower and these advantages are present even if the two loans bear an identical interest rate.

The obvious advantage to the GI loan is that it may be obtained for home, farm, or business purposes whereas the FHA has no comparable farm and business loan program.

Other advantages of GI loan financing are as follows:

First. The GI loan guarantee or insurance is furnished without charge to the borrower whereas FHA loan insurance is paid for by the borrower through a mortgage insurance premium payment of one-half percent per annum on the monthly declining balance of the loan.

Second. The VA valuation of the property fixes the maximum price which the veteran may pay for the property. The FHA valuation is used in determining only the maximum loan amount and the purchaser may pay in excess of the FHA appraisal if he chooses to do so.

Third. The GI loan may be made for 100 percent of the approved purchase price. The FHA loan may be no more than 97 percent of the FHA valuation of the property in cases where the property is valued at no more than \$13,500 and for a lesser percentage as the value of the property increases. Consequently, a downpayment requirement exists in FHA insurance authority which is not present in VA authority.

Fourth. The GI loan may be prepaid by the borrower at any time without premium or fee. A prepayment fee of 1 percent of the outstanding principal balance may be required if the borrower wants to pay off an FHA loan before maturity.

Fifth. The VA has authority to purchase defaulted GI loans where the holder refuses to extend indulgence in deserving cases, thereby affording the borrower a further opportunity to keep his home. The FHA has no comparable authority.

Sixth. The VA has more limitations on foreclosure action by lenders which are designed to protect the veteran's interest and prohibit precipitous action.

Seventh. The VA has a statutory directive to release an original veteran borrower from liability under certain conditions where the property is sold and a new purchaser assumes the mortgage indebtedness. The FHA has no such requirement.

Deep in the Heart of Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to submit an editorial under date of January 29, 1959, from the Wayne County News, a weekly newspaper published in Wayne County, Miss., by Mr. Harvey Hurt.

I think that even a casual reading of this editorial will prove enlightening to even the most biased critics of the Negroes' educational facilities in the South.

The editorial follows:

DEEP IN THE HEART OF DIXIE

Gene Wirth, in his column, Magnolia Mirror, in the Jackson Daily News and Clarion-Ledger, compiles some very interesting figures on taxation in Mississippi, as follows:

During the 1956-57 school session the State paid \$109.99 per Negro child in public schools at a total cost of \$22,505,475, while during the 1957-58 school session the State paid \$118 per Negro child at a total cost of \$23,922,209. Of these millions spent for Negro education, this figured that the white taxpayers picked up 90 percent of the check.

Since Mississippi's program started in 1954 to provide equal school facilities, the education finance commission has approved 186 construction projects for Negroes at a cost of \$39,576,910.37, while during the same period it approved only 39 construction projects for white children at a cost of \$12,100,544.47. The white children received 23.42 percent while the Negro children received 76.58 percent, and the white taxpayers footed 90 percent of the bill.

By the time this equalization program is completed, Mississippi's taxpayers will have coughed up more than \$200 million on school buildings. Based on the present percentage of racial distribution of school construction funds, Negroes will receive over \$150 million while the white children will receive less than \$50 million.

During the current 2-year period, the State will extract from the taxpayers' earnings and then give away in all forms of welfare some \$88,327,400. Of this amount, only 38.97 percent or \$34,421,187.78 will go to the State's white people, while 60.79 percent or \$53,694,286.46 will be given to the State's needy Negroes.

For old-age assistance, the State will take from the taxpayers' earnings and then give away \$59,400,000. Of this amount, only 40.70 percent or \$24,175,800 will go to the State's needy white people, while 59.11 percent or \$35,111,340 will be given to the State's needy Negroes.

For aid to the blind, the State will give away \$5,807,400. Of this amount, 42.11 percent or \$2,445,498.14 will go to the State's needy white blind people, while 57.56 percent or \$3,342,739.44 will be given to the State's needy blind Negroes.

For aid to dependent children, the State will take from the taxpayers' pockets and then give away \$17 million. Of this amount, only 27.32 percent or \$4,644,400 will go to the State's white children, while 72.22 percent or \$12,277,400 will be given to the State's needy Negro children.

For aid to the permanently and totally disabled needy persons, the State will give away \$6,120,000. Of this amount, 39.34 percent or \$2,407,608 will go to the State's needy disabled white people, while 60.31 percent or \$3,690,972 will be given to the State's disabled Negroes.

These figures would seem to be convincing enough that the white taxpayers of Mississippi are paying heavily to assist and advance the Negro.

The Court Blandly Disregards Its Own Established Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present two timely editorials of broad interest which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., on January 26, 1959:

THE COURT AGAIN BLANDLY DISREGARDS ITS OWN ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES

A few days ago the U.S. Supreme Court handed down another of its blandly inconsistent decisions, one which gained little public attention, because it affected only a single individual, but which is important as indicating the manner in which individual Justices hop back and forth across the judicial fence at will.

The case involved a single and very limited question under section 92 of the Articles of War, whether the United States legally was in time of peace in June 1949. A soldier in California had been convicted of conspiracy to commit murder, conviction coming through military court-martial on the ground that the United States was not legally in time of peace. If the Nation was in time of peace the case should have been tried by civil courts. The Supreme Court ruled, 6 to 2, that the country was legally in time of peace and ordered the conviction reversed.

Justices John Marshall Harlan and Tom Clark wrote the dissenting opinion, stating quite abruptly that the Supreme Court in 1921 had ruled on this point, holding at that time that "in time of peace" signified "peace in the complete sense, officially declared," and that this was not the condition in 1949 any more than it had been in 1921. In the current California case, all litigants agreed that peace had not been officially declared in the complete sense.

Speaking for himself and for Justice Clark, Justice Harlan said:

"I think that Congress, and the military authorities charged with the implementation of the Articles of War, should be able to rely on a construction given one of those articles by an unanimous decision of this Court."

The two dissenters pointed out that Congress had never objected to the Supreme Court's 1921 decision—on the contrary, Congress reenacted the military statute concerned without amendment.

Justices Harlan and Clark said that they failed to understand how their colleagues could hold that between 1921 and 1949 the meaning of the statute had changed so that "the authority under the statute then confirmed must now be denied."

That is sound and solid law. It is the principle of the long-accepted—and now often rejected by the Supreme Court—stare decisis. This simply means settled law; that points of constitutionality of Federal statutes passed by Congress, or points of issue in the Constitution itself, when once determined by the U.S. Supreme Court remain so determined until and unless Congress passes new law or the Constitution is amended by the people.

But it is necessary to point out that the sound principles of jurisprudence which Justices Clark and Harlan pointed out in this decision apparently did not occur to them in some of their own previous decisions, noticeably as recently as last September when they again voted to void the power of States to maintain racially separate schools.

Justice Harlan obviously is impressed by the fact that the 1921 decision as to court-martial or civil trial was a unanimous decision. Obviously he believes that Congress and the military, once this unanimous decision was rendered and since there had been no new law on its subject, should have been able to rely in 1949 on the ruling that had stood for 28 years. In 1899, Justice Marshall Harlan's grandfather, the first John Marshall Harlan on the Supreme Court, wrote a decision in which the Supreme Court held unanimously that "the education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States, and any interference on the part of the Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land." And that decision became the supreme law of the land just as much as the present desegregation decision of the Supreme Court.

Were not the southern States—or segregation States outside the South—entitled to rely upon that ruling? (That case was *Cumming v. Board of Education*). In 1927, in *Gong Lum v. Rice*, the Supreme Court again considered the allegation that segregation is in itself a denial of equal protection of the laws. Again, the Supreme Court refused to tamper with established construction of the Constitution—with "settled law," with stare decisis, since there had been no change in law or in the Constitution on the issue at stake.

In 1954 when the Supreme Court wrote its original opinion on the current school cases, the *Cumming* case had stood for 55 years and the *Gong Lum* case for 27 years.

The principles of "settled law" which Justices Clark and Harlan criticized for violating in the case of the California soldier are the same principles which Justice Clark violated in the original 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision, and which both have violated in desegregation decisions since 1955 when Justice Harlan became a member of the Court.

It has been clear for some time that nothing is safe these days from the Supreme Court through having been established and

accepted by time, previous Supreme Court rulings, or action or inaction of Congress. Apparently, Justices Clark and Harlan are not safe even from their own expressed judicial principles, on the basis of their votes in the California soldier's case and in the desegregation decisions.

BOMBINGS SHOULD BE HANDLED BY STATES

J. Edgar Hoover's reluctance to have the FBI pushed further than it already is into the campaign against church and school bombings should receive the support of Congress when House and Senate consider the various proposals before them to make such bombings punishable by Federal law.

As the Sun of Baltimore points out in a recent editorial, "We may be sure that Mr. Hoover is as much against the bombings as the best of us. The idea that bigots can write their bigotry with dynamite into the desolation of houses of worship is repellent. But repellent, too, is the prospect of slow Federal drift into every government responsibility across this continental Nation. Especially repellent is the prospect of an FBI swollen into a universal police force and bound as its first effect to wither local policing. This, obviously, is the main danger Mr. Hoover foresees."

Among the proposals to make school and church bombings a Federal offense—which would authorize FBI entry into any such case—is a seven bill package introduced by the two Republican Senators from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS, and KENNETH B. KEATING. This package, in addition to making such bombings a Federal offense, would ban hate literature from the mails.

A similar bill, broader in some respects but confined to bombings, is offered by two Democrats, Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and SAM J. ERVIN JR., of North Carolina. This measure is said to have the backing of 30 to 40 Senators. In the House, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, of the House Judiciary Committee, is sponsoring similar bills, as he did at the 1958 session.

Shipping explosives across State lines for terrorist purposes would have been made a Federal crime by a key provision of a bill advanced last year by CELLER and Representative KEATING, then the ranking minority member of CELLER's committee. The specific ban was against such interstate transportation "with the knowledge or intent that it will be used to damage or destroy any building for the purpose of interfering with its use for educational, religious, charitable, or civic objectives, or of intimidating any person pursuing such objectives."

The bill would have justified immediate entry by the FBI in bombing cases by setting up a presumption that explosives used in bombings had been brought across State lines. It, and other similar measures, are in conflict with the position of the Department of Justice that ordinarily crimes of violence, including bombings of religious buildings, are subject to exclusive State jurisdiction, "even if they are a conspiracy and even if the conspiracy is operative in several States."

In this case the position of the Department of Justice and the expressed opinion of Mr. Hoover should prevail. Further extension of FBI authority into State police spheres should be avoided, both as detrimental to local police and as generally undesirable.

It is also worthwhile, in considering this legislation, to raise once again the question of why the same liberal Congressmen who are so eager to push through this antibombing legislation, turning over State and local police powers to the FBI, are not sponsoring similar legislation with regard to bombings and other terrorist activities by labor unions.

It is a safe bet that if provisions making labor terrorism a Federal offense were tacked onto the bills making church and school bombings a Federal offense, a good part of

the support now given the latter measures would suddenly and mysteriously evaporate. And this despite the fact that local enforcement has been far more effective and energetic where school and church bombings have been concerned than in the case of labor violence.

Address by Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy Before the Women's Forum on National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I request that the attached address by Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CHANGING DIMENSIONS IN NATIONAL SECURITY

"Changing Dimensions in National Security"—I wonder if you realize how very apt such a theme is for your forum discussion. In these days of exploding technology, change is the one constant dimension in national security.

Sometimes your Secretary of Defense feels that the component elements of our national security have all the stability of ladies' fashions—a subject with which each of you is concerned and quite obviously well informed. You know, for instance, better than I, that strange things happen from season to season to such items as necklines, waistlines, and hemlines. Once in a very great while you ladies can rise up and exercise some control over the changing dimensions of fashion—as witness your boycott and the consequent sack of the sack and the demise of the trapeze.

Changes in weapons come upon us even more unexpectedly than changes in fashions. They are also apt to be more radical and fantastically expensive. In fact new elements in defense frequently arrive on the scene just after we've made a huge investment in yesterday's weapons' style. This upsets the defense budget keepers just as a sudden change in fashion raises havoc with your clothes budget. But you have options. If you don't like a new fashion you can rise up en masse and reject it collectively. In my experience as a husband and the father of two girls who are now young women, this seldom happens but it is theoretically possible. Or, you can choose, to ignore the new fashion for economic reasons and wear last year's model. This also seldom happens. Again—I'm speaking as a husband.

In the serious business of defense, unlike the world of fashion, we do not have the option of freezing styles in weapons nor can we reject new weapons for either aesthetic or economic reasons. In fact, we must carry on unceasing research deliberately to outmode what was invented and built just yesterday—however uneconomic such a practice may be. We must, in short, seek to change dimensions and catapult into new and untried areas. In the business of defense the cow has already jumped over the moon. Almost anything can happen in the future. Ask Dr. Wernher von Braun when he speaks to you tomorrow.

He can testify also to the impact of a vast dimensional change on a brand new, freshly caught Secretary of Defense to be. On the night of October 4, 1957, I was at-

tending a dinner at the Army's Redstone Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala. It was one of the last stops on a month-long orientation trip I had made to military installations across the country. A group of us were discussing the changing dimensions in warfare. While we were talking about changes which would be brought about by guided missiles Dr. von Braun was called to the telephone. He returned, visibly excited, to inform us that the Russians had just announced the successful launching of an earth satellite. To the three standard dimensions of warfare—land, sea, and air—a fourth had been added, space. And this, just five days before I was to assume office as Secretary of Defense.

Yes, in the 16 months I have been in office there has been a steady and rapid evolution in our defense posture. But, while the dimensions of national security have changed, the overall superiority of U.S. military power in relation to any potential aggressor has not and must not change. While we cannot always be first with every link that makes the chain of our defense—we must always be first in the sum total strength of all the links. That is where we are tonight and that is where the Department of Defense is determined to remain.

Last September I expressed to the American Legion Convention in Chicago:

"Fullest confidence that the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union in overall strength in being . . . now."

I wish to bring that statement up to date by repeating it to you tonight. And, I wish to add that the Department of Defense, fully supported by the President, has no intention of allowing this condition to change. We believe that our planned military programs are adequate to achieve this result for the foreseeable future. You and the country may be assured that our programs will keep pace with what our official intelligence warns us any enemy of the United States may have in the future. Our budgets support military programs tailored to produce what that intelligence tells us we must have.

Americans have always shown themselves capable of both great effort and great sacrifice in times of national danger. Our whole history as a Nation testifies that our people need only to be informed and aroused to take any action necessary for national survival. I am told by Mrs. Gunn that the very purpose of this forum is to inform and arouse this representative group about the threat to our security. I'm glad that Mrs. Gunn used the word "aroused" and not I. As the loving husband of Mrs. McElroy and speaking as a veteran of 30 years of marriage I hold with Charles Dickens that—

"There is something about a roused woman . . . which few men like to provoke."

I agree, however, that the total resources of America can never begin to be marshaled unless the women of this country are kept informed of the problems facing us as a Nation. You need only be convinced that everything you hold dear—your home, your security, your children—calls to you for help. Victory in war, hot or cold is not possible without your support, it's as simple as that.

Now let me tell you something about the changing dimensions of the world I live in these days—the Department of Defense. I entered the Pentagon with the Space Age. For those engaged in the business of defense, entering space is vastly different from the use of new and unproved weapons in the known elements of land, sea, and air. True, such weapons as the airplane and the submarine changed the dimensions of warfare over the years but the changes came about by a process of evolution. Weapons of the space age—and I refer specifically to long

range missiles—have caused and will continue to cause a revolution in the art of warfare, with all its violent side effects.

We must devise whole new categories of weapons both offensive and defensive. Thus, you can see not only have the dimensions of new weapons changed but the very benchmarks—the very points of reference from which measurements may be made—have shifted.

Let me, at this point, give you just one example to illustrate what I mean. Up until a very few decades ago it took weeks for a weapon to be launched against America because it had to come by sea—then with the advent of the long range airplane the time for possible warning was reduced to hours. Then, suddenly, as the guided missile burst upon us we found ourselves up against one of the most fantastic defensive requirements ever placed upon military technology.

Instead of weeks or hours the missile will allow us something on the order of 30 minutes for defensive action. The actual number of minutes will depend on the effectiveness of our warning systems—systems which must be redesigned to meet the threat of a missile traveling 25 times as fast as the speed of sound. To devise a weapons system which will in the time required, detect, track, fire at, and destroy, such a small fast moving target, is a challenge military technology must meet.

Our scientists and engineers have dedicated themselves to this task. They are spurred on by the knowledge that technology has given to the offensive missile a striking and destructive power of well over one hundred thousand times the bomb which we knew in World War II as the "blockbuster." You can now understand why I say the benchmarks from which dimensions are measured have shifted.

In any commercial enterprise there are six basic elements known in management studies as the Classic M's. They are machines, men, materials, methods, money, and markets. Markets we don't have to worry about in the defense business. But the other five we must deal with to accomplish our objectives and their dimensions are constantly changing. Let's look at machines first.

Last year we were told by General Betts from the Office of the Director of Guided Missiles that technology in this day and age does not stand still—and that was the understatement of 1958. Later in this year's forum you will see and hear a dramatic story by Mr. Joe Powell of the Department of Defense on the "Collapse of Time" and the effect of the stampede of technology on our machines of war.

I've already told you about our defensive problems with missiles. They stagger the imagination of even a scientist. Let me just mention some of our more serious management problems with other weapons, submarines, for example. This is a weapons delivery system where we now enjoy a qualitative and technological superiority. We know that in less than 2 years our atomic submarines will be able to hurl powerful ballistic missiles many hundreds of miles. They will create grave problems in detection and defense for any potential enemy of the United States. But Russian submarines likewise pose serious defensive problems for us. While we believe they do not now have atomic submarines we must assume that whatever we have the enemy is capable of producing—sometimes much faster than we thought possible.

So, the increasing complexity and destructiveness of modern machines of war create new and grave management problems. You have to know just when and how long to go along with an old weapons system and just when to put your money and faith in a

successor system. And, of course, they must overlap for a while. This is not unlike buying the newest style before you know whether it will take. However, in the case of weapons, you bet your very life. The security of the country may hang in the balance on right decisions. Machines are indeed a changing dimension of national security.

The second M—materials—are likewise a defense management headache. No longer can we depend alone on the common materials of other wars. Excursions into outer space and deep under the sea call for exotic metals and plastics, for new and better fuels and for more powerful explosives in smaller packages. One of the major projects of the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense, for instance, is the development of a more powerful solid fuel needed for our third generation intercontinental ballistic missiles. Defense management is solving this problem and adding another new dimension to national security. In doing so we have devised new methods—the third classic M of management.

ARPA, the Advanced Research Projects Agency I mentioned a moment ago is in itself a new organizational method established by management for the purpose of advancing our knowledge in—to name just a few of its projects—the field of missiles, anti-missile missiles and military space vehicles. Set up to handle advanced research and development programs, ARPA utilizes the best brains of the university and industry. It focuses particular skills on special problems whose solution is vital to America. Old methods of research are too slow to cope with the pace of technology. Your defense management must and is finding new ones.

The fourth M is manpower. The research and development, production and operation of new weapons systems puts space age strains on our manpower resources. We must utilize the best scientific and engineering brains the country now possesses in research, development and production. At the same time we must take steps as a Nation to educate and train the scientists, the engineers, and the skilled workers of the future. Democracy's future demands and depends on an unending supply of well-educated citizens—educated, that is, to cope with all changing dimensions of the space age.

More numbers of men used to be a measurement of this Management M. Today skillpower and brainpower have had to make radical improvement in efficient use of manpower. A guided-missile ship, for instance, with a crew of 1,000 men but no skilled electronic technicians, wouldn't have any fighting power. The same is true for other modern weapons systems of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines.

Therefore defense management needs better educated and better trained soldiers, sailors and airmen to operate the complex machines of war devised by our scientists and engineers. Technology has multiplied the penalty for stupid or careless error 10,000 fold. The error of yesterday's gunsmith could cost us only a musket or two. The error of today's technician could cost us a bomber worth, literally, its weight in gold.

Improving our educational system to cope with the new demands of technology is an all-hands, all-American task. The average citizen can't invent fuels, build missiles or fly an airplane but he can and should find out what's needed in the field of education and take steps to insure that his community fills the needs.

Now, we come to the fifth and last great M of management, money, a problem that affects all of us. I imagine if I were able

to listen to the conversation of any one of you ladies for a few days I would be bound to hear you say, "Everything costs more these days." That's true of clothes, food, automobiles, houses and luxuries. It's also true of the materials and machines of defense. We buy everything you buy, we feed, cloth and house millions of people. Our costs have gone up, too. That's tough enough on our budget. But the cost of military hardware, unlike the ordinary commodities we buy, didn't go up just a little—it blasted off into space.

If an automobile cost 50 times as much today as it did in 1945 you'd be shocked and probably decide to keep your old one. Yet as the President pointed out in his State of the Union message today's fighter aircraft are 50 times more expensive than the fighters of World War II and we can't use the old ones. Our Polaris firing submarines will cost 15 to 20 times more than the conventional subs of the last war.

Of course, the weapons we buy at these increased prices are much more powerful. Indeed, their effectiveness oftentimes goes up in much greater ratio than their cost. We must have these weapons, regardless of cost. But in buying them defense management strives to spend your money in the most efficient manner possible.

Let me emphasize that money is important to defense but it's no panacea. You can't purchase prepackaged defense. It's the job of defense management to translate the amount of money needed into a winning combination of men, methods, materials, and machines. I think we have that combination.

In addition to the changing dimensions in national security brought about by the five great M's of management, we are always conscious of another M looking over our shoulder. This M stands for moments—we know you can't spend deficit time and you can't borrow minutes. Our potential enemies have exactly the same amount of time we have. He who uses his moments most wisely will be the winner in the cold or hot war of the future.

The framework I have set for your forum discussions bears principally on the problems of military defense. I would not want you for one moment to think that changing military dimensions are the only ones that are important to national security. The last few years have seen tremendous changes in the dimensions of the economic competition between the nations of the free world and the Communist bloc. These years have not lessened either, the changing political and psychological pressures. To these changes we must be responsive. We must, in fact, continue to develop political, psychological, and economic programs of our own—programs which are as appealing as our military might is unassailable.

America's military might is for defense not aggression. The dimensions of your Military Establishment keep changing only to make it clear to any aggressor than an attack on us would be foolhardy.

America's defense will remain geared to reality—we will keep pace with technology. We will keep America's military strength superior to that of any nation which threatens us.

We will—that is, if we—and I mean all of us—take care to insure that the dimensions of our minds keep pace with the dimensions of our problems. Our mental dimensions represent our ability to understand the problems ahead and our determination, with God's grace, to conquer those problems.

Ladies, your forum represents citizenship at its best—informed citizens are the price-less ingredients of a democracy—our democracy in particular. I salute you and join you in your efforts to keep America strong.

An Appraisal From a Citizen of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter received in my office from Carlos Cabrera, a citizen of Cuba. In its simplicity it speaks more eloquently than could anyone who has not suffered under the tyranny of a dictator. Without further comment, then, it follows, introduced by a shore note to me written on the margin of the letter:

THE CUBAN SITUATION

HAVANA, CUBA, January 22, 1959.

To the Editor,

DEAR SIR: I would like to have your permission to write you, not only this letter but others, from time to time, to keep you informed on how the man on the street feels and thinks about the present revolution and the Provisional Government of Cuba.

First of all, permit me to say a word in favor of the Provisional Government. It has been formed by young men (I am old), with great honesty and intelligence, as we have not seen it before in Cuba. But besides that, they have a surprising capacity for work. To find a man, the head of a government department, who did not have an hour's sleep in the last 72 hours is nothing exceptional these days. And these men will greet you with a smile and answer as many questions as you care to ask, as if they would have lots of time and nothing else to do.

We were very much surprised when the rebel army entered Havana. The men were so modest and polite that it was difficult to believe that these were the same men who fought with so much tenacity against an enemy 10 times their number, with much better armament, tanks, planes, navy, etc. But the previous army had no morale or reason why to fight.

Men at Havana were forgetting such courtesies as letting the seat to a lady in the bus, ask for permission, giving thanks, etc., and these rebels, in that respect, have gone back to the XIX century. While in the mountains, they were given instructions, not only on military matters but on other subjects, among them civics.

Now a word about Fidel Castro. Some papers, outside of Cuba, have referred to Dr. Castro as the "new strong man of Cuba." The strong man in Cuba, as you know, was Batista and it seems they are greatly confused when they compare our leader with the head of the previous Government.

Dr. Castro could have anything he would wanted in Cuba, after what he has done for us. But he wants nothing. We think so much of him, that he is often compared to our Apostol José Martí. There was a meeting yesterday, to back the provisional government and I believe that about a million persons attended it. We were parading from 2 o'clock in the afternoon to about 8:30 p. m. There were many foreign correspondents who would attest on the enthusiasm of the people for Fidel Castro. Hundreds of thousands came from the interior of the island.

With reference to the executions it is estimated that, during the Batista regime (about 7 years) there were more than 10,000 persons taken from their homes at night, tortured to get information from them, killed

and buried anywhere, in large groups. In a town, near Havana, there were 90 persons killed in one night.

A few days ago, eight policemen and soldiers were executed. But that was done, as in every case, after a fair trial was conducted, at which the tribunal listen to all evidence, no matter how many hours it would take. A military tribunal might carry on for 14 or more hours, without interruption, to have the facts clear and listen to everyone who has something important to say.

The referred to policemen and soldiers executed, were responsible for the death of 53 persons, robberies, etc. Since these persons had relatives, father, mother, brothers, etc., who were present when the men were taken from their homes and went the following day to the police or soldiers quarters, they furnish much more evidence than it was required to sentence the men to death. But the men had their lawyers and could appeal to a higher tribunal.

The code used in these trials was the one approved by the rebel army while in the mountains which, in its turn is a part of the much larger one used by the Cuban army in our wars of independence.

On the other hand, 59 army officers, from colonel to lieutenant, were released the same day. It is believed that they were guilty of something, but it could not be proved to the satisfaction of the tribunal, and the motto is: better let free an assassin than to kill an innocent man.

A week after the shooting was over, there were no policemen on the streets and traffic was directed by our Boy Scouts with no trouble at all.

We are enjoying peace and liberty as we have not known in Cuba in the last 25 years.

Cordially yours,

CARLOS CABRERA.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: This letter was sent to several periodicals in the United States of America. I am taking pleasure to send it to you in case you have not seen it. Thanking you for your attention to this letter.

Very truly yours,

CARLOS CABRERA.

Prayer Offered by Hon. Harold T. Garvin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1959, at a breakfast honoring Oklahoma's newly elected Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and other elected officials, an inspiring prayer was offered by the president pro tempore of Oklahoma State Senate, the Honorable Harold T. Garvin.

Because Senator Garvin's prayer is sure to have meaning and significance for all Americans in these days of stress and trial, it is here reproduced for the Record. Senator Garvin's prayer:

Since it is through the mercy of Almighty God that another day is added to our lives, we here dedicate both our souls and our bodies to Him and to His service in sober, righteous, and Godly lives; to the glory of His Kingdom and the everlasting benefit of this great State; and in such dedication, we ask that He confirm and strengthen us.

Knowing the weakness of our nature and the many temptations which we meet daily, we ask that He have compassion upon our infirmities that we may be restrained from sin and ever mindful of our duty.

We pray that He will imprint upon our hearts such a dread of His judgments and such a grateful sense of His goodness as to make us both afraid and ashamed to offend Him.

In particular, we implore His grace and protection in the days, the weeks, and the months to come—that He will keep us temperate in all things, and diligent in our several callings.

We ask that He grant us patience under our afflictions; grace to be direct and upright in all our undertakings; quiet and peaceable; full of compassion; and ready to do good to all men according to our abilities and opportunities.

We pray that He will direct us in all our ways; defend us from all dangers and adversities; and take us and all who are dear to us under His fatherly protection.

These things we humbly beg in the name of the Governor of all men.

Future Status of Military Installations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the following resolution adopted by the Beauregard Post of the American Legion, DeRidder, La., on January 12, 1959. This resolution follows the announcement of the closing of Fort Polk, a permanent military installation in Louisiana:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BEAUREGARD POST
No. 27, JANUARY 12, 1959

Whereas the deactivation and closing of Fort Polk will greatly affect the citizens of the State of Louisiana and particularly those residing in Beauregard and Vernon Parishes; and

Whereas the periodic opening and closing of Fort Polk during recent years has lessened the confidence of these citizens in the long range planning program and objectives of the Department of Defense; and

Whereas it is felt that proper planning by the Department of Defense would enable it to make effective use of existing military installations, thereby eliminating the practice of scrapping costly established installations and building others to replace them; and

Whereas the present method of operation not only disrupts and dislodges many thousands of citizens each year, but it also has a disastrous effect on the economy of the local areas involved and it also affects the economy of the United States as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, from the local to national level, institute a program to determine if existing military installations can be continued in their present capacity or be utilized in a more economical manner in the future; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be introduced at the Mid-Winter Conference of the Louisiana Department of the American Legion on January 24, for the purpose of having it brought before the national convention of the American Legion at its next meet-

ing. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation with a request for their support and cooperation.

O. W. WEST,
Commander, Post No. 27.

Attest Correct:

E. B. MURRELL,
Adjutant, Post No. 27.

Joe Pearson, a Dedicated Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, there is a very unique charitable institution in my congressional district which caters directly to the poor, the aged, the destitute. This institution is known as the Free Kosher Kitchen of Williamsburg; and it provides not only free food to needy individuals but also relief for entire families, help to youths who are in trouble with the law, reinstatement of families on welfare rolls, and other forms of direct aid to the poor.

The founder and president of this institution, which is today recognized by the welfare department of New York, is Joe Pearson. He is a dedicated man and a devoted humanitarian. He is loved and respected by the people of the district for his charitable work for the Free Kosher Kitchen and many other noble causes.

In this week's issue of the Williamsburg News, published in my district, there appears an article about Joe Pearson and the Free Kosher Kitchen. It is written by Harvey Rosenfeld, a very able columnist and reporter, and reads as follows:

ABOUT IMPORTANT PEOPLE

(By Harvey Rosenfeld)

The 28th annual banquet of the Free Kosher Kitchen of Williamsburg is ready for its unvelving this Sunday night, February 1, at the Grand Paradise. All the intense preparation and dedicated efforts will reveal that night what the institution has accomplished.

The last few days before the events has, in the past, resulted in a column heralding the affair, spotlighting the celebrities in attendance, and profiling the guests of honor. Joe Pearson, devoted president and founder of the kitchen, wanted to make sure this year would be no exception. He provided us with a long roll of personalities to be expected, and an alert signal for the guests of honor. As regards himself, hardly a word was mentioned. He just requested that he be shown the article when printed.

But we refuse to listen to you Mr. Pearson. This column is yours. Though many personages will be there that night, you take top billing. Though the dais will be heavily populated with names from diverse fields of human activity, your work in charity has preeminence over all the rest.

This is not meant to disparage, among others, the two guests of honor, who were accorded the same rank last year. In their work, they do not have to account for any defect in their performances.

"Big Joe" Rosenfeld, Jr., author and philanthropist, has allayed the distress of many, using such soothing powers when the cries of the unfortunate reached him. Formerly associated with radio station WMGM,

he now is the messenger of charity at WABC. But his deeds remain the same. In combination with Jim Gordon, a sports announcer once associated with WMGM, they speak over the microphones from midnight to 6 a.m. They work while most men sleep, so that many will have something to wake up for.

And Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO's record in Washington is a source of pride to his many constituents whom he represents. Many organizations, to which he has attached constant service, recognize his worth by the honors they accord him. As for his future, it can only be indicative of more success.

These men, however, are well known. Newspaper readers have seen their names in the familiar black and white. But to most Joe Pearson is at best a name which we may have vaguely heard of. Yet, those who have been aided by his generosity can fill in the details.

Joe Pearson likes poetry. The lines he writes are put into practice, though. When he formed the free kitchen about three decades ago, he penned such a poem. It was in the midst of the depression, and his verse was the expression of a man who wanted to help. It read:

"A feeling heart—a helping hand
Does its part, that hope and sunshine again
ascend.

A generous soul, a noble mind
Will hear a brother's cry and peace will find
When wounds are healed and hunger
stilled,

When hopeless life with faith and love
once more filled."

Joe Pearson became the minstrel of charity. He will tell you that for some people the depression still exists. The poor do not know any economics. For the emotionally depressed, there can be no prosperity. Working for the poor at 228 South First Street, he purveys food for 70 families weekly. These people, mostly aged, have the benefit of both cooked and uncooked food.

His wife, Tillie, has been a faithful aid in the running of the kitchen. And undoubtedly there are many others who share in the prizes of charity. Yet, the institution is run by one. The pile of papers and bills which fill Joe Pearson's living room is ample evidence.

The free kitchen is not only food. Its menu is complete with relief and rescue. Recognized by the welfare department, it has saved families whose cases were rejected by the department. Each year Joe Pearson pleads for 25 youths in trouble with the law; he reinstates 50 families on the welfare's register; numerous people are released through his efforts from mental institutions.

In Williamsburg, Joe Pearson helps in other ways. He is an unknown but important wheel in the Democratic machine of the 14th assembly district and has many a time been selected as an alternate delegate to presidential conventions.

This is the work of Russian born Joe Pearson, a father of four and grandfather of five. This is not the type of a column he wanted for the banquet, but it is one he deserves.

Farm Surpluses Can Be an Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1959, Gilbert

Rohde, president of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, sent a telegram to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, detailing the need for a responsible farm program that would utilize the abundant production of our farms to raise living standards at home and win friends abroad. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of Mr. Rohde's telegram in the RECORD:

President's Eisenhower's farm message shows pathetically weak imagination and no long-range vision in attempting to solve administration-created price-depressing farm surpluses. U.S. farmers, world's most efficient agricultural producers, could be a Godsend to low-income and hungry Americans and to overseas nations desperately in need of economic development to withstand the inroads of international communism—and these farmers could see incomes rise as surpluses are put to wise use. Our farmers should not be penalized through lower income for the administration's dismal failure to grasp the urgent need of putting farm surpluses to effective implementation domestically, and as major foreign policy weapon. Wisconsin Farmers Union urges congressional leadership, under vigorous guidance, to reject administration request to produce still lower farm prices, more farm surpluses and fewer farm families. In its place, we need responsible farm and food policy that, in benefiting all Americans and providing aid to free world nations, will be America's answer to the recent 21st Communist Party Congress plan of Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

The High Cost of Asylum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Wednesday, January 28, 1959:

BATISTA UNHAPPY IN REFUGE, AT COST OF A MILLION

(By George Dixon)

A well-known Latin-American diplomat underwent an odd metamorphosis the other night. He is ordinarily one of the most cautious gentils in diplomacy but something came up, or went down, which turned him from a listener to a talker.

He had no difficulty attracting an audience because everyone knew he had been thick as thieves with Batista, although he represents a South American country far removed from Cuba. But the thing that served most to win him attention was his disclosure that he has been in contact with the deposed Cuban President since the latter took exile in the Dominican Republic.

The diplomat threw out the provocative line that his dear old amigo was not wildly happy over his asylum. Satisfied that he had us properly on tenterhooks, he repeated that Batista was not a happy man at all.

Playing along with him, one of our number murmured sympathetically that it must be hard on a dictator to be torn from his despotism, but that Batista had the consolation of being with his great friend and fellow dictator, Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, adding:

"It must have touched Batista to be welcomed with open arms to the Dominican Republic."

One of the first things a properly trained diplomat is taught not to do is snort, but this careerist forgot his training. He snorted that Batista was not teary-eyed with gratitude toward Trujillo.

He proceeded to tell us the inside story of how one despot gave sanctuary to another. The revealing recital left me disconsolate.

The distinguished diplomat gave us a vivid word picture of the meeting, as he had gotten it direct from Batista. The fleeing Cuban was literally welcomed to Trujillo City with open arms. Trujillo folded him in brotherly embrace, but after all the Latino embraces were over, and the formalities of asylum dispensed with, the Dominican took the Cuban exile aside.

"You are, of course, welcome," beamed Trujillo. "Everything that is ours, is yours. But there are things we must think about."

By this time, Batista's smile of gratitude was beginning to change to one of uncertainty. He asked the benefactor if he would mind being a little more explicit.

"Well," said Trujillo, "we spent millions on public relations. When Peron came here, we had to augment our public relations budget; when Perez Jimenez came we had to increase it even more. Now that you are here we will have to increase it again."

"It is going to be very costly to combat this bad publicity and it seems only fair that you contribute a share."

"What is a few dollars between friends?" shrugged the benefactor beneficently. "We think you should contribute \$1 million."

Batista did.

Address by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, Before 35th Annual Session of Institute of World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to me to note a growing awareness within the State and Defense Departments that an all-out nuclear-type general war is less likely to occur than all other types of war from the extremely limited to the type fought in Korea.

Following this unavoidable logic, well substantiated by recent history and the international situation, our attention must be inescapably focused on the Army and its ability to meet the contingencies involved in less than a general nuclear war.

The modernization of appropriate Army equipment is, I am convinced, absolutely necessary to improve the capability of the Army in conjunction with sister services to meet the possible challenges which lie ahead.

At the present time the Army has on hand an equipment inventory of approximately \$14 billion, of which \$5 billion consists of World War II models or older. Experience has shown that the average wearout cycle for Army equipment is ap-

proximately 10 years. Thus, \$1.4 billion of new procurement is required to offset annual wearout and obsolescence of the current inventory, without considering additional inventory needs. The Army's fiscal year 1960 procurement funds available to offset wearout and obsolescence amount to \$1.19 billion. This means that at this rate the inventory is being depleted at the rate of over \$200 million per year.

It is bad enough that the Army has reached a point with its current equipment where it is no longer economical to maintain it or at best it is incapable of meeting the stepped-up requirements of today's or tomorrow's possible war. To not provide sufficient funds to maintain the current level of inventory is, in my opinion, completely inexcusable. That this inventory is only about two-thirds of what the Army should have further compounds the felony.

Modernization of Army forces will tend to improve the Army's strategic mobility as well as its ability to fight. An effort is being made to develop lighter, more effective weapons and equipment.

It naturally follows that modernization of the Army should be accompanied by modernization of the sea and airlift upon which the Army, along with the other services, is so dependent.

I have read with a great deal of interest the speech which the Army Chief of Staff delivered before the 35th annual session of the Institute of World Affairs in Pasadena, Calif., in December. This speech, dealing primarily with limited war, contains four conclusions of paramount importance if we are to be properly prepared for limited war. Two of these conclusions pertain to the need for modernization and mobility which I have already discussed. The remainder of the speech, however, is of such significance that I desire to insert it into the RECORD in its entirety.

The address follows:

IMPROVING OUR CAPABILITIES FOR LIMITED WAR
(Address by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, 35th annual session, Institute of World Affairs, Pasadena, Calif., Dec. 8, 1958)

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before this distinguished gathering and to talk about a few of the significant aspects of national security which confront us. It is a pleasure for a soldier to be able to share this platform with the eminent speakers who have preceded or will follow me in dealing with your theme of "Agenda for American Action."

In choosing a topic for my discussion this evening, I have decided to talk about limited war, what it is, why it is important to understand, and what are some of the requirements to cope with it. This choice is made because of the recurrent debates over our readiness for this kind of threat which appear in current press and radio. In view of the complexity of our national strategy it is not surprising that there are some misunderstandings about the nature of the problems which deserve a few words of clarification. At the outset, let me define general war and limited war as they are generally understood today. General war would be a direct armed conflict involving the United States and the Communist bloc in which our national survival would be at stake. In a conflict of such magnitude it is probable that weapons of all magnitudes would be used with little or no limitations.

It is depicted as an atomic fight to the finish by the two great power blocs.

The definition of limited war then becomes relatively simple—it is any military conflict short of a general war, one in which our national existence is not at stake. Thus, limited war covers a wide range of military action, from a patrol action to an operation on the magnitude of the Korean war or greater. While this definition is very broad, further to refine it leads to complications which add nothing to the clarity of the concept.

If I were asked why the growing interest in the limited war question, I would say that it is because we have all noted the fact that they have occurred—and in impressive numbers. In fact, a total of 17 limited war situations have arisen since 1945. They include a wide variety of military actions such as the Chinese civil war, guerilla operations in Greece and Malaya, the North Korean aggression, the Hungarian revolt, and the recent renewal of hostilities in the Taiwan Straits by the Chinese Communists.

Further, these have not necessarily been small or short wars. By striking a statistical time-manpower balance of all 17 limited wars, one finds that they have averaged about 2½ years in length and 570,000 men engaged. In most cases, a very significant military effort was required to bring these limited wars to an end.

Thus, in the past 13 years, there has been a notable incidence of active military operations short of general war. It is possible to pass from this fact to the inference that they will continue to occur and that the rate of occurrence may increase. This possibility arises from the fact that the Soviet leaders have always shown a willingness to take chances, even when they had no counterpoise to our preponderant atomic power. With the rise in their capability in the atomic and missile fields we may expect increasing intransigence on their part. We may well be required to respond to increased levels of provocation in an atmosphere of increased international tension. We have seen evidence of increased Soviet belligerence at the time of the Syrian crisis last year, in the situations in Lebanon and during the recent Taiwan Straits incident—all of which have occasioned Soviet threats of nuclear devastation directed at our allies and ourselves. The renewed pressure on Berlin is the most recent case in point.

The sober thought that both sides have the capability of destroying each other should nuclear weapons be used without restraint is a hard fact of life with which we are going to have to live for the indeterminate future. Meanwhile, the Communists are well aware of the very material gains they have made in the past through the more limited forms of aggression. Therefore, under the cloak of fear imposed by mutual atomic capabilities it would appear quite likely that they may henceforth undertake to kick us harder and higher on the shins than they have done during the period of our atomic monopoly.

At such a time it is well to take inventory of our resources and ask ourselves if we have the wherewithal to cope with the threat of limited aggression. I will speak now only of our military assets, recognizing that our national assets are truly wider than the military; that our national strength is an aggregate of political, ideological, and economic strengths as well as military resources. However, for the purpose of our discussion I am going to talk primarily about military matters.

Approaching the problem from the negative side, I should like to point out the military assets that we have which do not contribute primarily to coping with limited war. For example, the power of our atomic retaliatory bomber and missile forces is so destructive that it is difficult to conceive of a limited situation in which they would be

applicable. I make this observation while recognizing that forces of this kind are absolutely indispensable to deterring that general atomic war which it is our primary purpose to avoid.

By the same token, our expenditures for continental air defense—the interceptor planes of the Air Force and the surface-to-air missiles of the Army—do not contribute to our limited war effectiveness, notwithstanding their necessity for deterring or fighting a general war. The early warning systems, while justified by the requirements of general war, will have no use in lesser situations.

The Navy has very warranted concern over the submarine threat arising from the build-up of the Soviet submarine capability. On the other hand it does not appear probable that antisubmarine warfare would play a significant part in any limited war. Thus, our assets in that particular field would not contribute primarily to a limited war capability.

Likewise, I would say that those activities which we group under civil defense, although highly important and representing the expenditure of considerable money and effort at both Federal and State levels, do not contribute to limited war.

Indeed, most of our present atomic weapons systems may be of doubtful use in limited war, the doubt increasing in proportion to their destructiveness. In such wars, our normal role has been and probably will continue to be the provision of assistance to a friendly nation resisting some form of aggression. Under such conditions it will be important to rescue our friends with minimum damage to their homelands.

From what has been said thus far, it is apparent that we have a very impressive list of military assets which do not accord to any great degree with the requirements peculiar to limited war.

On the other hand, we do have important assets which are directly applicable to limited war. I would not say that the entire Army can be counted as a primary limited war asset, for in addition to our participation in continental air defense I mentioned earlier, a significant portion of our combat forces are deployed overseas, particularly in Europe. There they are involved in a defensive mission to deter or resist Soviet-bloc aggression in that area. While we can detach forces from Europe, as we did in the case of the airborne battle group which was sent into Lebanon last July, we would be reluctant to reduce our overseas deployments for use in limited wars outside their present location. The Army force specifically oriented toward readiness for limited war is the Strategic Army Corps, or STRAC, which is based in the United States, together with the back-up forces supporting its employment.

The marines are also a definite limited war asset in their amphibious role. This fact was illustrated by their use in Lebanon, where marine forces afloat moved in rapidly to seize the Beirut Airfield and the port, preparing the way for Army elements coming in by air and water to expand the beachhead and settle down for the long pull.

A great deal of the Tactical Air Command may be counted as a limited war asset, ready for rapid deployment overseas in similar manner as our Strategic Army Corps. So may be the Navy carrier forces, which can provide air support in peripheral areas where airfields do not exist ashore. Likewise, the long-range air and seallift furnished by the Air Force and Navy by which Army forces can be strategically deployed are a very important part of our limited war resources.

To summarize, I would say that a good part of the Army, the Marines, the Tactical Air Command, some of the Navy's carrier forces, and the strategic airlift and seallift represent a tabulation of our principal limited war assets.

Having identified what we have to work with, a logical question is, "Do we have enough?" I will try to answer this in two ways: first by discussing some specific situations short of general war, which are now history, and then by reference to some studies that have been made of hypothetical cases. In combination, such an examination should give us some insight into the adequacy of our means. Although I am going to speak primarily about Army forces, from what I have said thus far, it should be clear that there is no suggestion that limited war is an Army monopoly in any sense of the word, but a problem which confronts all of the services.

Korea is the most conspicuous case of U.S. experience in limited war. It is interesting to reflect that the Communists could not have picked another spot on their periphery where the United States could have reacted so successfully to sudden aggression as in Korea. It was most fortunate that they chose an area in close proximity to our Japanese base, where we had forces—unprepared though they were—but at sufficiently short range to permit a rapid reaction. As we study possible areas of future limited wars, one doubts that the Communists will be so obliging the next time. In any event, although we did respond in time in Korea, it was really touch and go. We literally had to assemble our Army on the field of battle under the bullets of the enemy, welding it into an effective combat force barely in time to avert defeat.

The most recent experience in operations of the small-war type was our expedition to Lebanon, mounted at the request of the lawful government of that country. This operation was, from a technical military point of view, entirely successful. By dint of careful advance planning permitted by due warning, all services responded rapidly and reached their destination in an acceptable lapse of time. However, in addition to the advantage of adequate warning, the operation was made simple by the absence of a shooting situation at destination, and the forces employed were limited. Thus, it is not possible to draw general conclusions from our experience in Lebanon.

Because of the limited experience derived from actual cases, the Army Staff has undertaken a number of hypothetical studies of possible limited war situations where the United States might be involved. From these studies coupled with practical experience, four major conclusions have been developed.

First, the reaction time of U.S. forces should be improved. Next, this improvement can be obtained in part by careful joint planning and training. Such training would include exercises involving elements of all services to rehearse the organization, dispatch, and movement of task forces to destination. Third, many logistical obstacles to strategic mobility exist, similar to those encountered in Beirut, where a single airfield and restricted port facilities limited the rate of buildup of our forces ashore. After these logistical bottlenecks have been viewed as insurmountable obstacles, My response is that if the leaders responsible for the development of naval power 200 years ago had accepted the conditions of the harbors, ports, and facilities around the world as they found them, we would not be able to project our naval power abroad as we can now. We have today the same problem for the projection of land power, in conjunction with its supporting air and sea components.

Finally, we determine from these studies that our limited war forces must have the most modern equipment. This equipment would include both conventional and low-yield atomic weapons and be characterized by lightness of weight and air transportability.

My conclusion then is that, although we now have a significant capability to cope with limited wars, we can and should take steps to improve it. So then the question becomes: "What should we do about it? What are these steps?"

My view is that we should embark on a five-point program to improve the capabilities of the Army and our sister services to meet the possible challenges posed by limited war. The salient points of this program are (1) the modernization of appropriate equipment; (2) the improved strategic mobility of limited war forces; (3) the preplanned use of air and seallift; (4) expanded joint planning and training; and (5) the publicizing of our limited war strength once it is reality.

In speaking before the national convention of the American Legion last September, the Secretary of Defense stated:

"Our Army has been undergoing a modernization program designed to prepare it for the stepped-up requirements of today's or tomorrow's possible war, not yesterday's. * * * This modernization program is by no means complete. We intend to push it vigorously."

In pursuance of Mr. McElroy's injunction, the Army intends to push its modernization along the following lines:

Dollarwise, our problem is not a simple one. Approximately 60 percent of the dollar value of the Army's inventory of equipment was procured during World War II or the Korean War; 10 percent of it is of pre-World War II vintage. As a result, many items have reached a point where they are no longer economical to maintain or are incapable of meeting "the stepped-up requirements of today's or tomorrow's possible war." As a result, we need to include second-generation missiles, light atomic weapons, improved conventional weapons, and many new types of air and ground vehicles to advance tactical mobility. To direct and control our units and weapons, we require improved lightweight signal communications based upon newly designed radio equipment.

The modernization of our forces will tend to support our second point; improved strategic mobility. As the Army lightens its loads, we hope that our sister services will modernize the sea and airlift upon which we depend for our strategic mobility.

As a part of our program to improve strategic mobility, we need to determine the logistical bottlenecks to mobility about the world which I earlier mentioned and endeavor to eliminate them. These can often be minimized by the forward stockage of supplies and equipment in critical strategic areas, to reduce the tonnages which must be transported in an emergency.

The third of our five points is the preplanning of the contingent use of a certain amount of air and seallift for possible limited war requirements. At present, the Army has no indications of the lift which would move its spearhead forces in an emergency. Some predesignation of air and sea elements for planning purposes would materially shorten the time required to get the initial forces on their way to a limited war situation. The actual lift would not be made available without the specific approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I do not suggest that such preplanning should cause a certain number of planes or ships to stand idle, marked "For Army Use Only." That makes no sense to me. However, it would make a great deal of sense if the Army knew in advance that in an emergency, a given amount of lift would be available at designated airfields and ports, on JCS approval. This knowledge would contribute materially to realistic planning for the rapid reaction of our spearhead units to limited war situations. I should add that the possibility of effective coordination of such preplanning will be facilitated by the new joint staff authorized by the recent re-

organization act of the Department of Defense.

In this latter regard I would like to say that, in my judgment, this legislation and its implementation now in progress, represent a major step forward in the achievement of an organization better able to deal with the military exigencies of today and the future. One important use of the new joint staff should be directed toward the accomplishment of the fourth point of the limited war program; namely, expanded joint planning and training for limited war. Such joint action might include the checking and testing of plans for overseas movement of forces, the verification of their readiness, and the actual movement of token forces as training for emergency situations. I should like to feel that we are as effective in meeting the complex requirements of limited war as SAC is in meeting the requirements of general atomic war. I think SAC is a most impressive military organization. Its complete dedication to readiness in its particular field is most impressive. I should like to find a similar intentness on the limited war problem.

The final point of the five-point program is to make clear to the world our readiness to react adequately anywhere to the challenge of aggression. To many observing America from a distance, we appear to be a country prepared to fight in case a general war should be forced upon us, but with unknown resources for a lesser response. It is highly important for psychological reasons to publicize our capabilities to react with weapons and means short of those associated with massive retaliation. This evidence of readiness could be attained through the exercising and testing of our limited war forces. Illustrative of what I have in mind was a small operation on a limited scale about 3 years ago in Thailand. We sent a joint airborne, sea-borne task force into this area for the purposes I have described. The Army furnished an Honest John rocket unit from Japan, a Marine unit and Navy ships participated, as did planes of the Tactical Air Command. The task force was assembled in Bangkok in about 48 hours. This exercise made a very favorable impression in southeast Asia as a token demonstration of the reaction capability of American forces in that area.

In conclusion, I would stress again that I am not preaching a purely Army program. All services are involved in this five-pronged effort to improve our effectiveness in limited war. It is an essential extension of our national policy. We must overcome any impression that we are a country which can respond with a big bomb and little else. Although we have significant assets now to cope with limited wars, these can and must be improved so that it can be made crystal clear to both our friends and foes that we can respond promptly with proper weapons and proper forces to any challenge. It is the goal of the Army to develop its strength so that it may play its indispensable part as a member of our tri-dimensional team in presenting this flexible military capability to the world.

Who Won What in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Karl Meyer, brilliant young editorial writer for the Washington Post, concludes his article in the current Reporter magazine

with the question, How much longer will the United States seem to be running after the crowd shouting "Wait for me! I'm your leader."

Under a previous consent, I am including the text of this excellent analysis of the situation in Cuba, entitled "Who Won What in Cuba?":

WHO WON WHAT IN CUBA?

(By Karl E. Meyer)

How Fidel Castro became the best known Latin American in this country—surely only Juan Peron and the Trujillos père and fils could give him a contest—constitutes a minor epic in the history of the hemisphere. The Cuban revolution began inauspiciously. On December 2, 1956, Castro invaded the coast of eastern Cuba with a guerrilla force of 81 men crowded aboard a leaky Mexican yacht. His invasion was spotted from the air, and the Cuban Army met the insurgents when they landed on the jungle shore, eliminating, I was told by Castro, all but 12 of the rebels.

Yet this was the nucleus of an army that ultimately grew to about 8,500, seized control of half the island, humbled one of the best-equipped military forces in the hemisphere, and sent President Fulgencio Batista fleeing to Ciudad Trujillo. Castro's story is a narrative worthy of Sabatini, Dumas, or Hemingway, but, let us be frank, with also just a slight flavor of opera bouffe.

As with others who spring from Hispanic stock, it is the genius of the Cuban people that moments of epic heroism and national tragedy are leavened to some degree by the absurd. There was, for example, the time that the rebels impudently kidnapped the world's leading auto racer, Juan Manuel Fangio, of Argentina, right under the nose of Batista's police. Senor Fangio emerged from his ordeal no worse for wear, with a good-humored smile on his face, and an immense pile of clippings for his scrapbook.

And who should stride before the footlights after the shooting was over to announce that he had spent the past months with the rebels? Who indeed but Errol Flynn, a little stouter perhaps than in his days of portraying Robin Hood, but with a thirst for melodrama still unquenched.

The Cuban revolution, in sum, violated many of the time-tested precepts of insurrection. It came during a period of unusual prosperity, and it was fought for the most part while tourism as usual prevailed. Last fall I spent 10 days in Santiago de Cuba, capital of the province that was the seat of the rebellion. The army ruled by truncheon; midnight killings and rebel reprisals were common. Castro's detachments made forays into the suburbs. Yet amidst this state of siege I was able to charge my stay at the leading hotel on an American credit card. One wonders how Richard Harding Davis would have reacted to this report—now, pay-later arrangement for covering a revolution.

Yet all this—the heroic and the seriocomic—is properly the province of the dramatist. I would like to focus on three broader themes: the dilemmas of a hero in an organization age, the waning of the caudillo, and the plight of U.S. diplomacy in which every gain for freedom seems a paradoxical setback to the State Department.

THE OBSOLESCENCE OF HEROISM

Our age has reason to assume all heroes guilty until proven innocent. In a century that has grown cynical about saviors armed with a sword, it is not surprising that Fidel Castro is regarded with equal parts of admiration and distrust. Cuba, to be sure, is only an island, but atrocities are as deplorable there as on a continent; Batista has given proof of that. Moreover, ours is an era of organization which has as its emblems the research team, the secretarial pool,

and the group therapist. Our age dwells in bureaucratic halls, preaches the futility of revolt, and confines its taste for the epic to adult Westerns. Our dissenters tend to be either beat or glumly angry.

Castro has confounded the categories of his age, and for that he cannot easily be forgiven—or understood, for that matter. And yet surely one is still free to hope that this misguided heretic will become more than a captive lion on "Face the Nation," or just another tabloid-size dictator in our backyard.

In the United States, it would be regarded as a mild form of insanity for an ambitious young lawyer to jeopardize his career at its start by leading a quixotic revolt for republican ideals. And yet this is what Castro did shortly after he got his law degree at the University of Havana, a year after Batista had returned to power in a bloodless coup. Leading a band of a hundred youths, Castro attempted a commando-style capture of the military barracks in Santiago. The attack was bloodily repulsed; and Castro was caught, tried, and sentenced to 15 years in prison. The date of the attack—July 26, 1953—provided the slogan for Castro's movement.

Freed from jail by a congressional amnesty, Castro took flight to Mexico and with the help of money from his wealthy sugar-planter father organized an army for an invasion. When the report came that Castro's invaders had been cut down by army bullets (and that Castro himself had been killed), even his friends sorrowfully concluded that the last had been heard from him. But Castro and a handful of followers took shelter in the peaks of the Sierra Maestra in Oriente Province. The rugged terrain proved an impregnable fortress against an apathetic army, while Batista's air supremacy was nullified because his planes were unable to spot rebel installations. Thus, by hit-and-run raids, Castro was able to expand his realm and ultimately bottle up the island's key sugar ports, striking at the heart of the Cuban economy.

His success would have been inconceivable without one essential factor: the support, either active or passive, of the great mass of citizens in Oriente, Castro's birthplace and the island's largest and richest province. This support for a youngster who brought his province economic hardship, and even misery, cut through all strata of Oriente's society.

Anyone who spent time, as I did, traveling around Oriente during the fighting can testify to the passionate quality of his backing. One instance remains vividly in my mind. In Santiago, I asked one of the city's wealthiest sugar planters, a self-made man, whose holdings were largely in rebel-controlled areas, how he felt when Castro's forces set his fields afire and scorched his profits away, as they had done the year before. His reply in Spanish was succinct, immediate, and explosive: "I am enchanted."

Plainly one reason why Castro won such backing is that he was a symbol of resistance to an occupying army as brutal as it was venal. But it also was an eloquent tribute to the character of a leader whose guerrilla force was disciplined and relatively restrained.

I lived for 10 days with rebel forces in the Sierra Maestra, and spend 3 days with Castro himself. For a guerrilla army composed of unpaid volunteers, many of them unlettered guajiros native to the hills, I was impressed by the tough-minded intelligence I found. As to Castro, I was struck by his tremendous vitality, his articulateness and wit, and his thoughtfulness—in roughly that order.

In a land where most men are short and wiry, Castro is a 6-footer whose energy is awesome; like all Latin Americans, Castro loves to talk, but unlike some, he talks ex-

ceedingly well—even in English, which he speaks with vigor if without grammar.

Indeed, he is a virtuoso in the art of personal communication; the intense look through owl-like, horn-rimmed glasses, the politician's amiable squeeze of the shoulder, the apt joke, and the studied concern with the listener's reaction. Combined with this is an indifference to physical surroundings: whether he is crouched in his shoebox-sized headquarter's cabin or marching at the head of a column in clothes as shaggy as his beard, the stream of words is incessant and sharply articulate.

For a man who has spent most of the past decade in the twilight world of revolutionary activities, his thinking shows a surprisingly thoughtful bent. Castro has fought like a zealot, but in private conversation he does not talk like one. Anything but an inflexible doctrinaire, he struck me as speculative and pragmatic.

In politics, he has insisted that his crusade had a single objective: the restoration of a freely elected government in Cuba. Yet on such details as the role of political parties he has been unsatisfyingly ambiguous. In economics, he asserts that he has changed his mind about the virtues of nationalization and favors a program of moderate reform and welfare legislation. I asked him if he wanted a New Deal for Cuba.

"Yes," he drawled, "but if you write that, be sure to say you asked me whether I favored a New Deal for Cuba and I said 'Yes.' Otherwise, people would think I want to be the Franklin Roosevelt of Cuba." (Castro has repeatedly said he does not want to run for the presidency, pointing that he is too young to qualify under the constitution. Nonetheless, Castro's voice prevails in the provisional government led by his choice for president, former Judge Manuel Urrutia Lleo. The caliber of the new regime's ministers has been generally high, representing Cuba's more moderate elements.)

On the debit side, however, have been the rash acts of Castro's subordinates—and some rash statements from Castro himself. Doubtless revolutions are not namby-pamby affairs, but the hijacking of airplanes and the seizing of United States citizens are a strange way of winning friends and influencing Washington. More worrisome has been the victorious movement's insistence on vengeance. Last November, Castro threatened reprisals against all traitors who participated in a Batista-sponsored election, and the recent sentences of the revolutionary tribunals have certainly lived up to that promise. Castro's angry threat that if the United States tried to interfere with the executions by landing marines—"no one had suggested it—there would be "200,000 gringos dead in the streets" may have been just "blowing off steam." But the cynics and some sniggering Habaneros are already betting that Castro will prove a counterfeit idealist. Perhaps they are right. Those who hope that the age of individualism has not altogether vanished hope time will show that Cuba will be a better place because Castro failed to become an organization man.

THE ROTARIAN REVOLUTION

If nothing else, the collapse of Batista draws attention to an admirably perverse phenomenon that is taking place in our backyard. Elsewhere in the so-called underdeveloped areas of the world, democratic governments are yielding to dictators—but in Latin America precisely the opposite tendency is evident.

Four years ago, 9 of the 20 Latin American republics were ruled by caudillos; today, only 3 dictators survive—and of these, only Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic is without visible challenge. (But all men are mortal, and it is delicious to contemplate what life will be like in the era of Trujillo, Jr., when El Benefactor's heir turns the Republic's postage stamps into a

gallery of pinups.) The region's democratic tide began in Argentina in 1955, when Juan Perón fled into exile aboard a Paraguayan gunboat. In 1956, Manuel Odria of Peru voluntarily stepped down and Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua was assassinated. A year later, the Colombians rid themselves of Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, and in 1958 neighboring Venezuela overthrew Marcos Pérez Jiménez. And now Batista is following a well-worn itinerary via Ciudad Trujillo.

All this, to be sure, is a negative achievement and offers no guarantees that new men on horseback will not soon prance into power. But accompanying this decline of the caudillo has been an extraordinary sequence of free elections in which the opposition party has not only won at the polls but has peacefully taken office. Within the past few years, this has been true in countries as diverse as Costa Rica, Venezuela, Argentina, Chile, Honduras, Guatemala, and Uruguay. Meanwhile, Mexico continues its two decades of stable and reasonably free government under President Adolfo López Mateos. And in Colombia, after a decade of fratricide, the Republic's two rival parties have joined forces behind President Alberto Lleras Camargo, one of the hemisphere's most esteemed liberal statesmen.

One interesting aspect of this steady democratic evolution in Latin America has been the aggressively antidictatorial position the Catholic Church has taken, notably in Argentina, Colombia, and Venezuela. Even in Cuba, where the church has traditionally been timid in politics, the hierarchy remained officially neutral in the civil war while the lower clergy and Catholic action groups actively sided with the rebels.

But more fundamental has been the changing structure of society in most Latin American countries. The region is in a ferment of economic growth, and one consequence has been the growing influence of Latin America's nascent middle classes. Another result has been the emergence of trade unions and a militant labor leadership pressing for swifter change.

In Cuba it is unthinkable that Castro could have waged his revolution without the support of the island's growing, if still small, professional and middle class. My contact with the rebel forces—I can record his name now—was Mariano Roca, a developer and appliance dealer who was an officer in both the Rotary and the Lions clubs. The man who undertook grave risks by smuggling me through the army lines to meet Castro was a General Motors dealer. Néstor Hernández, owner of the largest ice plant in Santiago, took equal risks in hiding me upon my return.

Everywhere I traveled in Cuba during the civil war, I found the most thoughtful and articulate supporters (and sympathetic critics) of Castro's movement precisely among groups that had the most to risk in a time of turmoil and anarchy. Although the labor movement remained lukewarm toward Castro until the closing battles, country clubs in Havana were frequently the rendezvous of rebel sympathizers.

Indeed, the medical profession was in the front ranks of the opposition to Batista. Some of Cuba's leading doctors joined Castro's forces in the hills; the four hospitals built under their supervision were the first established in the primitive back country of Oriente. Almost a year ago medical men took the lead in framing a manifesto condemning the Batista government that was signed by 42 of the island's religious, professional, and civic organizations. In December physicians openly refused to celebrate their traditional holiday as a protest against the barbarisms of the Batista regime.

Because of this strong middle-class complexion of the Castro movement, the charges that the insurgents were the harbingers of communism has seemed a wry joke to those

who were familiar with the rebellion's unlikely recruits. But not only does his bourgeois support seem a barrier against communism; it also holds hope that whatever course Castro may take the pull of Cuba's democratic tide will be steady and strong.

WHAT ARE WE AFRAID OF?

Like their counterparts elsewhere in Latin America, the Cuban middle classes are in revolt against the whole tradition of government that has held the region in thrall. Graft, favoritism, police brutality, profligate waste of public funds, neglect of education, and rule by military and landed oligarchs—all these are the venerable afflictions which the emerging Latin middle class seeks to eliminate or at least moderate. Is there anything on this agenda that should cause panic in the long corridors of the State Department?

Yet there's the rub. In Cuba as elsewhere in the hemisphere, the United States has frequently been caught in a melancholy posture of embarrassment when its good neighbors to the south overthrow a dictator and enlarge liberty's realm. Why this should be so is a puzzle that fully deserves the investigation of a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee that is now underway.

It must be noted, of course, that the predominant position of the United States during Cuba's revolution was cautious neutrality. Last March 14, the State Department clamped an embargo on the shipment of arms to either side, a step that pinched the Batista regime far more than the rebels, who were adept at smuggling. But few Cubans today believe that our policy was one of neutrality. One obvious reason is that Batista, who controlled what the press and radio could say, was careful to muffle the facts. Another reason, however, is that our official representatives allowed themselves to be used in a way that lamentably implied United States support for a government that was detested by its own people.

Until 1957, the Ambassador from Washington, was Arthur Gardner, whose personal chumminess with the Batista clique was widely known. His successor was Earl E. T. Smith, who had previously distinguished himself as a broker, sportsman, and Republican fund raiser in Florida. Mr. Smith was a novice, and only 6 days after he had presented his credentials to Batista he enraged the government by expressing a perfectly human if undiplomatic feeling of shock at seeing Batista's police hose down a group of women demonstrators in Santiago. But after this incident, Mr. Smith developed more amiable relations with the Batista set and made it known that he regarded Castro's rebels as an unsavory bunch of troublemakers. Mr. Smith has been recalled to Washington, but the sour aftertaste remains in Havana.

A more prickly controversy concerns the U.S. military mission in Havana. This group of 30-odd officers resides in Cuba under the terms of the Rio pact aimed at defending the hemisphere against communism. To the Cubans, however, it seemed worse than meddlesome for a group of U.S. military officers to be associated with the Cuban Army in the midst of a civil war, especially since the pact specified that in cases of civil strife the mission could be recalled. What particularly galled the Cubans was a much-publicized occasion last March when the mission, in a mood of convivial camaraderie, threw a congratulatory dinner for Gen. Francisco Tabernilla in honor of his promotion to chief of staff. Tabernilla has now left Cuba, and there are indications that the sociable mission, too, may be asked to depart.

These blunders, combined with the friendly association between the United States business community and the Batista regime, have contributed to the unpopularity of the United States in Cuba. But short of outright intervention, it might fairly be asked, what

can we do to disengage from a dictator's embrace?

Obviously, we can be scrupulously proper in our relation with dictators, both in public and private, without exhibiting excessive cordiality. This would rule out most of the gross errors committed in Cuba. It would also eliminate the embarrassment caused by the award of a medal to Venezuela's recent tyrant, Perez Jimenez.

An attitude of distant coolness to dictators is one side of the coin; the other is the obvious need to give warm and friendly support to the emerging democracies of Latin America. Here again, the United States record is ambiguous. The most grievous case of neglect came in Argentina after the overthrow of Juan Peron. An honorable and moderate-minded provisional government headed by Adm. Pedro Aramburu came to Washington, hat in hand, for help. The aid it got was both skimpy and belated, in large part (it is understood) because U.S. oilmen were unhappy about Argentina's policy of developing its own oil and because private power groups were annoyed about unsettled claims against a nationalized Buenos Aires electric concern.

Will we also risk offering too little too late to other democratic countries in Latin America? Economic distress in the hemisphere is widespread, mainly because the world prices of key commodities have declined sharply, and the one-crop economies of most Latin countries are extremely vulnerable to fluctuating prices. Some slight stirrings in Washington indicate that the seriousness of Latin America's plight and the scope of United States opportunity are at last registering on official consciousness. Dr. Milton Eisenhower has spoken out forcefully about the need for action. The Brazilians have come up with an arresting suggestion for "Operation Pan-America," a regional development plan which if given effective U.S. support might awaken new hope in the hemisphere.

And yet there was an uneasy symbolism in the way Dr. Eisenhower's latest report on Latin America was released to the press. This report, based on Dr. Eisenhower's recent tour through Central America, stressed the need for a cooler policy toward dictators. It was distributed to the press on December 30, but since Press Secretary Jim Haggerty dislikes giving a preference to either morning or afternoon newspapers, it was marked for release on Sunday, January 4—and hence Dr. Eisenhower's critical words about dictators came as a tardy echo of the explosion in Cuba. How much longer will the United States seem to be running after the crowd shouting "Wait for me. I'm your leader."

A Continuing Report From Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article concerning the new Cuban Government which appears in the February 8, 1959, issue of Our Sunday Visitor, the national Catholic action weekly:

WHY WERE THEY WRONG ABOUT CUBA?—U.S. COMMENTATORS HAVE TAKEN FOR GRANTED THAT THE PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED WERE MERELY POLITICAL OPPONENTS—THEY WERE NOT—THEY WERE CRIMINALS WHO MURDERED, TORTURED, RAPED

(By Dale Francis)

Denunciations of the executions by the new Cuban Government have followed no

political lines. Fulton J. Lewis and Edward R. Murrow found themselves in surprised agreement. David Lawrence and Max Lerner wound up for the first time in years saying almost exactly the same thing. The anti-Communist editor of American Opinion and the decidedly left-leaning editors of the New York Post were in agreement.

All without exception denounced the executions and they were joined by the editorial writers of all the secular newspapers in the United States.

But even as they denounced the executions, the highly regarded Catholic Bishop of Matanzas, a man known for his progressiveness, was declaring that not only were the executions just but that had the Government not carried them out it was quite possible that the people could have validly taken the law into their own hands.

What was the difference between these two widely separated viewpoints? Why was it that the Nation's opinion makers held such a vastly different viewpoint than this outstanding bishop?

The answer is simple. The bishop knows the situation, the opinion makers do not. Unfortunately radio commentators, columnists, editorial writers, opinion makers in general, believe it necessary that they comment on every issue that attains prominence whether or not they really know anything about the issue or not. This is exactly what happened in relation to what has been going on in Cuba.

U.S. commentators have taken for granted that the people being executed were merely political opponents. They are not. They are criminals who have murdered, tortured, raped.

Few men know this better than Bishop Alberto Martin y Villaverde, bishop of Matanzas, one of the most highly respected leaders of the church in Latin America.

Reinaldo Bermudez and Rene Fraga were two of the Catholic youth leaders in the city of Matanzas. Reinaldo works in the chancery office. Rene was an outstanding Catholic from the days when he was just a boy and he became a leader in Catholic Action. His home was near the bishop's home.

They were not members of the rebel forces but they were suspected of rebel sympathies and so the police of Matanzas arrested them. They were questioned and tortured.

Perhaps you saw the picture of Pepe Caliente, the notorious torturer of Matanzas, showing how prisoners were forced to kneel for their beatings. It was featured in some U.S. papers in a series of pictures that seemed almost designed to build sympathy for Pepe Caliente, who since has been executed.

They beat Reinaldo and Rene like that. They tortured them for 3 days. Reinaldo survived their tortures but his battered and beaten body took months to recover.

Rene was tortured even more brutally. Those who measure pain say that one of the most intense pains of all is that of a burning cigarette pressed against the skin. The police did this over and over to Rene Fraga until finally, crazed by pain, he broke loose and started to run away. They shot and killed him and tossed his body onto the roof of a little shack down along the bay.

The people of Matanzas, who knew and loved Rene Fraga, came out for his funeral and Bishop Martin, who was close to Rene and loved him, came to the cemetery, too. But the police didn't want the bishop there so they fired their guns over his head and forced him to turn away.

These were things Bishop Martin remembers. He is not a man seeking vengeance, he is a man seeking justice and he knows justice demands that murderers be punished.

The first public trial in Havana was the trial of the commander at Holguin and in one of the most astonishing bits of inanity in television history, the man on trial was compared by NBC's Frank McGee to the Christians in the coliseum.

Holguin is one of my favorite towns in Cuba. It reminds me somehow of a west Texas town, why, I'm not quite sure. Few towns suffered more. One day the people of Holguin awoke to discover 25 men hanging from the trees on the edge of town. They were murdered to teach a lesson to the people.

The man on trial was charged with 48 murders. It seems difficult to make many Americans understand but these were not combat deaths, these were murders of men suspected of rebel sympathies, suspected of aiding the rebels.

How many were murdered no one really knows. I see Raul Castro claims 10,000 were murdered in Oriente Province but that is twice the amount given to me. My figures came from Archbishop Enrique Perez-Serantes, archbishop of Santiago de Cuba; Carlos Chalm, civilian administrator of Oriente Province; and Oscar Cossio, director of the Red Cross for Oriente. They considered carefully and when they gave me a figure they told me they considered it a minimum figure. They said at least 5,000 people were murdered in Oriente Province. Since that time new mass graves have been found, and the figure mounts upward.

But the tortures that always preceded murders were also inflicted upon people who were not murdered. There is one officer still being sought who had one of the most horrible tortures of all. When he is caught he will be thankful for police protection for he must fear what would happen to him if his victims seized him.

The story of his method of torture was told to me by Father Francisco Guzman, S.J., and his knowledge comes from those who suffered.

In the villages throughout Cuba there were those who sold war bonds to help the rebels and there were those who bought them. The Batista men wanted to end this and so they sought to terrorize the people and to find out who helped the rebels.

This man brought in a suspect—and Father Guzman said he did this not just once but many times—and tied him to a chair. Then he brought in the wife of the suspect and before the husband, had a soldier rape the wife.

This happened in Cuba, not once but many times. And when the officer and the soldier are found they will be given great mercy if they escape the revenge of their victims and are executed by the courts.

Father Guzman told me of another similar incident where the fiancée of a suspect was raped before his eyes, not once but many times. The experience was too much for her and she is hopelessly insane.

If Americans could find some understanding of the crimes that have been committed in Cuba in the last year and a half then they would understand that the executions of the murderers and torturers are justice and not "blood baths."

A priest said to me, a little helplessly, "But I can't understand Americans. In the United States, when a man murders one then you give him a trial and if he is found guilty you place him in an electric chair and execute him. But when a man here murders 30 or 40 and we try him and when he is found guilty, execute him, you accuse us of being barbarians."

There was no way for me to answer this priest except to say, "They just don't know, Father, they just don't understand."

But now you do understand and you must tell others. See that your Congressmen and Senators read this series of articles and if you want to help the people to Cuba to recover then send your help to the Most Reverend Enrique Perez Serantes, Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba, Santiago de Cuba, Oriente, Cuba.

Appendix

Addresses Delivered at Testimonial Dinner in Honor of Leslie L. Biffle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, I desire to make a brief statement and to propose a request.

On Tuesday evening, January 20, 1959, a testimonial dinner was given at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington in honor of the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle, former Secretary of the Senate, in commemoration of his 50th year in Washington.

We are advised by the Public Printer that the remarks made on that occasion exceed the 2-page limit, and that the estimate of the cost of printing is \$351. Notwithstanding that fact, we ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Leslie Biffle is by all odds one of the most gracious and obliging personalities I have ever encountered in my lifetime. He has been completely unselfish, regardless of political identity, in being kind and helpful to everyone he might serve. The testimonial dinner in his honor was richly deserved, as were all the encomiums which were spread on the record.

So I am delighted in joining the majority leader in asking that these proceedings be made a matter of record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank my delightful friend from Illinois for his eloquent tribute to this faithful public servant. I was privileged to attend the dinner, although I arrived there just before it concluded. I have never seen a dinner in Washington which was attended by more members of both parties who felt so sincerely that they wanted to honor a public servant. The distinguished minority leader has expressed better than I can how all of us feel about this former officer of the Senate.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. HOWARD McGRATH. Ladies and gentlemen, the invocation will be offered by the Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate. Please stand.

Dr. HARRIS. Let us lift our hearts in prayer. Oh Thou God of the best we aspire to be in our highest hours, we are grateful for the

sacrament of friendship, and for the contagion of a friendliness which is not mixed with the alloy of self-seeking.

In a world where so much is marred by unworthy covetousness, we thank Thee for the abiding beauty of a care for one's fellows, pictured in the Book of Ages, where Thy servant, Saint Paul, tells of a love that is patient and kind, that is not jealous nor boastful, that is not arrogant and rude, that does not insist on its own way, that is not irritable nor resentful; a love that does not rejoice in the wrong, but rejoices in the right.

We come this hour with glad and grateful hearts to honor a friend whose record fits this scriptural frame and who, across the years, has lived in his house by the side of the road, and been a friend of man, who has a place of affection in the hearts of a host who have felt the warmth of his selfless interest in public and private life, across fruitful years for a half century in this Capital City.

With deep appreciation for all he means to so many, we salute this radiant friend in whose heart there is malice toward none and charity for all, and who, in the school of the years, has learned—

"To think without confusion clearly,
To act from honest motives purely,
To love his fellow man sincerely,
To trust in God and heaven securely."

We come in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

(The National Anthem.)

J. HOWARD McGRATH. I now present on behalf of every and all persons that are here tonight, in force and on our behalf, Mrs. Perle Mesta.

Mrs. PERLE MESTA. My father always taught me that a woman—a mother or sisters, or a wife—was behind any man's accomplishments, and tonight we have the charming wife of Mr. Biffle, and I am delighted to present these roses, on behalf of this committee, to Mrs. Biffle.

J. HOWARD McGRATH. We will now proceed with the purpose which brought us here—that is, to have a dinner.

A panoramic picture of the guests tonight; the camera is in that direction, directly opposite me; if you could give your attention for 2 minutes, the picture would be concluded.

Will you please cooperate in the taking of these panoramic pictures. This is not a sound picture, so upstairs you can make as much noise as you like.

Gentlemen and ladies, you will find on your table a sheet entitled "Friends of Leslie Biffle." These are enclosed in a cellophane envelope. It is our hope that each of you will sign his name, carefully preserving these sheets so that they can be incorporated in a volume that will be presented to Mr. Biffle as a remembrance of those who are here tonight. So, if you have not already signed your sheet, please do so now, reenclose it in the cellophane envelopes, and the waiters or members of the committee will collect it. The sheets that you have signed, friends of Leslie Biffle, that are to be included in a volume to be presented to him which have not already been collected, please see that your waiter picks them up and brings them to the head table.

Ladies and gentlemen, we must be on with our business. I would like now to

present those who are seated at what is commonly known as the head table. There is no significance about the personages of those who are here and are about to be presented; they are symbolic of the many beloved friends of our guest of honor. If you will bear with me I will ask each of them to stand for your approval.

To my left, Mr. Felton M. Johnston, the Secretary of the Senate; Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, the grandma of the Democratic Party; Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee; Mrs. Thomas C. Clark; Rev. Frederick Brown Harris; Mrs. Perle Mesta; Robert V. Fleming; Mrs. Samuel F. Pryor, Jr.; Senator Lister Hill; Mrs. Styles Bridges; Justice Wm. O. Douglas; Mrs. John L. McClellan.

On the other side of the table I would like to present Mr. James W. Carkner, chairman of the board of Pepsi-Cola of which our honored guest is a distinguished member; Mrs. Felton M. Johnston; John W. Holton, the Administrative Assistant to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; Mrs. Wm. O. Douglas; the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Wm. P. Rogers; Mrs. Frederick Brown Harris; the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr.; Mrs. J. Howard McGrath; Hon. Styles Bridges; Mrs. Lister Hill; Justice Tom C. Clark; Mrs. Leslie Biffle.

Now, it becomes my very pleasant duty and honor to present to you my cochairman of this magnificent tribute to our honored guest. There are happy privileges that come to one in a lifetime but none more rewarding than to have as a working companion, in a cause that is so wonderfully rewarding as this we are engaged in tonight, such as I have had. There have been no conspiracies betwixt nor among us save one—I agreed with my cochairman that he would seat the Democrats and I would seat the Republicans—so if any of you have a problem about where you are or why you are, blame each of us and find out where you are. I now want to introduce to this gathering which has been a real effort on behalf of those who are in attendance, and those who could not be here for many and varied reasons, the man who has contributed the most to making this affair the bipartisan, nonpartisan, triple partisan, whatever partisan you have—our cochairman, Sam Pryor.

SAMUEL F. PRYOR, JR. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Honored guests and distinguished guests and friends of our honored guest, Reverend Harris, that world you spoke of, Mrs. Pryor and I have had the privilege of seeing nearly every living corner of it and I can honestly say it's a beautiful world. In fact, I sometimes think we have Heaven on earth here, with the exception of one thing—people. People cause trouble, confusion, and unhappiness. But, tonight, tonight we have one of the great exceptions to the rule. Our guest of honor has brought happiness to nearly everybody in this room. He's brought kindness, regardless of party, regardless of whether you're big or small, he's been kind to us. And also we have another person of this category. We are very fortunate to have him. He is in the midst right now of making the United States a better place to live, not only for us, but, more important, for our children. And he comes from the same background; in fact since my party has been referred to, may I say he has a great many of the qualities of Abraham Lincoln. It is a great privilege the

committee has given me to introduce to you all our toastmaster, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN.

Senator McClellan. Thank you, Sam, Mr. Cochran, Les and Mrs. Biffle, distinguished guests, my colleagues in Congress, ladies and gentlemen. I should like also to thank the entire committee on arrangements and to express my deep appreciation for the privilege of serving as your toastmaster this evening. To have the pleasure of participating in this program in that capacity is a very high honor, indeed, and one that I shall greatly cherish because I regard this testimonial dinner as one of the most outstanding functions of this kind ever held in the Capital of the United States.

I know this is a happy occasion for all of us. We are here to do honor to a very dear friend and to a truly great American, on this the 50th anniversary of his entering into public service with the National Congress here in Washington. This magnificent audience, your presence here now, is an eloquent tribute to him who has earned our eternal admiration and esteem by the unselfish and devoted service he has so faithfully and abundantly given to his country.

Naturally, I am doubly proud, because he is a fellow Arkansan. Truly he is a beloved son of the great wonder State and one in whom all of her citizens take justifiable pride and in whom they are well pleased.

Our guest of honor first came to Washington in 1908 as secretary to the Honorable Robert Bruce Macon, Congressman from the first district of Arkansas. In that capacity his talents and qualities soon appeared and were recognized. They quickly attracted the attention and interest of Members of the Congress, and he was repeatedly called to serve in important positions in the U.S. Senate and in fact to almost every important non-Member position in that body, finally culminating in his being elected Secretary of the Senate in 1945 by the unanimous support and vote of both the Democrats and Republicans alike and later elected again to that same position in 1949. It was my privilege to place him in nomination before the Democratic conference on that latter occasion. I think some of the things that I said then at that time when there was no occasion like this in my mind nor contemplated, I think some of the things I said would bear repeating here this evening. I refer to his many years of faithfulness and devotion and loyalty to the Democratic Party, to the unexcelled highly capable and efficient service he has rendered in the many places of trust and responsibility he held, to his affable and matchless personality, and to his many courtesies and accommodations that have throughout the years indelibly endeared him to the hearts of all of us.

But, there is still more to the story. In the drama of national life many personalities have from time to time played impressive roles on the Washington scene. Presidents, Members of Congress, Cabinet members, and other Government officials, come and go. While they are here they make their influence felt in politics and on the affairs of our Government and the Nation, some of them only to a small degree, and others with potent effects and results. During the time our honored guest served as secretary to the minority and as secretary to the majority, particularly when the Democrats were in power, as Secretary of the Senate, but few men, if any, have had equal or greater influence than he was able to bring to bear in the direction of forces of the Democratic Party or in the formulation of policies and the enactment of laws by the National Congress.

His counsel has eagerly been sought by legislators, by administrators, by diplomats, and by military leaders and even by Presidents of the United States. He has been a counselor and adviser, a confidant, whose opinions and judgment were respected and often followed by those in the highest posi-

tions of trust and responsibility. I truly feel inspired on this occasion, but I must not, of course, monopolize the time. It wasn't expected that I should make even these many remarks, but I couldn't refrain from doing so.

Now, before I introduce our other speakers, I may say that there have been literally thousands of messages received from friends all over the Nation, and it is impossible for the presiding official at this dinner to read all of them, or to even call the names of the large number of friends who join us here tonight in this way of paying tribute to our honored guest. But, I shall read some few that I think would be of interest to you and that I think you would like to hear. The first is:

"Regret I cannot be present this evening, to join your many friends, in tendering you this well deserved recognition. My kindest regards and best wishes always.

"J. MILLARD TAWES,
"Governor of Maryland."

"A new Governor does not have much time to travel. This becomes extremely regretful on the occasion such as this, when so many friends are joined in honoring Leslie Biffle on the 50th anniversary of his arrival in Washington. Very few individuals have made so many friends during a lifetime. Very few people have had such an influence on the destiny of our fellow citizens.

"I join all of you in expressing to Leslie many happy returns of this momentous day.

"MICHAEL DI SALLE,
"Governor of Ohio."

"Because of a mandatory commitment here I regret that I cannot attend the testimonial dinner to Leslie Biffle so I have requested Dick Patterson, my commissioner of commerce and public events, to represent me. Leslie Biffle has been a distinguished public servant for many years. Among his many fine attributes is his capacity for friendship. He has friends everywhere because he himself is a friend. The list of his friendships ranges from ditchdiggers to leaders in law, industry, and politics, to statesmen, ambassadors, and scientists. Loyalty is in Les Biffle's bloodstream. He never forgets a friend, he never fails to reward one. I salute him with admiration and affection.

"ROBERT F. WAGNER,
"Mayor of the City of New York."

"It is a most fitting and well deserved recognition of an outstanding career, and of a man who has followed a creed of placing the welfare of others ahead of his own. May I add my hearty congratulations and best wishes, may I further say that I am proud to be among your many warm friends and admirers.

"FRANK E. MCKINNEY."

"I hope you will tell Les Biffle how sorry I am not to be in Washington for his testimonial dinner. He is getting just what he deserves.

"Regards,

"ADLAI E. STEVENSON."

"Now I want to read you one from Arkansas:

"DEAR GENERAL McGRATH: It is a real pleasure to enclose herewith a copy of a resolution which unanimously passed both houses of the Arkansas general assembly yesterday. I have signed the resolution and will transmit original copies, along with my signature, to the members of the general assembly to Mr. Biffle, as soon as the resolution is enrolled. I regret very much that I am unable to be present at the dinner tonight; however, it will be deeply appreciated if you will convey my personal congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Biffle, who is certainly one of Arkansas' most distinguished and favorite sons.

"Most sincerely,

"ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
"Governor."

May I read you the resolution?

"SIXTY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE RESOLUTION, JANUARY 19, 1959

"Whereas there will be a testimonial dinner honoring Leslie L. Biffle at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on Tuesday evening, January 20, 1959; and

"Whereas the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle is a native of Piggott, Clay County, Ark., from where he went to Washington in 1908 to distinguish himself and bring honor to his native State with 50 years of public service in the Nation's Capital; and

"Whereas the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle has become enshrined in the hearts of his fellow men through his great acts of mercy, compassion, brotherly love, and a benevolent spirit that has given joy and sustenance to thousands of people; and

"Whereas during this period of 50 years in which he worked in the service of his Government, of his country, and his fellow men, this son of Arkansas has constructed a place of greatness as he has moved with charm and warmth, trust, and dignity in the political arena; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 62d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas does by unanimous action hereby commend their fellow citizen, the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle, for a half century of devotion in the service of democracy; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the testimonial committee dinner in Washington, D.C., to the Piggott Banner, in Piggott, Ark., to the Piggott Public Library, and to the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle of Washington, D.C."

Here is one that I know is from a dear, dear old friend:

"DEAR LES: Conditions have arisen which will prevent my making a trip east on the 20th as I had hoped. I congratulate you on the wonderful show of appreciation our friends are giving you. The Senate and the country never had a more faithful public servant than Leslie L. Biffle. I have never regretted anything more in my life than not being able to be with you on this occasion.

"Sincerely yours,

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

And, now I am happy to read a message from the highest authority in the land:

"DEAR LESLIE: I am sorry that I cannot join the friends who are with you this evening to congratulate you in person on your first 50 years in Washington. You have long been known as one of Washington's foremost citizens, noted for your warm personality, your readiness to be helpful, your professional efficiency and your loyal service. You have carved out a position that is unique in this city. Only a man of deep understanding, fine character, and a warm personality could have formed the many and warm friendships that enrich your life. Truly, you have done much to make Washington a better and more pleasant place in which to work and live. May the Lord in his providence keep you healthy and happy in the years to come.

"With best wishes to you and Mrs. Biffle.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

I certainly am not going to take further time. We have a brief program arranged. Some of our speakers that had been invited are unable to be present. Quite some time ago, when this meeting was first initiated, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, graciously accepted an invitation to be present and to speak to us on this occasion. Subsequently there was arranged a state dinner at the White House, and, of course, you know what takes precedence in such a situation. So, our Mr. SAM, our beloved Speaker, is at the White House this evening, but he has here as his

representative one who has already been introduced to you as his administrative assistant and whom I am proud to present again, Mr. John W. Holton.

JOHN W. HOLTON. Senator McCLELLAN, distinguished guests and friends of Les Biffle: Les, I do not think we need to ring the bells tonight because the entire membership is already here.

I bring you the friendly and warm greetings of Speaker RAYBURN. If you have read the biography of the distinguished honor guest tonight and the biographies of many other illustrious statesmen of our time, the Speaker would have me remind you that if you really want to reach the pinnacle of success, you must have had some association with the House of Representatives.

Mr. Biffle, your charming lady: I extend to you my sincere congratulations on this happy occasion. My wish for you is that your life may be spared for long and useful service; that the path of life may lead you by still waters; that you will be healthy; that you will find a prosperous and strong America and the world in peace.

Senator McCLELLAN. Thank you, Mr. Holton. The gentleman I shall now present to you is now serving, I believe, his 17th consecutive term in the Congress of the United States. He has twice been Speaker of the House of Representatives, and is one of the best known, the most influential, and one of the most loved Republicans in the United States: I give to you, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, the guest of honor and friends of Les Biffle, I am glad my good friend and neighbor Howard McGrath explained where he seated the Republicans. I was rather lost why a back seat Republican should be at the head table; but your explanation cleared that up most thoroughly. He did it from the kindness of his heart. You see we live only 12 miles apart. But what is the reason I am so happy to come? Because it gives me the privilege of paying a warm personal tribute to a man who through the years has won the affection, the regard, and the esteem of all who come in contact with him. He's a great American. He has given 50 years of service to our country. Think of the events that have happened in all those years, and realize that Les Biffle has played an important part in so many of them. My good friend JOHN McCLELLAN has stated he has been the confidant of Presidents. He has been the confidant of Senators and I can remember him 35 years ago in the early days when we House Members ventured into the rarefied atmosphere of the Senate—he would extend to us a helping hand. Now, of course, we go over there with the brusqueness of the modern age; because we have so many former House Members over there now. Sometimes we think we run the Senate. Well, at the critical moments they show us that we don't. But I find it a great privilege to come here tonight. It's a wonderful tribute to see this magnificent gathering, fine telegrams and messages, that have come from all over the country. They are heartening, they are warming. And they indicate to us the building of America is due to lives like Leslie Biffle's doing the everyday work, thoroughly, conscientiously, and with but one thought—what is best for America. Oh, my friends, as we face these critical years that are ahead, we need dedicated Americans, we need men of undoubted loyalty to our country, for that is the only way we are going to come through. It doesn't make much difference after all, whether we are Republicans or Democrats, the one great thought must be, "Are we doing what we honestly believe is best for America?" Are we doing our best to build this great country of ours? And so wherever I sit, in the back seat or the front seat, that shall be my purpose, because I love this country. It has done so much for all of

us. I know it can't be written in the stars, that in this hour this great country shall fall. No, we are going to go forward, we're going to go forward because we have men like Les Biffle, men of stalwartness, men of courage and men of discernment. * * * As I looked over that bicycle over there, automobile I guess it is, it says: "The Arkansas Pollster," and Les, I know the results of your polling. Sometimes as a Republican, I rather resented the reports you brought back from the country, but I know one thing always, that your reports were thorough and you were a keen observer. And, so I say to you tonight, I wish you well, Les. You see all these people who have come here tonight to pay tribute to you and your wife. It must make you feel proud; it must make you feel happy. Because after all, material possessions may vanish; the financial wealth that men accumulate may disappear; but the real friends a man earns are enduring. They are the real wealth. Les, you're a millionaire in the friends that you and your wife have accumulated in your long 50 years of service. May God bless you and take care of you in the years ahead.

Senator McCLELLAN. Thank you, Congressman MARTIN. I certainly take back nothing I said about him, don't you agree with me?

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, our able and distinguished majority leader, in the Senate, was also to address the group this evening. He gladly accepted when the invitation was extended, and, unfortunately for us, he, too, is at a command performance at a state dinner down at the White House. But, he has a representative here, in the distinguished Senator from Alabama, one of the ablest men on the Hill. He is Chairman of the important Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He served some 15 years in the House of Representatives and is now serving in his fourth term in the United States Senate. I am pleased to present to you, my able distinguished colleague and friend, Hon. LISTER HILL.

Senator HILL. Mr. Toastmaster, Les Biffle, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, when I was called at the last moment, advised that our distinguished Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON could not be here tonight, and that our fine assistant leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, is ill with pneumonia and could not be here tonight, and therefore, I had been chosen to say a few words at this time, frankly I was frightened. And then I thought about Les Biffle, and I thought, "Well, there'll be no trouble about that speech, except that it will take all night to tell all the good things about Les Biffle. And, then I was reminded, my friends, that 2 years ago last fall, Les Biffle sent me out to Iowa to make some speeches in the campaign there and I was with this good gentleman and his good wife; we were going to a city about 100 miles north from Des Moines, the capital, the good lady was driving the car and I was sitting on the front seat with her and the good husband was sitting behind, when we got about 15 miles out of our appointed destination we ran into one of the hardest rains I have ever seen in my life. The rain really came down in sheets. Just at that time the automobile stopped. It had given out of gas. Fortunately, it stopped right at a farmer's driveway and the good husband and I got out, went into the farmer's house, and of course he gave us enough gas to go on into the city. But you can imagine that on our way in, we really gave that lady a good time about giving out of gas. That night after I had spoken and the meeting was over she came up to me, shook my hand and said, "Senator, I want to congratulate you. I gave out of gas but you certainly didn't."

Who is there here who knows where Piggott, Ark., is? Well, there are a few, but I tell you my friends, it's the place whence came Leslie Biffle to Washington and that was 50 years ago. Think of it, that was before

most of us here this evening were even born. But, I want to say this about Les Biffle: all the ladies tell me that he's still young, charming, and captivating. He had his start, just as many of us did in the House of Representatives and then got demoted and came on over to the Senate. He fell under the eagle eye of that great statesman from Arkansas, Joe Robinson. Joe brought him to the Senate folding room; and ever since then Leslie Biffle has been a busy folding good things for his friends, for the Democratic Party, and for our country.

During World War I, the War Department sent Leslie to France; there he made a record to be proud of, one of honor and distinction. And when he came back he was made the factotum of the Senate, the doer of all things. Wherever a good man was needed, wherever a wise man was needed, Leslie Biffle was put into the breach. For we know that this fellow Leslie Biffle never puts off anything until tomorrow. He always gives everything his best attention, he attends to every detail, to every little requirement, and the job he does is always the paragon of perfection. And then as JOHN McCLELLAN has told us, in 1933 Les became secretary to the majority in the Senate, and there ripened that friendship that made Leslie Biffle the intimate friend, the closest confidant and counsellor to the one and only, the immortal Mr. "Veep" our own beloved Alben Barkley. In those early days, Leslie Biffle contributed so much to the passage of legislation that took our Nation out of the depression of the thirties, that he was named a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission by the gallant leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt. And, may I say that he is honored tonight and we are all honored by the presence of one of his fellow members on the American Battle Monuments Commission, Mrs. Wendell Willkie.

In 1945 Les became the Secretary of the Senate and when our good friends the Republicans came into power with the 80th Congress of course they took the job; so Leslie came with the Democratic policy committee. I remember, as a member of that committee, we had a lot of discussion on some of the problems and we had to sit around the table trying to solve those problems, and finally some member would say, "Les, what do you think about it?" and then Les would seem to know everything. It was like turning the light on in a dark room and we gazed and the wonder grew how this little small head could carry all that Les knew. But, you see, Les not only thinks himself but he knows what everyone else thinks. Why, if he were in the Senate today, he would know exactly what BOB BARTLETT and ERNEST GRUNING were thinking. He made so many contributions to the work of the Senate and did so much for the Senate that we nominated him Mr. Biffle the Senator at Large from the United States. Our good friend, that great and fine American JOE MARTIN, referred to this poster up here; you see it. Well, you know for a long, long time we heard about the Arkansas traveler and we wondered who was the Arkansas traveler. In 1948, as you recall, all the experts, and all those who thought they were experts, declared that there was no question about it; the election was in the bag for the Republicans. Governor Dewey was certain to be the next President of the United States. Well, Leslie Biffle went back to Piggott, Ark. He went into the old trunk, got out the old blue denim overalls that he had down there on the farm, put on a pair of old brogan shoes, got him a tin lizzy and he went out across the country to visit the people, the farmer, the filling station operator, the corner grocery store operator, right down to the grassroots of American democracy, and then he began to send back the reports that the Democrats could win, that the Democrats would win, and I often wonder how much those words of encouragement and assurance from Leslie

Biffle inspired that two-fisted fighting campaigner, give-'em-hell Harry. Our Republican friends know that Les is their friend; they also know his love for the Democratic Party that he is the dedicated Democrat. It is as a friend above all else that tonight we pay our tribute to him. He is the friend that asks no questions, needs no assurances, makes no demands. All that he asks is to extend a helping hand, to do something for his friend and, as his friends we rejoice to pay our tribute to him. In Leslie Biffle and the example of his life we see the nobility of friendship, the strength of character, the fellowship of humility, the gospel of humanity, and the love of God. To know Leslie Biffle is to love him, to name him is to praise him.

Senator McCLELLAN. Thank you, LISTER; thank you very much. I am indeed pleased to present to you another of my colleagues in the Senate, the former Governor of the great State of New Hampshire, now serving, I believe, his 22d year in the Senate. He was minority leader in the 82d Congress, the President pro tempore in the 83d Congress; he was also chairman of the Appropriations Committee during that Congress, and I may say to you that he is the ranking or the senior Republican in the United States Senate and the ablest statesman in the Republican Party. I present to you the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, Les, Mrs. Biffle and friends of Les Biffle. Probably few men in America have more genuine friends over the length and breadth of this country than Les Biffle. He is known for many of his accomplishments. One of those accomplishments referred to here this evening was the time in 1948 he went out as a pollster. He, at that time, attained a reputation as being a sort of "barnyard Gallup." He conducted a barnyard Gallup poll. It has been recalled here how he dressed up in old clothes, took a Ford pickup truck and started out to learn the political sentiment in this country. You know what happened and how he told the then President Truman that the pollsters had underestimated his strength. Les urged the President to hustle during the last few weeks of the campaign. This advice was followed, unfortunately, and the result was that on election day the Republicans were singing that song, "Hang down your head, Tom Dewey." There is one thing that most of you don't know, however, and that is that we Republicans were on the job at that time. We sent a man out to follow up Les Biffle. The only thing different was that we had him buying turkeys instead of chickens and we found that there were more chickens in this country than turkeys, much to our disappointment. Now, Les didn't make a poll in 1954 or 1956. He rested on his laurels but this last year he made a poll and he predicted that the Democrats would gain 14 seats in the Senate and 25 in the House. The rest is a sad story and I won't go into it. It reminds me of the anecdote about our President from the little State of New Hampshire, Franklin Pierce, who, incidentally, was a Democrat. We also at that period produced another great citizen who was the publisher of the New York Tribune—Horace Greeley. They didn't care for each other. After Franklin Pierce had been elected President—and this is a true story—Greeley sent one of his reporters back to the little town of Hillsboro, N. H., to make inquiry as to what kind of a President the local people thought Franklin Pierce would make. He finally went to a storekeeper by the name of Smith and said to Smith, "What kind of a President do you think Franklin Pierce will make?" The storekeeper in his typical Yankee tone said, "Well, I'll tell you. He has done pretty well here in the State in all the State offices he has held, but when you spread him over the

whole country he will wear kind of thin in places." That was our "only trouble last fall. We were a little thin in places. Now, when Les was Secretary of the Senate and when he was secretary of the majority here, he was known to us on the Republican side as a sort of "walking encyclopedia" and he lived up to that because he was the author of more proposals than I can describe on various bills which were sponsored by other people. He was uncanny in his ability to predict how the votes were going to come out and how each Senator was going to vote. As a matter of fact on several occasions I saw polls prepared by Biffle in which he predicted how I would vote before I had decided myself. It was a great source of wonder to me and admiration too to see Les Biffle move around the Senate floor and whisper to the various Senators. He is the only man I know who can whisper to you and not move his lips. I have always thought he would make a great, great ventriloquist. The only thing that bothered me was what Democratic Senator would he use as the dummy. Seriously speaking, there are a great many things about Les Biffle in which he and his family and all his friends can take great pride. He has done well for a country boy from Arkansas. He has attained a pinnacle in the Nation's Capital that few men reach. And I don't believe there is anyone in this room who would deny that there is no one individual on the American political scene today who has made more friends, real friends, in both political parties than Les Biffle. And as long as the American political scene continues to attract men of Les Biffle's character we don't have too many worries about the future of our Nation. He has my affection, my respect, and my esteem. You know, in closing, that I have not always agreed with the former President of the United States, Harry Truman, but he said at one time, and I quote, "They don't make them any better than Les Biffle." As we say on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I wish to associate myself with those remarks.

Senator McCLELLAN. I have a pleasant surprise for you. We are very happy that the distinguished majority leader of the Senate has been able to break away from the White House long enough to join us. LYNDON, you have the mike—they are waiting for you.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Biffle, my fellow Americans. Somebody once said that there are two ways for every boy in Arkansas to go. He can either go up in the world or he can go to Texas. A loss to Texas can be a gain to the Nation. Les Biffle is one Arkansas boy who went up in the world but none of us are here tonight to honor him for that alone. For Les Biffle did more than to go up in the world for himself. The important thing is that he helped a great many others go up in the world themselves and once there he helped all of them serve the Nation better. When Les Biffle left his native Arkansas and came to Washington he brought with him far more than what he packed in that little suitcase. He brought good sense, warmth, and human understanding, and a lot of real backbone. As long as he was here his supply never ran low. He made men stronger, he made the Senate stronger, he made his party stronger, and he made a great contribution to strengthening his Nation by his counsel and his leadership. This is a great thing for any man to have said of himself. I hope, Les, that you will admit it to yourself. We honor you tonight as a man because you deserve it. In a larger sense, though, we honor you for the standard of selfless service which you have set because this Nation deserves such a standard of service. You, as all your friends know, spent your time here seeding your party with responsibility. I know it must be a great satisfaction to you and your gracious

lady to see the harvest now being reaped by your party in these fields of responsibility. If I were writing you a postcard instead of speaking as I am I think you would appreciate the new meaning of an old message if I would say only, "Having a wonderful time, wish you were here with us."

Senator McCLELLAN. Thank you, LYNDON, we are so happy that you could get away from the White House dinner in time to join us and your remarks, I think, are a very fitting close and climax to the speeches we have had here this evening. My part on this program is coming to a close. Before I turn the gavel over to the cochairman, however, I should like to recognize and have her stand and take a bow—the estimable and charming lady, Mrs. Alben W. Barkley. Mrs. Barkley.

Now may I say, and I know everyone of you will join me in these sentiments, I want to say to Mrs. Biffle that every tribute paid here this evening to your illustrious husband and every sentiment we have expressed for him, you share in our thoughts equally. You have been to him a wonderful companion. You have made it possible for him to achieve his great success and to be endeared to all of us as we have expressed here tonight. I now turn the gavel back to your distinguished cochairman, J. Howard McGrath.

J. HOWARD McGRATH. I assure you that I have made every effort to have my cochairman, Sam Pryor, take this place but he has declined. Leslie, you know that we would not have a testimonial in your honor unless we brought gifts so we have them and, briefly, I will present them to you and to Glade without remarks. First of all, let's open this up because these are very valuable gifts. On behalf of each and all who are gathered here, Les, we give you your 100th watch. And to you, Glade, we give you your 1,000th diamond. But above and, oh, yes, there is a little throw in here, Les, this is a book. You are from Arkansas, you know what a book is. It is something with a proud name on the back and a cover on each side but inside this book will be the most precious names you will ever know, at least for the next 50 years. So, once in a while when you are not at a Cafritz party or a Mesta party look through this book, read these names and remember us. Now, for all who are here and who are not here who have contributed to this dinner, I just want to announce that when the Biffles go home tonight, in their apartment there will be set up the finest yet produced color television set. This is a delicate instrument and it was thought unwise to display it here but this is the picture for all to see. As a matter of fact it is so delicate that Pryor and myself decided that we had better insure it for a year, so Les, if anything goes wrong with this machine for the next year, it is on us. After that you are on your own. These are our gifts. Don't you want to thank us for them?

LESLIE L. BIFFLE. My wonderful, wonderful friends. I am deeply, deeply touched at what you have done tonight. What an anticlimax this is going to be in the way of a speech. I am going to suggest to you something that you know already. I am as nervous as a June bride—it's true, too. I did pencil a few lines this morning. Thought I would be able to read them, but you turned out the lights on me. My good friends, I am deeply indebted to you all for this party, including the presents. I don't know how to thank you. So many have put in hours and hours—working day and night. I am very grateful. It says here, I am the happiest man in the world. I have already said the next paragraph. My 50 years in Washington. It's a long, long time in anybody's life. I arrived in the Capital City the last of November 1908. I was one of the greenest young fellows that ever arrived in the Capital; however, I know a certain fellow who was a little green when he came to Washington.

I am calling no names but many of you know him. He got a job in the Senate in 1935, he studied and worked hard for 10 years, and then he was given another place. Shortly after that he was given still another place, which he held until January 1953. I think he has a job in a library out in the Middle West some place. May I tell you folks how I happened to come to Washington? In the month of May 1908, Congressman Macon came to my hometown, Piggott. He was running for reelection. I went with my father down to the train to meet him. He walked up the street and the Congressman asked my father's permission for me to take him around and introduce him to the different people in our community. Well, I took him to the courthouse, to the different stores around the square, to the cotton gin, and to the sawmill. About 3 weeks after that my father had a letter from the Congressman saying he would like to appoint me his secretary. My father accepted before he could change his mind. He was so happy about it. I borrowed some money, I think it was \$60. I went to a school in Little Rock to study shorthand. I think they called it "cross-electric." I never heard of it since. In the fall my father took me to St. Louis, bought for me a new suit, cost \$11, and a new hat, cost \$2. He put me on the train, day coach to Cincinnati, in an upper in a sleeper from Cincinnati to Washington. Our train had to wait about 3 hours for connections from Cincinnati to Louisville. I asked the conductor if it would be all right for me to walk down the street a little piece. It was just getting dark, the street lights were on. He said, "Yes, but don't go too far." While I was out walking it started to rain. My suit got wet; my hat got wet. The next morning when I got up I had a lot of trouble getting my trousers on—(it was an upper berth) you ought to try getting your clothes on in an upper berth in the mountains—when the train is throwing you from one side to the other. I may tell you I had a little trouble getting into that upper berth. I didn't know anything about a ladder. Had never seen a pullman before. The colored man wasn't in the car at the time, so I put my foot on the arm of the lower berth and tried to get up. Couldn't make it. A fellow sitting across the aisle from me said, "Buddy, if you will wait awhile the porter will bring you a ladder," which he did and I finally made it. I must say that the Congressman was certainly nice to me. He would dictate the mail to me in the morning, would go over to the House, and come back in the afternoon to sign it. It would take him about 3 hours to correct my letters and I would have to stay until about 11 or 12 at night rewriting them. It is a wonder he didn't send me home after the first month. I remained with the Congressman until he left public life and I then went over to the Senate side where I held various positions. Finally, I became Secretary of the Senate. Let me tell you of one of the most interesting experiences I ever had. It was in January 1947. The question before the Senate was the seating of Senator Bilbo. We at that time did not have a Vice President. President Truman having gone to the White House. The man who was to be President pro tempore was a Senator-elect. His name was way down on the list to be sworn in. I had to preside, being Secretary of the Senate at that time. The galleries were crowded, the floor packed and jammed. The debate started on Bilbo. I was not permitted to call a Senator to come and relieve me when I wanted to go to lunch or do anything else, all day long, all day long. It was a long, long afternoon. If you folks could see some of the notes that I have on file that different Senators would write and send up to me. "Les, would you like me to go out and eat a little lunch for you or would you like

me to do this or that?" I must say this about my dear sweet wife, Glade. She has been a tower of strength to me. She has been a little peeved at me since Christmas. I gave her a Hagerstown Almanac. There is also something about Glade. Many of you know I am cross and irritable and hard to get along with. I sometimes go home cross and say something critical to her. She doesn't say a word back. She just shuts up like a clam. If she would fight back a little I think I would feel better, but she goes right along washing dishes or sweeping the carpet or something. She has been, as I said, a tower of strength to me. I had the most efficient help when I was Secretary of the Senate—Mrs. Darling, Mrs. Kraus, Mrs. Roche, and Mrs. Tucker. They were all very able girls and they were all loyal to the cause. Guess that's a blank piece of paper. Again, I must tell you how very grateful I am to you for the wonderful things that have been said about me tonight. You have touched me beyond expression. You have made me very happy and you have made my family very happy. My two sisters are sitting here. They came up from Miami for this occasion. Thank you ever, ever so much.

J. HOWARD McGRATH. Now the first part of our program is over. We have a beautiful entertainment program. I hope that all of you can stay to listen to it. I turn you over now to Director of Music.

(Eddie Pierce presented entertainment here.)

J. HOWARD McGRATH. I think now we have had quite a wonderful evening. The program has run a little longer than planned, but on behalf of Leslie and Glade and all of us who have had the privilege of being on this wonderful committee, I want to thank you a thousand percent. A thousand percent is the interest that we hope to make next year on the prosperity of America.

"If America Forgets Where She Came From, if the People Lose Sight of What Brought Them Along, Then Will Begin the Dissolution," Carl Sandburg, Biographer of Abraham Lincoln, Declares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Lincoln scholar, Carl Sandburg, poet and philosopher, wrote in his book "Remembrance Rock" that:

If America forgets where she came from, if the people lose sight of what brought them along, if she listens to the deniers and mockers, then will begin the rot and dissolution.

Surely, the inspiration to be derived from the great lessons of the past which are set forth in our rich heritage of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities is of the utmost significance and importance in guiding the present as well as future generations toward similar high standards and worthy attainments.

With this thought in mind, legislation to save this cultural heritage has

been sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WINNALL], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], myself, and no doubt others.

The need for such legislation, Mr. Speaker, was first made evident by the protests of the Federal Commission of Fine Arts, the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Society of Architectural Historians, the National Park Service, the New York Times and many other newspapers, as well as a large number of groups interested in conservation of our resources.

In introducing his companion bill the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] declared that:

Studies by these groups and by others have made it obvious that literally thousands of the most priceless treasures of our national heritage have been plowed under and utterly destroyed by the bulldozers of a ruthless progress during the past few years. The tragedy is that in most such instances, the destruction was wholly unnecessary. The valuable historic objects could have been preserved without retarding progress.

We obviously should not permit this thoughtless and wanton destruction of these last relics of our past, because they provide, in many cases, the only visible links to connect us with periods of our own national history. They remind us of the greatness of our past, of the hardships endured by those who with such painstaking care laid the foundations of our history.

Congress has, in the past, enacted legislation to preserve historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities. I would cite, in this connection, the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906—16 U.S.C., sections 431, 432, 433; the act entitled "An act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities, and for other purposes," approved August 21, 1935—16 U.S.C. 461 and the following; and section 7 of the act of August 27, 1935, as added July 18, 1940—40 U.S.C., section 304a-2.

Certainly, the intent of the Congress is clear enough in this matter. It clearly intended to preserve our heritage, but the present administration has chosen repeatedly to ignore the intent of the Congress.

It recommended to Congress that the historic Civil Service building, in Washington, D.C., designed by Robert Mills, architect of the U.S. Treasury Department building and Washington Monument, be destroyed in order that the site could be used as a parking lot.

It recommended that the historic State, War, Navy building in the Nation's Capital be replaced with what it described as a more efficient modern building.

Morristown, N.J., National Historical Park has been threatened with a federally assisted highway, 90 percent of the cost of which is furnished by the Federal Government.

It proposed to survey some 30 historic buildings across the country preparatory to replacing them with more efficient office space, too. Obviously, these recommendations were part of a plan to reward builders who were faithful to the Republican Party with fat contracts.

But this this not the end of this sorry tale, Mr. Speaker.

A number of historic buildings dating back to the Revolutionary period, including the ancestral homes of the Lee family of Virginia, are right now in danger of being obliterated to make way for the new Chantilly Airport. These homes should be preserved and, if necessary, relocated.

The old San Francisco Mint, one of the few buildings to survive the earthquake and fire of 1906, a classic building of great historic and architectural value, has been declared surplus by the General Services Administration. The site is wanted for a parking lot.

A historic Dutch mansion, built around 1790, was acquired by the Government along with the surrounding land on the Hudson River for a Veterans' Administration hospital. This building certainly could have been preserved on the site as a museum and used as a waiting cottage for visitors. Instead, it was sold to a wrecker for \$32. The wrecker dismantled it, sold the facade for \$3,000 and disposed of the remainder in piecemeal sales.

It is to be hoped that the Committee on Public Works, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will move rapidly to consider the legislation dealing with the preservation of our great heritage which has been referred to them and that they will favorably report this legislation to the Congress early in this session. There is no time to lose, particularly in view of the fact that the administration obviously considers that the legislation previously enacted by the Congress does not apply to it.

I include here two items which gives some idea of the scope of the problem which I have been discussing.

WANTON DISREGARD OF OUR HERITAGE

An architect visiting West Point a few years ago was admiring the superintendent's residence, beautifully situated to command a sweeping view of the West Point plain. The oldest building still being used at the Academy, this one has housed almost every Superintendent, and so has historic as well as architectural value.

"We're tearing it down for more barracks room," an officer told him matter-of-factly. The architect was horrified. Couldn't it possibly be saved? No, the plans were made.

The visitor hastened to Washington and buttonholed Congressmen and Senators, but could interest none. Then he had an inspiration: he called on Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia. "Senator," he said, "did you know that Gen. Robert E. Lee's famous home while he was superintendent of West Point is about to be destroyed?"

The Senator was incredulous. "Get me West Point," he said to his secretary. No one will give a verbatim report of the ensuing conversation, but the destruction plans were canceled and today this architectural landmark still stands, used and admired.

The patriotic architect is but one of many Americans who are alarmed at the wanton razing of places precious to our heritage. All over the country structures that help

recreate our past are being sacrificed to make way for shopping centers, superhighways, skyscrapers and subtopias. Studies indicate that at least 25 percent of the finest historic and architectural monuments that existed in the United States in 1941 have been destroyed.

Much of this destruction is the result of callous disregard of cultural values. Residents of Charleston, S.C., used to point with pride to their Orphan House Chapel, designed in 1802 by Gabriel Manigault, one of the finest of early American architects. Culturally it was of national importance and when a mail-order house acquired it along with other property for a retail store, Charlestonians begged the company to spare the charming chapel. But it was destroyed to enlarge the parking lot.

Boscobel, a classical mansion dating from 1804, was considered one of the most distinguished examples of Hudson River architecture. Located in Westchester County, N.Y., on the grounds of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Veterans Hospital, it was in rapidly deteriorating condition in 1950. Despite local efforts to save it, Government officials declared it surplus property and sold it for \$35 to a wrecker, who tore it down.

Even in ruin it was beautiful. Admirers of the old house raised enough money to purchase the dismantled structure and move it, piece by piece, to a 30-acre park site at Garrison, N.Y. There it lies today, while devoted sponsors go about the heartbreaking job of collecting funds to reconstruct the mansion as a community center and museum of Hudson Valley history and art.

Why save old places? What can they contribute to living in the world today?

A nation with no regard for its past will have little future worth remembering. We need authentic, tangible reminders of our national virtues and heroes to make us feel a part of the best in our heritage. Properly presented, they breathe life into past experience. The most cleverly illustrated children's book cannot compare with the Farmers' Museum at Coopertown, N.Y., for example, as a means of giving boys and girls the feel of rural living before the Civil War. The housewife churning and cooking, weavers fashioning fabric from wool or flax, the brawny blacksmith working red-hot iron, the country storekeeper cutting into a generous head of cheese—all create a vivid picture of the industrious men and women of the time. City youngsters are enchanted by Coopertown's farm animals, the team of sleek brown oxen pulling a cart, the parade of gray geese and goslings. A morning there is not merely a history lesson, but an unforgettable taste of early America.

Historic preservation speaks to the spirit. In 1942 an Army private wrote to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., about his visit to colonial Williamsburg: "Of all the sights I have seen and the books I have read, none ever made me sense the greatness of this country with more force and clarity than when I saw Williamsburg slumbering peacefully on its old foundations."

Williamsburg and Cooperstown are famous. But many a lesser known locality, taking a fresh perspective of its past, is finding an old courthouse or residence, even a covered bridge or a tavern, that is rich in historical associations. How can such sites be preserved?

Deciding just which structure to select, how to raise the money to save it and present it to the public is a baffling job for amateurs. Fortunately they can get advice from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, a private, nonprofit organization supported entirely by patriotic individuals and organizations. Anyone can join. Chartered by act of Congress in 1949, it owns a number of historical properties, but its chief task is encouraging and guiding other groups over the country. Its president, Richard Hubbard

Howland, is an architectural historian, and he and his staff of five experts are continually at work advising townspeople how to make the most of their best. More than 250 preservation organizations are affiliated with the National Trust and support its programs in their own areas. Trust services are rendered by mail or by on-the-spot consultation.

A number of cities have put entire areas under architectural control. Charleston, S.C., started it in 1924 by passing an ordinance creating the Old and Historic Charleston District. Since then, New Orleans has preserved the Vieux Carré, Boston has set aside Beacon Hill, Washington has protected Old Georgetown, and Natchez has made her finest architectural area inviolate. The National Trust has stimulated this activity in dozens of cities by distributing copies of model ordinances, and publishing regular reports of new legislation.

The National Trust helped bring to life the Mississippi River town of Galena, Ill., once a busy lead-mining center. A century ago as many as 18 steamers loaded and unloaded at its levees at one time; Joseph Jefferson performed and Jenny Lind sang there. Galena gave the Union its most distinguished general, Ulysses S. Grant.

But as the years passed, traffic left the river for the highways. The lead mines failed. The town sank into oblivion, and its young people drifted away. Today it has one-third the population it boasted in 1858.

Four years ago, when the National Trust held its annual meeting in Chicago, members were invited to visit Galena. They were enchanted to find an almost untouched antebellum town on steep hills with a wonderful river view. But the General Grant home was shabby and dominated by a souvenir stand peddling tawdry tourist trinkets.

A careful restoration of the home was started; the famous Market House was saved from becoming a parking lot, and Galena's last remaining old firehouse, built in 1836, was restored. By last November 200,000 people had visited the once sleepy town, and Galena had opened a productive mine of tourist gold.

Historic homes can retain their charm and still be put to good everyday use. In Washington, D.C., when three handsome buildings of the Federal style were about to be torn down for a parking lot, a group of neighbors formed Historic Georgetown, Inc., an organization designed to prove that preservation will pay. They sold stock at a dollar a share, bought the buildings and leased them to a restaurateur, a florist, and an interior decorator.

D'Estrehan Plantation House in Louisiana, built in 1787 and remodeled in 1840 in the style of the Greek revival, was one of the finest homes overlooking the Mississippi River. An oil company took it over. But instead of destroying this beautiful reminder of our 18th century agricultural economy, the 20th century technologists restored it. They now use it for administrative offices.

As the experience of Galena and many other towns testifies, preservation can be good business. A recent Government survey shows that an average of only 28 tourists a day visiting a town with historic attractions will bring in as much money during a year as a new business with a \$100,000 annual payroll.

The true preservationist, however, is not motivated by money. His is the spirit of Ann Pamela Cunningham, the South Carolina woman who almost singlehandedly saved the proudest prize of all our past—Mount Vernon. Washington's home was in sad disrepair and in danger of falling into ruin when she formed the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association. In 1858 the association bought the historic place for \$200,000 and restored it as a national shrine.

Now is the time for every town to take stock and determine what is most worth

preserving. As Lewis Mumford has said, "The concrete cloverleaf is becoming our national flower." In the next few years 41,000 miles of new highways will charge through some of our last surviving wilderness areas, through major cities, along historic old roadways. Many communities may not attempt to save their historic places until it is too late.

How can you tell what to save? Here are a few touchstones which the National Trust suggests be applied to any building or site.

1. Is it of substantial historical or cultural importance to your community, State, or Nation? It could be a mansion, a pioneer's squared-log cabin, a sod house or even an Indian mound.

2. Is it suitable, that is, is it accessible to the public and in presentable condition? Generally speaking, say the experts, it is better to preserve than repair, better to repair than restore, better to restore than reconstruct.

3. Can you maintain it, once you've bought it? Few places can sustain themselves from admission fees. If yours cannot, and is not fully endowed or otherwise self-sustaining, perhaps it can be adapted to use by an organization or business firm without losing its significance.

If we can save enough of the homes, churches, courthouses and other places where Americans who went before us lived and worked, we can sense their way of life, their ideals and character. We want our children to sense them, too. Unless we act now, few of these firsthand lessons from the past will remain.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
Washington, D.C., February 1959.

To: Members and friends of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.
From: Richard H. Howland, president.
Subject: United States Mint in San Francisco.

On February 18, at 2 p.m., on the third floor of the Public Health Building, in the Civic Center in San Francisco, a public hearing has been arranged to permit interested organizations and individuals to express their views on the preservation of the old mint. This hearing is of utmost concern, not alone to those who wish to see this nationally significant architectural monument preserved, but to all who realize the threat it poses to the legal basis of preservation as defined in certain Federal laws.

By a wise provision of the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 885), as amended July 18, 1940 (54 Stat. 764); 40 U.S.C., 1952 edition, section 304a-2, the Administrator of General Services is authorized to demolish any building declared surplus to the needs of the Government. Before proceeding with demolition he is to inform the Secretary of the Interior in writing of his intention to demolish it, and shall not proceed to do so until he has received written notice from the Secretary of the Interior that the building is not of national significance.

Between April 23, 1956, and August 23, 1957, eight buildings were referred for opinion to the Secretary of the Interior, and only one, the San Francisco Mint, was given the nationally significant designation, in a report dated December 6, 1956. It was then agreed that the building would be turned over to the National Park Service as a national historic site for their administration. An item in the 1959 budget provides for its renovation as headquarters for the Western Division of the National Park Service, which includes five Western States, Alaska, and Hawaii. The offices now occupy expensive rented space in the city. It would also provide for museum exhibits telling the story of the San Francisco Mint, its importance in the financial history of the country, of the process of coinage, and

of the vigor and courage of the citizens of San Francisco as exemplified by the heroic efforts of those who saved it in 1906.

City officials have asked their Representatives in Congress to disregard the evaluation of the Secretary of the Interior, and the provision of the law for Federal responsibility for preserving its nationally significant structures, and demolish the building (at an estimated cost of at least \$250,000) to return the site to the city for private development as a parking lot or building site.

The American Institute of Architects, the Society of Architectural Historians, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation have also rated the Old Mint as one of the few notable historic buildings and architectural monuments in the city of San Francisco. Its demolition at this time would be a short-sighted waste of our national heritage, and one that the future could only regard with deep regret. Rehabilitated, it could become one of the city's major tourist attractions, and an incentive for redevelopment of the area surrounding it.

In other great cities, Philadelphia, Boston, St. Louis, and Providence, major efforts are being made to preserve many buildings of less distinction. It has been repeatedly demonstrated by careful study that such historic attractions bring to the areas that save them a larger share of the \$20 billion annual tourist business.

Culturally, the old mint built in 1873, is accepted as one of only three or four important buildings in San Francisco to survive the fire and earthquake of 1906, and one of the finest examples of 19th century Federal architecture in the West. It was designed by the great A. B. Mullett, leading architect of Government buildings of the post Civil War era. Writing of its value to the city, State, and Nation, Stephen W. Jacobs, president of the Pacific section of the Society of Architectural Historians stated: "The San Francisco Mint, of Columbia blue stone with a classical portico of Rocklin granite, has retained its characteristic setting with cast iron fence and fountains, and beds of greenery. The integration of the tall chimneys at the rear, which served as flues for the metal retorts, gives the whole complex an unusual and striking character. On the interior, the high ceilings and the vaults of brick on iron beams retain the early type of Federal construction which represented a pioneering attempt at structural engineering and fireproofing. Its massive construction enabled the mint employees to save the building and the \$200 million it contained during the 1906 fire, when a 7-hour battle was fought by mint employees and soldiers with a single, 1-inch fire hose to keep at bay the flames gnawing at its barred and iron-shuttered windows. One of the best surviving examples of Government architecture sponsored by Jefferson and Jackson in the early days of the Republic, the old mint is probably the only building in San Francisco famous throughout the country for its design character."

"San Francisco is unusually fortunate that the Federal Government has retained this building and is willing to restore it and maintain it in an eminently suitable way at no expense to the city." Mr. Jacobs stated in another report, "It seems almost incredible that the city does not realize how lucky it is to have what is perhaps its most important architectural monument maintained at no expense to it. . . . There is every reason why the Old Mint should remain one of our principal monuments and a memorial of San Francisco's unique history."

David E. Finley, chairman of the board of trustees of the National Trust, in a letter to the Administrator of General Services Administration stated the Federal responsibility for observing the spirit as well as the

letter of the law governing demolition of nationally significant structures in January 1957, "The preservation of this building is important not only because of its intrinsic merits but also in order that the Government may set an example for the preservation of important historic monuments."

On January 23, 1959, at a meeting of the full board of trustees of the National Trust held in Washington, a resolution was passed again sustaining the cogent reasons for preservation of the Old Mint, and instructing us to communicate to our concerned members and member organizations an appeal for their support. We are accordingly asking our member organizations to send representatives to the meeting of February 18, and for individuals to attend the hearings if possible, also. May we urge that you write your Congressman sending copies to City Planning Commission, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.

Tribute to Hon. Richard B. Russell, of
Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of remarks on January 30, 1959, by the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress from the 20th District of Pennsylvania, in presenting to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] the annual Minute Man of the Year award of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, JANUARY 30, 1959, IN PRESENTING U.S. SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA, THE ANNUAL CITATION BY THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION AS MAN OF THE YEAR FOR 1959

It is a signal honor to have been selected to present the Reserve Officers' Association annual citation to the citizen who has contributed most to national security in these times.

The recipient of this year's award is a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate, and since it is the habit in Congress to rely upon the Congressional Directory for background information, it is interesting to observe that the recipient of the award is recorded in the pages of the directory listing Senators as follows:

"RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Winder, Ga."

This is the sole reference from a biographical standpoint to one of the most able and popular Members of the U.S. Senate.

Even though his biographical sketch is the personification of brevity, Senator RUSSELL's official activities embrace chairman of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, and membership on the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations.

He is also a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and, in addition, is serving as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy, the Board of Visitors to the Naval

Academy, and the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The resolution selecting Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL for this annual citation describes him in a manner in keeping with his worthwhile contributions to our national defense.

The resolution that accompanies the citation reads as follows:

"Reserve Officers Association of the United States annual citation to the citizen who has contributed most to national security in these times: 1959, RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL.

"An association resolution: To the Honorable RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, because throughout your career you have been—

"(a) Profoundly aware of the obligation of every citizen to service to his nation, and by continuing precept and example aided in keeping alive this vital tradition;

"(b) Broadly knowledgeable in history and motivations of peoples and nations of the world, you have exercised a genius for leadership critically contributing to this Nation's victories in wars;

"(c) Nobly motivated in your public service, you have shunned narrow considerations, including partisanship, but rather have fixed your course and your influence toward highest standards of national interest;

"(d) Deeply dedicated to honor and duty, you have given of your strength and genius far beyond and above the call of both honor and duty.

"In the name of this Nation's first Minutemen, who gave our forefathers the inspiration and instinct to contest to the death for their liberty, this association proudly recognizes your service as a patriot, and its meaningful contribution to the national security shared by every citizen of the United States in these times.

"For the association—by the National Executive Committee, Washington, D.C., January 30, 1959.

"(Signed) Rear Adm. Leon J. Jacobi, USNR, national president, Detroit; and Col. John T. Carlton, USAR, executive director, Washington."

Senator RUSSELL—or DICK as you are known to your thousands of friends—it gives me great pleasure to present you with the Reserve Officers Association award of Man of the Year for 1959, and with it I extend my sincere congratulations.

The Business Users of the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it has been my privilege to preside over committee hearings when business users of the postal service have testified. These sessions have emphasized just how important our Postal Establishment is to a healthy American economy. Too often we forget the role which the post office plays in helping to keep the machinery of business going. Countless thousands of businessmen use the facilities of the post office to advertise and sell their products.

The present administration has been too prone to attack business users of the mail, charging them with causing all the ills of the postal service. In the balance sheets which executive depart-

ments transmit to the Hill, no notice is ever taken of the wealth created, the employment opportunities afforded, the taxes paid by customers of the Postal Establishment.

It was encouraging, therefore, to observe in an article published in the New York Times of January 28, 1959, some kind words regarding the Nation's businessmen who depend on the post office to transmit their sales messages to the American people.

I know that the ranking Republican on the committee, the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], feels as I do about postal patrons and will recommend the Times article to the attention of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPICS

RESULT OF THE BLACKOUT

An interesting result of the recent newspaper blackout, when any bit of informative reading matter took on the aspect of a brandy-laden St. Bernard to a lost mountain climber, was the care with which all members of the family read the morning mail. Bills weren't let go until each item was scrutinized. Small print was read with as much solicitude as the large print. And business mail, of the kind that often winds up, unread, in the waste basket, enjoyed far more attention than ever before was lavished on it. Many of us joined—perhaps to remain as members even after the newspaper returned—the army of adventurers whose mailboxes are an ever-changing vehicle for all kinds of wonderful flights of imagination. Helping us on these flights, of course, are business concerns that realize that the postal system represents a direct link to prospects for their products and services. The post office is delighted; last year it received \$272 million of welcome revenue from business mail. And the postmen are at their happiest when the mail flow is at its heaviest for, in the words of Gilbert and Sullivan, they are then employed at their employment.

THE FULL MAILBOX

Who doesn't remember the days when, as children, we would clip every coupon in the back of the magazines, fill them all out, and mail them in? And for no other purpose than to receive mail specifically addressed to us, a definite sign of growing up. Nor has the excitement really diminished. A full mailbox can be as good for the morale as a full stomach. Content often has little to do with it. While there is little so heart-warming as a letter from a friend, written in familiar hand, an interesting piece of business mail often is quite attractive, too. The fact that it is printed rather than written in hand does not remove completely the personal touch. It means that we are on various lists, as persons interested in specific things, specific ideas, specific publications. Not everybody in the world is on the same lists, because, with the wisdom peculiar to this trade, it is realized that not everybody in the world shares the same interests.

A UNIQUE INDUSTRY

Behind the business mail borne daily to mailboxes near and far is a unique industry. According to the Business Mail Foundation, more than a billion and a half dollars are invested each year to bring things to our attention by way of the mailbox. Many organizations deal with the public only by mail, while others use the mail to supplement efforts in other channels. Business mail is

also a favorite technique of that American hero, the small businessman. Many a company, long in business and respected for integrity, consists solely of an individual, a product or a service, and a happy union with the post office. As a result of this combined effort, 16 billion pieces of printed matter find their way each year into our mailboxes, with commercial mail resulting each year in sales of merchandise worth more than \$20 billion.

SELLING BY MAIL

The use of the public mails for other than personal messages and business-to-business communication is by no means new. It was, in fact, a tool in the forging of our country. Stoking the fires of liberty before the American Revolution was the Committee of Correspondence, through which such patriots as John Hancock and Samuel Adams dispersed, as they were throughout colonial America, kept one another informed. The method was not unlike methods used today. A circular letter was printed and mailed to members of the committee in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and wherever else patriotic groups existed. Since that time entire cultures in America have been built around the catalog from the mail-order house. Many a shopping problem has been solved in the comfort and quiet of the living room. Of all the forms of selling that American ingenuity has devised, none is closer to us than business mail—as close as our mailbox.

Institute of International Education Award to Leonard Bernstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last Friday evening, January 30, at a dinner in Washington, D.C., the Institute of International Education marked its 40th anniversary. This commemoration was a part of the Third National Conference on Exchange of Persons which the institute sponsored in cooperation with some 139 national private and public agencies interested in exchange programs. As a feature of the anniversary celebration, awards were tendered to organizations, institutions and individuals who have made unusual contributions to the improvement of understanding among nations. Among the five awards presented was one to the American born and educated composer and musician, Leonard Bernstein. It is my pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation of Mr. Bernstein by the institute for his outstanding contributions in behalf of his native land as a cultural ambassador in what has been termed the international language, music.

We are very proud of Leonard Bernstein, and I am delighted to see him so honored.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR AN INDIVIDUAL

To Leonard Bernstein, American-born and American-educated conductor, composer, and cultural ambassador of the United

States, the Institute of International Education presents its award for distinguished service.

All great art, and music in particular, transcends the barriers of language. Music is itself a universal language. Mr. Bernstein speaks it fluently.

Performances by Leonard Bernstein and other American artists have demolished the cliché that the people of the United States are completely materialistic and concerned only with technical gadgets.

The Cultural Presentations Program of the Department of State, ably administered by the American National Theatre and Academy, has given the world a chance to see and hear the best of our performing artists. In the first 6 months of 1958, American symphony orchestras, ballet companies, drama groups and individual artists performed in more than 500 cities in 94 countries. The jazz of Dave Brubeck, the spirituals of Marian Anderson, the modern dance of Martha Graham, have been offered to audiences who had never before seen or heard an American artist.

The impact of cultural diplomacy is clear. Mr. Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic, in their recent tour of Latin America, were acclaimed everywhere.

For example, the Caracas Daily Journal said, "The visit here of the New York Philharmonic under the baton of the great conductor, Leonard Bernstein, enables the United States of America to speak to Venezuela in a field where the bonds between people are strongest." *Le Prensa* in Lima said, "Critics have classified unanimously the presentations of the Philharmonic as an event without precedent in the musical history of Peru." *El Mundo* Argentina in Buenos Aires said, "Without any doubt, the New York Philharmonic is one of the most perfect orchestras which it is possible for the human ear to hear." Even *El Siglo*, the Communist daily of Santiago, said, "The men who make up the orchestra are very great artists and they carry the message of beauty and emotion in a language which crosses frontiers and is common to all human beings, and can for a moment calm the passions and hatreds which daily life awaken in man. The performance of the New York Philharmonic was magnificent."

In 1949 Leonard Bernstein composed his second symphony, "The Age of Anxiety." A decade later, we still live in anxious times—but so did Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms, whose affirmation of the triumph of good over evil is so superbly interpreted by Mr. Bernstein.

In recognition of the significant role which the American artist plays today in cultural exchange, the Institute of International Education bestows its distinguished service award upon Leonard Bernstein, whose music unites us in the belief that harmony will one day prevail among all men.

precipitate its true significance. These uninformed critics might well reflect carefully upon a recent definition of seapower made by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SEAPOWERS IS NOT JUST MEN-OF-WAR

(By Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, USN, Chief of Naval Operations)

Seapower is not just men-of-war. It includes freighters, tramp steamers, passenger liners, tankers, and the many other ships which make up the merchant marine.

But seapower is even more than this. It is the sum total of weapons, ships, shipbuilding capacity, and geography which enable a nation to use the sea advantageously during peace and war.

These are the physical things, the tools of seapower. They can be made effective only by a nation whose people are aware of the advantages offered by the sea, and whose government understands the employment of its maritime assets.

With the great progress the world has made in communications and transport between land masses, seapower has become progressively more important as free nations have become more interdependent economically and militarily.

As populations have grown, as world resources have developed, maritime commerce has also increased. In the past 10 years world commerce has increased 50 percent.

Ten years ago United States water-borne foreign commerce was 183 million short tons. By 1956 this had risen to 327 million short tons—and it is still going up.

This indicates not only a continuing, but an increasing need for shipping.

Yet while our water-borne foreign commerce has nearly doubled in 10 years, the percentage of this traffic in ships flying the American flag has gone down rapidly.

In 1947 American-flag ships carried 54 percent of our foreign ocean-going commerce. This percentage has been decreasing steadily since then until it is now just 20 percent.

The implications of this trend are too serious to be ignored. The United States is the greatest trading nation in the world today. We exported last year one-fifth of the world's total export trade of \$100 billion.

We are heavily dependent upon the sea, and this demands not only that we control the sea but also that we have the means to use the sea. This means ships under effective American control.

Both in peace and in war, a strong American merchant marine is essential to the strength and well-being of our country.

mending the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY PRESTON J. MOORE, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION

At its 40th national convention in Chicago last September, the American Legion went on record commending both the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, for their vigilance and effectiveness in protecting our Nation and its people from Communist subversion, while at the same time, respecting the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

Since that time I have been asked on many occasions, "Why was it necessary to reiterate a confidence in the FBI and Mr. Hoover shared by every loyal American?"

The answer is that there are some individuals in this country and certain publications determined to discredit the FBI and its Director. It is difficult to attribute any purpose to these attacks other than a desire to destroy this Federal law enforcement agency and its leader as an effective deterrent to undetected, unopposed Communist subversion in this country.

That a deliberate smear Hoover and the FBI campaign, similar to the Communist Party's unsuccessful efforts of 1940, has been launched is no mere supposition.

The entire October issue of *Rights* magazine, the official publication of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, branded by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee as a Communist front organization, is devoted to an article, "The FBI and Your Freedoms." It is, of course, a biased, one-sided attack on the FBI, distinguished only by its omission of any reference to communism's denial of human dignity or humanitarianism.

Coincidentally, or so the timing suggests, a recent issue of *The Nation* magazine featured an article by Fred J. Cook, attempting to discredit the FBI. Some reviewers have evaluated this piece as 60 pages of distortion, half-truths and innuendoes.

Finally, and most significantly, former FBI agents have been approached recently by reporters of the *New York Post* seeking derogatory material on J. Edgar Hoover. These reporters have extended their beat to Paris, France, in what is obviously a far-flung and must be a discouraging attempt to do a character-assassination job on Mr. Hoover.

Evidently the initial failure of this mission resulted in the *New York Post* stepping up its major effort in Operation Gumshoe back in the States. Apparently forgetting, at least momentarily, that they were supposed to obtain information, not reveal it, reporters for the paper disclosed to unquestionably reliable *New York* sources that the Post plans to assign reporters to Washington, D.C., and other cities to skulk around restaurants and other public places in the hope of digging up information that could be used against Hoover and the FBI.

The American Legion believes that the American people will not permit their justified confidence in Mr. Hoover and the FBI to be compromised by scurrilous distortions and half-truths. Nor will they allow irresponsible journalism to blind them to the need for continued FBI investigation of the dangerous Communist conspiracy in this country.

Mr. Hoover and the FBI have earned the gratitude and trust of every American. They ask only that they be permitted to continue their essential and effective efforts to protect our country and all of our people from Communist subversion.

Seapower Is Not Just Men-of-War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, at this late date, after the experiences of two World Wars and the Korean conflict, no justification of the American merchant marine should be needed. Yet, year after year, our merchant navy is a target for elimination by those who fail to ap-

Commendation of Federal Bureau of Investigation by National Commander of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement by Hon. Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion, com-

The American Legion believes they should be given this right. We believe that our people should reaffirm their faith in Hoover and the FBI by insisting that they push more vigorously than ever their investigation and exposure of the Communist traitors in our midst. We hope that the American press which, with a few tragic exceptions, is commendably patriotic, will continue to give J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI their necessary and persuasive editorial vote of confidence.

Labor Reform and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent editorial published on January 29, 1959, in the *Chattanooga Times*. This thoughtful editorial makes a convincing demonstration of the need for action on the Kennedy-Ervin bill and the desirability of separating labor reform and labor relations legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LABOR REFORM AND POLITICS

The differences between the labor reform bill introduced last week by Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and the measure called for in President Eisenhower's special message yesterday are more a matter of extent than intent. This is of significance, lest the needed changes advocated by both be obscured, then lost in a welter of political charges and countercharges.

Senator KENNEDY was explicit in his purpose. "This is primarily a labor-management reform bill," he said, "dealing with the problems of dishonest racketeering; it is not a bill on industrial relations, dealing with the problems of collective bargaining and economic power. The two areas of legislation should not be confused or combined."

With that in mind, Senator KENNEDY did not include proposals to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, which is the basic law in the area of labor-management relations. Instead, he said, he would seek the advice of a panel of experts in the field and introduce needed amendments to Taft-Hartley later to be considered on their merits.

Several of the Kennedy and Eisenhower proposals are parallel in purpose, including provisions to insure fair elections of union officials, regular inspection of financial records with penalties for misuse of union funds or destruction of certain records and closer supervision of union affairs by the Secretary of Labor with additional authority to move decisively to eliminate corruption in union ranks.

If anything the Kennedy bill goes further by specifically prohibiting persons convicted of serious crimes from serving as union officers and spelling out additional safeguards against improper management of local unions by the parent organizations through so-called trusteeships.

Mr. Eisenhower went on to call for changes in the Taft-Hartley Act clauses covering certain types of picketing and secondary boycotts, among other things. It was precisely this field that Senator KENNEDY said should be covered separately in order that the anti-

racketeering measure not become bogged down in consideration of the broader aspects of labor-management relations.

In this respect then, Mr. Eisenhower's characterization of the Kennedy bill as a halfway measure seems unfair and may be a political maneuver designed to offset the Senator's advantage in having introduced the first bill.

There is need for sensible revision of labor-relations laws, based on experience as well as revelation of union corruption, and there is room for recommendations from both sides of the aisle. But, as exhibited last year, the need cannot survive the play of pure politics.

The Case of Povl Bang-Jensen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a column, *These Days*, by George E. Sokolsky, which was published in the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald*, Wednesday, February 4, 1959.

In his penetrating analysis entitled, "Bang-Jensen and the U.N.," Mr. Sokolsky reveals many important facts about the particular case of Povl Bang-Jensen. I place such importance on the information contained in this column that I am inserting in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* as a further means of alerting the American people to this situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THESE DAYS—BANG-JENSEN AND THE U.N.
(By George E. Sokolsky)

What does membership in the United Nations mean? Is this a body in which a member state, particularly one that pays a large part of the expenses of running the institution, has nothing to say?

An American citizen addressed a letter to the American Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, concerning the dismissal of Povl Bang-Jensen, a United Nations official, a citizen of Denmark, who was entrusted with taking testimony from Hungarian refugees. Bang-Jensen was authorized to guarantee the witnesses that their names would be disclosed to no one and he gave the guarantee. Ultimately, he was dismissed from the United Nations for refusing to give up the names of these witnesses whose relatives would have been murdered, to say the least.

A reply was sent to my correspondent by Stephen Lancaster, who signs himself Public Affairs Officer:

"The status of Mr. Bang-Jensen in relation to the United Nations is strictly a matter between the Secretary General of the United Nations and Mr. Bang-Jensen, who is a citizen of a foreign country, Denmark. It does not call for any comment by the United States representative to the United Nations. In fact, it would be improper for him to appear to trespass on a matter involving Denmark. Similarly it would be regarded as unwelcome interference if a foreign power took an active interest in a case involving a U.S. employee of the United Nations. You may recall Mr. Lodge's effort to eliminate dis-

loyal Americans from employment by the United Nations in 1953. This was regarded as a matter between the United States and the Secretary General, one in which intercession by a foreign government would have been improper."

This is a case which does not particularly involve Denmark, and the fact that Bang-Jensen is a Danish citizen is incidental. The case involves the dignity and honor of the United Nations and all the members thereof. The United States as a member and the largest dues payer to the United Nations cannot avoid responsibility for the administrative conduct of that body. If Bang-Jensen were a citizen of Patagonia or Ghana or any place, the principles at issue would be the same; namely, that when an official of the United Nations takes testimony from individuals on the guarantee that the names of the witnesses would be kept from the persecutor of his country, that promise must be inviolate. Bang-Jensen was not acting in this capacity as a Dane; he acted as an official of the United Nations.

What is the role of the Secretary General of the United Nations? He represents no country. He is a hired administrative official who is assigned to the housekeeping functions of a growing organization which can only exist as long as there is no war. The first Secretary General was Trygve Lie, a Norwegian, who tried to establish the position of Secretary General as a kind of head of the universe. He was tactful and avoided projecting himself beyond the terms of the Charter.

The second Secretary General is Dag Hammarskjöld, a Swede, who seeks to build his position into something more than mere administration. He has in some measure succeeded because the exigencies of the times, the cold war, require a neutral to perform tasks, regarding which there can be considerable distrust. Many do not regard Hammarskjöld as a neutral, but rather as one who would pay any price to keep the United Nations afloat. And of course, the biggest price that must be paid, if Russia is to remain in that body, is to favor Russia over the United States.

Bang-Jensen is a victim of that attitude. The Russians demanded his scalp because he would not disclose the names of his witnesses. The whole matter became administratively difficult. To give the list of Hungarians even to Dag Hammarskjöld would mean that it would become available to all Iron Curtain personnel on the administrative staff of the United Nations; to refuse to obey Hammarskjöld is insubordination. Therefore Bang-Jensen was fired.

Lancaster's explanation, which is probably a form letter, does not hold water. It is an alibi and therefore meaningless. An honest answer would have been: "The Russians have our hands tied. We don't want to start anything."

The Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, an editorial entitled "Sane Program in Store?" from the January 30, 1959, issue of the *Atlanta (Ga.) Journal*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANE PROGRAM IN STORE?

The administration's limp proposals for farm aid legislation make the bill offered by Senator HERMAN TALMADGE look all the better.

President Eisenhower Thursday sent to Congress a message calling for some changes in existing programs but offering nothing really new or far reaching.

The President's message had about it the same tired look that has adorned other administration congressional efforts this season.

Senator TALMADGE has introduced a measure which would provide for a major overhaul of present farm policies. His proposal would put free enterprise back down on the farm and yet give the farmer reasonable governmental assistance.

The dynamic nature of the Talmadge bill already has gained it the approval and support of major Democratic powers. The peaked nature of the Eisenhower proposals undoubtedly will deliver up even more support for the Senator's program.

It's too early to predict anything but prospects appear to be growing bright for sane farm legislation at last.

Legality of Adoption of 14th Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on February 3, there appeared in the Washington Evening Star an illuminating article by the able and widely read columnist, David Lawrence, on the subject of the legality of the adoption of the 14th amendment and other related questions. This article carries a serious challenge that should be met with forthrightness. It should have wide circulation, and I therefore ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATION AND THE CONSTITUTION—LEGALITY OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT AS BASIS OF DESEGREGATION QUESTIONED

(By David Lawrence)

The people of Virginia are not happy over the enforced integration of their public schools. They feel they are being coerced into doing something against their will. They have been told the Constitution is "what the people of the United States say it is." But is it always? In no State of the Union have the people ever voted to approve any change in the Constitution that requires integration or desegregation in the public schools.

Nine men sitting in the Supreme Court of the United States have, however, said they interpret the 14th amendment to require desegregation in the public schools.

But did the people ever ratify the 14th amendment by the method prescribed by the Constitution—namely, by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the States, either through their legislatures or constitutional conventions?

The historians tell us this wasn't done. The Secretary of State who proclaimed the 14th amendment in 1868 frankly expressed

his doubts as to whether it had been legally ratified.

Upon what were these doubts based? Abraham Lincoln had said the Union was indissoluble and that no State could secede. When the War Between the States was over, President Johnson, in May 1865, formally proclaimed amnesty to former rebels and established provisional governments in the Southern States. During that summer, new State legislatures and Members of Congress were elected. All these governments in the South—except one—ratified the 13th amendment, abolishing slavery. Their ratification was accepted as legal. So they were unquestionably in the Union.

When, however, Congress met in December 1865, all the Senators and Representatives from the Southern States, except Tennessee, were excluded from both Houses of Congress. Nevertheless, the 14th amendment was voted on by Congress and was formally submitted to the States in June 1866. Ten Southern States rejected it.

Congress thereupon passed a law putting the South under military rule and specifically ordering the States to ratify the amendment or remain excluded from the Union. The President vetoed the bill and called it plainly unconstitutional, but it was passed over his veto. Federal troops took command of the State legislatures in the South.

Under military rule, the Southern States—with their legislatures composed largely of Negroes, because most of the white voters had been disenfranchised—ratified the 14th amendment. W. E. Woodward in his "American History," one of the best known of the standard school textbooks—published in 1936, long before the present acute controversy arose—says the "ratifications were obtained at the point of the bayonet." Historians are unanimous about the facts.

Up to 1896 not a single court of importance held that the separate but equal idea for public schools was a violation of the Federal Constitution. In fact, the highest courts of several States, including Massachusetts, Ohio, and New York, repeatedly upheld the "separate but equal" doctrine as conforming to the Federal Constitution. Even the same Congress which had ordered the 14th amendment ratified by the South under military coercion passed a law providing for segregated public schools in the District of Columbia. Yet the present Supreme Court of the United States, before its 1954 decision, asked for testimony on the intent of the framers of the 14th amendment, and then called the facts as submitted "inconclusive."

The truth is the present Court followed precedent in declining to examine the legality of the process by which the 14th amendment was allegedly ratified. Every time anyone has tried to get the previous Justices to examine the issue—and this has happened several times—the matter has been turned aside as political. No decision has ever been rendered by the Supreme Court on the merits of the case. This was doubtless due to the feeling that, if ever passed upon, the amendment would have to be declared illegal.

But why turn the clock back to 1868? This question is often asked, and it is answered by asking another question: Why in 1954 turn the clock back to 1896 to invalidate the doctrine of separate but equal which was for 58 years the law of the land?

This correspondent attended an integrated public school, both in the elementary grades and in high school, and would gladly attend one again if he were a student. If a constitutional amendment were proposed that would permit the States to deal with this subject, this writer would vote for such an amendment. If the 14th amendment were adopted today by the States, and it specifically forbade segrega-

tion, this writer would welcome it as an expression of the free will of the people uncoerced by bayonets and representing the desires of the American electorate.

In the absence of any Supreme Court decision to the contrary, the 14th amendment is assumed to be valid. This means Federal court orders based on its provisions must be obeyed. But no State is denied the right to try by legal means any form of circumvention to achieve its objectives. This is lawful until the court in each case specifically rules otherwise.

Meanwhile, can America afford to let the record of fraud and coercion stand as it is before the world—or will a troubled conscience some day make the people of the United States square that record by a lawfully adopted amendment to the Constitution?

Antarctica's Value to Nation Increasing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the old saying "It's a small world" is being graphically proved now in Antarctica. Mention of this frozen land still conjures pictures of snowy wastes inhabited only by penguins and a few hardy explorers.

From 1954 to now, approximately 10,000 Americans have been in the Antarctic, thanks to Operation Deep Freeze and other activities. And we are there to stay; not as mere visitors, but as keeping permanent bases there. The value of this region for scientific, business, and defensive purposes is becoming more and more recognized throughout the world. The Russians also have bases in Antarctica.

In recognition of the importance of this vital region, I have cosponsored a bill to create the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission.

Due to atmospheric conditions, scientists say the Antarctic is the best place in the world from which to launch devices bound for outer space. In addition, the area is of supreme significance in assuring our national security, particularly when we are under threat of guided missile attack. And thirdly, uranium and copper have been found and there is a great deal of marine life in the water surrounding the Antarctic Continent. I am confident further exploration will uncover other facets of economic value. There may be other scientific advantages locked in this 5½ million square mile area.

I feel our Nation should take immediate action to capitalize on the considerable investments we have made and will continue to make in Antarctica. It would be a practical move from the scientific, economic, and defensive standpoints.

Mr. President, in support of this, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jim G. Lucas which was published in the Washington Daily News for Tuesday, January 20, 1959, under

the heading: "Eight Nations To Stay in Antarctica."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**EIGHT NATIONS TO STAY IN ANTARCTICA—
TYREE WILL COMMAND U.S. FORCE**

(By Jim G. Lucas)

At least 8 of the 12 nations which established Antarctic bases during the International Geophysical Year—including the United States and Russia—intend to remain there indefinitely, Rear Adm. David Tyree said today.

Admiral Tyree will take over as commander of Operation Deep Freeze, the American Antarctic force, in April. He will succeed Rear Adm. George Dufek, who is retiring.

The permanent Antarctic community will include parties from the United States, Russia, New Zealand, Australia, Argentina, Great Britain, France, and Sweden.

ENIWETOK

Admiral Tyree until recently was deputy of U.S. forces at the Eniwetok nuclear testing grounds and commander of Joint Task Force Seven, the naval supply force in those tropical waters. He flew to Washington last weekend after his first visit to the Antarctic.

Admiral Dufek will remain in command until the last ships are out of the ice, probably in March. After the changeover, Tyree will remain here working on future programs. He plans to fly to the Antarctic in August or September.

Admiral Tyree said we will leave approximately 150 scientists and military personnel in the Antarctic to winter in at four stations. These are at the South Pole, McMurdo Sound, Byrd, and Hallet. The United States is turning its base at Ellsworth over to Argentina and its Wilkes base to Australia.

REDS EXPANDING

The Russians will maintain four, perhaps five, bases. Admiral Tyree said the Russians not only intend to stay, but are expanding the operation. But he said our force of 150 men will be, by far, the largest in the Antarctic this winter.

The 18-month International Geophysical Year ended December 31 and its scientific functions temporarily have been transferred to the National Science Foundation. Admiral Tyree said there is some thought of setting up a permanent American Antarctic Foundation.

He said our interest in the frozen continent is primarily scientific. Studies will be made this winter into meteorology, minerals, glaciology, the ionosphere, and cosmic rays.

To date, he said, approximately 10,000 Americans have been in the Antarctic, beginning with the first trip of the icebreaker *Atka* in 1954. Deep Freeze has cost between \$75 million and \$85 million.

The Navy is making surveys looking to the construction of a permanent airfield near McMurdo Sound, and some estimates of its cost run as high as \$300 million.

**Address by Hon. Herman E. Talmadge,
of Georgia, Before the American Coalition
of Patriotic Societies**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered on Tuesday, February 3, 1959, at the 29th annual convention luncheon of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, held at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**THE CONSTITUTION AND RESPONSIBLE
GOVERNMENT**

(Text of remarks of Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia, in addressing the 29th annual convention luncheon of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies held in Washington, D.C.)

President Lory, distinguished guests and members of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, to have the privilege of sharing this significant occasion with you is a twofold pleasure for me.

Not only is it a great honor for which I am deeply and humbly grateful but, even more important, it affords me the desired opportunity to express to you and the societies you represent my profound gratitude for the assistance and support which you gave me, as a freshman Senator, in obtaining an unmistakable expression of public sentiment on the question of freedom of debate in the Senate.

The 364-page printed transcript of testimony, statements, and letters compiled by the special subcommittee of which I was chairman during the 85th Congress was the most comprehensive presentation of public sentiment on limitation of debate ever assembled. It was an impressive and convincing document which confirmed my long-held belief that the rank and file of the American public consider free debate in the Senate a vital safeguard of individual liberty in this country.

While I personally was opposed to any change in the Senate's rule governing cloture, I am pleased to report to you that the revisions made will not affect materially the right of any Senator to speak out in defense of the viewpoint of his State and people. Furthermore, I am convinced that the addition of a new provision recognizing for the first time in the rules of the Senate the body's constitutional continuity more than offsets the changes which were made.

Considered in balance, I believe those of us who adhere to the concept that the Senate is a continuing repository of State sovereignty on the national level won an impressive victory for constitutional government—a victory in which you of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies can take particular pride for the invaluable role which you played in making it possible.

I want to thank each of you here today as representatives of your individual organizations for the magnificent way in which you acted to bolster our defense of constitutional fundamentals. And I especially want to express my gratitude to your alert and able executive secretary, Mrs. Leetch, for her indefatigable efforts in seeing that you and, through you, your organizations and citizens at the grassroots level throughout the Nation were fully informed about the ramifications of the issue. She is doing an outstanding job for you and the Nation.

It is most gratifying and encouraging to those of us in Congress who subscribe to the philosophy that responsible government is the product of strict adherence to the Constitution of the United States word for word as it is written to know that we are backed in our position by dedicated organizations with truly national memberships like the American Coalition. I wish this country had 100 more groups like yours to espouse the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and I am confident that if we had them the affairs of

our Nation, both foreign and domestic, would not be in their present sad state.

The Declaration of Independence was written to give expression to the principles which our forefathers learned from bitter experience were essential to the maintenance of liberty and the Constitution was drafted and ratified to perpetuate those principles for posterity.

Under them the United States was founded as a nation in which government at all levels would be the least government necessary to do for the people what the people could not do for themselves.

Under them the United States was founded as a nation which respected the rights and integrity of other nations and demanded that it be accorded the same respect.

Under them the United States was founded as a nation dedicated to faith in God and the right of the individual to achieve his highest destiny under God consistent with the right of every other individual to do the same.

So long as the United States adhered to those founding principles, it grew, prospered, and was respected throughout the world.

But in recent years the United States has departed from those founding principles and, as a result, its economy is deteriorating, the rights of its people are being circumscribed and it is losing the respect of the other nations of the world.

In foreign affairs we have taken the position that we are always right and everyone else is always wrong. We have undertaken to try to make the world over in our own image and in so doing have sought to substitute words for wisdom, dollars for deeds, and bluster for good faith.

In domestic affairs we have countenanced the development of the philosophy that an all-powerful Central Government is better qualified to manage the affairs of the people than are the people themselves. In so doing we have sanctioned an ever-encroaching Federal bureaucracy which is steering the Nation on the road to bankruptcy and totalitarianism.

In personal affairs we have built unto ourselves false gods of creature comforts and have become so preoccupied with an all-consuming quest for security that we have forgotten the words of the Psalmist that "blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

Is it any wonder then that our enemies depict us throughout the world as a nation of neurotic, meddling busybodies who attempt to buy what we are unable to earn and to preach what we ourselves are unwilling to practice?

Is it any wonder then that we are burdened with a taxload which borders on confiscation and a national debt which has mortgaged future generations and that government by laws enacted by the elected representatives of the people has given way to government by executive decree, judicial edict, and Federal bayonet?

Is it any wonder then that we have become a Nation plagued by stomach ulcers and heart attacks in which personal debt and national crime have reached all-time records and the Golden Rule is something which is used only to print on advertising rulers?

The sum total of the experience of mankind is that the inevitable result of the failure to profit by the mistakes of the past is to repeat them in the future.

Distressing as it is to admit, we in the United States seem bent upon proving that we have learned nothing from the past of either our own or any other nation.

What other conclusion can be drawn from the plain facts that the policies which we are following at home and abroad are diametrically opposed to the principles upon which our country was founded and are parallel to the courses which have brought

about the downfall of every other major world power in history?

The apologists for our present course of personal and political expediency seek to promote their ends through the coercion of conformity and the intimidation of labels. Their reply to criticism is to call the critic a reactionary or worse and to plead in the name of their brand of pseudo-progress that changing times and changing conditions have made our founding fundamentals obsolete.

They would have the American people believe that the Constitution of the United States is an accordion which can be contracted or expanded to play any tune which might be popular at any time rather than the music by which the instrument is supposed to be played.

The lessons of the past give the lie to those constitutional improvisers.

They choose either to forget or deliberately to ignore that the collapse of Roman law under the weight of a decadent bureaucracy heralded the conquest of Rome by the barbarians.

They choose either to forget or deliberately to ignore that the attempt of the British Empire to extend its control over the world reduced Britain to national bankruptcy, state socialism, and military impotence.

They choose either to forget or deliberately to ignore that every nation in the history of the world which has sought to control the destiny of the world at the expense of its own citizens has fallen from within or without.

It could happen to the United States unless we change our course.

It will happen to Soviet Russia unless that country changes its course.

The advocates of our present course maintain there is no alternative.

I emphatically reject that philosophy of fatalism.

There is an alternative to a foreign policy based upon the inevitability of world conflict.

There is an alternative to a domestic policy based upon the regimentation of people and resources.

There is an alternative to a personal philosophy based upon physical existence as an end unto itself.

That alternative is simply expressed in the development of an America so strong militarily, economically, and spiritually that any nation choosing to attack us invites not retaliation but annihilation.

And it is an alternative which can be realized only in a return to the principles of individual freedom, free-enterprise economy, and government on all levels which is the servant, not the master, of the people.

The cause of our present national dilemma is what Thomas Jefferson characterized as "more machinery of government than is necessary."

With the exception of the external menace of communism, all of the ills and problems of the United States can be summarized in the one phrase—too much government.

The American economy is suffering from too much government.

We have 48-cent dollars and face the prospect of 10-cent dollars as the result of ever-broadening governmental policies and programs which are bankrupting our Nation and mortgaging our future.

American prestige abroad is suffering from too much government.

We find ourselves despised and distrusted throughout most of the world as the result of our continued interference in the affairs of other nations through our various bureaucratic and paternalistic programs of spending and instruction.

The American people themselves are suffering from too much government.

The mushrooming Federal establishment, like quicksand claiming its victim, is steadily embracing more and more affairs traditionally and constitutionally regarded as local matters and as a result the individual citi-

zen finds himself with less and less voice in the conduct of his local government and its institutions.

I cannot bring myself to believe that the majority of American people approve of the current philosophy that central governments must be all things to all men and do all things for all men.

To the contrary, the mail which I receive from all sections of the Nation indicates to me that the average citizen is gravely concerned about the present course of our Nation and the consequences of pursuing it to its ultimate conclusion.

It is my belief that the American people want to see the Federal budget balanced and the Nation's economy stabilized.

It is my belief that the American people want the United States to cease doing for people in other countries what it either is unable or unwilling to do for our own citizens here at home.

It is my belief that the American people want the Federal Government to confine its activities to those areas reserved to it by the Constitution and leave the management of all other affairs to local people on the local level.

It is my belief that the American people want above all else for the United States to be made militarily and economically secure and for themselves to be left alone to run their own affairs and enjoy the fruits of their own labors.

Our present course offers only one of three ultimate conclusions: conquest from without, collapse from within or development here in the United States of a totalitarian government as reprehensible as that which exists in the Soviet Union.

It is incomprehensible to me that free men and women living in a free society will choose to wait supinely for either of the first two consequences or to countenance passively the implementation of the latter.

I choose rather to believe with Thomas Jefferson that:

"The people may be misled or deceived for a time, but where the avenues of truth are open there men will learn to reject what is false and harmful. Where the people are well informed, they can be trusted with their own government; whenever things get so far wrong as to attract public notice they may be relied upon to set them to rights."

Throughout the Nation there is a growing awakening to the dangers inherent in our country's present policies and a swelling voice for a recognition of the lessons of the past through a return to the fundamentals of constitutional, republican government.

I feel with all my being that the American people already would have expressed themselves in favor of such a return to fundamentals had they had a clear-cut choice at the polls.

They certainly did not have it last November and frankness compels the observation that the overwhelming sweep of the Democratic Party was less an endorsement of its program than it was a repudiation of the Republican Party for its failure to act decisively to solve the Nation's problems.

Perhaps the saddest aspect of our present situation is that at this critical juncture in our national life, we of the United States have no one in a position of top executive responsibility to whom we can look for dynamic and imaginative leadership to thwart the spread of inflation and regimentation at home and to deal with the threat of communism abroad.

But I have unlimited faith in the desire and willingness of the American people to demand that their national house be set in order and I believe that that desire and willingness is not far from making itself felt.

In a constitutional republic such as ours, the masses may not be immediately articu-

late, but once given leaders and leadership they are swift in making their wishes felt and known.

A fact which must never be discounted is that the essence of our concept of constitutional government is, from the words of the Declaration of Independence, that our National Government derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed."

It is true that policies and programs can be initiated and sometimes even carried out without the "consent of the governed" but ultimately, as always has been the case in our national life, the will of the people has overwhelmed the efforts of those who sought to frustrate or circumvent it.

The most serious constitutional problem to confront our Nation since the War Between the States is the direct result of the failure of those in responsible positions of leadership in all three branches of the Federal Government to take into account the fact that governmental programs and policies to be implemented successfully must square with the "consent of the governed."

I refer to the present effort to force a new social order upon an entire region of our Nation by judicial constitutional amendment.

It is my firm conviction that the historians of the future in looking back upon the present time will record as one of the gravest and most costly mistakes of our national life the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to usurp unto itself authority to make judicial questions out of matters of human relations which should be left to the orderly processes of evolution.

I say that, my friends, because, unless Congress acts soon and decisively to resolve that issue on a realistic, constitutional basis, the inevitable result will be the destruction of public education throughout the South. And, engaged as we are in a life-or-death struggle with the forces of world communism, the United States cannot under any circumstances afford to permit such a tragic consequence to rob it of the minds and talents of a great segment of its youth.

The answer is not to be found in the use of Federal bayonets, Federal control of education, or rearing a generation in ignorance.

My long and serious study of the question has convinced me that—feelings on the subject being as strong and as inflamed as they are on both sides—there is only one solution compatible with constitutional concepts to which all persons of all shades of opinion can subscribe.

That solution is to invoke our heritage of "consent of the governed" by amending the Constitution of the United States to give the people on the State and local level the right to determine for themselves the manner in which the issue will be solved in their localities.

It was with that in mind that I last week stood before the Senate and, with all the sincerity of my being, proposed a constitutional amendment which would read as follows:

"Administrative control of any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by any State or by any political or other subdivision thereof, shall be vested exclusively in such State and subdivision and nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny to the residents thereof the right to determine for themselves the manner in which any such school, institution, or system is administered by such State and subdivision."

The adoption of such an amendment would settle the question for all times and rid the Nation of a divisive issue which threatens to tear it asunder.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would leave the citizens of each State and locality free to make their own decisions in accordance with local conditions and prevailing attitudes as to how

and when their schools would comply with the Supreme Court's school decision.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would prevent destruction of the public schools of the South and would end for all time any threat from any quarter of Federal control of education.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would assure uninterrupted instruction for all the children of this country regardless of their color or place of residence.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would permit either retention of the status quo or orderly change as dictated by the requirements of public opinion and make certain that whatever change might take place would be by the constructive process of evolution rather than the destructive process of revolution.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would create a basis for unity throughout the Nation at a time when it is vitally important that we present a united front before our enemies.

The public schools of the United States are local institutions which have been established and are operated and financed by local people on the local level and all persons willing to view the question dispassionately will admit that to fulfill their role they must be administered on the local level in accordance with the wishes of the parents of the children attending them.

I do not believe there is any person who is genuinely concerned about the future of our Nation and the education of all its children who cannot and will not subscribe to the proposition of local control of schools.

And it is on that basis that I have appealed to all Americans—particularly to the parents of school-age children—to let their wishes on this subject be known to their Senators and Congressmen. It is an appeal which I reiterate here today and urge that you take it back with you to the citizens and organizations of your respective communities throughout the Nation.

I am convinced that if the public will express itself on this question the result will be to give the 86th Congress a mandate to afford the people of America an opportunity to amend the Constitution to assure for all time to come that control of the public schools shall forever remain in the hands of local people on the local level.

Our heritage as free Americans is that our Government's foundations rest upon the will of the people.

It is a heritage of which we are proud and which the entire world respects.

It is a heritage to which we must adhere if we are to succeed in passing it uncompromised to our children and their children after them.

It is a heritage which is to be put to an acid test in the issues now confronting our country.

Those of us who believe in responsible, constitutional government have our work cut out for us if we are to preserve that heritage.

With our faith in Almighty God and our feet firmly planted on the rock of the Constitution, I am supremely confident that we shall not fail.

I thank you.

Arthur E. (Gus) Cook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

Record, I include the following broadcast by Joseph McCaffrey reporting on "Today in Congress" for the Independent Airlines Association, Friday night, January 16:

A lot of people lost a wonderful friend today.

"Gus" Cook, who spend 60 years on Capitol Hill, died early today. He was 85.

"Gus" was Assistant Architect of the Capitol.

He came to the Capitol as a \$1.50 a day laborer—that was back in 1898.

He knew them all in that time. When he came to the Hill, William McKinley was President.

For the last 30 years or more it was "Gus" Cook who served as the official greeter for the Presidents when they arrived to deliver their state-of-the-Union messages.

During World War II, it was Cook who was responsible for security at the Capitol. And he was the key man in the security arrangements for all the Presidents on their visits to the Hill.

Time and time again reporters, this one included, have tried to persuade "Gus" to let them write about his experiences and about the people he knew, as he knew them. But he always turned down the requests.

Only about 6 months ago I talked to "Gus" about this and after he turned me down he said, "Don't worry, Joe. When I get ready to let some one write about me, I'll tell you and I'll answer all your questions."

But this is the only chance I ever had to write about him—and my questions are still unanswered.

Britain's Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, February 1, 1959. The author of the letter Mr. O. R. Strackbein, is acknowledged to be one of the foremost proponents in this country for the protection of the jobs of American workmen from the effects of unlimited importation of foreign-produced goods.

BRITAIN'S POLICY

I have been much impressed by the great to-do that has been made over the failure of our Government to award an electrical equipment contract to British manufacturers who were low bidders. Even the British Ambassador to this country has expressed dismay over such inconsistency in our policy. British newspapers have flayed us for similar reasons and have mentioned the close alliance between our two countries as a backdrop, the better to highlight our faithlessness.

It has also been said that we were motivated by crass political considerations. Senator HUGH SCOTT, while campaigning for election, apparently gave assurances to business-hungry voters that the contract would be awarded to a Pennsylvania firm, Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., as it later turned out to be.

What a shame, indeed, that candidates for office should come bearing gifts to voters in the form of promises and assurances. What further shame that the money voted by

American taxpayers should be spent in the United States to give employment to Americans out of work.

These complaints only show how far we have gone in fanning the expectations of those who look to us for favors from abroad. The British Ambassador, indeed, said quite clearly that if we had no intention of awarding public contracts to foreign bidders we should not invite bids from them.

He has a point there, and a good one.

Let us turn to page 477 of the printed hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on Renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, February 17 to March 7, 1958. The following testimony is found there: "For example, since its creation in 1947, the Central Electrical Authority of Great Britain has limited its procurement of power and transmission equipment to domestic suppliers because, as its official report to a parliamentary committee of inquiry states: 'It would be unwise for the electricity supply industry (of England and Wales) to be dependent upon foreign manufacturers for spares and maintenance.'"

Now, that is straight to the point, forthright, and admirable. It shows clearly that we could learn from the English; and we would not be in the present hassle.

In your editorial of January 24 you say that "a strong odor of fish emanates from the denial of a turbine contract to the English Electric Co. on national security grounds." That company's bid, you say, was 19 percent below that of Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton.

Should there be any wonder that the English company could underbid by 19 percent when its wages are about a half to two-thirds below those paid by electrical and other companies in this country? Do you want our wages cut to the European level, or what have you in mind?

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, Nationwide Committee on
Import-Export Policy.

Tribute to Hon. Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Concord Daily Monitor relative to my colleague [NORRIS COTTON] entitled "COTTON'S Big Job."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON'S Big Job

Senator COTTON has won appointment to the powerful Senate Finance Committee which deals, primarily, with Government financing. And what it does also involves taxation.

It is pleasant to think that there is a possibility of Federal tax reductions. There is hope this can be accomplished by the obviously painful and difficult process of budget balancing, but it would be welcomed by any other method the Government can devise.

Just about everyone, from the troubled business managers to the man or woman of moderate income feels the strong pinch, year by year, of Federal tax requirements. Everyone wants taxes reduced, but the best guess is that it will not be brought about in the immediate future.

In Congress there are pronounced Democratic and liberal Republican tendencies to pile on perhaps billions above Eisenhower's suggested budget. There are powerful pressures spurred on by results of the recent congressional elections.

There are demands for more rocket and missile production and research, for higher unemployment relief, for aid to seriously depressed areas. There is talk of vastly expanded Federal aid to education and of providing free hospital and medical care for millions of social security beneficiaries.

Eisenhower's \$77 billion spending means \$1 out of every \$5 the American people earn. And these Americans already know that inflation means rising costs for all housewives and a falling value in pay envelopes.

When he was informed of his appointment to the Finance Committee, CORTON said he believed taxation is one of the most serious problems the country faces. There will be widespread endorsement of this observation.

Taxes must come largely from privately generated income. The burden is a heavy one. The taxpayer cannot be blamed for wondering where it will all end of for reacting with a black rage against taxes of any description.

CORTON and other members of his committee face difficulties. They will be urged to spend more, not less. They will be told the public demand for Government services has priority over a spending pattern based on thrift.

Broad scale tax reductions may not be just around the corner. But easing, as far as possible, of the tax load could produce valuable results for the entire Nation.

Dan Flood Justifies Confidence With Work at Mine Catastrophe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, February 1, 1959:

DAN FLOOD JUSTIFIES CONFIDENCE WITH WORK AT MINE CATASTROPHE

When the people of Luzerne County, in their wisdom, last year once again reelected DAN FLOOD they got more than a Congressman.

They got a man who, when the emergency arose, proved the one real leader available in these parts to serve them.

And if he does nothing more than what he did for the awful mine catastrophe at Port Griffith, when the river breakthrough threatened all the mines of the region, his would be a greater accomplishment than that of most of the other Congressmen who have been elected in recent times—in all of their combined terms.

It was a splendid service and proved that not only is the know-how of experience so valuable in the right hands but that you also need someone who has the force of character to make full use of it.

Actually, Congressman FLOOD was in charge of nothing at the scene of the accident.

In complete command was State Mine Inspector Daniel Connolly, who was assisted by other State men, Federal men, Army engineers, and Seabees.

But it was FLOOD who first and so quickly determined what could be done to help, where to get those who could help, how they could be combined into an effective team and then, serving as liaison man between Federal and State forces, brought them together.

And it was at the Friday night meeting in his office that the work was planned on a scale sufficiently massive to accomplish something.

Before that happened, the struggle that had been made was heroic but also an unequal one.

The resources, the power, and the equipment were just not of sufficient size and strength to make an impression against the almost limitless power of the raging waters.

However, the individuals did their best and the little towns gave their all as they struggled until the State and Federal powers were on the scene.

But in all that time, from beginning to end, most conspicuous by its complete absence was any effort or even sign of interest from the government of Luzerne County—the only local branch of government big enough and with sufficient resources really to try.

Yet not one county leader was in any small way even slightly concerned.

For All Who Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the Baldwin (N.Y.) Citizen under date of January 29, 1959, commenting on a timely reminder by the American Legion of the wisdom of recognizing our responsibilities.

The editorial follows:

FOR ALL WHO CARE

The annual "For God and Country" telecast of the American Legion reminds all Americans—with especial force, this year—of the most vital issue of 20 centuries.

As we stand at the crossroads of history, and in the gathering storm that must revolve whether this world is to be God fearing or anti-God, the world's largest body of veteran fighting men asks us to stand up and be counted. It commands us to recall that from its faltering beginnings on the precarious edge of a wild man's wilderness, the strength of this Nation has flowed from God and been manifest in freedom of worship and respect for faith.

Against the shocking background of the recent visit of Anastas Mikoyan—the arch spy who directed the theft of U.S. atomic secrets, and the assassin of the victorious Hungarian freedom fighters—and the hospitality extended by Americans of prominence, we quote from the supplication of the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Twiss, national chaplain of the Legion:

"Remind us, Lord God, of the pressing need today of reemphasizing, rather than shying away from, the word 'loyalty'."

"Warn us that the recent decline of this concept of loyalty can undermine the foundation of a free America—the family and the home—unless we return to those values and virtues that claimed the uncompromising allegiance of those who founded this Nation and made the struggle for life, liberty, and

the pursuit of happiness irresistible and undeniable.

"Above all, help us to be passionately loyal to America and our way of life. Make us nonpartisan in our choice of programs and policies for the service of the Nation. Lord, may we always ask: 'What will best serve America as God wills that America be served?'"

Spiritually, the Nation endures again the discouragement of Valley Forge. And Americans may seek today, as General Washington sought then, the strength of divine guidance, or they may flee to the temporary warmth of indifference and expediency.

—This is the critically timely message of the American Legion.

Kansas Observes 98th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 29, 1959, Kansas observed her 98th anniversary of her achievement of statehood. Since 1903 this day of January 29 has held special significance to all Kansans. It has been regularly observed on most of these years by schools, organizations and particularly by the Kansas Day Club. Although the Kansas Day Club does have a political connotation, its membership is open to all and the annual meetings are generally attended by Kansans from all parts of the State. The arrangements for the annual meeting in 1959 were largely taken care of by Mr. Richard D. Rogers, of Manhattan, the president. Among the distinguished guests attending this annual meeting was Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred A. Seaton.

One of the outstanding features of the program for the annual banquet of the Kansas Day Club was a testimonial to Kansas delivered by Ned Cushing from Downs, Kans. Little could I say that would describe this testimonial in addition to the persuasive phrases that it contains. Not only is it a testimonial to Kansas, but it also depicts the great trials that faced the pioneers of Kansas as well as the historical events that have left their mark in the history of our State.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert following my remarks this testimonial to Kansas by Mr. Cushing:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, fellow Republicans and Kansans, on this night, the 98th birthday of our great State, I ask that you pause briefly with me to review our "search for the stars."

Ad astra per aspera—to the stars through difficulties since the 1500's the way has been rough and hard for those who have made our great State what it is today, but the motto on our State seal tells us that if we ever expect to reach the stars we must overcome difficulties.

It thrills us to recall the great deeds of those who lived before us, and isn't it natural to wish we could have been present for those historic experiences? If it were possible to make a wish and have it come true, what would you choose?

To ride with Coronado's Spaniards and discover the Indians in the 1500's?

To sing with the French boatmen as they traded up and down the Kansas Rivers in the 1700's?

To explore with Lewis and Clark in the early 1800's, or maybe travel the Santa Fe, Oregon, and California Trails?

To take part in the chaotic, turbulent days of pro and anti slavery when Kansas was only a territory?

To see President Buchanan, on January 29, 1861, sign the Kansas Bill which admitted us to the Union under the Wyandotte Constitution as a child of the Republican Party?

To join those who came to Kansas by covered wagon, on horse, on foot, from the East, North and South, all "searching for the stars"?

Whatever your wish or whatever road to the stars you choose, none can deny that Kansas has had a splendid past as the child of free statehood, a land of variety and extremes, a land of promise and disappointment; all put together into one glorious heritage by the energy and intelligence of determined Kansans before us. A heritage that is ours today.

Yes; we have a legacy reaching back even to the very beginning; to the man who built the first dugout canoe; made the first wheel; fashioned the first instrument of metal; or raised his eyes in worship to the stars. The progress of Kansas as well as civilization has been uneven, but every generation can add something, be it little or much, to this heritage of the past. And today we face the greatest challenge history has ever known. Each one of us, as a trustee of the past, has the task of living up to our heritage and adding something to it.

Our search for the stars must not stop with our early history. How about our present and future Kansas? It is even more vital that we point with pride to what she is and will be than what she was.

In this century the skies are as blue, the clouds as white, the grass as green, the people as courageous, and the rainbows as full of promise as in the days of the pioneers. Kansas is not yet complete, and every time is a good time to live in if we know what to do with it. We should all be concerned about the future because that is where we will spend the remainder of our lives. The past is gone and static. Nothing we do can change it. The future is before us and dynamic. Everything we do will affect it. Each day brings with it new frontiers if we will only recognize them. Existence is a strange bargain. Life owes us little. We owe it everything. The only true happiness comes from dedicating ourselves to a purpose.

What better than to have as our purpose, now and for the future, to build a better and even more glorious Kansas? "Ad Astra per aspera." To search even harder for the stars through difficulties, toward the highest ideas of political, social, and moral excellence. There is politics written in almost every line of Kansas history and if we will make this motto not only the motto of Kansas but of the party which gave her birth and being, the Republican Party, we shall continue onward and upward through all difficulties to ultimate success.

To continue our search for the stars will mean untiring effort—it will require the utmost harmony—it will demand strict adherence to moral right—it will call for the strongest and ablest of leaders. The task will not be easy, but it can be done. We are saying with our presence here tonight that we will reach those stars.

And so, tonight I would propose,

Yes, of difficulties we've had our share
But Kansas is none the worse for the wear.
What's been done should not concern us
most,

Rather look to the future as we end this toast.

Federal Government Largely to Blame for Housing Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Commission, on February 2, 1959 in New York City, began a study of racial discrimination in federally aided housing as well as in the private and public housing fields.

Walter L. Kirschenbaum, public relations director of the Jewish Labor Committee told a Workmen's Circle audience on February 1 at the Workmen's Circle Center, 615 Rittenhouse Street, Washington, D.C., that it was imperative for President Eisenhower to issue an immediate Executive order establishing a committee to aid in the abolishment of discrimination in federally aided housing. He said that such an order would become a beacon for State and municipal governments to follow in the private and public housing arena.

Mr. Kirschenbaum said that sordid housing conditions, created by neglect and apathy on the part of some landlords, had a direct bearing on the attitudes of these landlords toward minority groups.

Depressed areas—

He said—

are depressed because those who own the property have a contempt for those who tenant the buildings. Out of such conditions is spawned juvenile delinquency, racial tensions, moral decay.

There are Little Rock conditions—

Mr. Kirschenbaum said—

because real estate interests have been codified. They have been permitted by law and by the apathy of public officialdom to destroy the basic tenets of human dignity; the right of human beings to live in peace together without regard to race, religion, or national origin. From segregated housing has also been spawned segregated schools.

Mr. Kirschenbaum said that—

It will become shockingly clear at the Monday and Tuesday hearings in New York, that minority groups are forced to live in ghettoized slums, their children forced to attend segregated and often inferior educational institutions, because decent housing is closed to them, and public housing is consistently under attack from real estate quarters and professional bigots and therefore scarce.

Conditions exist in New York State that cry out for legislative remedy. Existing laws, such as the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs Law in New York City banning discrimination in private housing was passed in spite of vicious pressure from a combination of bigoted real estate interests and equally bigoted politicians who sought to curry favor for financial returns to political coffers. Right now, in Albany, highly placed officials in the Rockefeller administration are advising against the passage of the Metcalf-Baker Bill which would do on a State level what the New York City ordinance is designed to accomplish locally.

There is sufficient evidence—

Mr. Kirschenbaum said—

to indicate a conspiracy against minorities in the housing field. Such evil practices as coded listings of available apartments, hiking the rental of an apartment after a price had been agreed to, discouraging non-whites from residing in a community after a Negro family had moved in, or spreading vile and ugly rumors about Jews, Negroes, Puerto Ricans in order to create the ghetto atmosphere, are some of the devices employed.

Harry Belafonte's agent had been quoted one rental and Mr. Belafonte a higher one after the landlord learned of the singer's interest in becoming a tenant. In another case, the New York City Commission on Intergroup Relations successfully mediated a complaint brought by a Jewish family against a self-styled cooperative. Cooperatives under the United Housing Foundation which includes the major labor and fraternal organizations have pioneered in breaking the barrier of discrimination in their occupancy practices.

Ghettos are monuments of shame, built on foundations of bigotry—

Mr. Kirschenbaum told his audience.

He cited examples in the District of Columbia, Chicago, New York State which, he said, "indicates that segregation is a national problem and not relegated to any geographical center."

The labor movement, especially through the AFL-CIO civil rights committee, is determined to crack not only the employment barriers of discrimination but the housing barriers as well. Long before a local law was passed in New York City, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Amalgamated Butcher Workmen, and the Hat, Cap, and Millinery Workers and the Workmen's Circle were sponsoring cooperative housing on a nonsegregated basis—

He said.

Mr. Kirschenbaum announced that the JLC position will be presented by the New York State Committee Against Discrimination in Housing at the Federal Commission hearing. The JLC is actively supporting the antibias housing committee.

In my opinion, Mr. Kirschenbaum's remarks are timely and his statements very informative. I fully agree with him.

Morris Cunningham's Articles on Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include three very ably written articles which appeared in the Commercial Appeal, published in Memphis, Tenn.

I had the great pleasure of serving with the author of the articles, Mr. Morris Cunningham, on the U.S. delegation to the ninth meeting of the council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in Geneva, Switzerland. Mr. Cunningham's articles read as follows:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Jan. 14, 1959]

REFUGEES: PERPETUAL RESULT OF CONSTANT WORLD TURMOIL

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—Wars, revolutions and political coups and persecutions loose a continuing stream of refugees upon the rest of the world.

The size of the stream rises and falls in reasonable proportion to the political stability of the combined nations of the world.

For more than 20 years now it has stayed at a high level, falling in one area as peace is restored but rising elsewhere as a new conflict bursts forth.

Nazi persecutions in Germany, the Spanish civil war, Nazi conquests, World War II, Russia's seizure of the satellite countries, Russian persecutions, the Israeli-Arab conflicts, Communist conquest of China, the India-Pakistan division, Indochina, Indonesia, Korea, the revolt in Hungary, Algeria—these and other less-publicized conflicts have fed the stream of refugees, have put people in alien lands, looking for asylum and homes—old people, young people, sick people, healthy people; some good, some bad; some, no doubt, Communist agents.

The United States once was a generous host and a haven for the world's persecuted. Between 1920 and 1914, the United States accepted more than 32 million immigrants. This was in the days when populations and wars were smaller and when conflicts affected lesser numbers of people. In these years the United States served as a primary "escape hatch" for those refugees who had the means and the inclination to migrate.

The wholesale dislocations of World War I brought refugee problems of such magnitude that a continuation of this relatively "open door" policy became impossible. The people of the United States no longer could accept all of the people from abroad who wanted to come here without risking serious dislocations within their own country. As it is, 2,925,000 aliens are registered in this country.

BACKS NOT TURNED

While realizing that they could not continue to carry such a high proportion of the load, the people of the United States have not turned their backs on the problem. Far from it.

Today the U.S. Government is the leader in recognizing the refugee problem and in trying to cope with it on many fronts and through various organizations.

There are various components of the problem since refugees fall into many different categories and situations.

For instance, there are the Germans in Soviet-held East Germany, who are escaping into free West Germany at the rate of 10,000 a month. They are easily assimilated into the prosperous, growing West German economy, particularly since they are of the same nationality and speak the same language.

This is also true with other refugees of ethnic origin or culture similar to that of the country of asylum.

Since the outbreak of the Korean war in June 1950, an estimated 750,000 residents of Communist-held North Korea have sought and found refuge in South Korea. A small number, mostly defecting North Korean soldiers, are still finding their way through the lines.

Between 1950 and 1952, about 175,000 Turks who were living in Communist-held Bulgaria were expelled. They found asylum in Turkey.

Since the cessation of hostilities in Indochina in 1954, about 900,000 persons have moved from the Communist Viet Minh area into free Vietnam. About 150,000 were French and Vietnamese military personnel.

The French mostly have returned to France. The others have become a part of Vietnam. In addition, the Chinese community in Vietnam has absorbed about 400,000 refugees from Red China.

FIVE MILLION MOVED

One of the largest movements of people in recent history resulted from the division in 1947 of British India into two nations, India and Pakistan. Shortly thereafter about 5 million Hindus and Sikhs moved from west Pakistan into India and about the same number of Moslems left India for west Pakistan. Since then an additional 3 million Hindus have moved to India from east Pakistan and another million and a half Moslems have moved to east Pakistan from India. While these vast exchanges have not been without difficulties, the immigrants have been accorded equal political rights and their economic problems generally are no worse than those of the people they have joined.

There also are instances of the successful integration or refugees of ethnic origin or culture alien to that of their country of asylum.

For example, France still has about 110,500 of the 400,000 Spanish republicans who fled to France during the Spanish civil war in 1937-39, about 20,000 Armenians who arrived between 1919 and 1926, and about 3,600 Austrians from the Nazi era, all now integrated into French life.

England has about 110,000 former members of the Polish Army and their dependents, and Sweden about 200,000 other Europeans of non-Swedish origin, but including about 50,000 from other Scandinavian countries. All of these also are permanently established in their adopted country.

These are examples of situations where refugees have found new homes with relatively little difficulty.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Jan. 15, 1959]

REFUGEE CHINESE AND ARABS BIG PROBLEM FOR FREE WORLD

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—State Department statistics indicate there are more than 2,600,000 refugee in the world today who have not yet been integrated into the life of an asylum country.

By far the greatest number fall into two groups. First there is the estimated 1 million Chinese who have fled Red China and crowded into teeming Hongkong, the British colony. Next there are the 947,000 Arabs who fled Palestine during the Arab-Israeli hostilities in 1948, and since then have been living in camps in nearby Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt.

In addition, there are now about 100,000 refugees of the fighting in Algeria. About half are in Tunisia and the remainder in Morocco.

An estimated 50,000 Dutch refugees from the civil disturbances and unrest in Indonesia have been forced to return to Holland.

Austria has about 100,000 un-integrated refugees, mostly from Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania.

Most other European countries also have varying numbers of refugees of alien ethnic origin or culture who have not yet been integrated into a new life. State Department figures show France with about 75,000, Germany 126,000, Belgium 56,000, Italy 28,000, and other countries with lesser numbers.

IRON COUNTRY ESCAPEES

Many of the latter have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and therefore are of special interest to the United States.

Escapees, in the American view, are living evidence of the malfunctioning of political-economic systems. So are the elaborate border guards maintained by Soviet Russia and her satellites.

After an escapee has evaded these guards, the aid accorded him is symbolic of Western concern for the satellite populations of Eastern Europe. Word of this aid filters back behind the Iron Curtain and rekindles hopes and disaffection.

Thus, the remarkably successful job that was done in finding homes for the Hungarian freedom fighters was an expression of this realistic though humanitarian policy.

The basic interest of the United States in unresolved refugee problems stems from three factors:

1. The desire of the United States to uphold and support the principle of asylum to refugees and its corollary principle of a refugee's right to choose or reject repatriation. From these principles stems the humanitarian desire of the people of the United States to alleviate suffering among refugee groups.

DESIRE TO STABILIZE

2. The desire of the United States to assure the stability of free world governments. An unresolved refugee problem is a factor in internal stability.

3. The desire of the United States to avoid the creation of factors within free world countries which would be exploited by Communist agents and propaganda either to utilize disaffected refugee groups as a part of the Communist espionage-sabotage-propaganda apparatus or to produce unfavorable comment on free world interest and effort in behalf of refugees.

These, then, are the American objectives in attempting to cope with the never-ending refugee problem.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Jan. 16, 1959]

UNITED STATES AIDING REFUGEE WOES BY INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, January 15.—The United States is tackling the world refugee problem on its own and through various international organizations.

Chief among the international organizations is the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, a 27-nation group which since its creation in 1951 has found new homes for more than 800,000 migrants and refugees.

Essentially a processing and transport organization, ICEM had received little publicity before the Hungarian revolt, October 23, 1956.

ICEM maintains a secretariat at Geneva, Switzerland, and delegations from the member nations meet there in the spring and the fall.

UNITED STATES MAKES PROPOSAL

Member nations currently are considering a U.S. proposal for a special program aimed at closing the remaining refugee camps in Europe. The camps now house about 38,000 persons, which is less than the average number of European refugees resettled each year.

The U.S. delegation suggested at the November ICEM meeting at Geneva that the program be coordinated with World Refugee Year, which the United Nations General Assembly has designated to begin June 1.

The proposal is to be discussed at the April meeting.

With Western Europe now recovered economically, the U.S. delegation also proposed that ICEM give thought to broadening its program.

WORK WITH EASTLAND

The American delegation's nerve center is the State Department's Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs, headed by Robert S. McCollum, a 42-year-old former Denver, Colo., businessman. His assistants include Richard R. Brown and George L. Warren.

This State Department agency works closely with Representative FRANCIS WALTER,

Democrat, of Pennsylvania and Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairmen of the House and Senate Subcommittees on Immigration and Naturalization.

In addition to participating in ICEM, the United States operates the U.S. Escapee Program and the Far East Refugee Program. These programs aid selected individuals and groups, providing them with food, clothing and other essentials, and working with ICEM to find permanent new homes for them.

CARE FOR ARABS

The United States also participates in the programs of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This includes the \$16 million United Nations Refugee Fund, which is dedicated to the resettlement of difficult cases—those refugees who require permanent institutional care.

And, finally, the United States is the largest contributor to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. This is the agency that cares for the 947,000 Arabs who were forced out of Israel during the 1948 hostilities between the Israelis and the Arabs and who since have been living in camps in neighboring Arab countries.

UNRWA, which cares for them, draws its financial support mainly from the United States, which contributes about 70 percent of the budget. This country has averaged donating about \$22 million a year for each of the last 2 years.

Americans cannot accept all of these people into the country. But we're compensating for this on many fronts and through many organizations, with work, money and planning.

Poison in Your Water—No. 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the Cleveland, Ohio, press on July 2, 1958, set forth some more reasons why the Federal Government must vigorously pursue its efforts to clean up pollution in lakes and streams.

This story entitled "A Terrible Price To Pay" describes the health menace along the shores of Lake Erie resulting from raw sewage being dumped into that lake by the communities of Euclid, Wickliffe, and Willowick. The situation is so bad that the article says, "If a man took a bucket of that polluted water and set it down in Public Square he would be arrested for creating a health menace."

This is the drinking water and the water for recreation that Americans depend upon:

A TERRIBLE PRICE TO PAY

A health menace almost beyond description exists on the county's East Side, along the lake.

It stems from the city of Euclid's sewage outlets, which are pouring thousands of gallons of completely untreated sewage into the already polluted lake hour after hour, day after day, week after week.

A sickening stench pervades the entire area, constant reminder of the terrible price in health risk the suburb is paying for all the years of delay in meeting the need for a new sewage plant.

A need that was recognized almost 20 years ago.

This is not to blame Euclid officials entirely. Many factors, including the prolonged Hilltop sewer line controversy, played a part.

But the point is that the years slipped by, each year the problem growing worse and worse.

Now, to Euclid's credit, it is doing something to eliminate the problem. A \$5 million plant is underway, but at what a terrible price beyond dollars.

While the work is going on, while pipes are being installed, the old sewage plant has to be shut down 60 percent of the time at a very lenient estimate.

The result is that raw waste from Euclid, Wickliffe, and Willowick homes, thousands upon thousands of homes, is pouring directly into the lake, is carried up and down the easterly lake front.

And this situation will go on until late next year—almost 18 months.

Swimming? Out of the question. Boating? Who can stand to sail or dock boats in a mess like that?

The Euclid lakefront is so polluted, some residents say, that if a man took a bucket of that polluted water and set it down in Public Square he'd be arrested for creating a health menace.

Euclid's Mayor Sims knows of the menace and pledges to see what can be done to minimize this health hazard.

If there is any single thing that can be done to alleviate this mess, to safeguard the health of many people, it is worth every effort.

Address by Charles H. Silver, President of Beth Israel Hospital, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FARBSSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles H. Silver, president of Beth Israel Hospital in New York City, at the cornerstone laying ceremonies for its new residence for nurses last September 28, 1958:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BETH ISRAEL HOSPITAL, AT CORNERSTONE LAYING CEREMONIES FOR ITS NEW RESIDENCE FOR NURSES, SEPTEMBER 28, 1958

On the wall of one of the buildings that comprise Beth Israel Hospital there are some words that constitute our credo. This is how our credo begins:

"I know of no phase of human endeavor which is nobler in purpose than the healing of the sick and the alleviation of suffering."

"I know of no institution that serves a community with such utter unselfishness and such great effectiveness as a modern hospital."

When the cornerstone of the structure in which those phrases appear was laid in June of 1952, and I knew that it would be named for me, I felt a surge of pride, and gratification that I thought could never come again to any man in his lifetime. Now, a little more than 6 years later, I know that I was wrong. Today, I feel that this hospital is at the threshold of a great fulfillment, the realization of its founders' dreams and a monument to the vision, determination, and courage of every man and woman on our board of trustees. This is their triumph * * * and I salute our trustees as this new building starts to rise. It will stand as a tribute, in

stone and steel, to their dedication in developing Beth Israel into the great, new medical center of the East Side, second to none in our metropolis.

The announcements tell us that we have gathered to lay the cornerstone of a residence for nurses. Actually, it is much more than that. This will be part of our splendid school of nursing, and the living accommodations it will offer to our students will be on a par with the finest available in any college or university in the country.

Its exciting architecture, its comforts and dramatic design, are an invitation to attract more young women to choose a career in nursing. The nationwide shortage of nurses is critical. Here is a profession whose mission to humanity approaches the divine * * * whose rewards cannot be measured in material compensation alone.

The building to be erected here will enable us to take a long step forward in meeting the personal needs of our student nurses.

Many of us, as we saw this edifice take shape on the drawing boards, have called our new project a multipurpose building. In a very practical sense, that is just what it is * * * for the lower three floors will house complete operating suites, an integrated X-ray department, recovery rooms and auxiliary services. These facilities will increase the capacity of our main hospital by about a hundred patients' beds.

So you see, it is, indeed, a building of many purposes. And yet, it has, basically, just one purpose—the same one for which Beth Israel was founded and has grown from strength to strength for almost three-quarters of a century.

Above all—and to all—Beth Israel is an island of compassion in the midst of a teaming melting pot of more than eight million souls. It stands as a symbol of man's concern for the welfare of his fellow men. It is an arsenal of unending research and ceaseless care in which the advances of science and the heritage of tradition meet to ease the tensions of a troubled society. For these are times of momentous decision when justice and mercy seem to be forgotten virtues in many places.

Well, here is a place where these things still matter. Here is a hospital where our aim is not the betterment of our balance sheet, but the betterment of humanity. An endless procession of ailing men, women, and children from all walks of life, from all races, colors, and creeds, come to us for help—and they do not come in vain.

For this is our dedicated purpose: To grow with a growing New York—to serve the needs of today and plan for the needs of tomorrow. And as we lay the cornerstone for which we have gathered this afternoon, we lay the cornerstone of other afternoons in the future when we will build, and build again to fulfill our mission to relieve pain, to prevent suffering, to prolong life.

The importance of our task is attested by the vast throng who have come to join in these ceremonies. These are our friends and neighbors, our workers, our volunteers, our doctors, our nurses, our technicians, our administrative personnel * * * all members of the Beth Israel family, all devoted to the ideal of service which is the true cornerstone of our hospital.

I speak of them as the Beth Israel family, and I speak of such notables, whose presence honors us on this occasion, as my dear and cherished friend, that revered humanitarian and great American, Bernard Baruch.

I speak of that outstanding champion of human rights, statesman and inspired leader of his people, Carlos P. Romulo; that beloved Governor of our sovereign State of New York, Averell Harriman; our distinguished, crusading Senator, Jack Javits; the best friend of Beth Israel, and every institution of public welfare in the city he serves so faithfully, our Mayor, Bob Wagner;

that devoted servant of his country and his State, Nelson D. Rockefeller; the public-spirited president of the Borough of Manhattan, Hulan Jack.

These men and women, and many more that time will not permit me to name, have filled this platform with the foremost figures in the civic and professional life of our city, State, and Nation. They, and the many foundations and benefactors—including our Federal Government—have made this great moment possible.

Finally, let me acknowledge our heartfelt gratitude to the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York of which Beth Israel is proud to be a charter member. Without the constant and generous assistance of the federation, the work of this hospital could not continue.

When I realize that federation is responsible for the support of 116 welfare agencies in our city, I am deeply aware of how much we all owe to the tireless efforts of its president, trustees, and hard-working personnel.

The doctors and nurses, in whose name we will dedicate this building when its doors open next year, fulfill the final words of that credo from which I quoted at the beginning of my talk:

"I know of no personal relationship that is more genuine and tender than that which exists between the patients in a hospital and the men and women in white who function within its walls. This, our credo for more than half a century will endure long after those who now serve Beth Israel have passed on."

Let me close by saying, on this memorable day, that I rejoice in having been able to give more than 30 years of my life in constant service to this hospital. If I tell you that they were the best years of my life, it is only true that they were the best because I gave them, with love and devotion, to Beth Israel.

Hon. Louis B. Heller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following remarks made at the induction ceremonies of our former colleague, Hon. Louis B. Heller, who was inducted as a justice of the city court of New York at the Central Courts Building, Brooklyn, on January 6, 1959. Hon. Nathan R. Sobel of the county court of Kings County presided at the ceremonies:

Judge SOBEL. May I invite the newly elected justice of the city court, the Honorable Louis B. Heller, to enter the courtroom.

(Judge Heller enters. Applause.)

Judge SOBEL. May I introduce Rabbi Baumol, Judge Heller's rabbi, who will deliver the invocation.

(Rabbi Baumol delivers invocation.)

Judge SOBEL. Judge Heller has requested that these proceedings be kept as informal as possible. We have had requests from many of his dear friends and associates in the courts, as well as the legislature and Congress, to speak. We have explained to them that we shall curtail the speechmaking and make their presence known so that they may briefly congratulate the newly elected justice.

Before calling on the speakers, I should like to introduce to you Mrs. Ruth Heller, the judge's charming wife, who has so understandingly cooperated with him in his work over the years.

(Presentation of flowers by the officers of the court.)

Judge SOBEL. I should like also to introduce his very lovely daughter, Marcia.

His son Bobby, who was present at the formal swearing-in last week, returned yesterday to Bucknell University, and the judge has just whispered in my ear that he is cramming, as we all used to do, for his final exams.

I should like to introduce for a bow his lifelong partner and associate in the practice of law, his devoted brother Harry, who has been by his side during many trying years.

There are so many of Louis Heller's old friends here, even his childhood and boyhood friends, that I must, without selecting any particular one or group, mention that included in the group, sitting in the audience, are 22 members of the class of June 1922, of Boys High School. This is a class which has great historical significance to Boys High because it was the only class in the history of this country, I think, which captured all of the State scholarships, all of the Cornell scholarships, and all of the Harvard scholarships, and, indeed, all of the other scholarships offered throughout the country, all in one class, in one school, and in one particular year.

We had a great many geniuses among them, geniuses in the medical profession who have proved themselves, in business, in the other professions, and, of course, least of all are the geniuses who ascended the Bench. I see present one of them, Judge Keogh of the Supreme Court, and Judge DiGiovanna of the Supreme Court, also a member of the class, and, of course, Judge Starke and Judge Schor are present here, and a great many members of the legislature, and least of all, myself.

My friendship with Louis goes back even much before the time we attended high school. We knew each other when we attended elementary school.

The following addressed the meeting:

Francis Verill, Esq., the president of the Brooklyn Bar Association.

Albert Gondelman, Esq., chairman of the city court committee of the Brooklyn Bar Association.

Judge Joseph A. Solovet, who presented a scroll on behalf of the Kings County Criminal Bar Association, which reads as follows:

"The Kings County Criminal Bar Association presents this plaque to Hon. Louis B. Heller, justice of the city court of the city of New York, for his distinguished services as a lawyer and judge, his warm-hearted concern for his fellow man and counsel to the bench and bar."

Gilbert S. Rosenthal, Esq., president of the Association of Lawyers of the Criminal Courts of Manhattan, also presented a scroll, which reads as follows:

"The Association of Lawyers of the Criminal Courts of Manhattan extend to Judge Louis B. Heller the heartiest congratulations and best wishes on his appointment to a higher court. For many years Judge Heller served the city and State of New York with pride and distinction. His untiring efforts, wise counsel and vast experience have done much to further the cause of justice. We, who practice in the criminal courts, indeed regret to see him go but are happy that his new appointment reflects a job well done. May he continue his dedicated work for many years in the best of health."

Morris Himmelfarb, Esq., representing the Queens County Criminal Bar Association.

Judge Heller, as you know, has held many public offices. I know you recall that he served for more than 10 years on the execu-

tive committee of the Democratic Party of Kings County.

I should like to introduce for a bow at this time the Honorable Joseph T. Sharkey, majority leader of the city council and chairman of the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Kings County.

I should also like to note the presence of Judge Heller's former associates of this committee: the Honorable James V. Mangano, general clerk of the supreme court of Kings County, who had the distinction of opening the ceremonies on yesterday commemorating the dedication of the new supreme court building; Hon. John Cashmore, borough president of Brooklyn and former chairman of the Kings County Democratic organization; Hon. Jack Weinberg; Hon. Harry M. Mortimer; Hon. Ross J. DiLorenzo; Dr. Joshua H. Friedman; Hon. Frank A. Nolan, commissioner or borough works; Hon. Joseph B. Whitty, county clerk; Hon. Frank A. Cunningham, Jr., chief clerk of the appellate term; Hon. Harry Morr, deputy fire commissioner; Hon. James M. Power, commissioner of the board of elections; Hon. Albert M. Leavitt, chief clerk of the surrogates court, Kings County; Hon. Vincent P. Carney, former motor vehicle commissioner; Councilman Edward Vogel; Assemblyman Stanley Steingut; Hon. John A. Valente, deputy markets commissioner; and Hon. Alexander G. Hesterberg, tax commissioner—all State committeemen associated with Judge Heller in many of his activities.

I can see many coleaders present, but I must be pardoned if I do not call out their names, and in lieu thereof I shall read the following telegram by Victoria Rapps, chairman of the coleaders executive committee.

"On behalf of the Democratic Coleaders of Kings County, I congratulate you and I wish for you and your family good health, and many happy years in judicial life."

I shall also read an excerpt from a message from a former associate of Judge Heller in the legislature, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of the city of New York. He says:

"Regret exceedingly that official business makes it impossible for me to be with you on the occasion of your induction as a justice of the city court. I am pleased to join with all of your friends in congratulating you for you have done so much to help make our city a better place in which to live."

Present in spirit is the lifelong friend of Judge Heller, the president of the city council, Hon. Abe Stark. I shall read only part of his message.

"Your constructive record in Congress and on the bench naturally endow you for this new responsibility. I am confident that the city court will be enriched by your demonstrated talent in the realm of judicial affairs."

As you are all aware, the legislature has convened this morning for its first session of the year 1959. Present, however, are a great many members of the legislature who are taking early trains to Albany. They insisted on staying for these ceremonies. I regret that I am unable to call on all of them, but I should like to have the senior delegate from Brooklyn, the Honorable Bernard Austin, speak for the members of the assembly.

(Assemblyman Austin spoke briefly.)

Judge SOBEL. I should also like to have Senator William Rosenblatt speak for the members of the senate.

(Senator Rosenblatt spoke briefly.)

Judge SOBEL. The attorney general of the State of New York, the Honorable Louis Lefkowitz, is detained in Albany, and has sent the following message:

"It has been my privilege to be a friend of Louis Heller for many, many years. Blessed with innate wisdom and unexcelled integrity, Louis not only has gained an enviable record in public service but by his sincerity and consideration of others, he has earned the regard and love of all with

whom he has come into contact. I am confident that Louis Heller will add immeasurably to the city court's proud record of achievement."

As all of you know, Louis has served for several terms with great distinction in the House of Representatives. As you have no doubt read in the newspapers, the House is organizing this morning and since there is a controversial matter before it concerning the increase in the membership of the powerful House Rules Committee, many of his former colleagues who had planned to be here have been unable to attend.

I have too many messages to read, hence permit me to read excerpts from only a few and then mention the names of his colleagues, whose messages I hold in my hand.

From the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House:

"I want to congratulate you as you begin a splendid career as city court justice and extend to you my kindest wishes for a long life of useful service to your people."

From Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, Massachusetts, the majority leader:

"Dear Louis, I regret very much official business in Washington prevents my being with you and your many friends when you are sworn in. While I have missed you here I extend to you my hearty congratulations and very best wishes for every happiness and success in your new position and field of great responsibility."

From Hon. CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma, Democratic whip:

"It is really marvelous to know that such a good friend is getting along so well. We certainly miss you in Washington. Come to see us."

Now, from the Senate side, may I read the following excerpts:

From the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, senior Senator from New York:

"My warmest congratulations on this auspicious occasion. Your new appointment reflects the great pride and confidence of your colleagues and associates in your ability and the integrity of your actions. Please accept my every good wish for success."

From the Honorable KENNETH KEATING, newly elected and now junior Senator from New York:

"Warmest greetings as you begin your new duties as city court justice. I know you will bring dignity and judgment to your new post and I wish you every success and happiness in the years ahead."

From a very warm and dear friend of Lou's, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, Senator from Massachusetts:

"Warmest congratulations on the occasion of your taking over your new position as court justice. I am delighted that you have received this important judicial recognition and that you'll continue to serve the New York community with eminence. With every good wish."

From the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana, majority whip of the Senate, and a member of the powerful Foreign Affairs Committee:

"Dear Louis, congratulations. I know that New York will be well repaid on the basis of your ability, integrity and understanding in the position you are assuming. On behalf of your many friends in both Houses, as well as my own, I wish to extend to you good luck and success in the years ahead. You have been a great public servant and your contributions to the public good will be your monument in life. With best personal wishes, I am, sincerely yours."

And this telegram is a must. It is from the Honorable STEPHEN M. YOUNG, who formerly served in the House with Louis, and last November upset all predictions by becoming the junior Senator from the great State of Ohio:

"Lou Heller is a truly great public servant and a real friend to any of us. As a former colleague of his in the Congress of the United States, I congratulate the people of New York on his induction as justice of your courts. I extend to him my sincere personal greetings and regards with the full knowledge that this is but a continuation of a great career in public service."

Other Members of the House of Representatives who served with Judge Heller and who sent messages are: Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Hon. ABE MULTER, Hon. ISIDORE DOLLINGER, Hon. JOHN B. BENNETT, Hon. HERBERT ZELENSKY, Hon. OREN HARRIS, Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr., Hon. PAUL A. FIO, Hon. LESTER HOLTZMAN, and Hon. EUGENE KEOGH.

Only yesterday I received a telephone call from the dean of the Kings County delegation in the House. He is, of course, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Congressman CELLER is a close and dear personal friend of Judge Heller and, indeed, of all of us. We, in Brooklyn, are particularly proud of our Congressman, because we feel he has made the greatest contribution to the welfare of the people of the United States in the many years he has served as chairman of that powerful committee. We particularly emphasize his magnificent achievement in the field of antitrust and anti-monopoly legislation.

Congressman CELLER phoned in a warm message. He asked me to state that he has been made very happy, Judge Heller, because your ambitions are being realized. He is certain that you will bring to bear upon your work in the city court the fine qualities you exemplified in the Congress of the United States.

Seated at the bench next to Louis is the chief justice of the city court, the Honorable PETER A. QUINN, who has had a distinguished career in the legislature and in Congress, and who now graces one of the finest courts of our city. Both have been colleagues but now Peter is going to be Lou's chief, and a finer chief Lou knows he could never have. He will soon address you.

Present are almost all of the justices of the court of special sessions. They all desire to say a few words. However, the limitations of time make it impossible for us to complete these proceedings and yet hear from all of them.

Seated with us on the bench is the president-justice of the court of special sessions, the Honorable IRVING BEN COOPER, a very dear friend of Lou's. And also our very dear friend, the Honorable VINCENT IMPELLITTERI, a member of the court and the former mayor of the city of New York. We want to express our appreciation to Justices Cannella, Galloway, Cawse, Gassman, Rossbach, Acquavella, Silver, Loscalzo, Byrne, Dunaff, Ringel, and Thompson, who traveled from the outlying boroughs to visit with Judge Heller this morning.

I should also like to note the presence of former Justice Louis I. Kaplan, now the commissioner of investigation of the city of New York.

Also present are his new colleagues of the city court of Kings County, Justices Sabatino, Feldem, Wecht, and Low, as well as many of Judge Heller's new associates of this court from the other counties.

I also note the presence of many judges of the domestic relations court, including Judges Lorence, Marchisio, Kaplan, Ruiss, Ramsgate, and Pagnucco.

And from the municipal court, all friends of Lou's, Judges Alter, Williams, Berry, Rinaldi, Simon, Andreozzi, Johnson, Pearlman, and Damiani.

And from the magistrates court, I must salute Judges Chapman, Solomon, Potter, Maglio, Rader, Tolleris, Gray, Schanzer, Fa-

gan, Serper, Ohringer, Malbin, Livotti, Wal-lach, Glowa, and Cullen.

I am acting as chairman on this occasion only by surference. We had expected that Chief Judge Conway's duties would permit him to attend and preside over these ceremonies. Unfortunately, this was not to be, but I have here a very warm telegram from the chief judge to the new justice. It reads:

"I send you every good wish for health and happiness in your further service to the people of our city as city court justice."

The District Attorney's Association is holding its annual convention in California, a much more pleasant, and I am sure, warmer place than Brooklyn is today. District Attorney Silver has sent his chief assistant, the Honorable Kenneth McCabe, who will address you later.

The Honorable Frank Hogan, who is also on vacation, has deputized one of his chief assistants, the Honorable Anthony Leibler, who will also address you.

Frank O'Connor, the district attorney of Queens County, phoned in a warm message just a few minutes ago.

Most of the justices of the supreme court from Kings County are with us. Mr. Justice Anthony DiGiovanni, the chairman of the board of justices, will speak on their behalf.

But I cannot permit this occasion to pass without asking Mr. Justice J. Vincent Keogh, a life-long friend and classmate of both Judge Heller and myself, to stand up and take a bow.

I should like to have Mr. Justice Arthur Klein, of New York County, a colleague of Judge Heller in Congress, to stand up and take a bow.

It is also my privilege to introduce the Honorable Ferdinand Pecora, former justice of the supreme court of New York County. [Applause.] I know your applause would be even more resounding, if that were possible, if you knew that Judge Pecora is celebrating today his 77th birthday. You will soon hear from him.

I should also like to note the presence of the surrogate of Kings County, the Honorable Maxmillian Moss, who will speak, and also the Honorable Samuel DiFalco, surrogate of New York County, who asks leave to return to a motion calendar which was scheduled for early this morning. [Applause.]

Present also with us on this occasion is the Honorable Henry Ughetta, justice of the appellate division of the second department, who brings with him the greetings and good wishes of all of his associates in this department, and who, I am sure, will want to say a few words.

Similar messages have been sent by the Honorable George J. Beldock, a lifelong friend of Lou's, and now a justice of the appellate division of the supreme court. Also from the Honorable Leo F. Rayfiel, judge of the United States District Court, Eastern District of New York, who served in the legislature with our distinguished guest. And another from the Honorable David N. Edelstein, a judge of the United States District Court of the Southern District of New York. And I hold in my hand a very warm message from the lovable John MacCrate, a former justice of the appellate division.

This completes the list of public officials present here with us today within my immediate view. I am sure I have been unable to spot them all in this crowded courtroom, but I hope that those whom I haven't mentioned will forgive me.

Present also are many of Louis' very old friends from his childhood, boyhood, and school days. It is obviously impossible for me to mention all of them. I must, however, note the presence in the courtroom of one of his dearest friends and his guiding mentor through all the years of his public life. I should like the commissioner of jur-

ors from the eastern division of New York, the Honorable "Moish" Solomon, to take a bow.

Lou wishes me to state that he has received a very warm message from one whom he holds in very high esteem, but for the fact that he is out of the State he would have been here with us. I refer to Mr. Morris Forghash, president of the United States Freight Co.

And from some other friends, Jerry Wurf, regional director, State, County & Municipal Employees; the Honorable Charles R. Howell, commissioner of the department of banking and insurance of the State of New Jersey; and Arnold E. Feldman, attorney-adviser at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

I should like to introduce also for a bow, some very, very dear friends of the new justice: First, the Honorable Meier Steinbrink, former justice of the supreme court; also Al Kevelson, Eddie Zilner, of the Mirror; Harold Harris of the Journal; Geane Toomey of the Telegram-Sun; and Al Turk of the Journal-American.

I have hundred telegrams, letters, and messages in my hand that I cannot possibly wade through now, hence I will order that they may be made part of the official record and turned over to the judge.

As you know, we have used Judge Barshay's courtroom, which is the largest in this building, and Lou and I wish to thank him for his generosity. Unfortunately, he is home ill, otherwise he would have been present.

And, of course, I cannot forget my own colleagues who are present, Judges Marasco and Starkey.

And also from the court of general sessions, Lou's former colleague, Judge Culklin. Also Judges Geller and Schweitzer.

My next duty is to convey a message from Mrs. Heller. She has asked me to invite each and every one of you to participate in a collation in the courtroom of the new justice of the city court on the 10th floor at the conclusion of these proceedings. I hope each and every one of you will accept that most cordial invitation.

(The ceremonies were brought to an abrupt end by the sudden illness and death of Assemblyman Bernard Austin.)

Public Backs Ike on Hold-the-Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup Poll of last weekend clearly sets forth how interested the vast majority of our citizens are in having Uncle Sam live within his income.

People want a balanced budget. They want cutbacks in spending and not more taxes. They want a real fight waged against inflation. Let us give the people what they want and are entitled to.

The Gallup Poll as it appeared last weekend follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 31, 1959]

PUBLIC BACKS IKE ON HOLD-THE-LINE

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., January 30.—In the clash between President Eisenhower and congressional Democrats over the budget, the President holds a great initial advantage in pub-

lic support for his philosophy of holding the line.

Just what may happen to this advantage, however, will depend on how well and how hard the Democrats sell their philosophy that an expanding economy requires more Federal aid even if it means deficit spending to accomplish this.

The important political significance is that the public still thinks in strictly orthodox terms regarding the budget, or like a family, the Government shouldn't spend more than it takes in.

Behind this overwhelming vote is a feeling on the part of many voters that operating in the red during the next year or two will result in serious inflation and have a generally harmful effect on the Nation's economy.

Some political observers have felt that if prices continue up between now and 1960, the Republicans will have a readymade issue in blaming the Democrats and their policy of deficit spending for rising prices.

Democrats challenging the President, therefore, have yet to convince voters of their economic philosophy; namely, that increased spending is needed to make certain of national growth and progress to keep pace with Russia.

Some key questions and results in the Gallup poll's nationwide study of the public's attitude toward the budget:

Do you see any connection between an unbalanced budget and the prices of things you buy?

	Percent
Prices will rise.....	56
Prices will drop.....	1
See no connection.....	43

Do you see any connection between an unbalanced budget and the value of the dollar?

	Percent
Inflation:	
Value of dollar decreases.....	58
Value of dollar increases.....	1
Sees no connection.....	41

If the time should come when Government income cannot pay for all the things in the budget, which would you favor—cutting back on certain things or increasing taxes?

	Percent
Favor cutting back.....	72
Favor increasing taxes.....	15
No opinion.....	13

When voters who favored cutting back under these circumstances were asked what they would like to see pared, two areas of the budget were mentioned most often.

The No. 1 item which voters would like to cut back on is Government operations—salaries, personnel, and other expenses incurred in the day-to-day operation of the Federal Government.

The next most frequently mentioned was foreign aid.

A Look at Psychiatry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor for me, both as a Roman Catholic and as a native of the Boston area, to be able to insert into the RECORD at this time the lecture delivered last night at the Catholic Univer-

sity of America by his eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, our beloved archbishop of Boston. I am sure that my colleagues in the House will be interested in his topic, and I commend to their attention the following words which Cardinal Cushing has to offer:

A LOOK AT PSYCHIATRY

(By Richard Cardinal Cushing, Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists at the Catholic University of America)

Anyone who attempts to discuss the field of psychiatry within the space of a half hour must do so with many misgivings. Psychiatry is a broad and complex field of study with roots that are historically deep. It is also a comparatively new branch of medicine and is still in its infancy. The ever-increasing amount of literature, the development of different systematic approaches, and the current advance in therapeutic procedures give testimony to the vigorous growth and development of this science which deals with the causes and treatment of mental disorders.

When, however, one untrained in this field attempts within a limited space of time, to take a look at and, in a sense, appraise the field of psychiatry, misgivings arise not only in his own mind, but also, I suspect, in the minds of his audience. I believe, therefore, that my approach to this subject may well precipitate in your minds such questions as: "Are we in for another attack on psychiatry? Will there be a reinforcement of the position, taken by some, that there actually exists a fundamental opposition and a necessary hostility between the church and psychiatry?"

Let it be said from the start that in discussing the topic, "A Look at Psychiatry," I profess that I look on psychiatry and psychiatrists with interest, respect, and admiration for their work, even though these sentiments are at times tempered with a legitimate concern.

I might add that I not only look at but I also look to psychiatry as an important collaborator with the church in its concern for men's minds and souls.

The church's interest in and respect for psychiatry dates back to the early history of medical psychology. This history has been one of ideas, originally incomplete and often naive; of dedicated men and women; of movements born of man's love and concern for his less fortunate brethren. To be sure, there has been much bias evident in the retelling of this history as ideas and events were viewed out of their context. Yet one who reads this history cannot overlook the interest of the church in psychiatry or fail to see the tradition, early established by the church, of founding hospitals and infirmaries for the care of the insane, crude though some of these may have originally been. One thinks in this connection of the infirmary at Monte Cassino which played a great role as a source of medical knowledge in the sixth century. One recalls the Hotel Dieu at Lyons, France, in the same century and at Paris in the seventh century, the monastery of the Alexian Brothers at Cologne also in the sixth century which cared for mentally sick men, and the colony at Gheel, in Belgium, which was founded as a religious work, and whose tradition of care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill is still carried on, influencing therapeutic and rehabilitation methods down to our own day. This is the place where St. Dymphna, the patron saint of the insane, was martyred.

But we need not go back to historic times to validate the interest and respect of the church for psychiatry. We find abundant testimony today in the establishment of psychiatric wards in many of our hospitals, the use of psychiatric services in our hospitals,

the use of psychiatric services in our child-caring institutions and youth-guidance centers. Psychiatrists are found on the staffs of our clinics, in our schools and institutions for exceptional children.

Our diocesan charity offices throughout the United States regularly make use of the services of psychiatrists and refer cases to them. Under church-related auspices, institutes and workshops on pastoral care and psychiatry are conducted yearly at several Catholic universities where the clergy and psychiatrists come together to learn from each other while working on a mental health problem that calls for mutual understanding and cooperation. Orientation courses in psychiatry and abnormal psychology are becoming common in our theological seminaries and are implemented by practical field work done by seminarians in mental institutions.

Full-time Catholic chaplains are regularly assigned to mental hospitals and, currently, in the archdiocese of Boston, we are building chapels for the Catholic patients in the mental hospitals owned and staffed by the State of Massachusetts.

These facts are overlooked by many who have been swayed by ill-considered statements of uninformed people, not excluding some members of both the clergy and the psychiatric profession that the church takes a negative and somewhat unfriendly view of psychiatry. It is true that there have been few formal statements of either approval or disapproval of psychiatry by the church, but there exists ample evidence in such activities as these to which I have referred that she respects the science and is anxious to cooperate with it.

Surely it should not be difficult to understand why the church, as the healer of sick souls, should have high regard for psychiatry, the healer of sick minds. Is it not in accord with true religious principles and the charity of Christ to do everything we can to heal the sick mind while we care for the troubled soul? In the fulfillment of this apostolate, religion and psychiatry must frequently complement each other.

This recognition and the complete and wholehearted respect for the field of psychiatry which it should entail is, however, tempered by a legitimate concern regarding the ideas on the nature of man, ideas, which of course, are basic to the practice of psychiatry.

Psychiatry is concerned with human nature and human behavior; the church is concerned with human nature and human behavior. When, therefore, she meets those psychiatrists who deny the existence of the spiritual, whose concepts on the nature of man, on his purpose and destiny in life, on what morality means and what in the concrete is morally good and what morally bad behavior, are diametrically opposed to her own, it is not to be expected that she will agree with their proposals and methods.

It is not the science of psychiatry but the concepts and such psychotherapeutic techniques of individual psychiatrists as rest upon a materialistic interpretation of life that have called forth a warning on psychiatric procedures and make necessary a careful examination before accepting or rejecting them.

Our late holy father, Pope Pius XII, sounded this warning with great clarity, scientific objectivity and Christian charity when he addressed the Fifth International Congress of Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology held in Rome on April 13, 1953, and again on April 10, 1958, when he spoke to the 13th Congress of the International Association of Applied Psychology.

You have read, I am sure, these two pronouncements and recognize the moral principles upon which the warning of the late holy father is based. Predicated upon principles of sound philosophy and morality, as

they are, the precautions which his holiness warned were necessary, will not only contribute significantly to the general acceptance and prestige of the field of psychiatry but will also insure the mental, moral, and religious well-being of patients.

The theme of both addresses by Pope Pius is the compelling necessity of accepting the teaching of the church on the nature of man—teaching as old as the church herself—that man is a unity of body and soul, made in the image of God and destined through his own free choice to eternal union with Him. To quote his holiness, "What constitutes man is principally his soul, the substantial form of his nature."

It is clear, then, that the spirit of materialism, atheism, and determinism which colored certain psychoanalytic theories in their origin and whose influence can still be found in the present psychotherapeutic procedures of some psychiatrists cannot fail to be a matter of concern to not only the Catholic religion but all religions. Add to this pervading spirit a pansexual emphasis and an orientation toward man which in rejecting his spiritual aspects and reducing him to the level of the brute characterizes his natural tendency toward God and religion as a compulsive neurosis and an illusion. Can we, then, wonder at suspicions that have been aroused in God-fearing men?

Nevertheless, even while warning against these false premises held by many psychiatrists, the holy father spoke in a spirit of great friendliness toward the profession of psychiatry itself, as is clear from his concluding words:

"Be assured that the church follows your research and your medical practice with warm interest and best wishes. You work on a terrain that is very difficult. Your activity, however, is capable of achieving precious results for medicine, for the knowledge of the soul in general, for the religious dispositions of man and for their development. May Providence and divine grace light your path. In pledge thereof we impart to you with fatherly good will our apostolic blessing."

With the words of the holy father in mind, let us consider to what extent psychiatry can be an aid in the pastoral work of the clergy. Let me look, too, not at psychiatry. Mutual understanding between psychiatrists and the priests, while important, is not enough. Mutual cooperation and a sharing of knowledge is needed, for in these days mental illness ranks as our major national health problem. Religion and psychiatry can and must join forces in helping mankind in what is so frequently called our current age of anxiety. In fact, it may well be that on this common ground of human anxiety that we can find a focal point for the best cooperation between the psychiatrist and the priest. For anxiety in my experience is at the heart of most mental disturbances and appears to be the basic core of neuroses. Both the clergy and psychiatrists encounter people who are burdened with anxieties in varying degrees and concerning many things. We must help these people not only in the negative sense of controlling their anxieties, but in the positive sense of preventing abnormal anxiety reactions. We must help the individual attain vigorous sound intelligent cheerful mental health. For this we need not only a psychiatric and a psychological approach to the problem; we need, above all, a religious approach.

Anxiety is likely to develop when there is a threat to some value or values which the individual considers essential to his existence as a personality. The understanding of anxiety, therefore, cannot be separated from the problem of values, for in the values which the individual lives by is the key for the treatment of his anxiety. What particular events or stresses will constitute a threat to a person depends on what particu-

lar values he considers important to his existence, status, or prestige as an individual personality. For any given individual these may hinge upon health, wealth, economic and social prestige, or whatever else he believes is worthwhile in life.

What of the values which many people today are overlooking or have allowed to grow dim, and which, nevertheless, are essential to their existence as personalities? What of the many values which must not be threatened or lost in the contemporary crises of modern life? We know that these values transcend all other values and can be realized when all other values fail. They are the eternal values which flow from the fact of Almighty God's love for us and our eternal salvation. It is toward the attainment of these values that we must direct men in order that they may be better persons not only religiously, but psychologically as well. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven."

Much of the anxiety of our time is due to the circumstance that people, by being solicitous about the wrong things, in an immaturity which is at once psychological and religious, have identified their happiness with the wrong values. "Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, where rust and moth consume and where thieves break in and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither rust nor moth consumes, nor thieves break in and steal. For where thy treasure is there also thy heart will be."

It is through a reorientation on the lasting and eternal values that mankind can obtain insight and find wisdom to meet the anxieties that must come into our everyday lives. Such an orientation enables a man to meet anxiety, not in a negative, neurotic nervous manner, but with courage and confidence. It is through courage and striving rather than through evasions and withdrawals in meeting the day-to-day anxieties as they arise that we can prevent normal anxiety from becoming pathological.

Yet problems and anxieties cannot be met in a positive and constructive way unless courage and fortitude be coupled with faith in the protecting providence of God. The person who achieves acceptance of real values and attacks his problems in the light of this acceptance has, generally speaking, banished mental anguish and is returning to health. He discovers his place in life and realizes that he has a work to do. The shilly-shally of anxiety gives way to the expansion of the creative force of a stable personality. The meaning of life itself becomes clarified, and the science of psychiatry, under God, has achieved a victory. For, whatever may have been alleged in the past to be the chief psychological factor in the development of mental problems, there is a growing consensus of opinion today that it is an anxiety concerning the meaning of life. In short, we must recognize the relationship between mental illness and one's philosophy of life, and all psychiatric treatment must take into account as a basic consideration the philosophy of life in the light of truth.

Contingent upon acceptance of the true meaning of life is the setting of goals, in order to avoid mental conflicts. I speak now not of the great goal of life, union with our Heavenly Father, for recognition of this is inseparable from knowledge of the true meaning of life. I am thinking of the minor goals of everyday living, goals which should be in accord with the great goal of life, but whose importance can be lost sight of just because so often they seem to be so insignificant. But the are never insignificant. Happiness and peace of mind and soul are found in the possession of definite purpose. Wholesome interests develop realistic goals and in reaching for them the personality matures and finds true happiness in cooperating with his neighbor in daily work, in service to

others, in charity, and love. Psychiatrists and psychologists remind us constantly of the importance of goals. The church knows that no goal is ultimately realistic unless in it there is a place for Almighty God.

Psychiatrists speak of what they call an internal goal of actualization in the personality, the ideal toward which the personality tends and they call this the ego-ideal or the self-ideal. This ideal is the goal or pattern of realization which every person sets for himself, they tell us, the concrete image of what one proposes to make of himself. It is the goal of every person's striving and, whether distorted or not, whether articulated or not, some degree of knowledge exists in every person showing him the relationship of what he truly is to what he wants to be. We are told that this ideal of self, may well be the core of integration in any personality.

Here, as perhaps at no other point, religion and psychiatry join hands. "Be ye perfect, as your Heavenly Father is perfect." While it is true that a person's ideal of self is influenced by many factors—biological, psychological, social, or cultural—yet a complete understanding of any ideal requires a recognition of its religious and spiritual components. For this tendency toward the realization of a self-ideal, which is found in some manner in all men, exists in a type of life—a psychic life—which can know and aspire to realities which transcend the limits of the material world. Man can incorporate his aspirations toward a better self into desires to be more like his Creator. In religion alone have all men received in the mystery of the incarnation a concrete model of what his ideal of personality should be: The imitation of Christ, as Christ lived our kind of life on the shores of Galilee. The most perfect man was St. Francis of Assisi.

Religion and psychiatry have, indeed, many points of contact within the totality of the human personality. They can be for each other—they must be for each other—important auxiliaries in the understanding and care of men's minds and souls. This does not mean that the priest should try to play the role of the psychiatrist; nor that the psychiatrist should attempt to take over the work of the priest. It does mean that each can find common ground for mutual understanding and cooperation in the work of alleviating human sufferings and in the salvation of souls.

There is much evidence today that religion and psychiatry are drawing together to face these problems. The establishment in 1955 of the National Academy of Religion and Mental Health with the explicit purpose of bringing together psychiatrists and clergymen to work on problems of mental hygiene is a more recent instance of the trend toward closer and better relationships. It is natural that this should occur. For mental hygiene is but a new name for some very old ways of dealing with life's problems. There is a close parallel between a philosophy of life and what we call mental hygiene; therefore, religion, which plays so important a role in the former, cannot be overlooked in the latter.

As psychiatrist, you can do much good for the souls of men if, mindful of your own moral and religious responsibilities, you are aware of the part that religion can and should play in the lives of your patients.

May God bless you in your important work.

May He help you to see the divine in all persons for whom you labor.

May He foster your scientific insights as you strive to develop your theories and perfect your techniques.

May He give wisdom and prudence to your counsels, so that as trustees of human values, you may be ever concerned with those that are divine.

May He assist you in your therapies so that they may be the means by which each

person whom you treat may come to find, through you, the ultimate source of his health, happiness, and security, Almighty God, Himself.

Wisconsin's Capital Has a Two-Party Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it was 10 years ago that the two newspapers in Madison, Wis.—the Capital Times and the Wisconsin State Journal—formed Madison Newspapers, Inc. This action enabled the newspapers to have efficient, combined business operations, while continuing to have separate editorial and news departments.

Thus Wisconsin's capital city remains one of the all-too-few cities in the United States having two newspapers and, even more rare, having a vigorous two-party press.

The following article, setting forth the story of Madison Newspapers, Inc., and its importance to the people of Wisconsin, is from the Capital Times of Monday, February 2, 1959:

TEN YEARS OLD—TWO-NEWSPAPER PLAN IS SUCCESS; IS BIG ASSET TO MADISON

Madison Newspapers, Inc., a corporate device which has given to this community two militant daily newspapers in the best tradition of a two-party press under a representative form of government, has reached the 10th anniversary of its birth.

Thus, Madison today is still the only city in Wisconsin, outside of Milwaukee, which has two daily newspapers expounding and fighting for the political, civic, and business philosophies that should prevail under a two-party government.

The newspaper situation which now prevails in Madison is succinctly described in the 1958 Year Book of Editor & Publisher, the newspaper fraternity's publication. This statement follows:

"Madison Newspapers, Inc., is publisher and owner of the Capital Times and Wisconsin State Journal. The editorial and news contents of the respective newspapers are provided under contract by the Capital Times Co. and Wisconsin State Journal Co., and are editorially independent and competitive. Madison Newspapers, Inc., operates the business, circulation, mechanical, distribution, and all other departments. Officers and personnel of Madison Newspapers, Inc., are Don Anderson, chairman of the board; William T. Evjue, president; E. G. Lockwood, treasurer and general manager; Martin Wolman, business manager and secretary; W. H. Scrivner, advertising manager; John M. Canny, circulation manager; and Howard McCaffery, assistant circulation manager."

When the Second World War ended in 1947, newspapers all over the United States found themselves in precarious positions. Printing equipment—presses, linotypes, stereotyping machinery—was badly worn. Buildings were too small and expansion was needed. Print paper skyrocketed from \$50 a ton in 1940 to \$135 in 1956. Union labor scales were soaring skyward.

What to do? This was the question facing the two Madison newspapers. Not less

than \$1,500,000 would be needed to buy new presses for both papers and to pay for expansion additions to the buildings of the two papers. This expenditure was prohibitive.

The came negotiations and the suggestion that the local publishers should bring the two papers under one roof—one paper should remain in the evening field and one should publish in the morning field. Under this plan one new press and pressroom would be required for both papers. This meant a saving of \$1 million over a two-paper operation. Other big savings were made by having the business office staffs under one roof as outlined in Editor & Publisher above.

This is a sketchy outline of what was done to insure that Madison would be a two-newspaper city—an asset that every city 25,000 or more should have to guarantee a two-party press under a two-party government. It is idle to talk about a two-party government where there is a one-party press.

In 1952 and 1956, 90 percent of the total daily newspaper circulation in the United States supported Eisenhower. It was during one of these campaigns that Adlai Stevenson, Democratic candidate for President, made his famous statement that we are living under the American system of two-party government, but we live under a one-party press.

The Capital Times has frequently pointed out that the following metropolitan cities in the United States did not have a single newspaper that supported Stevenson for President:

Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Indianapolis, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Des Moines, Kansas City, Denver, Salt Lake City, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Tucson, Tulsa, and other cities.

Here is something for the American citizen to think about. The city of Chicago now has only two ownerships of newspapers—the multimillionaire Tribune and American owned by the McCormick estate and the Chicago Sun-Times and Daily News owned by the Marshall Field interests. In New Orleans, every newspaper being published in that city is under one ownership. This has been the trend all over the United States.

Two newspapers under one roof is the type of operation adopted in scores of cities over the United States to guarantee that there will be a two-party press. Here are some of the cities in the United States now operating under the same type of ownership and operation carried on in Madison:

Springfield, Ill.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Shreveport, La.; Evansville, Ind.; Tulsa, Okla. (Richard Lloyd Jones, formerly owner of the State Journal is the owner of the Tulsa Tribune); Birmingham, Ala.; Cheyenne, Wyo.; El Paso, Tex.; Nashville, Tenn.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Amarillo, Tex.; Charleston, W. Va.; Bristol, Tenn.; Tucson, Ariz.; Davenport, Iowa; Lincoln, Nebr., and many other cities.

Here in Wisconsin, however, Madison is the only city in Wisconsin, outside Milwaukee, that has two newspapers. The hyphenated names of Wisconsin newspapers shows how the dominant newspaper in each of the following cities gobbled up the weekly newspaper and came up with the following hyphenated names:

The Appleton Post-Crescent, the Baraboo News-Republic, Green Bay Press-Gazette, Marinette Eagle-Star, Marshfield News-Herald, Racine Journal-Times, Wausau Record-Herald, LaCrosse Leader-Press, Chippewa Falls Herald-Telegram, Fond du Lac Commonwealth-Reporter.

All of these newspapers have been in the pocket of the Republican Party for years. Today we see what it means to reduce every outstanding city in Wisconsin to a one-newspaper level. Eventually these newspapers all gravitate toward alignment with the forces

of special privilege and private interest in government.

The biggest asset to point out on the 10th anniversary of Madison Newspapers, Inc., is that a corporate device was used here to bring about a situation under which Madison would have the benefit of two newspapers fighting for different issues and principles so vital in a representative form of government.

Madison is fortunate in being the one city in Wisconsin, outside Milwaukee, which has two newspapers representing both sides of all questions under our representative form of government.

In the first decade of its existence, Madison has demonstrated that it is possible for American citizens to have newspaper setups under which all matters vital to the welfare of the American people can be presented to the people. This can only be done by newspapers operating under a setup such as Madison Newspapers, Inc., here.

The Capital Times is glad to be a partner in this guarantee of a two-newspaper operation here in the city of Madison.

German Embargo of American Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, suddenly, on January 23, 1959, Germany unilaterally and in violation of her coal and steel treaty with other European nations, placed a tariff of \$4.76 a ton on foreign coal. This practically was an embargo and was aimed at the United States, which normally ships over 16 million tons of coal per year to Germany. Not only was this action in violation of Germany's Coal and Steel Community treaty, but I suggest that it was in violation of another treaty, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—of which the United States is a member, forbidding bilateral or group agreements by members of GATT without the unanimous consent of all nations concerned. So sudden was Germany's unilateral action that even our State Department, which had been negotiating with the Bonn government since last September, was taken by surprise. The other day when our Government made a last minute request for a 60-day delay in the German action, it was brushed aside and the rash decision of the German Government was rushed through the Bundestag for formal approval.

Where does this leave American mining and shipping interests? Many American miners will be forced out of work because this huge hike in German coal duties will make prohibitive the importation of American coal to Germany. The \$4.76 per ton will raise the price of American coal far above Ruhr coal. This hike, as I noted, came like a bolt from the blue. No warning, no advance notice, and no way of cushioning the blow. American coal miners in Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Tennessee, and other States will be faced with continued idleness. Already West Virginia, which supplies more than 50

percent of the Nation's annual output of coal, has the highest percent of its labor force unemployed. Starvation and want stalk its hills and that situation will be exacerbated by the rigors of the cold winter. Based on 1957 figures, Germany's action involves a loss of 500,000 days' work to coal miners.

American shippers have contracts to purchase this coal as mined, and have in turn chartered ships for transportation and are under obligation to deliver coal to German importers. Germany's action will make these contracts virtually impossible of performance. These people are well on their way to suffering immeasurable damages. Charter fees run into the millions. Damages in other respects are inordinate. More than 30 million tons of U.S. coal still are on order. With a \$4.76-a-ton tariff staring them in the face—a tariff which, by action of the Bonn government was made retroactive to January 1 of this year—many American exporters face bankruptcy. Thus coal in transit is affected.

The Bonn government seeks to justify this drastic action on the grounds that it is an economic move designed to rescue the Ruhr coal industry from its year-old doldrums. This is somewhat hard to believe when it is remembered that Germany was in real need of American coal in 1957 in order to maintain at that time its strong domestic economy. The facts indicate that her move is not based on economic need; rather it is political. Having fully recovered from World War II, Germany is once again becoming industrially aggressive and is seeking to change the whole distribution of coal in Europe. And being the dominant power of the nations which comprise the European Coal and Steel Community, she can force her arbitrary action upon her weaker neighbors. I seriously question the right of Germany to impose these drastic tariff duties. It is morally indefensible.

Be that as it may, in the absence of diplomatic negotiations, which appear at this time to be inadequate, what remedies do American producers and shippers have? Germany's action, though arbitrary, is not a case in law which could be classified as a "force majeure" or confiscation, so that businessmen who suffer, may recoup damages from the government. It may be that they could sue the individual German importers of coal; but this would take much time and involve insurmountable difficulties.

Meanwhile, what?

It seems anomalous at a time when the United States is responding to the requests to rescue West Germany, particularly as to the status of Berlin, that the Bonn government would so heedlessly injure American shippers and producers. It certainly does not make for pleasant or cordial relations between the United States and the West German Government. On the contrary, it shows a country willing to accept advantages and display no gratitude. Nay, more, it is symbolic of utter apathy on the part of West German rulers as to the interest of American citizens who are or will have to continue to ship coal to Germany.

I have been a friend to Germany, but this latest maneuver has tainted that friendship.

It is incumbent on West Germany forthwith to come forward with some remedy, otherwise there will be agitation in and out of Congress to retaliate. Raising duties without rhyme or reason will bring in its trail ever increasing American duties against German manufactured goods. The thrust will be given where it hurts Germany the most.

Tour Reveals Coal Camp Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague [Mr. SLACK], the gentleman who represents the Sixth West Virginia District, has dramatically emphasized the distressed economic plight of West Virginia through the medium of a tour of coal mining areas in his district.

He was accompanied on his trip by a reporter for the Charleston Gazette and a series of articles has ensued. With accompanying pictures, the newspaper accounts underline the depression in our coal counties.

He has found in his district, as I have found in my own First District coal mining communities, a dreary story of lengthy unemployment, of mines that have been worked out, and of unemployment benefit credits long since exhausted.

The story, too, includes the thread of tables bare except for Government handouts of surplus commodities. There are hungry children and men and women in my State of West Virginia. Something must be worked out immediately in the way of a works program or something of similar nature to alleviate the want and depressed economic condition which presently exists.

Statistics show that West Virginia has been one of the States hardest hit by the business recession and while other areas of the Nation are now showing recovery, very, very little of the same has been noted in West Virginia.

With consent of the House, I would like to insert an article from the Gazette, a newspaper for which I have great respect, which was printed in its edition of February 2, with further assurances that I will submit for all to see future articles written on this most pressing problem in West Virginia:

TOUR REVEALS COAL CAMP POVERTY

(By John G. Morgan)

HIGHCOAL.—"All of them have been cut off, their unemployment checks are running out, and they're up against it."

That's what Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr. heard on his way up the creek to this ghostly mining camp in Boone County.

The report was quickly confirmed. Here in little old mining shacks, the heads of large families told the new Congressman from the Sixth District:

"I don't know how I'm going to make it. I've been everywhere and I haven't been able to find nothing."

"This is the first time I've ever been in a place like this. I've looked this country over for a job, everywhere."

"We get molligrub (surplus food), but we run out of some things before the end of the month."

"We usually have gravy and oats for breakfast."

"An egg? When was the last time I eat an egg? I just don't know."

"We look across at the hills for entertainment."

As if all of that wasn't trouble enough, SLACK also heard:

"No colored fellows are working in the mines. We don't get the same treatment as the white man, not since 1952."

"They won't hire no colored fellows."

Highcoal, about 45 miles from Charleston, was the first stop on SLACK's 1-day tour of the coal fields in Boone and Kanawha Counties. He decided to make the trip because he is:

1. Irked by the Eisenhower tendency to spread the impression that the Nation has fully recovered from the recession.

2. Further irked by the fact that the budget bill presented to Congress makes no provision for relief of economically distressed areas.

3. Fearful that Congress may take no action on the dozen distressed-area bills now before it.

By his visit to the coal fields, SLACK hopes to accomplish at least three things:

1. Find dramatic proof of economic conditions in the distressed areas.

2. Present that proof to Congress for action.

3. Join with other Congressmen representing similar areas in an effort to expedite the action.

"It is my intention to make improvement of the economic situation in my district the first order of business," SLACK declared.

"A first-hand look is necessary to get the facts."

The dramatic approach is SLACK's last resort. He adopted it after discovering that few people in Washington are mindful of West Virginia's unemployment statistics.

Among such statistics is the glaring fact that nearly 80,000 coal miners lost their jobs in West Virginia during the last 11 years, including 20,000 within the past year. That leaves approximately 46,000 still working in the mines.

In district 17 of the United Mine Workers it is estimated that about 60 or 70 of 200 mining communities are deserted or partially deserted as a result of mine shutdowns and layoffs. The district includes parts of four counties represented by SLACK—Kanawha, Boone, Logan and Raleigh. It covers other areas in southern West Virginia and two counties in Kentucky.

While the economic recession obviously has had its effect on coal mining, leaders of the industry point out that mechanization has had more to do with the decline in employment.

Production declined sharply last year, but the estimated total of 113 million tons was about the same as in 1954 when 18,000 more men were employed in the industry.

SLACK wants to tell the Nation that West Virginia's unemployment problem is peculiar and pressing.

It's peculiar because unemployment in West Virginia's leading industry is persisting in the face of general economic recovery. It's pressing because the miners and their families are beginning to get hungry and desperate.

On the trip to the coal fields, SLACK took with him R. R. (Big Chew) Humphreys, secretary-treasurer of district 17; a photographer and a reporter.

The Congressman drove the car through the town of Marmet and then followed U.S. 119 across Lens Creek Mountain.

As the hills rolled by in their cloak of wintry brown, the gloomy aspects of the mission were brightened somewhat by Big Chew's vivid stories of earlier, more dangerous days in the mines. A fondness for tobacco while working underground earned him his nickname, he said.

At Racine, SLACK took West Virginia 3 through the towns of Comfort and Seth. At Sylvester he picked up Johnny Protan, who is the constable for Sherman District in Boone County, an amateur fight promoter and coal miner.

Protan has an unusual understanding of the problems of miners in the local area. Some of the younger ones fight for him.

As SLACK drove up Seng Creek toward this mining camp, it was Protan who said:

"All of them have been cut off, their unemployment checks are running out, and they're up against it."

Dr. Shaeffer Continues Efforts for Improved Wildlife Habitat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most effective and persistent champions of proper wildlife preservation and management is Dr. J. H. Shaeffer of Parker, S. Dak. He has attracted nationwide acclaim for his efforts to preserve wetland areas necessary for the production of waterfowl in the prairie pothole areas of the Dakotas and Minnesota. Dr. Shaeffer recently appeared before a combined meeting of the Senate and House Committees on Game, Fish, and Parks of the South Dakota Legislature with additional recommendations. I include at this point in the RECORD a summary of the doctor's remarks as reported in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, February 1, 1959:

STATE NEEDS MORE WETLANDS—DR. SHAEFFER OUTLINES PROGRAM FOR PRODUCTION OF DUCKS

PARKER, S. Dak.—Ducks are not getting a decent break in South Dakota.

That's the opinion of Dr. J. H. Shaeffer, Parker, regional director of the National Wildlife Federation and chairman of the North and South Dakota Emergency Conservation Committee.

He is asking the South Dakota Legislature to assist in a program that will restore the State's waterfowl production to its former levels and to restore the State's waterfowl hunting.

Here is his review of conditions which led to 1958 being the worst duck-hunting season in the memory of man and his solution to the problem:

The 1939 legislature passed legislation providing for the acquisition of duck habitat and public-shooting grounds.

Then in 1941, the legislature set aside \$5 of each nonresident pheasant hunting license fee to finance land acquisition.

"That measure," he explained, "has produced \$2,184,455 for the acquisition of duck habitat and public-shooting lands."

To date, approximately 150,000 acres of land are owned or controlled by the department.

Fifty-two thousand of these acres form Custer State Park.

Nine other State parks, 58 State recreation areas and 43 roadside parks account for another 17,000 acres.

Another 25,000 acres comprise the multiple-use lands along Federal reservoirs.

"But only 13,991 acres are classified by the department as potholes and marshes," a point which Shaeffer emphasizes as showing that ducks are not getting a decent break in South Dakota.

While the game, fish, and parks department has acquired approximately 137,000 acres of other lands, subsidized drainage has destroyed 121,285 actual surface waters acres of duck habitat since 1954.

This destruction represents the loss of the Nation's finest duck-producing areas and the loss of the best duck-shooting areas in South Dakota.

How has this influenced South Dakota duck production and duck hunting?

South Dakota formerly produced 1,500,000 ducks a year. The production in 1958 is estimated at less than 300,000.

In 1952, when we lost 14,591 actual acres of potholes and marshes by subsidized drainage, we still had a breeding population of 1,002,000 ducks.

With subsidized drainage continuing, by 1954 the estimated breeding population had declined to 826,000.

"And by 1955, the estimated breeding population was down to 360,000."

"This represents an 80 percent decline in South Dakota duck production since 1944," Shaeffer explained.

Then he compared the loss of duck habitat to hunting conditions.

"The State has shown a population increase during a 10-year period."

"At the same time, improved highways and faster transportation has made available duck areas more accessible to all hunters."

"But during the 10-year period, 1946-56, South Dakota has 40 percent fewer duck hunters going afield according to the sale of Federal duck stamps."

The drought, he said, has further aggravated the waterfowl situation when it is realized that in 1958 the Sioux Falls area received 9.39 inches below normal rainfall; Watertown area 8.84 below normal, and Aberdeen 6.69 inches below normal.

Many areas not drained are now dry because of drought.

"The South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Department has been very negligent in acquiring potholes and marshes."

"Minnesota in 1958 alone acquired 17,417 acres of wildlife lands of which 90 percent is potholes and marshes."

"Since 1951, Minnesota has acquired 57,455 acres of duck habitat in 62 counties."

"Minnesota in 1 year acquired more potholes and marshes than the South Dakota department has acquired in its entire history."

The solution is a definite program for acquisition of wetlands and marshes in South Dakota.

"This can be accomplished by increasing the nonresident pheasant license fee from \$20 to \$25 and earmarking the \$5 raise for wetland acquisition and development."

"Approximately 40,000 nonresident pheasant hunters would provide \$200,000 annually and this sum would total \$1 million within 5 years."

"These funds should definitely be earmarked for acquisition and development of potholes and marshes."

"And it would be wise to further earmark these funds providing 90 percent for acquisition and 10 percent for development."

"It is very possible that South Dakota could again produce a million ducks annually at the end of a 10-year period if members of the present legislature would recognize these facts of the current waterfowl situation.

"They in this session can provide funds for acquisition and development of wetlands by raising the nonresident pheasant license \$5 and provide a definite program of restoring the dwindling supply of ducks and at the same time restore the State's waterfowl hunting," Shaeffer concluded.

Hon. Charles H. Silver Dedicates Alfred E. Smith Elementary School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, the address by the Honorable Charles H. Silver, president of New York City's Board of Education and a prominent New Yorker, which Mr. Silver made on the occasion of the dedication of Alfred E. Smith Elementary School, deserves our attention. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT DEDICATION OF ALFRED E. SMITH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, DECEMBER 2, 1958

It is a high point in one's life to do what I am doing now: To dedicate a school building to the memory of an old and dear friend. Alfred E. Smith was my friend. Vivid in my mind are the many occasions when we walked together on Fifth Avenue chatting like old comrades and discussing the state of the world. In my mind's ear, I can still hear his warm, vital voice full of common-sense and homely wit. He had an uncommon talent for getting at the nub of any matter he discussed quickly and without fuss.

Al Smith's life is in a classic American mold. His is the celebrated story of the self-made man, up from the streets of New York to the seat of power and prestige. It is the heartening saga of the open society, in which people of humble background can aspire to, and often attain, lofty positions. The Al Smith story is the Lincoln legend of our times. Instead of the log cabin, there is the humble tenement; for the crossroad general store, there is the street corner; for the remote schoolhouse, there is the neighborhood school. The Al Smith story is in essence the American dream—a society in which the poor can become rich, the downtrodden can attain the highest level of dignity, a society in which no one is in any final way handicapped by class, color, or place of origin.

But if Al Smith is a reminder of what is profoundly good and true in our democracy, he also stirs some troubled chords in the American consciousness. He symbolizes the unfinished business of American democracy. Though Al Smith's life is a thrilling success story, it reached its noblest height in a moment of apparent failure. But the failure was not that of the Happy Warrior. It was instead the moral infirmity of American society. We all know the grim story of 1928—the far-sighted statesman, the tal-

ented administrator defeated as presidential candidate because he was a member of a minority religious faith. We all know the bitterness that this naturally caused and his rise above this to an even greater stature in his last years.

Al Smith poses a challenge to us today: How far have we progressed from the bigotry which stained the America of Al Smith? Are we ready now to fulfill the promise of America in all particulars, for all its citizens? These are questions which must occupy us from now on.

But let us turn to happier thoughts. Al Smith himself would approve of that for he was a man of robust humor and zest for life. As I look upon this handsome building, I know that the gallant spirit of Al Smith is pleased by it. Though a self-educated man, he was a steadfast friend of free public education. He knew its value, he knew its enduring contribution to American democracy. He recognized, in all modesty, that few could educate themselves as he did. He above all people knew the complexity of the job which confronted the ordinary citizen who had to thread his way through a maze of issues and make bewildering choices of political parties and candidates.

Al Smith, I dare say, would take a view of the current controversy about school buildings which would be both amused and indignant. A man who learned the value of the dollar the hard way, he was also unafraid to spend money in the public interest. He knew well that there are no shortcuts to good education. As Governor of the State of New York, he pioneered in public housing, in creating belts of greenery in the large cities, in public works of all kinds. He was also a man of sensitive artistic appreciations. He understood that education should take place in the most attractive setting possible and that a mural on the wall is as much an educational device as a textbook, a gym where the body is trained as important as a classroom. Inexpensive education comes dear, for it can exist only at the expense of our children. Al Smith would say: "Let us save if we must, but not on our most precious resource, our children."

The open society which Al Smith exemplified is never an accomplished fact; it is, instead, a continuous process, a recurring challenge.

People believe in Al Smith because he believed in them and he never feared their actions as long as they knew the facts. We in the board of education follow this principle. We have built, here, a school for your children, and our faith in you and the splendid faculty and administrators gives us our belief in this school's future—it is your children's future. We have provided a setting for the parent-teacher-community team that spells success for the adult of tomorrow. We in the board of education welcome your participation with us on that team. This is so appropriate here because that is the way Al Smith would have seen it. The question we must ask ourselves searchingly today and always is: Do the Al Smiths of our time, regardless of color or creed, have the opportunity to rise in the social and economic escalator of our society? What part does education play in making that rise possible?

Since education is the only way to open up opportunity for our children, there can be no school too good for our children. Our goal is clear: The best education for all the children of our city. In doing this we are being loyal to the memory of that great American, Al Smith, and to the highest ideals of democracy.

Tribute to American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the poem entitled "Tribute to American Indian," which was written by the late Riley Thompson, of Cloquet, Minn., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN INDIAN

(Dedicated to Minnesota's State Centennial, 1858-1958)

Once a proud and noble Indian race,
Endowed with nature's freedom reigned:

Tradition of our past century since has flown
Thus to our forefathers; they well known,
Told how they greeted him who found us:

The great discoverer of America, Columbus.
Reigning this glorious land of painted scene,
A proud and noble race roamed serene.

Resisted tide of emigration, in conquest
sought,

Avenging cruel and bitter wrongs they fought.
From his savage bosom, the medicine-man's
song:

He sang nature's own lyrics, the day long.

Weird chants through his reed of cane he
reign,

Blowing into potherb, cedar twigs, and herbs
in vain.

Driving evils from medicine, pestilence, fever,
cast

Sickness from his people, to future vast.

In his savage heart, he worshiped in token,
Not idols, his handicraft made of stones
broken.

Nor images made of glittering gold,

Like ancient Romans and Egyptians behold.
The "Great Spirit" was his guide and master
From skies above, the land of here-after.

A race passing slowly to happy hunting
grounds,

Going there forgotten in hallowed mounds.
Like unto green leaves, of summer to decay,
For swift autumn wind to blow away.

From branches leaving but bare twigs to
endure,

Gathered into melancholy clusters in
obscure.

Dying un-renting, obedient to wind begin,
Toward their winter's snowy grave within.

Beside gleaming campfires, aged Chieftains
told.

The listening youthful, our Indian history
unfold.

They told of treaties vowed, and broken to
defy.

Our noble race, with sacred promise and
pacific.

How bitter hatred sprang and flourished; war
began

In strife and blood-shed resisted time and
again.

To beating of tom-toms and rattling of shell,
The noisy chorus began with whoops and
yell.

By warriors, at twilight circling camp-fire
flame

With tomahawks, gesture in anger war-dance
fame.

Shouting loudly echoed, war-cry in bitter
wrath,

Faced terrifying shot and powder on the war-
path.

Dying with camp-fires, never begging mercy
or plea,
Ever fighting, never fear death's warning on
knee.
To weapons of White Father's armor the foe,
Chieftains told of bitter fate, poor conquered
Lo.
The strife ended with battle fray at peace,
Hear no-longer Indian war-whoops now
cease.
Hearts filled with bitter hatred exist not any-
more;
Wounds that bled many ages are healed as
before.
Thus the noble Red-man, now immersed in
woes,
Vanquished in bitterness: "Today the world
knows"
Now the Indian-sun, sinking with drooped
head in sorrow,
Without silvered rays are not bright with to-
morrow.
Sinking slowly with grief-stained face to
grave
Soon be forgotten; his history never for-
gave.
To his memory, erect a monument inscribed
his acclaim.
Write a sonnet, with pathetic rhyme of ex-
claim.
With soft music as tuneful lay of brooklets
onward,
Rippling in moon-light rays, and sun ever
seaward.
Erect an image of a warrior, to his likeness
an antique,
War-bonnet on head, decked with eagle
feathers meek.
With war-paint his face, tints of many colors
by plan,
From nature's rude designs, his ancestral
clan.
Lean beside him his bow un-strung, in token
the past,
His savage ways and customs; our Chieftains
cast
The mighty tomahawk, place in hand useless
aside.
Strap across his shoulders, quiver filled ar-
rows his pride,
In token of reluctance his history, write big
letters bold,
Let not time blot, tribute to American In-
dian, behold.

—By RILEY THOMPSON.

Urban Renewal Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a letter I received from Honorable John B. Hynes, mayor of the city of Boston, Mass., relating to urban renewal legislation, together with copy of my reply to him:

CITY OF BOSTON,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
January 30, 1959.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Urban renewal legislation is pending before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Both of the mayors organizations, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the American Municipal Association, are heartily in favor of a bill which would provide for a 10-year urban renewal program with the Federal

Government appropriating \$600 million each year and the local communities providing the usual one-third or even a 20 percent share.

As you know, the administration bill is for \$250 million a year for 3 years and \$200 million for the following 3 years. This simply will not do the job that must be done. In addition, the requirement in the administration bill that cities share on a matching 50-50 basis will be the death knell to the urban renewal program, for cities simply cannot contribute that much to this most necessary program.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors, and through its president, Hon. Norris Poulson, mayor of Los Angeles, has placed its case before the committee on January 26. I am in accord with everything that Mayor Poulson said at that time because it reflects the unanimous opinion of the mayors throughout the country.

I will appreciate if you will keep your eye on this legislation and help wherever you can. I know that you are interested in the continuation of urban renewal on a sensible scale and in a sensible manner and I know also that you hardly need to be asked to help.

With best wishes, I am

Respectfully

JOHN HYNES, Mayor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1959.

HON. JOHN B. HYNES,
City Hall, Boston, Mass.

DEAR JOHN: I am in receipt of your letter of January 30 and in reply will say that the President's recommendation in relation to urban renewal legislation is completely inadequate.

I am having your letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Excise Tax Cut Could Save Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is cheering when the newsmen of the country understand clearly that specific legislation is important to the whole country, and transmit that information to the readers in their editorials.

I submit herewith for inclusion in the Record an article which appeared in the January 28 edition of the Flint (Mich.) Journal. This piece gives an excellent summary of why the bill to repeal the 10 percent excise tax on automobiles is important to the economy of the whole Nation.

I welcome this opportunity to again put before my colleagues the vital importance of removing the excise tax as a measure helpful in spurring sales and restoring jobs to many Americans.

The article follows:

Excise Tax Cut Could Save Jobs

The announcement that 2,250 Buick and Fisher 1 workers are being laid off is the kind of news that none of us like to hear.

Expressions of sympathy don't pay the gro-

cery bills of those workers and their families. What we need is the kind of economic climate which will spur the sales of automobiles and restore those unfortunates to the factory payrolls.

One measure which could stimulate sales is now before Congress. Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, Sixth District Republican, has introduced a bill to repeal the 10 percent excise tax on cars.

A similar attempt to cancel the automotive excise tax was defeated last year because of the opposition of the Eisenhower administration, which argued that the Federal Government could not afford the loss of revenue.

The Treasury Department probably will oppose Representative CHAMBERLAIN's new bill because the need for revenue is great, particularly in view of the probability that Congress will vote more spending than the administration considers sound.

However, there is a definite possibility repeal of the excise tax would result in more tax revenue, not less.

Individuals who are laid off from their jobs are not earning and therefore are not paying income taxes. They become an expense to local, State and Federal governments through unemployment compensation or direct relief.

In addition, lower sales reduce the profits of automotive manufacturers. The corporations profits tax, as a result, will not bring in as much revenue as it would if car manufacturers could maintain high production.

It is impossible to prove that abandonment of the excise tax on cars would mean an increase in tax revenue. It is impossible to prove that it wouldn't. At least it is worthy of consideration.

If manufacturers did not have to pay a Federal excise tax, which averages about \$180 per vehicle, the price of cars could be reduced. Lower price tags probably would mean more buyers for new automobiles, and possible return to work of those who are being laid off.

Elimination, or substantial reduction, of the excise tax could be most helpful in spurring sales and, of most importance, restoring those laid off to their jobs.

The administration and Congress should give it a try.

Alaska: Wildlife Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the vast new State of Alaska has tremendous wildlife and waterfowl resources which must not be allowed to disappear. Both the Federal Government and the State of Alaska have a heavy responsibility to preserve and protect these resources.

R. G. Lynch, conservation writer for the Milwaukee Journal, made an extended visit to Alaska last year. In the following article from the Journal, Mr. Lynch discusses Alaska's resources and the nature of the conservation task ahead:

ALASKA: WILDLIFE RESERVOIR—UNITED STATES HAS CHANCE TO AVOID MISTAKES OF PAST IN TEEMING AREAS OF ITS VAST NEW STATE
(By R. G. Lynch)

Many a man, and perhaps a few nations, would like to turn back the clock and do something over again, without mistakes now

realized. In a sense, the United States has this chance in Alaska.

A century ago, Congress turned over 65 million acres of wetlands to the States. Now the Nation is trying to buy back some marshes for ducks and geese.

Settlers in the Great Plains plowed up 14 million acres of prairie sod that the Nation is trying to get back into grass to keep the soil from blowing away.

Farming and overgrazing have left but few remnants of virgin prairie, and in the east and the Lake States only islands of primeval forest have survived logging operations.

PRESERVE KEY AREAS

Scientists, conservationists, and sportsmen are determined that these things shall not happen in Alaska. They are supporting efforts of the Fish and Wildlife Service to preserve key areas for public ownership and management.

These proposed wildlife areas are expected to become an issue in the present Congress, when Alaska tries to gain control of its fish and wildlife, which was withheld in the Statehood Act because commercial fisheries interests dominated the Territorial administration.

Alaska is big game country probably surpassed only by Africa. The Alaska brown bear, largest land carnivore, is found nowhere else. The new State has several varieties of grizzly bear, an animal dangerously near extinction elsewhere. It has mountain sheep and goats, moose, caribou, deer, and polar bear, as well as small herds of musk oxen and bison, established by game managers.

BIG ARCTIC RANGE

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, late in 1957, temporarily withdrew 14,000 square miles from the public domain for an arctic game range, abutting Canada. It has grizzly and polar bears, Dall sheep, caribou, and many small animals, including the wolverine, another creature near extinction. It is an important nesting ground for waterfowl.

Severe winters and summer insects make this arctic shelf unattractive to man, but the area adjoins oil and gas fields, so Seaton wants it kept open for leases for petroleum and mining operations.

Development would proceed as in the Kenai moose range, where oil companies drill under regulations which protect wildlife. The land would remain public.

BIG WATERFOWL SITE

The delta of the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers is one of the world's greatest waterfowl breeding places—20,000 square miles of marshy tundra with thousands of small ponds. The Pacific flyway gets 20 percent of its flocks from here.

Since 1947, the Fish and Wildlife Service has been trying to get this waterfowl factory protected and meanwhile has cut its request to 2,900 square miles. A few Eskimos use the area. Other settlement is unlikely. Because of petroleum possibilities, a game management area is proposed, rather than a refuge, so that leasing may be permitted.

Southward, across Bristol Bay, there is a waterfowl crossroads at the tip of the Alaskan Peninsula. Millions of geese, brant, and ducks concentrate here to fatten up before continuing flights. The Wildlife Service wants 500 square miles of land and 183 of water around Izembek Bay, where berries on the upland and eel grass in the tidal flats provide food for the tremendous flocks.

PROTECT WALRUS, BEAR

Alaska has other urgent problems for the attention of Congress. A marine mammals act will be introduced to provide some protection for walrus and polar bear.

With the demand for carved ivory, hunters kill walrus for their tusks and

leave the carcasses to rot. The animal is a source of meat and skins for boatmaking. Its depletion would work a hardship on the natives.

Glenn Orton, a Federal game agent, with whom the writer made some flights out of Fairbanks last summer, had just made a walrus survey. Along the coast from Unalakleet on the Bering Sea to Point Barrow on the Arctic Ocean, 69 carcasses were counted. Heads or tusks had been removed from all but six, which probably got away from hunters before dying.

The polar bear was safe from too much hunting until the airplane enabled man to seek it on the ice pack at sea.

Now it is feared that the kill of both walrus and polar bear exceeds their reproduction. Since both range beyond the 3-mile limit, a treaty may be necessary to provide international protection.

National Defense Student Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment upon a program which has significance for the young people of this Nation and for the strength of the Nation itself. I refer to the national defense student loan program authorized by Public Law 864, enacted by the 85th Congress in its closing days and signed into law by the President on September 2.

The national defense student loan program provides for the establishment, at institutions of higher education throughout the Nation, of loan funds from which needy students may borrow funds for the completion of their education at low interest rates and on generous repayment terms. Its objective is to encourage needy students to continue their educational pursuits, an objective contemplated in several features of this act. The Congress is authorized to appropriate \$295 million for this purpose during the next 4 years. The assistance and encouragement that this program can and will offer to needy young people throughout the country is immense. It should do much to reduce the waste of talent which has resulted from the failure of able but needy students to continue with their educational plans.

President Eisenhower signed the National Defense Education Act into law on September 2, 1958. I have followed the progress that has been made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in implementing this program. I believe that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Arthur S. Fleming, and the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, are to be complimented upon the prompt and sound manner in which they have undertaken the implementation of all programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act. This is a new era of departmental responsibility and they have

measured up to the challenge. They are to be complimented upon the appointment of Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., to head the administration of those programs affecting American higher education. It has been my pleasure to work with Dr. Babbidge in various capacities over the years, and I am confident that he will lend able and imaginative leadership to the administration of these programs.

It is a particular source of pride to me that officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have selected to administer the national defense student loan program a resident of the State of New York, and a prominent official of the State university of New York, Mr. Peter P. Muirhead. Mr. Muirhead has for many years served as director of the New York State regents scholarship and examination program. He served as executive secretary of the New York Higher Education Assistant Corporation, which was responsible for the establishment of New York State's successful student loan program. Mr. Muirhead is a man of experience and wisdom, and in entrusting to him the responsibility for the administration of this program, the Department has ensured that the program will be administered soundly and well. Mr. Muirhead's appointment to this post was made possible only through the cooperation of Dr. James S. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education for the State of New York. Dr. Allen's willingness to lend to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a key member of his own staff is a splendid example of effective Federal-State Cooperation. It is an example of the constructive concept of partnership which has been stressed so much by the President and other administration leaders, as the key to effective progress in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, the national defense student loan program authorized by the 85th Congress is a well conceived program. It is secure in the hands of able educators and administrators. I am confident that it will do much for the young people of our Nation, and therefore for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I have one concern regarding the effective implementation of this program; and this has to do with the amounts of money available for this purpose. As I indicated earlier, the act authorizes the appropriation of sums up to \$295 million during the next 4 years. For this, the first year of the loan program, a total of \$47½ million is authorized. The respective Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, under pressure to act on an appropriations request during the closing hours of the 85th Congress, effected an interim, or stop-gap, appropriation for this purpose of only \$6 million. This was done with the clear understanding that the Appropriations Committees would reconsider at the earliest opportunity a supplemental request for this and other purposes. I trust and hope that this body will see to it that the additional funds in substantial quantity are made available at the earliest possible opportunity.

Let me suggest the importance of prompt action on a supplemental request for the purposes of the National Defense Education Act. Taking the student loan program by itself, let me indicate how inadequate a figure of \$6 million is.

The most recent figures show that 92 institutions in the State of New York have applied for funds under the loan program, and these institutions represent more than 167,000 full-time students. The total amount requested by New York State schools is approximately \$7 million. In my home city of New York alone, 28 institutions, representing more than 71,000 full-time students, have applied for Federal funds under this program. Under the State allotment formula embodied in this act, the State of New York would be entitled to only \$623,442. If the initial stopgap appropriation of \$6 million were not increased this sum would not begin to meet the needs of New York City institutions alone. This sum would not meet one-tenth of the current student loan needs of institutions of higher education in the State of New York. Failure to provide additional funds under this program, therefore, would work a hardship upon the young people of the State of New York and upon the institutions which they are attending. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the leadership of this body give prompt and positive attention to this critical need.

I am confident that President Eisenhower will forward to the Congress a request for supplementary funds with which to implement the national defense student loan program. I know that Secretary Flemming and Commissioner Derthick are well aware of the urgent need for additional funds for this purpose. Certainly the colleges and universities of the Nation know how pitifully inadequate \$6 million is for this purpose. The young people of the Nation and their parents have made perfectly clear how urgently they need this assistance. It now rests squarely upon this Congress to respond promptly and positively to a need identified and endorsed by the entire Nation.

School Money Without Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years Federal grants-in-aid have developed rapidly until now, in a substantial degree, they help to support many major State government services. In Federal aid programs, the Congress has intended as much as possible to remove from such grants Federal direction, control, and interference, but it is obvious that through establishment of Federal standards it is not possible to eliminate Federal Bureaucratic dictation and intervention.

What has happened is that to meet enormous and ever-increasing expenditures the Federal Government has tapped the most lucrative sources of tax revenue, leaving State and municipal governments little other than real property taxes and sales excises from which to meet their needs unless these State and municipal governments duplicate Federal taxation including individual and corporation income taxes, admission taxes, beverage taxes, as well as tobacco, gift, luxury, transportation, and communication taxes, to name a few.

The Federal Government developed the grants-in-aid type of appropriations to provide incentives to State and local governments to meet local needs. In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that the purposes of these aid programs are certainly for the most part meritorious. Of course, it is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums from the taxpayers of each State and then have a portion of such funds trickle piecemeal back to the States. However, the real argument against Federal grants is of course the Federal strings and the compulsory requirements imposed by law and regulation of Federal administering bureaus.

In my State of Washington, like in many other States, the State legislature is presently struggling with the problem of obtaining funds to meet adequately the responsibilities of State government under our constitution, including the needs of education. The government has requested \$135 million in new taxes for public services as well as for a deficiency appropriation of \$25.5 million to cover overspending in public welfare and to help lower the current State deficit estimated at about \$80 million.

The Governor in his budget chopped off about \$12 million from the current State school fund estimate recommended to the legislature by our State superintendent of public instruction. The State school directors association had recommended \$40 million above the Governor's figure.

For educational construction funds our State is planning to issue \$30 million in bonds, but all the while we are told the State is running out of borrowing power.

The harrowed Governor in a dilemma has expressed an opinion that Federal aid to education is the answer.

I have opposed Federal aid to education, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless I deemed it my responsibility to confer with our Washington State superintendent of public instruction, Lloyd Andrews, who is widely recognized as courageous politically and at the same time dedicated to the cause of public education and conversant with its financial needs.

Thus, I sent Mr. Andrews a copy of the Murray-Metcalf bill because it seemed to represent the type of legislation which will get the nod from the congressional committees having jurisdiction over education.

As I expected, Mr. Andrews wrote me opposing the bill and, may I add, I

strongly share his criticism in that as presently written this bill sets forth limitations and definitions of the States' education programs, and places authority for administration in the Office of the U.S. Commissioner of Education. For example, section 4, subsection (b), spells out specifically that this money shall be used for school construction and teachers' salaries.

I agree with Washington State's superintendent of public instruction in his position as stated to me that the general operation and maintenance of our public schools must be treated as a whole, and not in this manner, or to quote Mr. Andrews' own words, "We would have to abdicate our local and State jurisdiction over educational process."

In the Murray-Metcalf bill, furthermore, as Mr. Andrews pointed out, section 5 by inference sets forth priorities for school buildings, removing from the State the latitude of determining its own needs. Also in section 6, the U.S. Commissioner determines the purposes for teachers' salaries.

Mr. Speaker, I share my State superintendent's concern of such encroachment on State and local responsibility by control of the Central Government. But I likewise have a deep interest in education and recognize adequate money must be provided to our local school authorities to enable them to provide classrooms and decently paid teachers for our expanding school population.

Therefore, I am introducing a no-strings-attached alternative bill to pay back some of their own money to the respective States and Hawaii for educational purposes free from any Federal controls. My bill would authorize an appropriation equal to 2 percent of all Federal income taxes collected in each State and Hawaii for education in the common or public schools. That is all. No standards or specifications of any sort are stipulated. The purposes for which these funds would be spent would be entirely up to each State and its legislature providing it was for education.

In other words, if some of our local school districts' financial affairs are critical, and I am convinced such is the case, let us give the local and State authorities help but refrain from dictating how they must solve their problems.

Under my bill, the handling of funds will not be in any way, shape, or form through the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The only Federal responsibility will be the calculation of amounts to be returned to each State and then the transfer of funds by check from the Secretary of the Treasury. The amount would be automatically geared to the national income for each year. There would be no bureaucratic power or expense involved.

The accompanying table of the approximate Federal income tax collections by State or Territory for fiscal 1957 shows the estimated amount of income taxes. Also shown is 2 percent of each amount, which gives an idea of how much each State could expect to receive.

Estimated Federal income tax collections, by State or Territory, fiscal year 1957

(In millions)

State or Territory	Estimated Federal income tax collections	Estimated yearly payment to each State or Territory
Alabama.....	\$394	\$7.9
Arizona.....	170	3.4
Arkansas.....	143	2.9
California.....	5,134	102.7
Colorado.....	697	13.9
Connecticut.....	1,079	21.6
Delaware.....	702	14
Florida.....	820	16.4
Georgia.....	602	12
Idaho.....	105	2.1
Illinois.....	5,081	101.6
Indiana.....	1,275	25.5
Iowa.....	405	9.3
Kansas.....	404	8
Kentucky.....	450	9.1
Louisiana.....	510	10.2
Maine.....	156	3.1
Maryland (plus District of Columbia).....	1,308	27.3
Massachusetts.....	1,710	34.2
Michigan.....	4,104	82
Minnesota.....	939	18.8
Mississippi.....	129	2.6
Missouri.....	1,385	27.7
Montana.....	109	2.1
Nebraska.....	298	6.0
Nevada.....	77	1.5
New Hampshire.....	119	2.4
New Jersey.....	1,708	36
New Mexico.....	113	2.3
New York.....	11,985	239.7
North Carolina.....	671	13.4
North Dakota.....	62	1.2
Ohio.....	4,547	90.9
Oklahoma.....	511	10.3
Oregon.....	419	8.4
Pennsylvania.....	4,271	85.4
Rhode Island.....	250	5.2
South Carolina.....	219	4.4
South Dakota.....	59	1.2
Tennessee.....	476	9.5
Texas.....	2,016	40.3
Utah.....	150	3
Vermont.....	60	1.2
Virginia.....	695	13.9
Washington.....	728	14.6
West Virginia.....	274	5.5
Wisconsin.....	1,124	22.5
Wyoming.....	49	1
Alaska.....	29	.6
Hawaii.....	128	2.6
Puerto Rico.....	1	.02
Total.....	59,078	1,181.6

¹ The difference between this total of \$59,078,000,000 and the total figure of \$60,500,000,000 as reported by the Internal Revenue Service is due to: (1) A difference in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance contributions' data estimated by the IRS for the entire United States, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates thereof, which had to be used in compiling this report; and (2) other adjustments made by the IRS to its State data in deriving its total figures—such adjustment is a \$797,000,000 adjustment for undistributed depositary receipts.

Sources: 1957 Annual Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and Social Security Bulletin, March 1958.

As a matter of interest I am also showing the figures from the budget of the United States Government for fiscal 1960 to indicate other amounts allocated to education in the form of grants.

Selected Federal grants for education

Program	Appropriations	
	Fiscal 1958	Fiscal 1959
1. Vocational education.....	\$33,750,000	\$33,750,000
Permanent authorization.....	7,138,000	7,138,000
2. Land-grant colleges.....	2,502,000	2,502,000
Permanent authorization.....	2,550,000	2,550,000
3. Grants for library services.....	5,000,000	6,000,000
4. Federal-impacted areas assistance for—		
School construction.....	98,650,000	60,800,000
Maintenance and operation.....	127,000,000	130,000,000

Selected Federal grants for education—Con.

Program	Appropriations	
	Fiscal 1958	Fiscal 1959
5. Program and financing, Office of Education.....	\$7,186,000	\$8,780,000
6. President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.....	50,000	(1)
7. National Defense Education Act of 1958.....		40,000,000
8. National school lunch program.....	99,872,310	145,000,000
Total.....	383,098,340	426,526,000

¹ No longer operating.
² Estimated.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me urge consideration of a no-strings-attached type of bill instead of opening the door to a program that will only end with a Federal bureaucrat, so to speak, sitting on and dictating to, so to speak, every school board in America. Let us not take away the management of our schools from the parents and local communities and school boards.

Report of Recent Attacks Against the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the November 1, 1958, issue of *Firing Line*, published by the American Legion, containing a statement by Commander Moore of the American Legion, and referring to the FBI and its Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REPORT ON RECENT ATTACKS AGAINST THE FBI

Recently, a series of apparently unrelated attacks, with the obvious intent to smear J. Edgar Hoover and discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation were initiated. Instigator of the initial attack was Cyrus Stephen Eaton, aged, multimillionaire industrialist, on May 4, 1958 American Broadcasting Company television program financed by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic. That episode was exposed in the July 1, 1958 issue of the *Firing Line*. In a statement released on October 27, 1958, National Commander Preston J. Moore stated that the national convention in September 1958 commended both the FBI and Director J. Edgar Hoover. He found it difficult to attribute any purpose to these attacks other than a desire to destroy this Federal law enforcement agency and its leader as an effective deterrent to undetected, unopposed Communist subversion in this country.

Commander Moore declared "that a deliberate smear Hoover and the FBI" campaign, similar to the Communist Party's unsuccessful efforts of 1940, has been launched is no mere supposition. The entire October issue of *Rights Magazine*, the official publication of the Emergency Civil Liberties Com-

mittee, branded by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee as a Communist-front organization, is devoted to an article (postponed by exposure) "The FBI and Your Freedom." It is, of course, a biased one-sided attack on the FBI, distinguished only by its omission of any reference to communism's denial of human dignity or humanitarianism. Coincidentally, or so the timing suggests, a recent issue of the *Nation* magazine featured an article by Fred J. Cook, attempting to discredit the FBI. Some reviewers have evaluated this piece as 60 pages of distortion, half-truths and innuendoes."

"Finally, and most significantly, former FBI agents have been approached recently by reporters of the New York Post seeking derogatory material on J. Edgar Hoover. These reporters have extended their 'beat' to Paris, France, in what is obviously a far-flung and must be a discouraging attempt to do a character-assassination job on Mr. Hoover. Evidently, the initial failure of this mission resulted in the New York Post stepping up its major effort in 'Operation Gumshoe' back in the States. Apparently forgetting, at least momentarily, that they were supposed to obtain information, not reveal it, reporters for the paper disclosed to unquestionably reliable New York sources that the Post plans to assign reporters to Washington, D.C., and other cities to skulk around restaurants and other public places in the hope of digging up information that could be used against Hoover and the FBI." Commander Moore believes "that our people should reaffirm their faith in Hoover and the FBI" and hopes "that the American press which, with a few tragic exceptions, is commendably patriotic, will continue to give J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI their necessary and persuasive editorial vote of confidence."

Hero of the Cook article in the *Nation* is none other than the aforementioned Cyrus S. Eaton, recently returned from a visit to the Soviet Union and Austria. Based on an article published in *Pravda*, Soviet Communist Party organ, the New York World Telegram of September 8, 1958, quoted Eaton as stating that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's "directness, sense of humor and sincere aspiration for peace throughout the world would find a response" in the United States. The New York Herald Tribune, European edition of September 25, 1958, reflected that Khrushchev interrupted his vacation and returned to Moscow "for a session with the American industrialist Cyrus Eaton" and to conduct a Communist Party meeting. According to Eaton, the fundamental reason for world tension and distrust of Russia is "based on the misconception of the people of the United States about the Soviet Union, its people, resources and present government." He further stated, "I am confident that in Khrushchev we have a man with whom we could deal." (See Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 8, 1958, p. 1.)

Eaton believed Communist China should be recognized and admitted to the United Nations and "we should start doing business with them." The credulity and abysmal ignorance of Eaton in damning Hoover and praising Khrushchev appears difficult to understand. Eaton obviously never read the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report on "The Soviet Empire: Prison House of Nations and Races." Senator EASTLAND in his release of July 7, 1958, summarized the modus operandi whereby the Soviet, through trained agitators, exploiting national and racial feelings and duping nations into severing protective ties, renders them defenseless. Like a ripe plum they fall into the waiting arms of the Soviet, either as a subordinate republic or as a satellite state.

Many of the questions raised by reporters of the New York Post parallel the smears of the Nation. James A. Wechsler, editor of the Post, testifying before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations on April 24, 1953, stated he joined the Young Communist League in the spring of 1934 and left the subversive organization at the end of 1937. In the fall of 1937, after returning from an European trip which included Russia, he wrote articles for the Nation and became its full-time editor early in 1938. He resigned from the Nation in May 1940, to become assistant labor editor of PM. The reason for Wechsler's antipathy to Mr. Hoover and the FBI is not known, but an article in the New York Journal American of August 9, 1952, stated:

"It is true that Wechsler now howls he is a staunch anti-Communist, but like his Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), he protests much but seldom acts. Both Wechsler and the ADA—which houses a selection of leftwingers—spend more time lambasting the Smith Act, the McCarran committee (Senate Internal Security Subcommittee), Senator McCarthy and Louis Budenz than they do in direct frontal thrusts at Stalin's local boys. Wechsler also has a peeve at the FBI and he has tried to rack up this Federal Bureau time and again. Fortunately, J. Edgar Hoover's lads are sturdy souls and they continue their pursuit of Remington and other riders of the subversive circuit who gallop as heroes across the pages of the New York Post.

The California Senate Factfinding Committee on Un-American Activities made the following statements on pages 621 and 622 of its 1949 report: "The Nation and the New Republic have long records as liberal publications. They cannot be described as Communist, but they are so infiltrated with the Communist Party policy that they serve the interest of the Communists and confuse liberals on many issues, much more than do some of the Communist publications." Concerning the attack by the aforementioned subversive Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, Carey McWilliams, an executive committeeman of its national council is editor of the Nation. His record of affiliation with subversive organizations is extensive. (See Firing Line, Oct. 15, 1958 and House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC), "Operation Abolition," 1957, pp. 8 and 9.)

NEW VOICES OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

During the last several months, the international Communist movement has made noticeable strides in attempting to further indoctrinate its own members and propagandize the non-Communist world through the circulation of new Marxist periodicals. The most important of these was the publication in September 1958 of World Marxist Review: Problems of Peace and Socialism, the theoretical and information journal of Communist Workers' Parties. Prior to the appearance of World Marxist Review, the worldwide Communist revolutionary conspiracy has been without a published directive since the expedient dissolution of For A Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy in April 1956. The latter periodical was the official weekly organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties (Cominform), successor of the Soviet dominated Communist International (Comintern).

World Marxist Review is published monthly in 14 foreign languages and distributed by the Press Circulation Agency, Sadova 6, Prague, Czechoslovakia. English language editions are published in both Canada and in Great Britain. The Canadian edition is issued by a dummy setup called Progress Books of 924 King Street West, Toronto 3, Ontario. According to a recent catalog, Progress Books also operates under the name of

Progress Subscription Service which specializes in the distribution of numerous periodicals from the Soviet Union and Communist China. It also advertises subscriptions for three subversive periodicals published in the United States; namely, Mainstream, National Guardian and Political Affairs. (See HUAC, "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1957, pp. 104-106; and "National Republic," October 1958, p. 33.)

On page 98 of the October 1958 issue of World Marxist Review, the Communist journal claims it is a magazine dealing with a wide range of questions of Marxist-Leninist theory, problems of Socialist and Communist construction, the struggles of the working class and the national-liberation movements. It provides a tribune for the exchange of experiences and opinions in the international labor movement. Its contributors include leading figures of the Communist and workers' movement, as well as scholars, writers, representatives of democratic opinion. In translating this deceptive Communist jargon to understandable English, the above means that the Soviet Union is utilizing World Marxist Review as another tool for dictation and control over its subversive Communist Party apparatuses throughout the world. The masthead of World Marxist Review carries the Soviet revolutionary slogan, "Workers of all countries, unite."

The October issue also contained an article on pages 80 and 81 entitled "Consolidating the Ranks of the Communist Party of the United States" (CPUSA) reflecting the party has become a stronger and more militant conspiratorial organization. World Marxist Review stated: "Recent developments in the CPUSA indicate an important move in the direction of consolidating its ranks and improving its work among the masses. During the past few years the Communist Party was forced to conduct a serious struggle against the revisionists and splitters who sought to disrupt and destroy it. The undermining activities of the (John) Gates revisionist group gravely injured the party. However, the hopes of the enemies of the working class were not fated to be realized. The sound elements in the party leadership, supported by the organizations chiefly in the industrial areas, fought hard to preserve and consolidate the party. The first gains are now evident. Facts show that the CPUSA is surmounting the numerous obstacles and exposing the opportunities of all hues. It is making better headway along the road mapped out by the 16th national convention." For a complete report on this convention held in New York City from February 9 to 12, 1957, readers may wish to consult the March 15, 1957, Firing Line. According to both the October 5 and 12, 1958, editions of the Worker, the CPUSA solicited its membership to subscribe to World Marxist Review.

The September 1958 issue of Party Affairs, the official publication of the national committee of the CPUSA, disclosed startling revelations pertaining to the growth of local party periodicals. Party Affairs stated: "Within the past year, a number of party organizations have begun to publish community or party bulletins. The New York State committee has resumed publication of Party Voice, which had not appeared for some time. The Queens (New York) County committee issues a four-page monthly bulletin, the Comet, of which 1,500 copies are mailed each month to party and nonparty readers, including a number of prominent figures in the community.

"An unusually lively and well-written paper is the two-page Searchlight issued by the Erie County (Buffalo) Communist Party. This paper, of which some 3,000 are distributed monthly, covers a wide variety of subjects. A different type of publication is Moving Forward, a mimeographed monthly bulletin issued by the Communist Party of

Missouri. Now in its second year, it is addressed primarily to party members, though it is distributed more widely as well. Moving Forward is not a one-man job, but is put out by a party group assigned to this task, which involves as many as a dozen people in the writing and technical work."

"The Southern California District (CPUSA) issues a four-page tabloid, the Southern California Party Forum, which is addressed to the party membership. The Illinois district (CPUSA) is planning to issue a State party bulletin soon." In summarizing the article, Party Affairs declared that "these bulletins are an important means of reaching the party membership or the community. Their appearance is a welcome sign of growing party activity." Generally, the subject content of the aforementioned local party periodicals included the following: "ending H-bomb tests," "school segregation," "CPUSA ideological questions," "labor struggles," "news and announcements of party activities," and "statements by leading bodies and correspondence from (CPUSA) clubs and sections."

Our November 1, 1957 Firing Line reported that Party Affairs is an internal bulletin of the CPUSA which commenced publication in August 1957. Restricted to members of the CPUSA, Party Affairs is now printed by the subversive Prompt Press and is distributed from the party's national office located on the third floor of 23 West 26th Street, New York City.

An item of interest: Dr. Victor A. Kovda, of the Soviet Union has been named to head the Department of Natural Sciences of UNESCO. (See the New York Times, October 17, 1958, p. C-3.)

New Price Tags for Government Managers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article, written by Carl W. Robinson, which appeared in the September-October 1958 issue of the Harvard Business Review.

As the article points out, lower-level Government positions are usually paid competitively; but top-management jobs are frequently underpaid. Yet, in Government as well as industry, the caliber of management personnel determines the effectiveness of the total operation. We need good managers in Government positions if we are to get maximum return from our tax dollars.

NEW PRICE TAGS FOR GOVERNMENT MANAGERS

(By Carl W. Robinson)

An acute shortage of qualified top Government personnel has developed in this country. It affects every area of governmental jurisdiction, from the municipal level to the Federal. And it affects taxpayers—both corporate and private—for it is beginning to cut seriously into governmental efficiency.

No thinking citizen will deny that the effectiveness of an organization depends upon the skill and ability of a small number of key managers and professional personnel in strategic positions. In business the

stockholders have usually accepted this principle, but in government the voters and elected officials have been slower to respond to it. Only in a few enlightened communities have conscientious citizens joined with public officials in efforts to put the principle into practice.

All this has created a problem, as a study by the Harvard Business School Club of Washington demonstrates. In a 3-year survey of 8,500 businessmen who have held government jobs at the Federal level, the club found that the main reason for dissatisfaction with Washington jobs was loss of pay due to the lower salaries in Government service. The report states in summary that the business community has a "frightening lack of interest" in offering its best brains for Federal jobs.¹ (Working for Government at the State and local levels also has this drawback, besides lacking the glamour which is frequently attached to the life and limelight of Washington.)

TOP-LEVEL SHORTAGE

The conditions which are precipitating this growing shortage of capable executives and professional personnel in Government seem to be clear. In the race to win and hold professional and managerial talent since World War II, business has outbid Government by maintaining a more realistic balance between salaries in the upper and lower brackets. As long as management is able to show improved profits, stock holders raise few complaints about higher salaries and special forms of supplemental compensation for key executives.

In Government, however, it has been more difficult to face a mass electorate with demands for salaries of \$20,000 or more, despite the fact that the responsibilities of many of the officials are comparable in both magnitude and complexity to those of business. It has been especially difficult to overcome this obstacle because no accepted basis has existed for comparing top level jobs in Government positions of comparable responsibility in business.

DEMANDS FOR ACTION

Three developments have started a more realistic appraisal of the shortage of top personnel in Government.

The first is the mounting demand from citizens' groups for a higher level of efficiency in Government operations. It comes from such organizations as local community clubs and the League of Women Voters, and from growing numbers of businessmen and professional people who are taking a more active interest in Government problems at all levels. This demand is forcing some realization on the elected official, who is dependent upon the vote of the public, that it is increasingly necessary to have specially trained and widely experienced managers for the vast and complicated departments of Government if he is to produce the record of outstanding performance needed to wage a successful campaign for reelection.

The second development stems from the fact that some well-known top business leaders have undertaken key responsibilities in Government. When respected and highly paid men such as Charles E. Wilson, George M. Humphrey, W. Randolph Burgess, Sinclair Weeks, and Robert Cutler accepted positions of key responsibility in Washington, they highlighted the recent trend for business executives to accept a new degree of responsibility for service to the community. Even more important, they focused attention on the fact that Government is the country's biggest business, and that it calls for the best of managerial skill if it

is to operate efficiently and economically. As a result, a growing and highly influential segment of the electorate is beginning to know and respect the magnitude and complexity of Government operations.

But the development which is most likely to precipitate action in supporting reasonable Government executive salaries is the creation and use, in the last few years, of a practical method for evaluating and comparing the scope and responsibility of top-level jobs in Government and industry. Its continued use over a period of years by a growing number of Government units should help to keep Government salaries in a more realistic relation to business salaries. If this is achieved, one of the serious roadblocks in attracting and retaining high-caliber professional and management in Government service will be removed.

GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES

If there is any question about the need for putting Government executives and professional leaders on a salary scale more comparable to those in industry, look at what has been happening to management responsibilities in Government in recent years.

Population explosion

In the last 20 to 30 years sheer increase in size has made the managerial requirements more difficult in many Government jurisdictions. Between 1940 and 1957, the population of the United States increased by 40 million; and this rate of increase is expected to continue for the next few decades and possibly to accelerate. Individual States have experienced particularly spectacular gains. California's population, for example, increased by more than 3,675,000 between 1940 and 1950. But the most dramatic changes have come in cities and towns of the country, with population in many cases spilling across village, township, and county lines and thereby creating a maze of problems for public utility, transportation, school, and public health authorities.

Increased complexity

Another vital factor is the new range of governmental services which the public demands, bringing with it an alarming increase in the tax burden and in the magnitude and complexity of Government administration. The problem is especially acute at the State level:

Income, sales, and other taxes are now a major administrative problem of many of the States and larger cities.

Pension systems have developed within local governing units, and must be administered.

States now have their own labor laws, local programs for the aged, laws regulating public utilities, and, recently, a growing number of State planning and development commissions.

Large programs of urban renewal are often planned by the States in cooperation with city government.

Total State budgets have tripled since 1942. State borrowing amounted to only \$170 million in 1942. Today it exceeds \$2.2 billion.

Squeeze on executive manpower

The overall problem is further complicated by the executive manpower squeeze which every businessman has run into for the last 5 years and which will continue into the 1960's. This squeeze was precipitated by the rapid expansion of our economy. It will continue and be aggravated by the shortage of young men entering the country's labor force (the result of the low birth rate of the 1930's). It has intensified the bidding for competent young executive talent, and has increased the bargaining power of older executives who are needed to carry on until the shortage has passed.

The inevitable result is that government, with its low salaries for managerial jobs

and its reluctance until now to stand up for adequate salary boosts at the top, is being bypassed by ambitious young talent and is losing some of its key people to business.

BELETED RECOGNITION

Many observers, when viewing government's growth in size and complexity, might feel that it is getting too large too rapidly. They would agree, however, that this growth is controlled best by competent executives—men of proven ability who usually can be attracted and retained in government only by salaries that are in reasonable relation to those found in business.

Executives who have analyzed the managerial problems of both business and government are increasingly convinced that the executive requirements for effective public administrators are as exacting as those for executives in private business. Sound management of a public works or highway construction program for a large State, county, or city, for instance, calls for engineering and executive skills comparable to those of the management of a large private construction firm. Likewise, directing a statewide public or mental health program in this age of stress, mass emergencies, and the peculiar needs of an aging population calls for an unusual combination of professional management and public relations talents.

The main difference up to now is that industry has recognized the size and importance of the management job and has paid as much as was necessary to get and hold an executive or professional expert capable of handling the job efficiently. So, in fact, have the labor unions, the country's leading trade associations, and the big private foundations.

Thoughtful citizens are belatedly realizing that government, the biggest service organization of all, has not adequately recognized the need for high-level management skill and ability in top positions, and has not provided a level of compensation which will attract sufficient numbers of executives of this caliber to government positions.

EXHIBIT I.—Levels of Government employees

	Per- cent of total em- ployees	Per- cent of total payroll
Lower level (clerical, manual, and lower technical positions).....	75-90	65-85
Middle level (supervisory, technical, professional, and middle-management positions).....	7-22	11-33
Upper level (top-management positions).....	0.5-2	1.5-5

COST OF IMPROVEMENT

The potential cost of inadequate managerial talent in the executive jobs of government is appalling. By contrast, the cost of adjusting the salaries in upper-echelon positions of government to a level that will attract and hold managerial talent in government is small.

Varying needs

For the purpose of illustration and comparison, government workers can be divided into three broadly defined levels, as exhibit 1 shows. Among lower-level workers there is generally little or no salary differential between those in government and those in industry. Since the lower echelons usually account for 75 percent to 90 percent of the total number of employees, it is easy to understand the concern for their interests on the part of elected officials. As a result of that and also of the ease with which their jobs can be compared with similar jobs in private industry, the salaries of lower-level government workers have stayed generally in line with, and sometimes ahead of, the com-

¹ Businessmen in Government (Washington, May 1958); available from Division of Research, Harvard Business School, Boston 63, Massachusetts.

pensation of their private industry counterparts.

As exhibit 1 also indicates, the middle salary area usually accounts for no more than 7 percent to 22 percent of the total employed personnel, and 11 percent to 33 percent of the total payroll dollars. But these averages, while they reflect the personnel and payroll distribution of a wide range of governmental organizations, can present an exaggerated picture to the taxpayer of the cost of a major salary adjustment for the key technical, supervisory, professional, and middle management positions of a city, county, or State. What is overlooked is that the lower positions of the middle level are generally in reasonable adjustment. It is the upper-middle jobs that are usually underpaid.

Because only a partial salary revision is necessary, the cost of making middle management compensation in government comparable to that in industry is lower than many people would expect. For example:

In one of the large counties of eastern New York the total cost to the community of increases which brought the salaries of all key positions in the middle level into a much improved relation with those of private business was only 1 percent of the total payroll. This was true even though several large individual salary increases were called for.

In one of the metropolitan counties in the Great Lakes area a similar adjustment of combined middle-level and upper-level administrative salaries raised the overall payroll budget a bare 1 percent.

These low percentages should not lead us to overlook the importance of the positions involved. The performance of the jobholders affects the efficiency not only of middle management but also of top personnel. We are dealing here with a wide variety of key men—specialists ranging from engineers connected with highway programs to medical and psychiatric specialists connected with public and mental health services, and from lawyers connected with the attorney general's office to accountants attached to the revenue, tax, or budget departments.

It is in the upper category that Government salaries most often fall notably below the levels which prevail in industry. The number of positions involved is small, and usually accounts for fewer than 1 percent of the total employees. Their salaries often account for no more than 2 percent of the total payroll. Yet it is this group, with its requirements for top-management skills, that should provide the catalytic force necessary to ensure a sound return on the taxpayer's dollar. The benefits from possible improvement of management are almost without limit, and the total cost is negligible because of the size of the group. For example:

In a county adjacent to a metropolitan area on the eastern seaboard, total annual payrolls amount to \$15,300,000. The 15 people who fall into top echelon positions receive \$238,290, or only 1.6 percent of the total. A 10 percent upward adjustment of salaries for this small group would add less than \$25,000, or 0.00163 percent of the total payroll. A more substantial adjustment would still add only an inconsequential cost to the taxpayer.

REVISING SALARY LEVELS

Even if we agree on the importance of raising upper-level salaries, we still have a problem: How can a satisfactory compensation scale for Government posts be determined?

Difficulties to overcome

Experts in the field of compensation have explored the feasibility of measuring the relative value of Government positions with a point-factor evaluation system similar to most all governmental salary and classification studies to date.

one used successfully for many years in industry. Such a system has been developed and, after application in a variety of governmental organizations throughout the country, has proved consistently reliable and effective.

Nevertheless, a serious shortcoming has characterized most Government salary and classification studies. In virtually every project of this sort, a sincere effort has been made to conduct the survey of prevailing salaries on a basis that would insure accurate comparison of as nearly identical jobs as possible. To this end, the surveys have generally included business as well as Government jurisdictions. But while adequate amounts of comparable salary data have been available from business in the lower-level classifications, little or no direct salary comparisons have been possible in the upper levels.

[Exhibit 2 omitted in RECORD.]

Exhibit 2 helps to illustrate both the problem and a new technique that has been developed to cope with it. It shows statistical trend lines of the relation of salaries to job values; this relation is used to analyze and compare salary levels from data gathered in comparative salary surveys. For jobs of about 90 evaluation points or less the chart is very useful, but for jobs above 90 evaluation points it is not possible to make comparison with positions in business. Examining the curves in more detail:

Line A was developed from data gathered in Government jurisdiction only. It rises steadily as job value increases, but the rate of increase falls off at the upper end of the line (reflecting the inadequate salaries of top-level men).

Line B was developed from data gathered in private business concerns. Its rate of increase does not fall off as it rises, but it covers only the lower three-quarters of the range of jobs. Data were not available for the top quarter because of lack of directly comparable business positions.

Line C, developed from both Government and business data gathered in a survey, tapers off, then coincides with the Government line in the upper section, since no private business data were used at this level.

A salary structure developed from this data would, therefore, fail to consider private business salaries in the higher levels. This is precisely what has occurred in al-

The reason for this condition is easily understood. In the gatherings of comparable salary data on a straight job-to-job basis there is adequate comparative business information at the lower levels, but little at the middle levels and almost none at the upper levels. A typist does similar work whether it is for a bank, for the office of the sheriff, or for the department of highways. It is therefore easy to establish a basis for comparison. The same is true for a photostat operator, who performs similar functions whether he is employed in a job print shop or in the county courthouse. And a janitor cleans the same way whether he is working in a city hall or in the State capitol.

But when the salary analyst is dealing with senior psychologists on an agency staff, or the warden of the penitentiary, or the sheriff, or the director of the division of sanitation for a State or county, it is difficult to find directly comparable positions in private industry. And the problem is even more difficult in the top echelons where the director of a State mental hospital, or a county attorney, or a county health commissioner must be compared with positions in private industry.

New approach

To meet the problem of the lack of comparable top-level private business salary data, we need a new approach. A suitable one has, I believe, now been developed. By careful factor rating and point evaluation of the jobs of business executives on the same point-evaluation scale used for Government positions, business jobs can be compared with governmental executive positions in terms of relative value, scope, responsibilities, and requirements, even though they differ in specific duties.

To illustrate, exhibit 3 presents four actual cases of evaluation of relatively comparable jobs in industry and Government, showing the close similarity in job values. The relative values of these jobs were calculated by using the factors employed in a typical evaluation plan. The jobs compared are similar though not identical. The evaluations, developed in terms of factors common to all of the jobs studied, are quite accurate and make possible the inclusion of business salary data in trend line computations.

EXHIBIT III.—Evaluation of comparable jobs in industry and government

	Special knowledge	Experience	Scope and complexity	Initiative and creativity	Contact	Working conditions	Judgment	Supervision	Total points	Salary range
EXAMPLE 1										
Industry: Market research executive.....	14	20	17	16	9	2	12	8	98	\$8,000-\$12,800
Government: Head of planning department.....	14	18	17	13	10	4	12	6	94	8,500-11,000
EXAMPLE 2										
Industry: Plant maintenance engineer.....	14	20	17	10	10	5	16	14	106	10,600-15,800
Government: Director of facilities and services.....	14	21	17	10	10	3	12	14	104	9,600-12,420
EXAMPLE 3										
Industry: General attorney.....	20	24	17	10	12	1	16	6	100	10,500-15,800
Government: Deputy county attorney.....	20	20	17	10	12	1	16	9	105	9,600-12,420
EXAMPLE 4										
Industry: Corporate construction executive.....	14	22	17	13	15	6	16	12	112	10,900-18,900
Government: Deputy commissioner of public works.....	14	22	17	13	12	6	16	14	114	10,800-13,880

Extending information

The new approach to salary comparison in Government salary surveys now makes it possible to utilize a long-neglected wealth of business executive salary information in setting professional and managerial salaries within Government. The American Management Association, the Dartnell Corp., and the National Industrial Conference Board, for example, all publish, more or less regularly, good basic surveys of a cross section of management salaries according to reasonably detailed job descriptions.

Of course, precise or perfect comparisons between top-level business and Government positions will not be possible, even with the new approach and the added data. But it will be possible to make fair, reasonable, and statistically supportable projections; it will be possible to develop equitable differences between the salaries for top men in Government and their subordinates. When selected business jobs are carefully analyzed against the Government jobs under study, a number can usually be found which correspond closely enough to permit useful comparison with factor-rating and point-evaluation methods.

Thus, we can extend the all business trend line in exhibit 2 through the level of the upper executive positions; similarly, we can develop the composite of business and Government data line to include the data for top-level business jobs. This eliminates the tapering off of the composite trend line and provides a sound and statistically supportable basis for explaining to legislators and the public the end for raising top executive and professional salaries to their proper levels.

CONCLUSION

A drive for better organization and for a higher degree of efficiency in Government operations is under way in this country. It had its impetus from the original Hoover Commission in the late 1940's. By 1953 more than 30 States had undertaken, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, to review and reorganize their administrative structures.

If this job is to be carried out promptly and efficiently, however, executives and professional leaders with a high caliber of skill and devotion to their jobs are required. In today's competitive market for this kind of key personnel in the upper brackets, most governmental units are at a salary disadvantage. Yet, without excellent personnel, the demands of the electorate for more and better services cannot be met.

Elected officials, until recently, have shied away from the problem of the higher-level salary groups. In the first place, a relatively small number of potential voters is involved. Further, until recently, few political leaders have had any encouragement from any segment of the public to go after salary increases for top officials, no matter how much more exacting their duties have become, or how much more necessary it is for them to invest in specialized education, or how critically their decisions may influence the economical use of the taxpayer's money.

Fortunately, studies like that of the Harvard Business School Club of Washington are throwing a new light on the problem, and are making it more acceptable politically for elective officials to campaign for a level of salaries which will attract to Government the kind of management talent that can do the job the public is beginning to demand.

With the development of a sound technique for comparing executive salaries with those in industry, one very important obstacle to a realistic handling of top-level Government salaries has been removed. Our elected officials can now face the issues with greater assurance of public understanding and acceptance.

**Congressman Daniel B. Brewster
Honored**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, signal honor has just come to one of the members of the Maryland congressional delegation, Congressman DANIEL B. BREWSTER, in the award to him of the annual distinguished service award of the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce.

This coveted award is made only after the most careful consideration of the activities and accomplishments of the young men of our city and of its environs. The JAC is so constituted that only those who manifest exceptional abilities and who bid fair to continued greater success can be the recipient of the award. Screening committees and executive action of its officers make certain that the ultimate choice is one who richly deserves the acclaim and the stamp of approval of this organization.

Congressman BREWSTER is the unanimous choice as the metropolitan area's outstanding young man of 1958. In the relatively short period in which he has held public office and been active in private pursuits, he has displayed unusual capabilities, unquestioned integrity, and an attractive personality. He has won the favor of those both in Baltimore County, where he resides, and in Baltimore City, where he is also active, through intelligent effort, zeal for the public good, and courageous action in emergency situations. In order that his colleagues in the House of Representatives and the public generally will have knowledge of the facts supporting this award to him, I ask unanimous consent to have the account of the award published in the Baltimore Sun printed at this point of my remarks.

BREWSTER GETS J.A.C. AWARD

Representative BREWSTER, Democrat, of Maryland, yesterday was given the annual Distinguished Service Award of the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce.

Alan H. Stocksdales, president of the organization, gave the freshman Congressman a plaque, citing him as the metropolitan area's outstanding young man of 1958.

The presentation was made at a luncheon meeting at the Park Plaza Hotel.

COMMENDED FOR ACHIEVEMENTS

A succession of speakers commended Mr. BREWSTER for his achievements, which they said "have transcended the city-county boundary."

Former State Senator John Grason Turnbull, Democrat, Baltimore County, Mr. BREWSTER's partner in a law firm, declared his feeling on the occasion was that of "a very, very proud older brother."

"As Dan's career goes on and upward," he told the J.A.C. members, "you can look back with pride at having given one of the earliest recognitions of his contributions and abilities."

EXAMPLE CITED

Mr. Turnbull said Mr. BREWSTER "has never been one of provincial or parochial in-

terests." To illustrate, he cited the young lawmaker's work on the Maryland Port Authority bill and his support of a municipal court bill for Baltimore City when he was a member of the State legislature.

He said Mr. BREWSTER also has been active on behalf of local charities, including the Cancer Fund and a campaign to raise money to support the Timonium State Fair.

"He's not the kind of fellow who says I'll take the job, but you get somebody else to do the work," Mr. Turnbull stated.

COMPARED WITH PRESIDENTS

The Reverend Vincent J. Beatty, S.J., president of Loyola College, compared Mr. BREWSTER's accomplishments with those of Presidents Jefferson and Madison, who, he said, also achieved fame at an early age.

The college president stated he was sorry not to be able to report that Mr. BREWSTER was a Loyola graduate, but he added the school is a training ground for future J.A.C. award winners.

D'ALESSANDRO SPEAKS

Mayor D'Alessandro, a third speaker on the program, declared, "Maryland needs more men like DAN BREWSTER. He has the qualifications to be a great statesman."

Other guests at the luncheon included the members of the committee which selected Mr. BREWSTER for the award: Martin B. Kohn, president of the Association of Commerce, chairman; the Reverend Monsignor David I. Dorsch, director of the Associated Catholic Charities; C. T. Crossfield, vice president of the Commercial Credit Co., and Judge John T. Tucker, of the Baltimore supreme bench.

Textile Tariffs**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from the Camden Chronicle of January 29, 1959, commenting on a statement by one of our leading textile industrialists. We think this is significant and worthy of the attention of the American public and of the Congress:

TEXTILE TARIFFS

For those who keep telling us that prosperity is just around the corner for the ailing textile industry, Textile Industrialist Leon Lowenstein had a disturbing warning this week.

Speaking before a congressional delegation from both Carolinas, the manufacturer warned that American mills cannot compete with foreign labor paid slave wages.

His words ought to carry much weight with our elected officials, our industrialists, and our workers. If his statements are correct, and we assume that they are, then some revision in the reciprocal trade agreements should be made.

Mr. Lowenstein said the State Department had been sold on a point of view which could ruin the textile industry: (1) That the whole picture of foreign aid and trade was more important than the textile industry, and (2) that the industry has enough ingenuity to take care of itself.

He called these two ideas fallacies and predicted that unless some changes were made in the law to help solve the import

problem, many plants would drop down to 5- and 6-day weeks, some would curtail activities to 3 days, and some marginal plants might have to shut down entirely.

Cheraw is greatly affected by the fortunes of the textile industry. Our dependence upon it for employment and retail trade has increased in direct proportion to the decline of agriculture.

Once a primarily free trade area, the Carolinas now must, in enlightened self-interest, move more into the protectionist field. While we favor foreign trade agreements, we do want to see our local industries and their workers protected, too.

Summary of Poll for Meeting of Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of a poll taken by Mr. Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission, as a part of his duties both in the Michigan Water Resources Commission and as a member of the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, to which he is appointed by the President.

The Federal Water Pollution Act, Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress, provides for grants from the Federal Government to the States and municipalities for control of pollution in streams and waters of this country.

Mr. Adams polled all of the States including Alaska, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission and the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River.

The results are significant. Agencies concerned with control of pollution overwhelmingly favored retention of Federal construction grants by some 48½ to 2½, a half vote representing a statement showing that there are good points and some bad points.

Even more significant was the vote of 48 to 2 against future sewage disposal construction grants to become an exclusive State function financed out of proceeds of the State excise tax on local telephone services as recommended by the Joint Federal State Action Committee.

Equally significant was the vote of 49½ to 3½ in favor of continuance of the Federal program for grants to States and interstate agencies as provided in Section 5 of Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress.

In order that all may understand the views of State agencies and interstate agencies controlled with water pollution I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD at this point the results of the poll

with the hope that it will help to make available the full \$45 million in grants to States as authorized in Public Law 660:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF POLL FOR DECEMBER 1958 MEETING OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

MUNICIPAL SEWAGE DISPOSAL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

1. Are current Federal allocations resulting in stimulation of sewage plant construction within your jurisdiction? Yes, 43; no, 9.
2. Do you favor doubling the authorization of construction grant allocations through reintroduction and enactment of the Blatnik bill (H.R. 11714—85th Cong.) or its equivalent? Yes, 38; no, 13.
3. Do you favor elimination of further Federal construction grants by repeal of section 6, Public Law 660? Yes, 2½; no, 48½.
4. Do you favor repeal of section 6 with future sewage disposal construction grants to become an exclusive State function financed out of proceeds of a State excise tax on local phone services as per Joint Federal State Action Committee recommendations? Yes, 2; no, 48.
5. If your answer to (4) is "Yes," do you think your legislature would enact such a tax in 1959? Yes, 1; no, 12.
6. If your answer to (5) is "Yes," do you think your legislature would appropriate from the proceeds of such a tax, funds in an amount equal to or greater than you are now receiving for sewage disposal construction grants? Yes, 1; no, 10.

OTHER MATTERS

7. Do you favor creation of a new position of Assistant Secretary of Water Pollution Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as per H.R. 13839 Blatnik—85th Congress, or its equivalent? Yes, 16; no, 28.
8. Do you favor continuance of Federal program grants to States and interstate agencies (sec. 5, Public Law 660)? Yes, 49½; no, 3½.
9. Are you satisfied with progress to date toward solution of interstate water pollution control problems in which the Public Health Service has participated? Yes, 44; no, 1.
10. Since industry cannot qualify for grants but its taxes assist in providing grants to cities, States and PHS, would you favor amendment of the internal revenue laws to permit industry an accelerated amortization rate for such capital investment as is necessary to meet State or interstate water pollution control objectives? Yes, 51; no, 3.

REPORTING STATES, TERRITORIES AND INTERSTATE AGENCIES

Region I: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island.

Region II: New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware.

Region III: Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina, District of Columbia.

Region IV: Tennessee, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida.

Region V: Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio.

Region VI: North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri.

Region VII: New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana.

Region VIII: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado.

Region IX: Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Interstate agencies: Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River.

Possible Solutions for VHF-TV Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, a native of my State, Mr. Frederick W. Ford, who is now Federal Communications Commissioner, appeared before the Radio and Television Executives Association of Houston, Tex., and delivered what I believe to be a timely and interesting analysis of problems involved in very high frequencies on television. It is essentially a rather technical paper, but it will be of interest to others, including those who operate and manage our television industry.

Commissioner Ford's address follows:

The communications industry is constantly faced with a set of problems that no one individual could possibly foresee or solve. The Federal Communications Commission seems to inherit a sizable share of these problems in one form or another. Tonight, I would like to review with you the problem which I consider the most pressing and perhaps the cause of many other difficult problems for you in the industry and for the Commission. I refer to the VHF-UHF TV problem. After I briefly discuss the history of the allocations of spectrum space to television, I will consider the possible courses of action which may be open to the Commission and some of the consequences of each.

There are four significant phases in the growth and development of television in the United States. I have divided these phases into the time period before July 1, 1941; July 1, 1941, to December 7, 1941; December 7, 1941, to May 25, 1945; and May 25, 1945, to the present.

For many years prior to July 1, 1941, scientists and engineers were devotedly engaged in the basic research and development, experimentation and, of lasting importance, the establishment of the technical characteristics of the TV system to be employed in the United States. These characteristics (525 lines, etc.) were promulgated as standards by the FCC on May 3, 1941, to be effective on July 1, 1941, and commercial TV in the United States was thereby established. It is difficult to see, by hindsight, any basic errors which emerged from this period. Indeed many of the benefits of television which we enjoy today stem from the pioneering done during this period.

The growth of commercial TV was restricted by the start of the war on December 7, 1941. The contribution which this brief second phase of development made to our present-day problems is nevertheless significant. The 18 channels then allocated were all VHF channels between 50 and 294 megacycles. The fact that TV began on VHF later became a controlling factor in deciding whether postwar TV was to be in the VHF or UHF spectrum.

The wartime restrictions on the availability of equipment and materials prevented the establishment of new TV stations and the war ended with six licensed commercial TV stations, all on frequencies below 84 megacycles, some 70 applications for additional stations in the pending filed, and an estimated 7,000 receivers in the hands of the public, most of which could tune only the frequencies below 90 megacycles.

Because it was apparent that the postwar uses of radio in the United States would

be substantially different and greater than the prewar uses, the Commission held its most comprehensive frequency allocation hearing in 1944, preliminary to determining the amount of spectrum space and the position in the spectrum for all services including television. Industry presented divergent views on the question of how much space should be provided for TV and its position in the radio spectrum. One group felt that the best place in the spectrum for TV as a service to the public was in the UHF spectrum, where much more space would be available than in the VHF spectrum. The principal advocates of UHF TV at that time were the Columbia Broadcasting System, Zenith Radio Corp., and the Cowles Broadcasting Co. whose arguments were summarized by the Commission in its report (January 15, 1945) in docket No. 6651 as follows:

"The demands of other services for frequency space below 3000 megacycles are so great that only a limited number of 6-megacycle channels can be assigned for television broadcasting (Craven Tr. 3494-95, 3500-03); that the advancement applicable to television made in the electronic art during the war cannot be fully utilized in 6-megacycle channels (Ream Tr. 1761-2, 1773-4; Goldmark, Tr. 1871-5, 1939); and that the art has reached a point where a superior television broadcast system adapted for the use of ultra-high frequencies could be proven and made available to the public within possibly 1 or 2 years (Ream Tr. 1764-73, 1801-09, 1813-14, Craven, Tr. 3498-3500; 3509-11; Goldmark, Tr. 1911; Brown Tr. 3483)."

The opposing industry group relied upon prewar progress that had been made in TV as a broadcast service (all of which was on VHF and mostly below 84 megacycles) and contended, among other things, that the use of UHF TV would involve operating difficulties, the solution of which would require extensive research and experimentation and that many years might elapse before a UHF TV system could be established.

Faced with these conflicting views, the Commission decided in May 1945, to allocate 13 VHF TV channels (later reduced to 12) each 6 megacycles in width—and, in addition, a UHF TV band the limits of which presently are 470 and 890 megacycles, i.e., a total of seventy 6-megacycle UHF channels or 420 megacycles of UHF spectrum space. In taking this action, the Commission commented that it was "still of the opinion that there is insufficient spectrum space available below 300 megacycles to make possible a truly nationwide and competitive television system. Such a system, if it is to be developed, must find its lodging higher up in the spectrum where more space exists and where color pictures and superior monochrome pictures can be developed through the use of wider channels. In order to make possible this development of television, the Commission has made available the space between 480 and 920 megacycles for experimental television. The time which may elapse before a system can be developed to operate on wider channels on these ultra-high frequencies is primarily dependent upon the resourcefulness of the industry in solving the technical problems that will be encountered."

Thus on May 25, 1945, the third period ended and the fourth or present period began. The studies, conclusions and decisions of this third period—right or wrong—essentially delineated the allocations of spectrum space for TV which we have today.

Since May 1945, we have witnessed the phenomenal growth of VHF TV, most of which took place after 1952, and the relative failure to attain a nationwide competitive system of TV with sufficient channels and equitable service for all. The Sixth Re-

port and Order (April 14, 1952) did not yield this result. Neither has the most recent decision of the Commission on June 25, 1956 to "undertake a thorough, searching analysis of the possibilities for improving and expanding the nationwide television system through the exclusive use of the UHF band throughout or in a major portion of the United States," resulted in any substantial amelioration of the problem to date.

Section 307(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, enjoins the Commission to make such distribution of frequencies and power among the several States and communities as to provide a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of radio service to each of the same.

Over half of the UHF-TV stations which went on the air have ceased operation for financial reasons. The financial report of television stations to the Commission indicates that the UHF stations which are still operating are either barely breaking even or are losing money regularly when in competition in the same market with VHF stations. At the same time VHF stations are generally quite profitable. This disparity cannot long continue.

Great dissatisfaction has been expressed in the past few years with this second-class television system we have in which only about one-fourth of more than 2,000 possible commercial television stations are on the air. Consider for example the interest of the Congress in the several hearings which they have held trying to find out what, if anything, can be done to convert the vast amount of spectrum space reserved for television into a truly first-class nationwide competitive television service, limited only by available spectrum space and competitive forces.

Since the adoption of the Sixth Report and Order there have been 401 VHF stations and 165 UHF authorized to go on the air. Of this number, 5 VHF and 89 UHF stations have ceased operation. Although about 90 percent of American homes can receive a signal, much less is known about what percentage of this number receive an acceptable signal, and what percentage of the homes in the United States have a choice of acceptable signals. These questions are answered in different ways by different people. I doubt that anyone has the correct answer. Too frequently, I fear, we tend to base our judgments on the fact that 50 percent of our population live in the top 25 TV markets of the United States and rough television justice for the rest is all we can hope for, but the Congress was not so callous when it wrote the Communications Act.

The plain hard truth is that UHF and VHF are not competitive in the same market, and, therefore, the spirit of equal treatment for all areas of the country has not yet been achieved.

I am frank to say that shortly after assuming my duties as a member of the Commission, I sought to understand this problem and devoted as much of my time as possible in trying to determine how to attack it. My interest has been in trying to find a solution which would cause the least dislocation to existing service and yet discharge our statutory responsibility. I have tried to approach this task with no preconceived idea of the ultimate solution. The only thing that has been clear to me is that the efforts made in the past to find an acceptable solution have not been productive. I am not able to propose one now. If we continue the present policies, however (which I assume are embodied in the sixth report and order, as amended from time to time) I believe the following results will be inevitable:

1. All or part of the allocation to UHF will be reallocated for nonbroadcasting services.

2. There will be a minimum of competition between local television outlets in many areas of the country.

3. Efforts to relieve monopoly situations and lack of a choice of stations will lead to shorter mileage separations between co-channel and adjacent channel stations, thus tending to degrade or eliminate service which the public now enjoys, particularly in rural areas.

4. Many communities will be denied local television outlets entirely.

Before considering the possible alternative courses of action open to the Commission it would be well to set up an ideal standard to which any of the alternatives may be compared.

1. The allocation of spectrum space should be in a continuous band, or as near to it as possible.

2. The ratio of the highest to the lowest order of frequency should be as low as possible. I am told that a ratio of not more than 3 to 1 would be desirable. (The lower the ratio the lower the cost and complexity of design of the television receivers.)

3. The allocated frequencies should exhibit as nearly similar propagation characteristics as possible.

4. The total number of channels should be adequate to provide a nationwide competitive television service with fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of service to all the States and communities.

With this ideal standard in mind, let us consider what I believe to be the six major alternative courses of action open to the Commission and consider some of the consequences of each.

The first course of action would be to make no change in the present allocations to television. This, in itself, is one solution, the consequences of which would be to compound the present difficulties already described and in my opinion ultimately lead to the demise of UHF.

The second course of action would be taken by a decision, as a matter of basic policy, to employ for the long-range future only the presently allocated 12 VHF-TV channels between 54 and 216 megacycles and revise the rules to accommodate as many stations as possible on these channels. It would follow that the spectrum space between 470 and 890 megacycles would eventually be allocated to services other than broadcasting. This would at least clarify the status of UHF-TV and clear up any questions about the economics, from a broadcaster's point of view, of trying to serve the public in the UHF-TV band. Whatever UHF-TV service we have now probably would be either discontinued or transferred to VHF under such a policy, since the ever-increasing requirements for frequencies for all users of radio must in some way be satisfied.

While this course of action might increase the total number of stations, it is also possible that it would lead to less service to the public. This could occur through increased interference between stations which are closer together.

If we elect a third alternative and decide to employ the present VHF and UHF-TV channels on any type of deintermixture basis we can find any number of versions of how this might be done. The fact remains, however, that deintermixture has been the interim policy since 1956 and it has not had the result that was anticipated by the Commission at the time it was decided to deintermix. This is perhaps due to the fact that this alternative meets only the fourth criterion in our ideal standard. Admittedly, novel schemes for deintermixture have been put forth but not tried out. But it seems clear that any deintermixture scheme would leave us with two different TV services in this country. The choice of which system serves a particular community would be de-

terminated by the geographical location of communities rather than by the normal standards of public interest, convenience, and necessity.

In July 1956, the United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce stated that it "specifically approved the Commission's interim program of selective deintermixture, urging that this essential preliminary step be pursued as broadly and rapidly as possible." At that same time the committee characterized the Commission's deintermixture proposals as an interim measure pending the shift of all or a major part of TV to the UHF band and urged that the Commission move as rapidly as possible to the accomplishment of its stated objectives. The same report indicates that the "key to the Commission's long-range proposals for allocations is contained in its request for comments as to the feasibility of ultimately shifting all or a major portion of the TV broadcasting to the UHF band."

If the presently allocated VHF and UHF channels are effectively exploited by TV, the risks of losing spectrum space for TV will be avoided. The longer it takes to effectuate deintermixture, however, the greater the risk of losing all or part of the UHF-TV band. Any inroads into this band could operate to prevent using deintermixture as the formula for putting TV broadcasting on a nationwide competitive basis with a choice of service to the public.

A fourth alternative would be to augment the present 12 VHF channels with as many more channels as possible and abandon the allocation of 470 to 890 megacycles to TV. The impacts of such a scheme are quite significant. Since the frequencies below 54 megacycles are generally considered not too suitable for TV broadcasting and since the upper limit of channel 13 is 216 megacycles, we can roughly analyze the cost and time factors by examining the present non-TV uses of radio between 54 and 300 megacycles. The only frequency bands in this portion of the spectrum which are not now allocated to TV are: 72-76 megacycles; 88-174 megacycles; and 216-300 megacycles.

A method of getting one additional VHF channel would be to find a way to allocate the frequencies between 72 and 76 megacycles now allocated to the operationally fixed service to TV. If we could find a way to increase this band by 2 megacycles we could acquire one more TV channel. It has often been suggested that this could be done by moving channels 2, 3 and 4 downward by 2 megacycles, or by shifting channels 5 and 6 upward by 2 megacycles. If we elect the first alternative, the impact on non-TV uses of radio would be primarily on the amateur service which is allocated 50-54 megacycles. The amateur service would lose half of its existing band. Whether it would be practical for the amateur service to make use of the remaining amateur band 50-52 megacycles is conjectural. It is already difficult, in certain areas where TV channel 2 (54-60 megacycles) is employed, for some amateurs to use the frequencies immediately below 54 megacycles. Moreover, all existing TV receivers in the hands of the public would have to be adjusted to receive channels 2, 3 and 4 on their new frequencies because the video and audio carriers for each of these three channels would be shifted 2 megacycles downward. This adjustment would take time and money and on some widely-used types of receivers is not considered to be practical.

Moreover, provisions would have to be made in existing sets to receive the new channel. We would also have to relocate the point-to-point users of radio now licensed by the FCC in the band 72-76 megacycles in areas remote from TV broadcasting stations on channels 4 and 5. Not only would replacement frequencies have to be found for these point-

to-point users of radio but time would have to be allowed for their shift, at their own expense, to any new frequency band provided for them. If these replacement frequencies, for example, were between 470 and 890 megacycles (the present UHF band) then, in many cases, new equipment would have to be purchased and installed by these users at their own expense. Many of these licensees are local governments whose budgets for this purpose are not adequate.

Another difficulty to overcome in establishing a new TV channel between 70 and 76 megacycles is that on the frequency 75 megacycles a great many marker beacons serve aircraft. We could not actually put TV broadcast stations on the air on this new channel, 70-76 megacycles, in any particular area until the marker beacons on 75 megacycles in that area were removed.

In order to move the marker beacon frequency we must first have international agreement for transferring these markers to some other frequency, or of providing the function now obtained from the present markers by some other means in some other frequency band available to aviation. Studies of ways and means of accomplishing this have made it clear that it would take not only national actions by the United States but also coordination within the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), an organization of governments to which the United States belongs. If international agreement to remove the markers from 75 megacycles could be reached, the negotiations would take a significant amount of time—months certainly, and more likely years. Thereafter, the actual transition itself would take several additional years.

It would be most difficult to estimate with any accuracy either the cost or the time factors involved in overcoming this one problem. The investment in ground transmitting equipment and airborne receiving equipment involves not only aviation within the United States but in many other countries as well. The cost to aviation to shift could not be estimated until it was known in exactly which frequency band and by what electronic technique this function would be performed as a result of the international agreements which would have to be reached.

Another way of using the frequencies between 72 and 76 megacycles for TV would be to move TV channels 5 and 6 upward by 2 megacycles. This would deprive FM broadcasting of 2 megacycles of space between 88 and 90 megacycles. FM broadcasting is presently allocated the frequencies between 88 and 108 megacycles and the FM band would thereby become 90-108 megacycles. Besides the cost and time factors involved in this 10-percent reduction of the spectrum space presently allocated to FM broadcasting, there would be a time and cost problem involved in adjusting those receivers susceptible of adjustment to receive TV channels 5 and 6 on audio and video frequencies 2 megacycles higher in the spectrum. Moreover, the removal of the 75 megacycles aviation marker would have to precede, any such implementation of the frequencies between 72 and 78 megacycles for TV broadcasting as previously explained.

Regardless of whether either of the two alternatives for employing the frequencies between 72 and 76 megacycles for TV broadcasting were adopted, the existing FM broadcasting band between 88 and 108 megacycles were adopted, the existing FM broadcasting could be allocated to TV provided some solution were found to provide for FM broadcasting a suitable band of frequencies and the time required to implement it. One, two, or three TV channels can be formed from the present FM broadcasting band between 88 and 108 megacycles. If, however, we are to take 6, 12, or 18 megacycles of space from FM for TV then we would surely

have to consider the adequacy of the remaining spectrum space from the point of view of FM broadcasting.

When we examine this problem we find that FM has already undergone a major post-war removal from around 40 megacycles to its present position in the spectrum (88-108 megacycles). Delays in implementation and slow progress in the rendering of service to the public resulted from the 1945 shift in the FM allocation. A further move of FM broadcasting to some other portion of the spectrum (presumably between 470 and 890 megacycles) might very well cripple it, obscure its importance and cause years of delay in the reestablishment of this very fine aural broadcast service to the public.

The cost and time factors involved in such an FM transition would be tremendous. The cost factors could not be estimated with any accuracy until we knew the specific details of the frequency band to which FM were to be moved. The time factors would be geared intimately to the public's desire to junk or scrap existing equipment in favor of purchasing new and possibly initially more expensive receiving equipment for a new FM broadcasting band. All of this movement of FM to some other frequency band would have to precede any implementation of the frequencies between 88 and 108 megacycles by TV broadcasting. Furthermore, there would be some cost and time delays for the viewing public, because the existing TV receivers in the hands of the public would require adjustment to receive any new TV channels on any new frequencies that were allocated for TV.

Whether or not we added a new TV channel between channels 4 and 5, or obtained 1, 2, or 3 new TV channels between 88 and 108 megacycles, we would, in evaluating this plan, have to examine the remaining non-TV frequencies between 108 and 174 megacycles.

When we examine the frequencies between 108 and 132 megacycles, we find that these are intensively used by civil aviation throughout the world and that the band has been channeled by international agreement and is being employed in accordance with internationally agreed practices. Any move on the part of the United States to abandon the use of all or portions of this band by aviation in favor of TV would require agreement within the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), and probably the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) as to a replacement band and an internationally agreed timetable to implement such a replacement band. It does not appear to be any incentive from the point of view of any other country to undertake such a move, or any basis for such countries to expend the tremendous sums of money necessary to implement such a scheme. Even assuming that international agreement could be reached on such a program, it would take some years to negotiate and still more years to implement.

The frequencies between 132 and 150.8 megacycles are now allocated to the U.S. Government services. Civil aviation is trying hard right now to obtain a part of this band between 132 and 136 megacycles as an extension to the present aviation band 108-132 megacycles. Our Government agencies have a significant interest in aviation communications, and it would appear that there must be some rather impressive reasons why the present Government uses have not so far been altered so as to provide for this requested expansion of aviation spectrum space.

If this proposed aviation expansion takes place, it would result in about a 25-percent reduction of the present Government allocations in the bands 132-144 and 148-150.8 megacycles (the band 144-148 megacycles is

allocated to the amateur service), thus increasing the difficulties inherent in the release of additional space to provide more TV channels.

On the other hand, if the proposed aviation expansion into the band 132-136 megacycles does not take place, the question would then be whether TV could make a superior claim to that now being pressed by aviation. If it could, there would be some imposing practical difficulties to overcome. For one thing, 4 megacycles would not suffice for a TV channel. If it were an "island" in the spectrum (that is not contiguous to other TV channels) then 10 or 12 megacycles might be required, as a practical matter, to avoid interference from narrow-band services in adjacent bands.

In studying this possibility of obtaining additional VHF TV channels between 132 and 150.8 megacycles we would have to develop new information not brought out in the 1956 conclusion of a special interdepartmental Government study. That conclusion announced in April 1956 was that "National security requirements and the needs of air navigation and air communications preclude the release for non-Government use of any of the very high frequencies now utilized by the Federal Government."

The non-TV frequencies between 150.8 and 162 megacycles are allocated for non-Government land mobile service, that is, police, fire, business radio, taxis, and a host of other vehicular uses. It is perhaps the most effectively exploited frequency band in the spectrum. If all or part of it were to be released to TV, the relocation impact would be tremendous. Most of the users of this band would find it most difficult to raise or to justify the money involved in moving to any new replacement band which might be provided. Again, if an isolated TV channel or "island" were established in this band, the actual spectrum space required for one TV channel would consume more like 10 megacycles of space and not merely the nominal 6 megacycles that is normally assumed for each TV channel.

The frequencies allocated for Government use between 162 and 174 megacycles also were the subject of study in the 1956 investigation, and any speculation about their availability for TV must likewise assume some change over the 1956 facts.

In summary, we see, on the one hand, that there is a possibility of 15 new additional TV channels in the present VHF band 54-216 megacycles. If all 15 of these potential channels could be allocated for TV, then we would have 27 channels in 1 block which would meet the first 3 criteria in our ideal standard with extensive studies required to determine whether the 27 channels would be sufficient for an adequate nationwide competitive television service.

In considering this alternative, we could, of course, study variations of it that would not require all of the spectrum space between 54 and 216 megacycles for TV. For example, we could decide to add only one channel, or perhaps five, which would still leave the same question as to the adequacy of the number of channels.

The fifth alternative course of action is the establishment of a single band of frequencies for TV which is large enough to provide a nationwide competitive service as low in the spectrum as feasible (for example, between 174 and 474 megacycles). Such a plan would meet the criteria of our ideal standard.

There are two important advantages that this alternative has over the 27-channel allocation of all frequencies between 54 and 216 megacycles to TV.

First, it is more feasible, that is, it has much less impact on other uses of radio. Second, the potential number of channels surely would be adequate to provide a nationwide competitive TV service.

These two advantages over the 27-channel

allocation (54-216 megacycles) are sufficiently important to require careful consideration of all features of this possibility.

If we take 50 channels as the minimum for a nationwide competitive service, then we must find 300 megacycles of spectrum space (in one block if possible) somewhere in the spectrum where this is feasible.

If, because of the difficulties in converting all or part of the space between 88 and 174 megacycles to TV, we were to decide to make an allocation for TV entirely above 174 megacycles, it seems logical to consider that the existing TV allocation between 174 and 216 megacycles (channels 7-13) would form the lower portion of this new TV allocation. Adding 300 megacycles (the spectrum space required for 50 TV channels) to the frequency 174 megacycles makes the upper limit of the TV allocation 474 megacycles. If such an allocation could be established (174-474 megacycles exclusively for TV) it would reasonably well meet the criteria in our ideal standard.

The feasibility requirement in this plan assumes it would be easier, or more in the national interest, or both, to seek new TV frequencies above 216 megacycles rather than between 88 and 174 megacycles. In any event the feasibility would depend on the impact on other affected radio services. This impact would include cost and time factors. The same April 1956 report mentioned above bore on the possible release of frequencies between 216 and 300 megacycles for TV. Unless the facts which then were relevant have changed, we would find, for these frequencies, that the worldwide buildup of our international defense facilities in collaboration with friendly countries has intensified the reliance which must be placed for defense purposes on these frequencies.

So, to the extent the April 1956 study was valid, one of the first questions would be whether the international defense considerations today would make it more feasible, or less feasible, to release space between 216 and 300 megacycles for TV.

The 1956 study did not consider frequencies above 300 megacycles. Therefore, in thoroughly examining the possibility of allocating the band 174-474 megacycles for TV, a new, careful, and competent study would have to be made of the possibility of releasing frequencies up to 474 megacycles for TV.

We would need such a new study before we could decide whether this plan was feasible or desirable in the national interest. We would not need any study to know that appreciable time and cost factors would apply to the non-TV services in implementing such a plan. If it could be agreed, it would take time to negotiate with a considerable number of other countries, and much time and many dollars to implement.

Assuming it could be successfully negotiated with the other countries involved and that all of these countries would bear the costs incident to its implementation, we would have to justify these impacts in terms of superiority of the end result in comparison with each of the other available alternatives.

As to the sixth alternative—all TV in one UHF band 470-890 megacycles—there would be no adverse impact on other existing radio services and it would reasonably meet all the criteria in our ideal standard. The 12 channels of VHF spectrum space now allocated for TV could be effectively utilized by a number of radio services.

Most of the impacts on TV licensees and the general public of this plan have been carefully analyzed before. The report of the Television Allocations Study Organization will, I hope, furnish new light on the engineering capabilities of UHF.

There is one aspect of this plan that may not have received full attention, and that is the ability and willingness of the public to obtain the necessary receiving equipment

for whatever frequencies are employed for TV.

We know that the 1945 decision on spectrum allocations for TV took into account some 7,000 receivers then in the hands of the public, the fact that these receivers generally were designed for reception of stations on frequencies below 90 megacycles, and the fact that the on-the-air TV stations at that time used frequencies below 84 megacycles.

The extent to which these factors were controlling in the 1945 decision is unimportant. The important fact is that the 1945 decision retained only 6 of the 18 prewar VHF TV channels intact. Nevertheless, the public and the industry rapidly adjusted to this situation in implementing the postwar VHF allocations of spectrum space for TV.

In deciding between the available alternatives, it may be worthwhile to note that there is relatively little difference, from the point of view of the public, between the 50 channel VHF plan (174-474 megacycles) and all UHF (470-890 megacycles), since the receiver conversion problem would be approximately the same for both. The 50-channel VHF plan would be costly and time consuming for the nonbroadcast users in this and friendly countries. The UHF (470-890 megacycles) would not.

All but alternatives 1 and 2 would entail serious disruptions because of necessary TV receiver conversion or replacement. In this respect, the alternatives which would extend the VHF range immediately beyond channel 13 are at a disadvantage in that there are no TV receivers which cover these frequency bands in existence or production. For an all-UHF system using the 70 channels now allocated there are now in the hands of owners some 8 or 9 million receivers which tune to some or all of the UHF channels, and in addition, there are all-channel sets in commercial production. It is of course obvious that use by TV of any part or all of the spectrum now allocated to TV would avoid the tremendous dislocation of other Government and non-Government services vital to safety or the national defense.

I would like to make it clear that in the event of changes in the present structure, if any changes are possible at this late date, the conversion period should be sufficiently long to permit appropriate amortization of sets in the hands of the public and investments in television broadcasting plants by broadcasters.

In an industry as dynamic and ever changing as radio this analysis may be outdated tomorrow, but in preparing this material, I have gained a new understanding of this problem, and I hope contributed something to your understanding of it.

I cannot predict what course of action the Commission will follow. I can tell you that we are all vitally concerned with this problem, and for the past several months have had a number of technical studies underway. We all hope these studies will contribute to the sum total of knowledge, and materially assist us in arriving at an appropriate solution. In this way, perhaps, we can chart a course which will eventually result in a truly first-class nationwide competitive television service with a fair and equitable distribution of television service to all our people.

A Look at the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of today's

date, there appears an editorial concerning what I feel to be the most momentous legislation presently before the Congress. This editorial urges careful consideration of the proposal set forth by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Wolf], as an alternative to a simple 4-year extension of the draft. The Post's editorial position is especially appealing, Mr. Speaker, because it does not attempt to prejudge the merit or lack of merit of the draft system on the basis of the inadequate evidence presently available. Rather than an unqualified 4-year extension, or an unqualified termination of the draft, this editorial supports Mr. Wolf's proposal for a limited extension, coupled with a searching examination of the Nation's military manpower needs. I believe this position is well calculated to avoid both the alleged perils of an abrupt cessation of draft authority, and a repetition of our previous uncritical acceptance of the draft as a permanent part of our Nation's peacetime defense policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial as follows:

A LOOK AT THE DRAFT

Before Congress automatically adopts a long-term extension of the military conscription law, it ought to take a careful and critical look at the way in which the draft has been operating. When draft calls take only a small fraction of the total number of eligible young men and the great majority avoid military service, a very serious question of fairness arises. John Graham notes in a study for the Fund for the Republic that "because of either disability or fatherhood, more than 60 percent of all non-prior servicemen" were being deferred in early 1957 and "there is no reason to believe the picture has changed since then, or will change in the future."

Actually, the Army is the only one of the military services using the draft. It calls approximately 8,000 a month, of whom fewer than 7,000 are inducted for the 2-year period. Some 90,000 young men each year take advantage of the plan for 6 months of active training and 5½ years of Reserve or National Guard service; and of course there are many thousands of others who volunteer for service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. All in all, however, the burdens and obligations are distributed very unequally among the 1.2 million young men who come of military age each year. Some have their education, career or family plans disrupted while many others make no national sacrifice at all.

The House Armed Services Committee has reported a simple 4-year extension of the draft beyond June 30. There is something to be said for using such means to avoid harangue over new plans for additional deferments and special-interest concessions. But there is a great deal more to be said, in our opinion, for the approach of Representative Wolf of Iowa. Mr. Wolf's bill would provide for a 2-year draft extension, but a concurrent resolution would require an intensive study by a joint congressional committee of military manpower procedures and alternative methods of meeting the needs.

This newspaper has long supported both the draft and the concept of national service. It does not share the views of those who feel that the country's youth is being stereotyped or "prussianized"; indeed, it believes that most young men benefit in one way or another from their military service. But it recognizes also that there is now no

chance of fulfillment of the universal military training plan which Congress approved 8 years ago. With the changing character of war, UMT probably has been outmoded; moreover, it would be extremely costly.

Now, the Army makes some compelling arguments, in which it is supported by the other services, that a draft law is necessary on the books whether or not it is fully utilized. A recent study shows that the Air Force and Navy benefit notably in the caliber of their volunteer enlistees because of the draft; and the Army obtains higher-quality men than might otherwise be the case.

Furthermore, the contention that there will be no more Koreans is highly dubious. It is impossible to predict the exact needs of limited war. If the Reserves and National Guard are worth anything, their requirements cannot be overlooked. The assertion that higher rates of pay for the lower ranks would attract an all-volunteer force rather begs the question of national obligation. Does the United States really want to abandon the concept that each young man owes some service to his countrymen? What would be the effect of higher pay scales in the countries where American forces are stationed abroad? And what would be the result in NATO, which is having trouble maintaining its strength, of an American decision to end the draft?

Plainly such questions demand thoughtful consideration, and we think there is strong reason for Congress to extend the draft temporarily. But the country also needs to determine whether the draft is the best way of meeting the problem—and whether, alternatively, if there is value in the concept of national service, it ought to be expanded beyond military conscription to include an overseas technical service corps, a scientific corps, a civil defense corps, a conservation corps, and the like. It is a delusion to think that there is an easy or even a wholly satisfactory answer. Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need, it ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Bishop-Elect, the Reverend John W. Comber, From Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, American missionaries of all faiths have inspired us with their courage and their devotion to God. And we in turn can learn much from the wisdom they acquired during their service in far-off lands.

A man who was born and raised in my home city has become superior general of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society, more familiarly known as the Maryknoll Fathers.

An additional honor came to him on January 28, 1959, when he was named titular bishop of Foratiana by Pope John XXIII.

Bishop-elect John W. Comber is the beloved leader of 1,200 missionaries, including the society's second superior general, the Most Reverend James E. Walsh, who has been imprisoned on false charges by the Chinese Reds.

As a mark of our respect for the honor conferred on Bishop-elect Comber, and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following account that appeared in the February 2, 1959, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

MARYKNOLL BISHOP-ELECT WAS JAILED BY JAPANESE

(By Jo-Ann Price)

MARYKNOLL, N.Y., January 31.—The New York area's newest Roman Catholic bishop-elect, the Rev. John W. Comber, superior general of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society (Maryknoll Fathers), is a short white-haired priest who, like a number of his clergymen, has served a term of imprisonment.

On the day after Pearl Harbor, Father Comber and about 25 Maryknollers were clapped into internment in Fushun, Manchuria, by the Japanese, with a large group of Protestant and Catholic missionaries.

They were treated well, Father Comber said today in an interview. But the experience, which ended when he was repatriated aboard the Swedish liner Gripsholm 2 years later, provided him with many valuable lessons on the subject of prison.

The new bishop-elect was named titular bishop of Foratiana last Wednesday by Pope John XXIII. He will be consecrated on April 9. He has been superior of the Maryknoll Fathers since 1956. He is the fourth superior general of the society, which was organized in 1911.

HEADS RELIGIOUS SOCIETY

Father Comber is 52. He heads a religious society of 1,200 American missionaries in Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, Formosa, Philippines, Hawaii, Mexico, Guatemala, Chile, Peru, Bolivia and Tanganyika. Since it was established in this country in 1911, it has built up a large honor roll of men who have died for their faith, he noted.

They include men like Bishop Patrick J. Byrne of Washington, who perished in 1950 after the death march and ill treatment by the Communists in North Korea, and Bishop Francis X. Ford, of Brooklyn who died in a Communist prison in Canton in 1952.

Between 1946 and 1951, a total of 180 Maryknollers were expelled from Red China. Between 25 and 30 of these were subject to arrest and imprisonment. Even now, the society's second superior general, the Most Reverend James E. Walsh, is believed to be a prisoner in Shanghai, Father Comber said.

Father Comber spoke with considerable caution on the subject of reported consecrations of Chinese bishops in the Communist-sponsored and schismatic national Catholic Church of China. He observed that "there can be no true bishops with jurisdiction, since jurisdiction comes from unity with the Holy See."

PRELATES RESIST REDS

A recent report reaching Maryknoll headquarters here said that Communist efforts to promote an independent church had met with opposition from most Chinese prelates. Many Chinese clergy have been jailed for defiance of their Communist rulers, it said.

On the credit side of the missionary ledger, Father Comber said that during 1958, more than 82,000 converts were baptized among the 10 million persons within the areas served by the Maryknoll Fathers. Everywhere, he said, "our missions are working under peaceful conditions."

While members of the society regard the present mission situation with optimism, he said, "we also have to look to the time when the church in mission lands must stand on its own." Every missionary "must think of the development of a native clergy" so the church may flourish after the last

foreign clergyman has departed from a country.

For his personal motto as a bishop, Father Comber, a native of Lawrence, Mass., has selected the classic missionary motto, "Going, teach ye all nations." It has inspired him through his years of service in Manchuria, from 1931 to 1943, and subsequently in Peru and Chile.

Purchase of Foreign-Made Turbine Generators by the REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised, although I must confess I was, like the rest of my hometown, puzzled at the action of the REA in the purchase of foreign-made turbine generators.

This in the face of a chronic unemployment of about 4 million American workers.

This, too, in the face of the cry for more aid from this country from practically every nation on the face of the earth.

I have said before, and I now repeat it is time to review our position in world trade and aid.

It is time we look after our own interest with a little more pride and zeal. I repeat again the wise admonition of President Theodore Roosevelt when he said:

There is room for only one soul loyalty and that loyalty is to the American people.

I submit for the RECORD the wire of protest from Mayor A. B. Elias of the city of Jeannette and my protest to the REA:

JEANNETTE, PA., February 3, 1959.

Congressman JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We in Jeannette are very much puzzled by last Friday's action of the REA in Washington. Contract for two large turbine generators for the Medina Electric Cooperative in Hondo, Tex., was awarded to Brown Boveri of Switzerland after the user had indicated our local Elliott Co. as the supplier. Loss of this business will seriously affect employment at the local plant which is already low, and our relief rolls, as you know, are already high.

A. B. ELIAS,
Mayor, City of Jeannette.

FEBRUARY 4, 1959.

Mr. DAVID HILL,
Administrator, REA, Washington, D.C.:

Pursuant to my telephone conversation, I herewith officially and vigorously protest the awarding turbine generator contract the Medina Electric Corp. to Switzerland. The Elliott Co. in Jeannette, Pa., seriously affected by this decision. Entire community considered serious labor surplus area and every man-hour payroll denied means that much more in local taxes, local loss of business, and local relief rolls. This matter goes deeper than a mere acquiring of machinery and seriously affects the economic and moral fiber of our way of life. Governments by their taxing powers are rapidly destroying

the competitive quality of American manufacturers and the unrestrictive right grants competition for country to bid on American requirements, especially in nontaxpaying corporations and Government purchasing sets an example that can be and is in some quarters, destructive and devastating to our economic well-being. I request a delay in the granting of this contract and that the work be given to American working men and American plants.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have today received in my office several telegrams from prominent citizens in my State of Oregon, protesting the passage, under the terms of the committee's report, of the draft extension bill, H.R. 2260. Two of these telegrams are simply the expressions of individual citizens, many of whom are known as thoughtful students of the problems posed by the international scene. The third telegram quotes in full the resolution on draft extension adopted by the Oregon Methodist Church in its annual conference on June 20, 1958. These telegrams present what I consider to be very persuasive arguments for supporting a much more severely limited extension of the draft than that proposed in H.R. 2260. I ask unanimous consent that these telegrams be printed in full.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1959.
Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Alarmed with hasty maneuvers to steamroller draft extension through House. After 19 years, 4 more years of draft must not be fastened on us from high pressure tactics and public apathy. Urge you speak out against H.R. 2260 when it reaches House floor.

Fern Gage, Roy Gage, Albert Querin, Mildred Querin, Hideo Hashimoto, Howard Richards, Esther Richards, Rev. Mack Caldwell, Pauline Doran, Rev. Raymond Walker, Eldon Helm, Fred Breckon, Lillian Breckon, Robert Hungerford, Mary Hungerford, John Wallen, Manvel Schaufier, Howard Willits, Christine Willits, Helen Jurgens, Wilton Hartzler, Bernhard Fedde.

Resolution adopted by annual conference of Oregon Methodist church, June 20, 1958, in regard to draft extension is as follows: "Peacetime conscription; we affirm the oft-stated position of the general conference that compulsory peacetime military training is contrary to the best American traditions and disregards the Christian hope for security through positive policies. We urge the abolition of peacetime conscription."

Official Board of Parkrose Heights Methodist Church meeting February 3, 1959, voted unanimously to adopt this resolution also.

Rev. DAVID POINDEXTER.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1959.
Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

We, voters of Clackamas County, Oreg., are disturbed over rushing draft extension through House. Are they trying to pass it before public can know and protest it? We oppose H.R. 2260.

Essie Hildreth, Mable West, Erna Kingsley, Katharine Talbott, Helen Millham, Mercy Holland, Edith Glassen, A. J. Prideaux, Mabel Downs, Herbert Hildreth, Nora Rumbaugh, Elvira Raven, Martha Wedemeyer, Elsie Grelle, Alta Edgar, Edith Bork.

End Rocket-Missile Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 4, 1959:

END ROCKET-MISSILE CONFUSION

America's aerospace position and programs in recent days have taken on a startling tinge of uncertainty and confusion. This is a condition that should be cleared up.

These programs relate, particularly from the standpoint of national defense, to intercontinental ballistic missiles. Our military and civilian authorities admit that Soviet Russia has made such gains in developing these vital weapons that we would need many months, perhaps years, to catch up.

A similar situation prevails regarding rocket vehicles for space exploration. There, again, Russia is said to be 3 years, maybe 5 or more, ahead of us.

Why? And what are our leaders, our scientists, doing about it? Indefinite answers we are getting on this score are not reassuring.

Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, told the House Space Committee yesterday that the nation which maintains mastery of aerospace will hold the means for survival—that "The decisive weapons of the future will be aerospace weapons."

This we can well believe. It points up the necessity for more determined and more effective rocket and missile research and development than current information indicates is in prospect.

But Dr. T. Keith Glennan, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, fends off the idea, given more or less political emphasis by some Democratic critics, that greatly increased amounts of money are needed to make real progress. Yet he told a House committee that "urgently sustained . . . time, money and effort . . . for years to come" are required. And, even so, he said, it will be 18 months to 2 years before the United States could send forth as big a space payload as the Russians have already launched into space.

A few days ago Dr. Wernher von Braun, of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, testified the United States is 12 to 20 months behind Soviet rocket and space technology. At the same time he and other witnesses declared Russia could now pinpoint a city in the United States with a ballistic missile fired more than 5,000 miles away.

If the Soviet Union continued at its present pace, Dr. von Braun said, it would require 5 years for us to catch up, and then only if the United States went ahead faster than present plans permit.

At the same time Defense Secretary McElroy, defending the administration's defense budget provision—\$41 billion—insists the United States is prepared to meet the threat it faces today and that the United States will be practically even with Russia in war-ready ICBM's by the end of this year.

The paramount question—as to rockets or ballistic missiles—Is the progress fast enough?

In Russia Marshal Malinovsky boasts that the West's—he means our—nuclear weapons are outdated by Soviet long-range missiles of great accuracy. That touches on our once-powerful bombers, capable of delivering nuclear bombs against Russian targets—if they can get to them.

There have been official decisions not to try to match Soviet output missile for missile. That may be wise, or it may not be. Aside from such questions the preponderant one is the plain lag in rocket and missile development, including such powerful propellants as the Russians, it is admitted, have produced and we have not.

The problem of America's new defenses, in outer space and here on earth, is the tremendously important one. In these projects uncertainty and confusion have no place. They should be eliminated, without further loss of time.

Cuban Woman Writes About Terror of Batista—Defends War Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a story from the Cheraw Chronicle, of January 29, 1959, about the Cuban situation. Since we have been so concerned, I thought it best to bring to the attention of the Congress this grassroots report which appeared in a letter to a member of the staff of one of the newspapers in my district.

CUBAN WOMAN WRITES ABOUT TERROR OF BATISTA; DEFENDS WAR TRIALS

A young Cuban woman who was a frequent visitor to Chesterfield County a couple of years ago has written a letter in defense of the Cuban war trials to Mrs. S. Gordon Brown, associate editor of the Cheraw Chronicle.

Miss Gilsa Agüero, a foreign student at Wingate College, told of the persecution under Batista's dictatorial regime. She said her letter, parts of which are reprinted below, was the first in nearly 6 years that she could send out of Cuba free of censorship.

Miss Agüero became a friend of Mrs. Ruth Horton, foreign student advisor, at Wingate and through Mrs. Horton, met Mrs. Brown. The student and the editor cultivated their friendship through correspondence, but this is the first account of the historic events in Cuba that Miss Agüero has been able to give:

"DEAR MRS. BROWN: What a nice surprise I had last month when I received your letter and a few days later the Christmas gift which you sent.

"It is so nice for you to remember me. I am sorry that both times before, when you wrote me, the letters were returned. I am writing down my correct home address and perhaps now you will be able to come visit me in Havana.

"We didn't have too much of a Christmas, but I, as well as all the Cuban people, had the most marvelous New Year, for we received the wonderful gift of 'Freedom,' about which we have been dreaming for so long. After almost 7 years of dictatorship, murders and finally civil war, we have reached a new period of peace, justice, and liberty. At last we should realize the well-being and progress that Cuba deserves.

"We know that normalcy will return right away under the leadership of the new revolutionary government and that we shall attain and safeguard those revolutionary ideals so well defended by Fidel Castro, his men, and so many of our people who have suffered the horrors of tyranny. The chief sufferers have been the university students who died defending a cause and their idealism which they valued above all else.

"Cuba is proud to know the tremendous effort made at the beginning by a handful of simple men facing incredible hardships, suffering, and danger. Thanks to their efforts Cuba has returned to the fold of democratic, sovereign nations.

"I recall when all this began at Havana University 5 years ago with the student boycotts and strikes. Our 200-year-old university was closed as the students began to plot against the dictatorship of Batista.

"We are filled with gratitude and appreciation for the discipline, discretion, sacrifice, and honor shown by the men of the revolutionary army. They have given the finest example of Cuban courage, citizenship, and patriotism. It is amazing that a group, beginning with 12 men and 1 determined leader, could win for a nation its freedom fighting against an organized army.

"Back in March 1952, Batista and his group of army officers threw out the constitutional government 2 months before general elections and started his dictatorship, which signaled the start of tyranny, killing, terror, censorship, and destruction of all our constitutional guarantees and civil liberties.

"Batista and his henchmen filled the jails and cemeteries with innocent people, murdered children and hit and abused women. For 82 months our country went through the worst kind of torture, crimes, and violation of human rights that compared with the German and Japanese tortures of World War II.

"It was even a crime to be young, for the young opposed the dictator, and for this reason, more than 20,000 young people, usually between the ages of 15 and 26, were killed. In the last 2 months Batista directed that our towns and cities be machinegunned and bombed with 500-pound bombs, including the use of napalm bombs, furnished him by the United States, and planes, tanks, and all kinds of arms sent to him by England and the Dominican Republic.

"Thanks to God that is all over now. What the entire Cuban people want is justice for all the crimes committed against them and their country. I have read that for this (executions), we are being criticized in the United States, but I for one, same as all the population, believe that the revolutionary government has as much right to exterminate the war criminals here as did the Allies in World War II to condemn the Nazi leaders at the Nuremberg trials. The trials are according to codes based on the Nuremberg trials, during which time your country sentenced to death or prison German war criminals.

"Anybody who did not see what was really happening in Cuba from 1952 until last month might not understand this, but we

who suffered know. Batista and his military clique did not hesitate to imprison, detain, torture or murder our relatives, friends, acquaintances, or anyone and everyone who they thought opposed them or who they feared might help the rebels.

"This is the first time in years that we can express in letters our real opinions without the fear that regime would open the mail.

"Sincerely,

"GILSA AGÜERO."

Poison in Your Water—No. 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago News of January 13, 1958, had an interesting article on sewage and pollution in the State of Illinois.

In an article under the byline of Mr. Jack Mabley the lead sentence is, "It looks to me as though the rivers and streams of suburban Cook County are destined to become open sewers." This is a situation that plagues not only Cook County but hundreds and thousands of communities throughout the United States. The article is as follows:

SEWAGE GOES STREAMING BY—STRATTON HIT FOR POLLUTION

(By Jack Mabley)

"It looks to me as though the rivers and streams of suburban Cook County are destined to become open sewers."

Burton Atwood, chairman of the Cook County Clean Streams Committee, and national secretary of the Izaak Walton League, makes this prediction in his annual report to the committee.

The committee is fighting to keep the rivers and streams in Cook County unpolluted. Right now it seems to be a stand-off. They've kept things from getting worse, but they aren't any better, either.

The lovely streams that meander through the forest preserves, the rivers that course through suburban towns and open country, and eventually pour into the Chicago River, are loaded with oil, garbage, sewage, and industrial waste.

The Clean Streams Committee tries to chase down the source of the pollution, but when they catch one, another may spring up.

They're getting little help from the State.

ATWOOD BLUNTLY BLAMES STRATTON

Mr. Atwood, like most conservationists a blunt man, says, "The record in Illinois should make Governor Stratton hang his head in shame.

"The Izaak Walton League has often cited the Illinois program of water pollution control as outstandingly successful.

"But the deterioration of the Illinois Sanitary Water Board during Governor Stratton's administration is today the outstanding example of the failure of State control.

"This deterioration is due to the loss of the experienced engineers who built the reputation of the Illinois Sanitary Water Board, due to an unrealistic salary scale."

Mayor Daley has, or had, visions of gondolas paddling up and down the Chicago River.

It is difficult to picture the gondollers picking their way through the filth.

Factories dump oil and waste into the rivers. Restaurants dump their garbage and empty their toilets into the streams. Trailer camps operating without licenses have been fouling streams.

AND THE MESS IS GETTING WORSE

The mess is getting worse because of actions such as that of a large subdivision next to Des Plaines which is planning to dump its combined storm and sanitary sewage into Weller Creek, which goes into the Des Plaines River, which flows mostly through forest preserves.

Atwood thinks 1958 will determine whether the fight to control stream pollution will be won or lost.

The law entitles citizens to reasonably clean water in streams that enter their communities. Protection of public health is a major factor. Atwood believes in the rights to clean streams for fishing, swimming, picnicking, camping, hiking, and plain enjoyment of nature.

I'm a little sensitive because my dog likes to swim in the west fork of the North Branch of the Chicago River, while the kids run along the bank trying to keep him from drowning.

It was only recently I learned that two trailer camps and a restaurant a mile upstream have been illegally dumping their sewage into the water.

GI Joe and Honest John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine of February 1, 1959, written by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, noted military editor of the New York Times:

GI JOE AND HONEST JOHN—MISSILES AND PLASTIC FOXHOLES ARE TRANSFORMING THE FACE OF WAR, BUT AS ALWAYS, DESPITE CHANGES, THE FOOT SOLDIER IS NECESSARY TO HOLD THE GROUND

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The slim, long shape of Nike rises above the sagebrush and mesquite of west Texas and missiles soar over the vast arid ranges where the drumming hoofbeats of the horse cavalry once stirred the desert dust. At Fort Bliss, where the lean, tough "yellow-legs" tamed the West's wild frontier, the Army of today is reaching into the frontier of the sky to develop the tactics of tomorrow.

In the highlands of Arizona, at Fort Huachuca, the thin notes of the bugle wail their sweet lament as in the days when Geronimo, the Apache, was the enemy. But today Huachuca is an electronic proving ground where the Signal Corps tests the instruments for tomorrow's secret, silent war, radar sentries, television spies, infrared detectors, electronic jamming devices to make enemy shell fuses detonate prematurely, new communications systems and mobile computers that will lighten the command burdens of some future Patton.

At Fort Rucker in Alabama, the cavalry of the past has sprouted wings. This is the Army Aviation Center, home of the flier who hedgehops across rivers or swamps or mountains to reconnoiter and to move men and

supplies—to "git thar," as in the days of Forrest, "fustest with the mostest."

And at Fort Benning, Ga., long the home of infantry, "Queen of Battle," the foot-slogger of yesterday—with new arms and new equipment—is still the pediment of tomorrow's Army. He may ride to war in an armored personnel carrier, skim the battlefield in an aerial jeep, receive his commands from a helmet radio and protect himself with plastic foxhole covers, but he is still the service that holds or dominates the good earth.

The Army's posts and forts today present to one who has long known the heritage of their history a strange and exciting mixture of past, present and future—yesterday's traditions and some of yesterday's ancient architecture; today's cramped Wherry housing built in wholesale lots and today's military generation groping into tomorrow's unknown dawn, and the fantastic battlefield dreams and tactical aspirations, the futuristic weapons and equipment of the Army of 1965-70, shaped and tailored for the atomic age.

What will this Army be like, so far as men can envision it now? What will be its purpose? What of its tactics and its equipment and its men?

The strategic purpose of the Army of tomorrow is still the same as that of the armies of Alexander the Great, of Hannibal, of Grant and Lee. To dominate and occupy the earth upon which man lives is, and will remain, the fundamental mission of the ground forces.

But in the age of missiles and atoms, victory—of a sort—could conceivably be won through the air by long-range nuclear bombardment. In such a general, unlimited war ground forces would have a secondary role. How secondary is a subject of debate.

Some strategists believe that even in an unlimited nuclear interchange ground forces would be essential—for martial rule in what remained of the warring countries, to fight a broken-backed conflict once the main atomic punches had been exchanged, or to pick up the pieces at the finale in a world gutted and in chaos. Such a war might end, as they foresee it, as wars began, with battles between small groups of men, lightly armed with rifles, bayonets, clubs, and stones.

But the army of tomorrow—though it claims an essential role even in the apocalyptic vision of all-out conflict—believes that its primary mission will be in limited conflicts. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, has pointed out that there has been a total of 17 limited war situations in the 13 years since 1945 (other counts make the total 20), and that by striking a statistical time-manpower balance, one finds that they have averaged about 2½ years in duration and nearly 600,000 men [have been] engaged.

If future history follows past experience, there will be more limited wars. Indeed, the rate of occurrence may increase, since Soviet leaders have always shown a willingness to take chances.

From this conviction that wars are still likely even in the atomic age, and that they probably will be less than all-out conflicts, has stemmed the Army's creation of STRAC, the Strategic Army Corps of three divisions, its objective instant readiness for transportation by air or sea to any part of the world. STRAC is envisioned as a mobile fire brigade, always ready for combat, prepared to put out small conflagrations before they become big ones.

But this is easier stated than accomplished. A nonaggressive nation never knows where it must fight. The defense never chooses the time or place of attack. Nor can the Army know how limited a war may be, whether or not it will develop into an unlim-

ited one, whether atomic weapons will be used, what kind of terrain it may have to dominate, the climate its soldiers will have to endure.

In short, the future role of STRAC—indeed, the primary mission of the Army of tomorrow—is to be prepared to fight any kind of war anywhere, with or without nuclear weapons; to confirm ultimate victory by the physical presence of "GI Joe" on the disputed soil. But the mere statement of this mission, comprehensive though it is, slights the tremendous problems—greater than in all the past—that face the Army of tomorrow.

Though the Army's strategic mission has not changed, the technological revolution in warfare has altered the weapons and equipment with which it fights so fundamentally as to shake its whole structure, tactics, and organization.

The revolution, first of all, is in fire power and range. One moderate-sized tactical nuclear weapon will yield as much explosive force as 21,600 105-millimeter shells; one weapon might wipe out a whole battalion—or even a division. Yet all kinds of tactical nuclear weapons are now available for land forces' use—nuclear shells fired by 280-millimeter cannon and 8-inch howitzers; large warheads for Redstone (200-mile) missiles; medium-sized warheads for the Corporal (90-mile) missile; small warheads for the Honest John field-artillery rocket (range: 20,000 yards) and for the Nike-Hercules antiaircraft missiles.

The Army already is developing its second-generation missiles; the solid-fueled Sergeant missile will replace the Corporal; the Pershing, the Redstone. And nuclear weapons are becoming even smaller and more portable; soon there may be 5-inch nuclear shells, and portable Davy Crockett "nukes" for the infantryman.

Nuclear weapons have tremendously extended the killing radius of a ground force; they incorporate in one weapon the destructive blast of a gigantic artillery shell, and the denial effects of mustard gas. For radioactivity is now a factor every commander must reckon with: his own weapons, as well as the enemy's, may create, with each burst, downwind elliptical patterns 70 to 80 miles long where the silent killer will prohibit—or at least limit—battlefield movement.

The revolution in firepower is not confined to nuclear arms. Tomorrow's rifles and small arms, though far lighter and simpler than those they supersede, will be capable of spewing out far more lead—and rounds that count—than the M-1 of World War II. The new M-14 rifle, now going into production, can be fired fully automatic—40 rounds in 45 seconds—with less kick, or recoil, than its predecessors. Its companion, the M-60 machinegun, is far lighter than its predecessors and its barrel, when heated from rapid fire of 100 rounds a minute for 10 minutes, can be changed in 4 seconds—just a twist of the wrist. Yet the end is not yet.

Luminous sights for night firing, light little rifles with plastic stocks and simple parts, high-velocity .22-caliber rifles that will lighten by one-third the infantryman's ammunition load, and a rifle that fires two bullets in tandem—thus increasing materially the chances of a hit for each shot fired—are under study. There are even liquid-propellant small arms in the offing.

Missiles are supplementing, and in some cases replacing, artillery. There is an anti-tank missile, controlled by trailing wire unreeling in flight, with a shaped charge powerful enough to penetrate the armor of any tank. There is LaCrosse, a robot that attacks field fortifications. There is even a napalm missile and the Lobber, a supply missile.

There are new recoilless 120-millimeter rifles, and improved bazookas. But the old

reliable gun tubes which made artillery the king of World War II still provide the principal punch for limited war, and new ones—a 175-millimeter piece, and a so-called mortar (marrying the characteristics of mortar and howitzer) are under development. New antitank and antipersonnel mines now have directional capabilities and wide dispersion. One, detonated at the proper time, can wipe out a well-dispersed patrol.

Chemicals—gases that are tasteless, odorless, colorless but toxic, persistent and lethal—could add to the hazard of tomorrow's battlefield. Against some of them, and against biological agents—the unknown, undiscussed weapon—the safest protection would be a completely enclosing rubberized suit with its own self-contained air supply.

To the revolution in firepower and the revolution in range must be added the revolution in speed, and in mobility. Just as the internal combustion engine and the machinegun doomed the horse in war, so the armored personnel carrier, weird cross-country vehicles, transport aircraft, helicopters, vertical takeoff aircraft, flying jeeps, and platforms are superseding the jeep of World War II.

The long-distance airlift (as in the Lebanon crisis) has reduced appreciably the Army's reflex time; ground forces can react to an enemy's aggression—even half a world away—far faster than in the past. Tomorrow, tactical mobility on the battlefield itself will be keyed to a light, aluminum personnel carrier which can ford or swim rivers and move overland on tracks; to the Mechanical Mule, a tiny, four-wheeled vehicle which can carry loads heavier than its own weight, and to gadgets that can skim over the battlefield and land on a dime.

Flying cranes—powerful jet-driven helicopters—will be the load carriers and the aerial scouts. Armed with machineguns and rockets, they will lay down suppression fire and, as "Skyevac," move small bodies of troops to the enemy's rear or flanks. For the infantryman himself, it now seems possible that terrain-skimming jeeps or individual flying platforms, perhaps utilizing ducted fans, may transform the mile-an-hour mudslogger into a man with seven-league boots.

For heavy load and supply missions behind the front, vehicles with huge wheels will drag supply pallets or rolling rubber containers of gasoline across the earth—waddling cross-country over uneven ground like prehistoric monsters. For the Arctic, the Sno-Train—with 6-foot rubber-tired wheels 48 inches wide—will supplant the sleds and wannisnags of today.

These—and other vehicles—may be run by atomic power or by universal engines capable of burning gasoline, diesel oil, or nearly anything but wood.

To link this hard-hitting, long-ranging, fast-moving Army together and to supply its commanders information about the enemy, there are new miracles in electronics: radar to spot enemy mortars, invisible eyes that can report walking men 4,000 yards away, television and infrared detectors to gather and transmit information about the battlefield and calculating machines and digital computers—their data presented on fluorescent screens.

Automation is coming to the Army—and with it, jibes GI Joe, will come the Army's greatest blessing: the machines will do the thinking and supersede the generals.

The revision of military organization has always followed the development of new weapons. The development of battlefield nuclear weapons forced the abandonment of big triangular (three-regiment) division with which the Army fought World War II. But the new pentomic (five-sided) division, which is the basis of today's army, has been created before most of the weapons with

which it is to be equipped have been produced.

Many of the weapons and equipment described above are still merely gleams in the designers' eyes, or exist only in prototype forms. At the same time, the multiplication of weapons and weapons systems—the old ones must be retained to fight non-nuclear wars, the new ones are essential for any atomic battlefield—presents a problem of amoebalike growth.

How do you keep a division—the tactical unit of any army—small (and it must be small if it is to be mobile, and it must be mobile if it is to live on any future battlefield) when it needs so many different weapons to meet an incalculable number of situations?

Today's answer—the pentomic division—is no more than a compromise. The fighting heart of the division is its five battle groups, with both conventional and nuclear support, but the structure already has been radically changed since its inception 3½ years ago. Its capability to fight nonnuclear battles has just been sharply increased by strengthening its conventional artillery support.

But the pentomic division still faces a number of what the Army calls "incompatibilities"—the greatest of them the incompatibility of nuclear and conventional war. It cannot retain its tactical, or battlefield, mobility (which requires such bulky items as tanks, armored personnel carriers, light planes and helicopters) and at the same time attain strategic mobility (portability by air across oceans and continents). Its communications and electronics equipment—there is now one radio transmitter for every 10.3 men in the division—already is so plentiful that electronic interference from its own equipment is an ever-present problem. It calculating machines and its weapons are so increasingly complex that the problem of maintaining them under field conditions sometimes seems insurmountable.

The tactical organization of the Army of tomorrow is therefore still a matter of trial and error. The trend is toward small mobile units (considerably smaller than present battle groups), quickly responsive to command, armed with light but very powerful weapons.

The tactics of tomorrow's Army will be dictated by necessity—necessity bred from the technological revolution in war. Battlefield nuclear weapons—whether used or not—enforce their own rules. A ground army can hope to survive only by widespread dispersion, operation in small groups, the use of cover and constant movement.

Tomorrow's ground battlefield—if there is one—will be a far cry in its dimensions from those limited areas overseen by Napoleon, astride his horse, where the destinies of nations were decided. In the age of the plane and rocket, airborne troops and guerrilla armies, the concept of the line is gone forever. A front may extend the depth of a whole nation. Under such conditions, victory would go to that force which—as in the days of Jackson's foot cavalry—was able to marry most closely the principles of mobility, firepower, and flexibility. The principles are the same, but the difficulty of applying them has increased by quantum jumps.

What about the men? Clearly, if tomorrow's soldier is to be master of the machine and not a creature of chaos he will require higher intelligence, better training, greater toughness and more initiative by far than all past GI Joes. More—much, much more—will depend upon the few.

The Army recognizes the importance of man as the hub of the battle, even though there are weaknesses and omissions in its preparations for the unknown battlefields of speculation. The criticism so often voiced between past wars that "the generals are

preparing for the last war" is certainly not valid today; indeed, the criticism should be reversed. The futuristic weapons, the revolutionary organization and tactics of tomorrow's army, as envisaged today, are geared perhaps too much to some future battlefield, not enough to yesterday's.

Today's Army, for instance stresses but slightly guerrilla tactics, or defense against the terrorist underground and irregular forces that have cost so much British and French blood and treasure in the postwar years. Today's Army views the skies as tomorrow's strategic and tactical answer to its mobility needs, yet the enormous supply problems of aerial movement are unresolved.

The Army of tomorrow is not backward looking; it has leaped into a whole new era of warfare since World War II. But one suspects that in some future time, if the chips are down, the fantastic dreams of electronic, automated armies may—sooner or later—under the stress of battle—bend and break beneath the sheer weight of complexity and incompatibilities. Then GI Joe with the will to win as his oldest-newest weapon—GI Joe, bearded, bloody but unbowed—will still slog through the mud to victory.

U.S. Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, once again the administration is preparing to ask Congress for a vast foreign aid appropriation and once more we will be bombarded with propaganda in support of continued spending abroad.

In line with this there has recently been prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress a very enlightening report, showing, among other things, that this country has extended aid to foreign countries in the last 18 years totaling more than \$120 billion.

This is significant, it seems to me, in view of the fact that this represents nearly one-half of the total national debt of some \$282 billion. Of course, there is a good deal more involved, but at the time of the first large expenditure for foreign assistance, in 1940, our national debt was approximately \$40 billion. Today the interest on the debt amounts to more than \$8 billion annually, and a large part of this interest is paid on money which has been sent to foreign shores for military and economic assistance.

While a good part of this total—\$49,223,859,000—was for lend-lease during World War II, the fact remains that the overwhelming part of it was for aid since the war. The report shows that from July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1958, a total of \$71,551,940,000 has been spent in foreign aid, including \$55,017,837,000 in direct grants—which we will never get back—and \$16,534,103,000 was in utilized credits and loans.

Mr. Herman L. Ficker, of the International Finance and Trade Unit of the Economics Division of the Library of

Congress, has gone into considerable detail in explaining the various aspects of the foreign assistance program, and I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD his entire report—feeling that it should be of interest to every American:

U.S. FOREIGN AID

RECAPITULATION AND EXPLANATORY NOTES

Summary totals

During the period July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1958, the United States extended gross utilized aid totaling \$120,775,799,000 to foreign governments and international organizations as follows:

War period, July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945

Gross grants—Lend-lease (table I).....	\$46,728,287,000
Gross grants—all other (table II).....	1,400,010,000
Utilized credits and loans (table III).....	1,095,562,000

Total..... 49,223,859,000

Postwar period, July 1, 1945–June 30, 1958

Gross grants (table V).....	\$55,017,837,000
Utilized credits and loans (table VI).....	16,534,103,000

Total..... 71,551,940,000

(Gross grants were reduced by \$2,256,854,000 consisting of prior grants converted to credits. This total was added to utilized credits in table VI.)

Not included in the overall total of aid are U.S. capital investments of \$3,420,000,000—in the International Bank, \$635,000,000; International Monetary Fund, \$2,750,000,000; International Finance Corporation, \$35 million.

Although these investments constitute an additional measure taken by the U.S. Government to promote foreign economic development, they do not result in immediate equivalent aid to foreign countries.

Availabilities of aid on July 1, 1958

Foreign grant and credit authorizations available during fiscal year 1957 approximated \$14.8 billions. Total authorizations during the year amounted to \$5.4 billions in grants and credits. The Office of Business Economics of the U.S. Department of Commerce estimated that, as of July 1, 1958, foreign grants and credits available and still to be furnished from prior authorizations amount to approximately \$9.5 billions. This did not mean that these carryover funds consisted of cash available for disbursement. These funds were substantially committed in long-range contracts under which goods and services had not yet been delivered. The availabilities by category comprised:

Billions

Grants of military supplies and services.....	\$3.4
Other economic grants.....	2.1
Credits and loans.....	3.9

In addition to these carryover funds, the 85th Congress, 2d session, provided \$6.1 billions in new appropriations for foreign aid:

Billions

Export-Import Bank Act amendment, Public Law 85-424.....	\$2.0
Mutual Security, Public Laws 85-477 and 85-583.....	3.3
Estimated available proceeds of additional sales under amendment to Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 85-931.....	.8

Thus the carryover funds of \$9.5 billions plus new funds of \$6.1 billions provided an estimated availability of \$15.6 billions for foreign aid during fiscal year 1959.

This approximate total may be disbursed under the following three main categories:

Billions

Grants of military supplies and services.....	\$4.9
Other economic grants.....	3.5
Credits and loans.....	7.1

Postwar military aid

The breakdown of military aid by country is not given as such information is classified for security reasons. A partial country list is given at the end of table V comprising postwar grants. Regional totals of military aid are given at the end of table V as military supplies and services by the U.S. Defense Department and other agencies as well as multilateral construction program contributions. Cumulative military disbursements during the postwar period are stated for the following regions:

Asia and Pacific.....	\$4,590,297,000
Europe.....	12,889,192,000
Near East, Africa, and south Asia.....	2,740,317,000
Other areas and overlapping programs.....	225,440,000

Total..... 20,445,246,000

It should be clearly understood that any total for postwar aid by the United States to any foreign country compiled from these tables will consist of economic grants and loans only. Military totals will not be included so that final aid totals are only a partial representation of disbursements.

Definitions

Grants are transfers for which no repayment is generally expected, but might involve an obligation on the part of the receiver to extend aid to the United States or other countries to achieve a common objective.

Credits are loan disbursements or transfers under agreements for specific repayments over a period of years, usually with interest. In some instances aid has been given under grants with the understanding that a decision as to repayment would be made at a later date. When such a decision for repayment is made a credit is established. As a rule such credits are not deducted from the grants recorded in previous periods. Only after the agreement for repayment is signed, an adjustment is made from grants to credits.

Credits to individual countries may include loans to private entities; e.g., loans to Canada represent credits extended solely to private interests.

The measure of foreign grants and credits generally is in terms of goods delivered or shipped by the U.S. Government, services rendered by the U.S. Government, or cash disbursed by the U.S. Government to or for the account of a foreign government or entity.

Reverse grants and returns on grants comprise: (1) Reverse lend-lease received in the immediate postwar years; (2) the return of military equipment loans, usually aircraft and watercraft; (3) the return of civilian supplies; (4) the return of military naval ships as well as lend-lease merchant ships; (5) the cash war-account settlements for lend-lease and other grants; (6) and finally, the foreign currency funds resulting from military aid collections, usually for administrative expenses, as well as the counterpart funds resulting from economic and technical assistance.

At the end of the war period such reverse grants, reciprocal lend-lease, and returns on grants amounted to \$7,872,637,000.

During the postwar period ending June 30, 1958, such returns totaled \$1,805,343,000.

Utilizations of credits and loans are given for the total war and postwar periods in table VIII. During this time the United States authorized net credits and loans including conversions from prior grants for an aggregate of \$20,481,987,000. On June 30, 1958 the unutilized total amounted to \$2,692,682,000. This would be available as lines of credit to be drawn down during fiscal year 1959 or until such time as the authorizations expired.

Direct utilizations since 1940 amounted to \$17,302,055,000 and an additional \$487,250,000 were lent through agent banks by the Export-Import Bank.

Since 1945 such utilizations including reconversions have amounted to \$16,534,103,000.

Repayments of loans or principal collected by the respective U.S. Government agencies on the credits extended, the loans, sales, commodity programs and prior grants converted into credits have amounted to \$5,595,364,000 since 1940. The major portion, or \$5,153,859,000, has been collected during the postwar period since 1945.

During fiscal year 1957 utilizations of credits amounted to \$440,282,000 and collections were \$639,574,000. This trend was reversed during fiscal year 1958 when utilizations totaled \$1,226,736,000 and collections \$614,769,000.

Outstanding on June 30, 1958, or utilizations unrepaid, amounted to \$12,179,482,000. Repayment prospects are excellent if forecasts are made according to the past history of collections. During the past 18 years principal charged off as uncollectible has amounted to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total lent or credit utilized.

Welfare data included under postwar grant aid comprise government grants of agricultural food surpluses distributed overseas by private American welfare agencies, churches or international agencies such as CARE. These agencies undertook the free distribution of such surpluses as part of their overseas missionary commitments.

Sources: (1) Material published periodically as Foreign Grants and Credits by the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce. Latest issue is for fiscal 1958, November 1958. (2) Various articles in the Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce during year 1958. (3) Foreign Aid, 1940–1951, by the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1952.

TABLE I.—Foreign grants, lend-lease, by country

WAR PERIOD, JULY 1, 1940–JUNE 30, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]

Total.....	46,728,287
Bolivia.....	5,026
Brazil.....	347,945
Chile.....	22,038
Colombia.....	8,278
Costa Rica.....	156
Cuba.....	6,154
Dominican Republic.....	1,458
Ecuador.....	7,208
El Salvador.....	877
Guatemala.....	1,736
Haiti.....	1,362
Honduras.....	368
Mexico.....	38,621
Nicaragua.....	885
Paraguay.....	1,952
Peru.....	18,001
Uruguay.....	6,942
Venezuela.....	4,480
Unspecified Latin America.....	108,539
Belgium.....	68,774

TABLE I.—Foreign grants, lend-lease, by country—Continued

WAR PERIOD, JULY 1, 1940-JUNE 30, 1945	
[In thousands of dollars]	
United Kingdom.....	28,600,797
Australia.....	896,641
India.....	610,172
New Zealand.....	249,432
Union of South Africa.....	93,370
China.....	845,743
Czechoslovakia.....	2,760
Ethiopia.....	1,238
France.....	2,613,543
Greece.....	75,365
Iran.....	7,791
Liberia.....	236
Netherlands.....	114,690
Norway.....	37,039
Poland.....	12,119
Saudi Arabia.....	5,489
Turkey.....	90,041
U.S.S.R.....	10,760,975
Yugoslavia.....	32,050
Unclassified.....	1,245,077

Source: Foreign Aid: 1940-51, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1952, pp. 85-90.

TABLE II.—Foreign grants, other, by country
WAR PERIOD—JULY 1, 1940-JUNE 30, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]	
Total.....	1,400,010
Argentina.....	1,239
Bolivia.....	1,926
Brazil.....	12,693
Chile.....	2,864
Colombia.....	2,230
Costa Rica.....	1,722
Cuba.....	503
Dominican Republic.....	400
Ecuador.....	4,132
El Salvador.....	1,026
Guatemala.....	1,484
Haiti.....	1,131
Honduras.....	2,720
Mexico.....	8,130
Nicaragua.....	2,267

TABLE II.—Foreign grants, other, by country—Continued

WAR PERIOD, JULY 1, 1940-JUNE 30, 1945	
[In thousands of dollars]	
Panama.....	989
Paraguay.....	2,406
Peru.....	3,485
Uruguay.....	814
Venezuela.....	2,557
Unclassified Latin America.....	4,373
Austria.....	1,022
United Kingdom.....	16,158
Australia.....	108
Bermuda.....	1
British East Africa.....	301
Hong Kong.....	368
India.....	77
Trinidad and Tobago.....	3
China-Formosa.....	385,116
Czechoslovakia.....	5,717
Egypt.....	1,700
Finland.....	1,489
France.....	7,449
Algeria.....	15,945
French Equatorial Africa.....	118
French Morocco.....	68
Greece.....	3,627
Iceland.....	99
Iran.....	353
Ireland.....	308
Italy.....	310,166
Eritrea.....	15
Ryukyu Islands (Japan).....	4,122
Liberia.....	236
Indonesia.....	3,625
Norway.....	70
Philippines.....	52,515
Poland.....	84
Portugal.....	1
Spain.....	1,759
Sweden.....	766
U.S.S.R.....	15,205
Yugoslavia.....	1,028
Trust Territories in Pacific.....	1,826
International organizations.....	53,238
Unclassified areas.....	447,379

Source: Foreign Aid: 1940-51, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1952, pp. 85-90.

TABLE III.—Foreign credits utilized, by country

WAR PERIOD—JULY 1, 1940-JUNE 30, 1945	
[In thousands of dollars]	
Total.....	1,095,562
American Republics.....	318,563
Argentina.....	390
Bolivia.....	4,510
Brazil.....	67,031
Chile.....	21,366
Colombia.....	22,254
Costa Rica.....	7,124
Cuba.....	18,200
Dominican Republic.....	3,284
Ecuador.....	5,567
El Salvador.....	900
Haiti.....	7,755
Honduras.....	895
Mexico.....	14,717
Nicaragua.....	4,065
Panama.....	2,338
Uruguay.....	7,086
Venezuela.....	5,111
Unclassified.....	121,276
Bahrein.....	17,048
British Commonwealth.....	607,447
United Kingdom.....	434,281
Australia.....	8,372
British Honduras.....	468
Canada.....	32,770
India.....	131,555
China.....	80,245
Ethiopia.....	4,358
Finland.....	15,074
Iceland.....	200
Liberia.....	3,334
Netherlands.....	36,137
Portugal.....	327
Saudi Arabia.....	12,714
Spain.....	116

Source: Foreign Aid: 1940-51, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1952, pp. 96-100.

TABLE IV.—Foreign grants: By program—Postwar period: July 1, 1945-June 30, 1958—Fiscal years 1957, 1958

[In thousands of dollars]

Programs	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Programs	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Total.....	57,274,691	4,109,498	4,130,476	International agencies:			
Mutual security.....	42,524,196	3,850,019	3,880,749	UNRRA.....	2,588,659		
Military aid:				For refugees.....	240,766		
Military supplies and services:				For children.....	137,120	11,514	9,664
Defense Department.....	20,334,455	2,267,823	2,432,841	Post-UNRRA.....	298,748		
Other departments and agencies.....	71,122	8,740	8,289	Lend-lease:	655,684		
Multilateral construction.....	492,425	63,367	67,442	Military (China).....	679,073		
Other aid:				Postwar pipelines.....	1,227,061		
From economic and technical aid ap-				Greek-Turkish aid:			
propriations.....	20,638,457	1,426,810	1,173,332	Military.....	530,203		
Atoms for peace.....	410		410	Other.....	122,484		
From Public Law 480 currencies.....	91,732	8,328	71,257	Philippine rehabilitation:			
Famine and other relief:				Private claims.....	397,540		
Wheat for Pakistan.....	67,403			Surplus property.....	100,000		
Under Famine Relief Act.....	9,375			Reconstruction and rehabilitation.....	137,035		
Under Public Law 480.....	346,588	80,469	86,787	Donations of surplus agricultural commodities			
Through Chinese-Korean student aid.....	7,429			through welfare agencies.....	777,419	165,221	178,234
Through international agencies:				Military equipment loans.....	390,605	45,597	24,192
Movement of migrants and ref-				Chinese naval aid.....	141,394		
ugees.....	78,464	21,044	17,074	Chinese military aid.....	119,732		
Multilateral technical aid.....	107,738	15,939	16,317	Chinese stabilization.....	119,594		
Palestine relief.....	185,722	26,500	16,000	Foot-and-mouth disease eradication.....	93,891		
U.N. Korean Reconstruction				Technical aid (other than mutual security).....	51,378		
Agency.....	92,876			Inter-American and related highways.....	67,014	15,977	20,961
Civilian supplies:				Trust Territory development and support.....	38,564	4,690	6,035
Civilian relief in Korea.....	444,255	2,675	1,814	Yugoslav aid.....	37,590		
Government and relief in liberated and				Berlin investment fund.....	12,857		
occupied areas:				Through American Red Cross.....	10,435		
By Defense Department.....	5,107,394	805	827	Libyan special-purpose funds.....	17,000	4,000	4,000
By International Cooperation Admin-				Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	53		
istration.....	172,533						
From lend-lease appropriations.....	134,444						

TABLE V.—Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Grand total.....	57,274,691	4,109,498	4,130,476	American Republics—Continued			
American Republics.....	1,041,404	167,428	192,199	Honduras.....	11,071	2,255	2,065
Argentina.....	320	84	38	Mutual security aid.....	6,538	1,295	1,094
Mutual security aid.....	122	84	38	Urgent relief.....	633		
Technical aid.....	193			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	1,145	472	296
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	5			Technical aid.....	722		
Bolivia.....	104,972	23,155	32,046	Inter-American highways.....	2,133	488	705
Mutual security aid.....	73,318	19,855	32,046	Mexico.....	108,664	1,701	1,257
Urgent relief.....	25,305	2,590		Mutual security aid.....	5,773	1,167	821
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	3,599	710		Urgent relief.....	216	216	
Technical aid.....	2,645			Lend-lease.....	553		
Inter-American highways.....	80			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	953	318	436
RFC.....	25			Foot-and-mouth disease eradication.....	93,891		
Brazil.....	50,301	17,039	6,228	Technical aid.....	7,277		
Mutual security aid.....	21,511	4,614	4,674	Inter-American highways.....	1		
Urgent relief.....	474			Nicaragua.....	18,012	2,410	3,896
Atoms for peace.....	350		350	Mutual security aid.....	4,787	709	756
Lend-lease.....	3,616			Urgent relief.....	41		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	7,821	2,288	1,204	Technical aid.....	395		
Military equipment loans.....	10,147	10,137		Inter-American highways.....	12,789	1,701	3,140
Technical aid.....	6,050			Panama.....	20,372	4,179	5,256
Inter-American highways.....	13			Mutual security aid.....	8,550	1,440	1,335
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	329			Urgent relief.....	68		
Chile.....	26,214	2,776	11,773	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	2,708	962	590
Mutual security aid.....	12,441	2,131	3,790	Technical aid.....	559		
Urgent relief.....	194			Inter-American highways.....	8,487	1,777	3,331
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	8,882	645	7,983	Paraguay.....	13,150	2,028	2,013
Technical aid.....	4,697			Mutual security aid.....	10,063	1,887	1,901
Colombia.....	19,027	3,345	6,203	Urgent relief.....	30		
Mutual security aid.....	7,502	1,189	1,923	Lend-lease.....	2		
Urgent relief.....	68			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	452	141	112
Lend-lease.....	11			Technical aid.....	2,571		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	9,549	2,156	4,280	Inter-American highways.....	2		
Technical aid.....	1,879			Peru.....	38,748	10,156	8,897
Inter-American highways.....	18			Mutual security aid.....	17,497	3,470	3,612
Costa Rica.....	27,586	4,604	7,985	Urgent relief.....	12,816	6,082	3,756
Mutual security aid.....	6,789	884	1,157	Lend-lease.....	237		
Urgent relief.....	267			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	3,537	604	1,529
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	495	128	332	Technical aid.....	4,605		
Technical aid.....	2,190			Inter-American highways.....	56		
Inter-American highways.....	17,845	3,592	6,496	Uruguay.....	2,707	259	260
Cuba.....	2,808	521	571	Mutual security aid.....	1,793	250	260
Mutual security aid.....	2,352	521	561	Urgent relief.....	1		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	10		10	Technical aid.....	903		
Technical aid.....	446			Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	10		
Dominican Republic.....	2,595	210	163	Venezuela.....	2,484	133	144
Mutual security aid.....	2,089	210	163	Mutual security aid.....	991	133	144
Lend-lease.....	3			Technical aid.....	1,493		
Technical aid.....	496			International Organizations:			
Inter-American highways.....	7			Inter-American Institute for Agri-			
Ecuador.....	14,591	1,894	2,419	cultural Sciences.....	20		20
Mutual security aid.....	10,245	1,715	2,189	Organization of American States.....	7,534	1,365	1,173
Urgent relief.....	96			Pan-American Sanitary Organization.....	3,500	1,500	2,000
Lend-lease.....	545			Unspecified.....	467,955	62,879	76,876
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	637	179	230	Military supplies and services.....	452,756	61,710	75,027
Technical aid.....	2,924			Other mutual security aid.....	11,679	1,169	1,849
Inter-American highways.....	144			Technical aid.....	3,838		
El Salvador.....	8,193	1,392	1,117	RFC.....	1316		
Mutual security aid.....	5,418	947	1,060	Afghanistan.....	19,651	3,376	11,909
Urgent relief.....	41			Mutual security aid.....	14,212	3,339	6,642
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	567	379	57	Urgent relief.....	5,317		5,317
Technical aid.....	1,242			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	104	37	40
Inter-American highways.....	925	66		Technical aid.....	18		
Guatemala.....	67,950	19,040	17,136	Albania: UNRRA.....	20,444		
Mutual security aid.....	35,586	10,454	9,792	Australia.....	12,539		
Urgent relief.....	3,344			UNRRA.....	239		
Lend-lease.....	1,347			Lend-lease.....	12,300		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	458	233	55	Austria.....	1,086,815	3,084	21,653
Technical aid.....	2,734			Mutual security aid.....	734,779	1,088	3,848
Inter-American highways.....	24,481	8,353	7,289	Urgent relief.....	18,255		15,235
Haiti.....	22,627	4,503	2,663	GARIOA ¹ (Defense).....	89,318		
Mutual security aid.....	14,715	3,565	2,474	UNRRA.....	72,696		
Urgent relief.....	3,571	749		Post-UNRRA.....	86,055		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	1,163	189	189	Interim aid.....	68,291		
Technical aid.....	3,148			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	17,421	1,996	2,570
Inter-American highways.....	33			Belgium-Luxembourg.....	582,937	80	82
				Mutual security aid.....	522,139	38	76
				Urgent relief.....	10		

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE V.—Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958—Continued

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Belgium-Luxembourg—Con*				French Union—Con.			
UNRRA	1,137			French Guinea: Agricultural commodities (welfare)	56	56	
Lend-lease	59,480			French West Africa: Agricultural commodities (welfare)	197	184	
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	154	42	6	French West Indies: Agricultural commodities (welfare)	140	79	44
American Red Cross	17			Madagascar: Mutual security aid	1,198	12	
Belgian Congo	32	14		Unspecified French Africa: Mutual security aid	337	38	
Mutual security aid	30	14		Germany, East	17,342	21	3
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2			Mutual security aid	16,585	21	3
Burma	21,799	306	537	Urgent relief	757		
Mutual security aid	21,073	74	299	Germany, Federal Republic	3,858,657	26,617	34,725
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	722	232	238	Mutual security aid	1,534,771	13,856	16,806
Technical aid	4			Urgent relief	5,080	1,284	306
Cambodia	122,219	40,808	39,193	GARIOA:			
Mutual security aid	119,844	40,846	39,183	Defense Department	2,033,248		
Urgent relief	2,343			ICA	172,533		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	32	22	10	UNRRA	3,616		
Canada	3,964			Post-UNRRA	2,086		
Military equipment loans (repaid)	3,964			Agricultural commodities (welfare)	86,814	11,477	9,961
Ceylon	20,101	5,385	14,478	Military equipment loans	7,652		7,652
Mutual security aid	7,168	2,251	4,804	Berlin investment fund	12,857		
Urgent relief	6,963			Ghana	477	65	238
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	6,025	3,134	2,771	Mutual security aid	238	11	227
Technical aid	5			Agricultural commodities (welfare)	239	54	11
China-Taiwan	2,373,339	99,243	73,596	Greece	1,739,931	39,620	20,400
Mutual security aid	768,880			Mutual security aid	865,186	29,230	4,775
Public Law 480 currencies	322	80,917	55,707	Urgent relief	997		
Urgent relief	504		322	Currencies from Public Law 480	7,443		1,286
Chinese-Korean student aid	7,363			UNRRA	279,785		
UNRRA	262,897			Post-UNRRA	37,255		
Post-UNRRA	43,919			Lend-lease	5,956		
Lend-lease military	679,673			Greek-Turkish aid:			
Lend-lease postwar pipelines	50,345			Military	371,146		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	23,244	7,702	5,067	Economic	122,484		
Military equipment loans	54,183	4,625	12,590	Agricultural commodities (welfare)	45,634	10,390	10,289
Chinese naval aid	141,354			Military equipment loans	4,040		4,040
Chinese military aid	119,732			American Red Cross	35		
Chinese stabilization	119,794			Hungary	16,430	8,873	1,702
American Red Cross	1,889			Mutual security aid	1,422	780	104
Czechoslovakia	185,827			Urgent relief	12,649	8,093	1,598
Mutual security aid	379			UNRRA	2,359		
Urgent relief	1,995			Iceland: Mutual security aid	29,893	79	55
UNRRA	183,374			India	310,254	47,283	54,193
Lend-lease	2			Mutual security aid	237,629	36,140	39,810
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2			Urgent relief	4,665	1,165	
American Red Cross	75			Lend-lease	5,000		
Denmark	247,635	1		Agricultural commodities (welfare)	64,940	9,978	14,374
Mutual security aid	247,631	1		Technical aid	20		
UNRRA	4			Indochina	110,811	49	
Ethiopia	18,950	3,762	5,305	Mutual security aid	110,183	49	
Mutual security aid	18,458	3,750	5,284	Urgent relief	446		
UNRRA	439			Agricultural commodities (welfare)	182		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	53	6	21	Indonesia	139,832	9,606	11,605
Finland	3,522			Mutual security aid	133,502	8,600	10,975
Mutual security aid	27			GARIOA (defense)	4,106		
Urgent relief	36			Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2,204	916	630
UNRRA	1,840			Technical aid	20		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	1,456			Iran	251,948	49,163	14,490
American Red Cross	163			Mutual security aid	241,608	43,551	12,633
French Union	4,396,030	62,714	629	Urgent relief	2,748	2,748	
France	4,390,774	61,551	372	Currencies under Public Law 480	4,472	2,235	2,237
Mutual security aid	3,609,542	61,151	141	Lend-lease	750		
Urgent relief	538			Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2,390	629	226
UNRRA	3,061			Technical aid	40		
Post-UNRRA	60			Iraq	15,267	2,592	3,750
Interim aid	311,388			Mutual security aid	14,804	2,540	3,287
Lend-lease	372,441			Agricultural commodities (welfare)	963	52	409
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	6,253	400	231	Ireland	18,346		
Military equipment loans	25,345			Mutual security aid	18,324		
American Red Cross	2,146			American Red Cross	22		
Algeria	1,128	808	213	Israel	285,838	16,101	20,842
Mutual security aid	186	159	27	Mutual security aid	245,894	14,935	19,004
UNRRA	97			Urgent relief	32		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	835	649	186	Agricultural commodities (welfare)	39,912	1,166	1,858
American Red Cross	9						
French Equatorial Africa: Mutual security aid	2,200						

TABLE V.—Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958—Continued

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Italy (including Trieste).....	2,734,023	51,002	55,817	Nepal.....	10,619	1,940	4,978
Mutual security aid.....	1,576,338	4,338	11,584	Mutual security aid.....	8,443	1,940	3,011
Urgent relief.....	68,478	30,099	17,364	Urgent relief.....	2,170		1,967
Civilian supplies (GARIOA).....	112,955						
Civilian supplies (lend-lease).....	134,444			Netherlands Union.....	916,737	3,766	1,183
UNRRA.....	409,754			Netherlands.....	915,329	3,229	791
Post-UNRRA.....	128,461			Mutual security aid.....	827,632	3,299	791
Interim aid.....	176,006			UNRRA.....	1,899		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	113,701	16,565	26,809	Lend-lease.....	64,334		
Military equipment loans.....	14,695			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	2		
American Red Cross.....	191			Military equipment loans.....	21,340		
				American Red Cross.....	122		
Italian Somaliland Trust Territory.....	1,736	395	998				
Mutual security aid.....	1,606	395	958	Netherlands New Guinea.....	39		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	40		40	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	39		
Japan and possessions.....	2,628,706	23,246	23,680	Surinam.....	1,369	467	376
Japan.....	2,397,554	18,466	18,486	Mutual security aid.....	1,211	309	376
Mutual security aid.....	14,745	1,696	2,267	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	158		
Urgent relief.....	28,438	13,699	14,092				
GARIOA (Defense Department).....	2,184,569			New Zealand, lend-lease.....	2,300		
Post-UNRRA.....	178			Norway.....	238,566	509	501
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	10,050	3,071	2,127	Mutual security aid.....	237,570	509	501
Military equipment loans.....	150,574			Urgent relief.....	24		
				UNRRA.....	71		
Ryukyu Islands.....	231,139	4,780	5,194	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	30		
Mutual security aid.....	748	403	345	American Red Cross.....	171		
Urgent relief.....	3,529	1,887	1,642				
Currencies under Public Law 480.....	3,265	1,093	2,172	Pakistan.....	343,436	55,715	71,473
GARIOA (Defense Department).....	222,078	805	827	Mutual security aid.....	190,540	49,834	44,467
Post-UNRRA.....	12			Urgent relief.....	115,119		7,069
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	1,494	592	208	Currencies under Public Law 480.....	17,430		17,430
American Red Cross.....	13			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	20,336	5,881	2,507
				Technical aid.....	11		
Miscellaneous Islands.....	13						
GARIOA (Defense Department).....	13			Palestine.....	175		
Jordan.....	72,921	8,843	34,888	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	175		
Mutual security aid.....	68,198	8,335	34,236				
Urgent relief.....	1,089			Philippines.....	822,908	26,874	31,883
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	3,634	508	652	Mutual security aid.....	145,076	25,223	28,197
				Urgent relief.....	484		
Korea.....	2,160,731	316,257	314,018	GARIOA.....	28,345		
Mutual security aid.....	1,179,596	289,820	247,476	UNRRA.....	7,700		
Currencies from Public Law 480.....	58,800	5,000	47,800	Philippine rehabilitation.....	634,575		
Urgent relief.....	899	78		Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	6,622	1,651	3,689
Chinese-Korean student aid.....	67			Technical aid.....	65		
UNRRA.....	92,876			American Red Cross.....	11		
Civilian supplies (Defense).....	444,255	2,675	1,814				
GARIOA (Defense).....	292,090			Poland.....	365,339		391
UNRRA.....	54			Mutual security aid.....	66		96
Post-UNRRA.....	72			UNRRA.....	364,031		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	51,348	15,972	16,928	Lend-lease.....	92		
Military equipment loans.....	40,212	2,712		Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	295		295
				American Red Cross.....	855		
Laos.....	152,724	49,004	38,015				
Mutual security aid.....	151,861	48,148	38,008	Portugal and possessions.....	33,435	12,052	2,750
Urgent relief.....	839			Portugal.....	32,669	11,935	2,517
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	24	17	7	Mutual security aid.....	15,937	63	117
				Urgent relief.....	68		
Lebanon.....	27,727	4,754	5,717	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	8,819	4,057	2,400
Mutual security aid.....	25,456	4,618	5,594	Military equipment loans.....	7,815	7,815	
Urgent relief.....	311						
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	1,959	136	123	Macao.....	207	44	163
Technical aid.....	1			Mutual security aid.....	97	44	53
				Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	110		110
Liberia.....	10,636	1,567	2,062				
Mutual security aid.....	10,439	1,561	2,057	Portuguese India.....	415	53	13
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	64	6	5	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	415	53	13
Technical aid.....	133						
Libya.....	61,723	21,917	11,807	Unspecified Portuguese Africa.....	144	20	63
Mutual security aid.....	33,236	14,084	6,940	Mutual security aid.....	144	20	63
Urgent relief.....	9,384	3,044					
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	1,963	789	867	Rhodesia and Nyasaland.....	11	6	4
Special purpose funds.....	17,000	4,000	4,000	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	10	6	4
				Technical aid.....	1		
Malaya.....	954	219	43				
Mutual security aid.....	83	2		Saudi Arabia.....	4,252	13	
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	862	217	43	Mutual security aid.....	2,639	13	
Technical aid.....	9			Lend-lease.....	1,991		
				Technical aid.....	22		
Morocco.....	14,492	2,217	11,445				
Mutual security aid.....	2,229	378	1,795				
Urgent relief.....	6,781		6,767				
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	5,482	1,839	2,883				

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE V.—Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958—Continued

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Spain and possessions.....	343,086	124,837	101,623	United Kingdom and Dependencies—Con.			
Spain.....	343,020	124,837	101,573	British Virgin Islands.....	31	15	5
Mutual security aid.....	255,473	87,903	81,553	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	31	15	5
Urgent relief.....	2,005	257	953	Gambia.....	130	50	46
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	65,234	16,609	10,067	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	130	50	46
Military equipment loans.....	20,308	20,308		Hong Kong.....	12,119	4,789	2,735
Canary Islands.....	16			Mutual security aid.....	2,436	933	607
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	16			Urgent relief.....	1,031		
Spanish Africa.....	50		50	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	8,652	3,856	2,128
Mutual security aid.....	50		50	Malta.....	2,334	313	688
Sudan.....	260		254	Mutual security aid.....	2		
Mutual security aid.....	254		254	Urgent relief.....	26		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	6			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	2,305	313	688
Sweden.....	87,143			Nigeria.....	204	72	82
Mutual security aid.....	86,539			Mutual security aid.....	88	34	54
Urgent relief.....	6			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	115	38	28
UNRRA.....	549			Technical aid.....	1		
American Red Cross.....	49			St. Helena.....	18	18	
Switzerland, UNRRA.....	1,803			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	18	18	
Thailand.....	108,482	33,133	23,477	Sierra Leone.....	115	89	19
Mutual security aid.....	108,293	33,078	23,402	Mutual security aid.....	102	83	19
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	165	55	75	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	13	6	
Technical aid.....	24			Singapore.....	87		32
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Carolina, Mariana, and Marshall Islands).....	43,008	4,690	6,035	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	87		32
GARIOA.....	4,444			West Indies Federation.....	2,963	1,290	714
Development and support.....	38,564	4,000	6,035	Mutual security aid.....	258	136	64
Tunisia.....	17,713	6,641	9,123	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	2,702	1,154	650
Mutual security aid.....	7,624	840	5,152	American Red Cross.....	3		
Urgent relief.....	9,325	5,507	3,818	Unspecified British Africa.....	423	130	276
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	764	294	153	Mutual security aid.....	423	130	276
Turkey.....	630,024	80,723	39,045	Unspecified British America.....	164		164
Mutual security aid.....	436,836	79,297	38,876	Mutual security aid.....	164		164
Urgent relief.....	12,187	884		Vietnam.....	795,335	245,349	222,510
Greek-Turkish military aid.....	158,575			Mutual security aid.....	799,162	233,455	219,102
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	1,086	542	109	Urgent relief.....	1,109		
Military equipment loans.....	21,340			Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	25,064	11,894	3,408
U.S.S.R.....	465,434			Yugoslavia.....	804,273	40,930	22,130
UNRRA.....	180,380			Mutual security aid.....	350,821	26,362	3,086
Lend-lease.....	277,254			Urgent relief.....	47,763	1,232	
American Red Cross.....	1,800			UNRRA.....	298,054		
United Kingdom and dependencies.....	3,821,725	42,034	8,275	Lend-lease.....	76		
United Kingdom.....	3,797,753	33,981	614	Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	69,280	19,336	19,044
Mutual security aid.....	3,447,491	33,967	614	Yugoslav aid.....	37,560		
Urgent relief.....	203			American Red Cross.....	719		
UNRRA.....	8,369			Other international organizations:			
Lend-lease.....	341,462			European Payments Union, mutual security aid.....	238,084		
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	179	14		Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, mutual security aid.....	66,814	14,144	13,524
American Red Cross.....	49			Intergovernmental Committee for Refugees.....	3,650		
Aden, agricultural commodities (welfare).....	11	6	5	International Atomic Energy Agency.....	60		60
Bahamas, agricultural commodities (welfare).....	188	59	61	International Refugee Organization.....	237,116		
British Borneo, agricultural commodities (welfare).....	567	150	201	OEEC, mutual security aid.....	5,100	2,000	1,350
British East Africa.....	3,423	727	2,431	United Nations.....	302,556	52,974	34,674
Mutual security aid.....	3,114	660	2,279	Mutual security aid.....	5,000	5,000	
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	309	67	152	Refugees.....	11,650	6,900	3,550
British Guiana.....	420	132	77	Multilateral technical aid.....	100,184	14,574	15,124
Mutual security aid.....	270	67	55	Palestine relief.....	185,722	26,500	16,000
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	150	65	22	United Nation's Children's Fund.....	137,120	11,514	9,064
British Honduras.....	683	125	121	World Health Organization, mutual security aid.....	5,000		5,000
Mutual security aid.....	88	35	50	UNRRA.....	273,505		
Urgent relief.....	274	16		Unspecified countries (see note 2, end of table):			
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	321	74	71	Asia and Pacific (excluding south Asia).....	4,610,065	623,190	884,939
British Isles East of Africa.....	4		4	Military supplies and services (defense).....	4,590,297	622,455	883,437
Agricultural commodities (welfare).....	4		4	Mutual security aid.....	19,768	735	1,802
British Somaliland.....	88	88		Europe.....	13,336,971	1,181,375	904,790
Mutual security aid.....	88	88		Military supplies and services (defense).....	12,391,847	1,113,209	831,579
				Military supplies and services (other departments).....	4,920	1,079	507

TABLE V.—Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958—Continued

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Unspecified countries—Con.				Unspecified countries—Con.			
Europe—Cont.				Other areas	541,288	70,924	78,110
Multilateral construction programs	492,425	63,307	67,442	Military supplies and services (Defense)	159,808	17,230	18,694
Mutual security aid	311,549	3,720	2,212	Military supplies and services (other departments)	65,632	7,583	7,624
GARIOA (Defense)	136,230			Mutual security aid	180,650	46,109	51,792
Near East, Africa, and south Asia	2,769,686	395,356	627,171	Urgent relief	80		
Military supplies and services (Defense)	2,739,747	393,219	624,104	UNRRA	102,967		
Military supplies and services (other departments)	570	76	108	Post-UNRRA	651		
Mutual security aid	28,888	2,061	2,959	Lend-lease	29,364		
Greek-Turkish military aid	481			Technical aid	11		
				American Red Cross	2,095		

NOTES

1. In this table mutual security aid does not include military supplies and services, either through the Defense Department or other agencies. It comprises only assistance rendered under economic and technical programs from the mutual security appropriations.

2. Military assistance data are generally not available by country and are stated at the end of this table under military supplies and services in "Unspecified countries."

A. Defense Department release of Oct. 7, 1958, gave some totals (in millions of dollars)

as follows for the period: Belgium, 1,069; Luxembourg, 7; Denmark, 385; France, 3,708; Greece, 678; Italy, 1,592; Netherlands, 998; Norway, 547; Portugal, 238; Spain, 239; Turkey, 1,222; United Kingdom, 693.

3. The military equipment loan to Canada is noted as "Repaid." The transfer represented the loan and return of aircraft under the program announced by the U.S. Department of Defense, Aug. 15, 1952.

¹ Credit.

² GARIOA—Government relief in occupied and liberated areas.

TABLE VI.—Reverse grants and returns on grants, by country—Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal year July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957, and fiscal year July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Country	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Total	1,805,343	76,881	81,188	Germany	85,672	1,058	5,128
American Republics	53,992	85	212	Greece	79,326	197	60
Brazil	52,880			Iceland	1,777		
Bolivia	200	23	172	India	28,611		
Chile	78			Indochina (1945-54)	6,375		
Colombia	154			Indonesia	5,183	89	49
Cuba	48			Iran	7,878		
Dominican Republic	245	62	40	Iraq	483	62	124
Ecuador	29			Ireland	910		
Haiti	7			Israel	438		
Honduras	30			Italy and Trieste	88,692	1,329	1,503
Mexico	73			Japan	5,864	1,062	1,917
Nicaragua	34			Jordan	63		
Paraguay	7			Korea	17,926		
Peru	117			Laos	29		
Uruguay	66			Netherlands	54,786	379	362
Venezuela	24			Norway	21,639	545	260
Australia	20,000			Pakistan	14,482	3,211	4,830
Austria	53,944	Cr. 1	2	Philippines	5,619	821	677
Belgium-Luxembourg	7,948	488	468	Poland	110	110	
Burma	625			Portugal	4,211	296	430
Canada	3,964			Spain	155,227	54,900	52,818
Cambodia	706	201	384	Thailand	5,735	993	745
China-Taiwan	72,966	Cr. 346	304	Turkey	40,648	6,556	7,262
Czechoslovakia	173			Union of South Africa	92,500		
Denmark	16,518	324	200	U.S.S.R.	39,204		
Ethiopia	726	175	293	United Arab Republic	58	78	
France	243,472	1,229	1,189	United Kingdom	531,152	599	569
				Vietnam	4,262	2,037	
				Yugoslavia	27,179	454	74
				United Nations	1,247		1,247

TABLE VII. Foreign credits utilized: By country—Postwar period: July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal year 1957, July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957, and fiscal year 1958, July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Country	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Total	16,534,103	440,282	1,229,736	American Republics—Con.			
New credits	14,277,249	439,605	1,229,736	Panama	4,919		916
Prior grants converted into credits	2,256,854	887		Paraguay	9,938	3,383	5,062
American Republics	1,837,405	152,809	348,939	Peru	116,450	32,986	51,678
Argentina	139,835		29,160	Uruguay	12,253		
Bolivia	42,532	1,041	26	Venezuela	19,422	166	1,678
Brazil	743,767	76,550	53,302	Unspecified Latin America	20,784	646	14,044
Chile	171,434	4,703	44,985	Afghanistan	44,425	9,307	8,285
Colombia	142,065	1,106	79,628	Australia	14,188		
Costa Rica	10,825	2,220	3,943	Austria	52,599	3,143	17,821
Cuba	38,734	8,851	3,393	Belgium-Luxembourg and possessions	239,522		
Ecuador	36,413	4,300	2,361	Belgium	234,972		
El Salvador	642	58	9	Luxembourg	3,000		
Guatemala	2,547	1,606	369	Belgian Congo	1,550		
Haiti	25,517	1,410	1,012	Burma	5,324		282
Honduras	1,693	14	1,456	Canada	163,285	66	
Mexico	205,761	13,695	55,177	Ceylon	1,423	1	1,421
Nicaragua	874	14	200	China-Taiwan	281,548	16,943	17,467

TABLE VII. Foreign credits utilized: By country—Postwar period: July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal year 1957, July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957, and fiscal year 1958, July 1, 1957, June 30, 1958—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Country	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Czechoslovakia	29,583			Norway	140,608	4	
Denmark	50,709	23	29	Pakistan	80,171	5,762	44,437
Ethiopia-Eritrea	9,499	2,400	3,700	Philippines	164,852	8,932	17,826
Ethiopia	9,449	2,400	3,700	Poland	97,551		19,839
Eritrea	50			Portugal and Angola	57,158	53	3,459
Finland	140,102		14,000	Portugal	57,046		3,400
French Union	2,480,809	1,211	9,703	Angola	112	53	59
France	2,474,231	1,211	9,614	Rhodesia and Nyasaland	60,686	6,978	
Algeria	680			Saudi Arabia	19,112		
French Equatorial Africa	4,457		88	Spain	128,902	10,039	7,404
New Caledonia	1,501			Sweden	24,200		
Germany	1,348,382	918	1,796	Thailand	21,298	10,429	3,110
Greece	167,012	2,633	26,727	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	517	8	115
Hungary	15,917			Tunisia	1,894		1,894
Iceland	12,544	866	6,069	Turkey	203,960	15,066	34,936
India	306,537	17,495	21,948	Union of South Africa	150,316	16,029	3,250
Indonesia	174,512	4,300	16,410	U.S.S.R.	222,495		
Iran	114,009	13,225	24,044	United Arab Republic	25,566	5,811	1,429
Iraq	1,222	155	177	United Kingdom and dependencies	5,056,567		250,000
Ireland	128,290			United Kingdom	5,032,428		250,000
Israel	226,861	18,642	38,827	British East Africa	2,394		
Italy	305,464	12,550	51,736	British Guyana	128		
Japan	916,426	101,654	109,320	British Honduras	13		
Korea	24,628			Nigeria	674		
Lebanon	1,550			West Indies Federation	20,930		
Liberia	30,438	2,250	4,300	Vietnam	35,196		10,196
Libya	157			Yugoslavia	55,900		
Morocco	37,028		18,659	United Nations	65,000		
Netherlands	436,035			European Coal and Steel Community	100,000		
New Zealand	17,459	40	24				

TABLE VIII.—Net foreign loans and other credits, by country, period July 1, 1940–June 30, 1958—Utilizations, repayments and totals outstanding on June 30, 1958

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Net authorizations	Utilizations	Repayments	Outstanding on June 30, 1958	Country	Net authorizations	Utilizations	Repayments	Outstanding on June 30, 1958
Total	20,481,987	17,789,305	5,595,364	12,179,482	Finland	166,313	166,314	67,054	99,259
New credits	18,225,132	15,532,450	5,442,945	10,075,264	French Union*	2,530,043	2,480,868	863,241	1,613,688
Prior grants converted into credits	2,256,854	2,256,854	152,419	2,104,218	France*	2,523,405	2,474,231	861,873	1,610,922
American Republics*	3,103,080	2,228,701	1,072,827	1,151,353	Algeria*	680	680	204	396
Argentina	294,365	131,225	47,756	83,469	French Equatorial Africa*	4,457	4,457	1,010	2,389
Bolivia*	47,042	47,042	10,947	34,173	New Caledonia*	1,501	1,501	154	
Brazil*	1,174,787	839,460	394,661	444,769	Germany	1,355,706	1,348,387	241,499	1,106,888
Chile	262,213	193,901	94,774	94,774	Greece*	187,799	167,012	55,354	110,149
Colombia*	230,858	164,500	69,076	95,395	Hungary	15,917	15,917	4,655	11,262
Costa Rica	23,799	18,000	3,801	14,199	Iceland	22,532	13,184	1,142	12,042
Cuba	98,600	84,412	60,637	23,754	India*	974,906	438,062	134,006	268,341
Dominican Republic	3,284	3,284	3,284		Indonesia	199,551	174,512	29,461	145,031
Ecuador*	50,285	41,980	13,438	28,538	Iran	153,835	114,471	10,838	103,634
El Salvador	1,542	1,542	1,517	26	Iraq	1,380	1,222	1,008	213
Guatemala	2,599	2,547	858	1,689	Ireland	128,200	128,200	1,643	126,557
Haiti	37,891	35,837	7,985	27,853	Israel	274,488	226,861	33,537	193,324
Honduras	12,321	2,588	1,146	1,146	Italy	587,325	519,780	255,712	264,068
Mexico*	435,451	321,528	171,813	147,187	Japan	1,012,724	916,426	710,556	205,870
Nicaragua	7,333	5,525	5,079	446	Korea	24,928	24,928	3,978	20,950
Panama	21,357	7,407	6,786	1,621	Latvia	11	11	11	
Paraguay	18,570	15,343	6,189	9,153	Lebanon	1,550	1,550	1,550	
Peru	178,087	116,450	10,384	106,065	Liberia	44,773	33,773	5,965	28,506
Uruguay*	19,338	19,338	12,122	6,508	Libya	3,500	157	157	
Venezuela	28,662	24,565	20,725	3,568	Morocco*	38,369	37,028	16,755	19,759
Unspecified	164,696	152,228	129,829	22,400	Netherlands	472,172	472,172	227,761	244,410
Afghanistan	51,684	44,425		44,425	New Zealand	17,566	17,459	5,139	12,320
Australia	22,559	22,559	16,335	6,225	Norway*	140,835	140,835	70,218	70,529
Austria	107,419	52,598	33,174	19,424	Pakistan	166,320	80,171	25,101	93,084
Bahrain	17,048	17,048	17,048		Philippines	182,654	164,852	75,574	89,278
Belgium-Luxembourg and Congo	239,522	239,522	108,917	130,606	Poland	136,268	101,098	27,288	73,810
Belgium	234,972	234,972	107,230	127,742	Portugal and possession*	58,512	58,494	6,988	51,473
Luxembourg	3,000	3,000	136	2,864	Portugal	58,317	58,317	6,925	51,393
Belgium Congo	1,550	1,550	1,550		Angola*	195	177	64	82
Burma	57,343	5,324	3,457	1,867	Rhodesia and Nyasaland	60,686	60,686	15,263	45,223
Canada	196,070	196,070	196,036		Saudi Arabia	31,825	31,826	13,491	18,254
Ceylon	4,100	1,423		1,423	Spain	305,148	142,583	43,960	98,624
China-Taiwan	407,858	400,051	190,218	203,831	Sweden	28,311	28,311	9,736	18,575
Czechoslovakia	430,377	30,377	25,507	4,870	Thailand	36,505	21,298	6,812	14,486
Denmark	56,748	56,709	11,114	45,595	First Territory of Pacific Islands	517	517	230	287
Ethiopia-Eritrea	32,457	13,857	4,682	9,174	Tunisia	3,500	1,894		1,894
Ethiopia	32,407	13,807	4,682	9,124	Turkey*	205,300	203,960	41,865	162,051
Eritrea	50	50		50	Union of South Africa*	150,316	150,316	37,234	112,949
					U.S.S.R.	222,495	222,495		222,495
					United Arab Republic	25,566	25,566	18,040	7,526

TABLE VIII.—Net foreign loans and other credits, by country, period July 1, 1940–June 30, 1958—Utilizations, repayments and totals outstanding on June 30, 1958—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Net authorizations	Utilizations	Repayments	Outstanding on June 30, 1958	Country	Net authorizations	Utilizations	Repayments	Outstanding on June 30, 1958
United Kingdom and dependencies*	5,741,316	5,401,316	822,491	4,668,394	Vietnam	53,300	35,196		35,193
United Kingdom	5,716,769	5,406,769	809,888	4,657,021	Yugoslavia*	227,700	55,900	11,880	43,796
British East Africa	2,394	2,394	426	1,968	International organizations:				
British Guiana	128	128		128	European Coal and Steel Community	100,000	100,000	2,900	97,100
British Honduras*	482	482	51		United Nations headquarters loan	65,000	65,000	11,000	54,000
Nigeria	674	674	674						
West Indies Federation	20,930	20,930	11,652	9,278					

NOTES

1. Apparent discrepancies are due to rounding of totals.
 2. Asterisks denote those countries where some principal has been charged off as uncollectible. For period July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1958, this total amounted to \$14,438,000 out of total utilizations of \$17,302,055,000 or less than 1/2 of 1 percent.

3. On June 30, 1958 the total unutilized from the net authorizations amounted to \$2,692,882,000 or the difference between net authorizations and utilizations. This total represents lines of credit still available till such time as the time limit expires or the authorizations are terminated.

Kennedy Realistic; Ike's Courageous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following column "An Editor's Notebook," by John S. Knight, from the Salt Lake Tribune of February 1, published in Salt Lake City, Utah. It is a forthright presentation of the differences between the administration labor reform bill and the labor reform bill cosponsored in the other body by Senators KENNEDY and ERVIN. It is a challenge to us in the Congress to act honestly and fearlessly in the correction of established union abuses:

AN EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK—KENNEDY REALISTIC, IKE'S COURAGEOUS
 (By John S. Knight)

Views on the news:

President Dwight D. Eisenhower's proposed labor reform legislation seeks to correct the worst of the union abuses exposed by the Senate Rackets Committee.

It is a better bill than the one introduced by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, because it comes to grips with the evils of "blackmail" picketing and secondary boycotts.

Senator KENNEDY thinks the President has gone "too far."

The Eisenhower recommendations would require amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act and Senator KENNEDY doubts that the Congress will approve of these changes.

The young gentleman from Massachusetts hangs his reasoning on the premise that "for 12 or 13 years, we have tried to do too much and accomplished nothing."

He believes that a more moderate bill, similar to the Kennedy-Ives legislation which passed the Senate with only one dissenting vote in the last session and then "got lost" in the House, can be enacted this year.

The Senator wants to settle for the attainable, rather than lose with the impossible.

Kennedy's position is understandable because he is a candidate for the presidency and the AFL-CIO prefers his bill.

I am not implying, as do his critics, a lack of courage on the Senator's part.

But he is a practical man and a skilled politician.

If KENNEDY, with the help of responsible labor leaders, can achieve a measure of reform, his reputation for statesmanship will have been enhanced without inviting labor's opposition.

And, as everyone knows, a thumbs-down verdict by labor in a Democratic convention means that an aspiring candidate has had it.

The Eisenhower recommendations appeal to me because they go to the heart of the problem.

Secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing are tools of unscrupulous strong boys in labor.

Although existing law forbids union pressures on an employer by persuading or coercing other businessmen not to deal with him, the law is consistently and flagrantly flouted.

Unions either advise their members to act as individuals or threaten employers with labor trouble if they don't boycott the company in disfavor with the union.

The President's bill is designed to stop these strongarm tactics.

It also would prevent, by court injunction if necessary, picketing by a union which does not represent a majority of the employees in a picketed company.

This crude and undemocratic method of organizing a shop or small business is contrary to our concept of freedom and makes a mockery of individual rights.

The administration bill would put an end to this tyranny.

The new Kennedy-Ervin legislation ignores its existence.

While it seems unlikely that a pro-labor Congress dominated by the opposition party will give much heed to the President's recommendations, the administration's position is both right and courageous.

If more of our Senators and Representatives in Congress would stop fawning on labor and assert a greater degree of independence, they might be agreeably surprised to find a grateful public giving them enthusiastic support.

It is inconceivable to me how any Federal lawmaker who can distinguish between right and wrong is able to condone the rotten conditions that exist in certain segments of the labor movement.

Here is your opportunity, gentlemen, to crack down on the rough stuff and perform, a real service for your country.

But I am not holding my breath until you do.

Honored by Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at noon today I was highly honored with the presentation of a badge from the Boy Scouts of America for the celebration of the 49th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America during Boy Scout Week, February 7 through 13. It is with genuine pride and honor that I shall wear this badge of the Boy Scouts of America which carries with it so much meaning and significance in the finest character-building organization for boys in the entire world.

The Boy Scouts of America have made monumental contributions in the building of sound, dependable character in the future young men of our country. In this fine work of moulding honorable character, the Boy Scouts are responsible for tomorrow's national leadership. Among the Boy Scouts in the Halls of the Capitol today and who will be here during Boy Scout Week, surely may be a future President of the United States and certainly those who will hold great positions of responsibility in the direction and affairs of our country in the years to come.

I was presented with this honorable badge of the Boy Scouts of America by a Boy Scout who not only excellently represented the Boy Scouts of America but also made an excellent presentation. Although young in years, Paul Murphy, Jr., who presented me with this honorable badge, is one who might inspire all of America to courage and fineness. Possessing an attractive personality, being very courteous and thoughtful, Paul is also extremely able. A student of the Russian language, already he is able to speak some of this very difficult language. In addition, he has many other accomplishments, but above all he has

the courage to overcome all difficulties and burdens with which he may be faced. This is indeed a real test of character.

Following is the quoted text of the presentation speech of Paul Murphy, Jr.:

I am Cub Scout Paul Murphy, Jr. During Boy Scout Week, February 7 through 13, the Boy Scouts of America celebrate their 49th anniversary. I have the honor to represent the Boy Scouts of America in making this presentation to you, Mrs. ROGERS. We would like you to join in the 49th celebration of Boy Scout Week by wearing this badge during Boy Scout Week.

At this point, Paul Murphy pinned the Boy Scout badge on my jacket lapel.

In conclusion, I extend my thanks and sincere and genuine appreciation to Paul Murphy, Jr., and through him to the Boy Scouts of America. I assure them I shall be honored to wear this badge during Boy Scout Week in America, February 7 through 13.

Reds Now Have Power Balance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 4, 1959:

REDS NOW HAVE POWER BALANCE (By Drew Pearson)

If you analyze carefully Secretary of Defense McElroy's statement that the United States will not attempt to match the production of Russia's dread, long-range intercontinental ballistic missile, it amounts to the most depressing, defeatist admission made by a public official since the United States became a world power. In effect it's an official admission that the United States is willing to accept the status of second-class power.

This is especially so when coupled with Nikita Khrushchev's confident harangue before the Communist Party Congress, comparing Russia's 8.6 percent annual increase in industrial production with the American increase of 2 percent.

These facts may have been new to the American people, but they are not new to the men inside the National Defense Advisory Council, nor to some of the newspapermen who have been accused of being Cassandras.

For weeks experts in the State Department and Pentagon, whose job it is to study what makes Moscow tick, have been warning that the balance of power was shifting. The emergence of Russia as the world's No. 1 missile power now puts a final period after that shift.

WHAT IT MEANS TO UNITED STATES

Here, in simple language, is what that shift means to the American people and the peace of the world:

1. Balance of power yesterday was with the United States. For the past 15 years, Russia knew that any aggressive action by it meant the risk of heavy and effective retaliatory action by the United States. It knew we had the power to retaliate and it did not want to risk that retaliation.

Time after time the Kremlin took exploratory steps to test the United States, then backed down. In 1946, the Red army

was on the northern border of Iran ready to march in, when the United States threatened action.

In 1949-50 it tested American readiness to retaliate in the Berlin airlift. We had the balance of power. Again Moscow retreated.

During the Korean war—another probing operation—Russia supplied planes, men, and materiel, but was careful not to risk any head-on showdown with the United States.

During the Suez crisis the Kremlin sent blunt warnings to the West, but kept out. Again, when the United States landed troops in Lebanon last summer, Moscow wrote notes and made speeches but scrupulously avoided any military test.

The balance of power up until then was with the United States.

2. The balance of power today is on the side of Russia. It began to swing last year. The swing became evident with Khrushchev's statement to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY regarding his latest long-range ballistic missile, which went unchallenged by Eisenhower. And with Secretary McElroy's recent admission that we would not try to match Russian ICBM's, the shift of power became categorical and definite.

This brings out from the diplomatic shadows the unpleasant reason why Russia is so tough regarding Berlin, why Mikoyan offered no compromises in the Russian position. Moscow knows that it has the balance of power.

It knows that a new Berlin airlift would not be effective. The American Air Force is now smaller than the Russian. Three Russian radio jamming stations could prevent American navigation into Berlin in bad weather. It knows that if American tanks attempt to open up the highways into Berlin, the strength of the American Army's 17 divisions is no match for the Red army's 175 divisions. The balance of power has shifted.

EFFECT ON ASIA

The balance of power affects not merely Berlin. It is likely to affect the entire neutral or pro-West perimeter of Russia.

In the Asian countries surrounding the Soviet bloc countries, one thing and one thing only has kept Moscow and Peking from moving in—fear of American striking power.

Pakistan, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, the Malays have been relatively free of Soviet threats. They are relatively defenseless. Their chief protection is the force of public opinion backed up by the power of the United States.

The Kremlin's hope was gradually to put its own pro-Communist governments in power. In many of these countries, however, strongly anti-Communist governments have recently taken over, in some cases dictatorships. This anti-Communist trend may well tempt the Kremlin to use strong-arm tactics.

It now has the balance of power.

Progress in High Fidelity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of the House, I have been gratified of late to observe the marked progress which our Nation is making in the field of electronics. Components of the electronic industry are located in my own district, and I have had a special opportunity to observe the rapid changes and advances which are taking place in this great industry which so well serves

the American people and our armed services. There are many facets to the marvels of electronic development which are currently transforming and vastly improving our communication systems, our sound reproduction media and automatic guidance and control systems and truly revolutionizing our industrial methods, weapon systems, and in fact, the reproduction instrumentalities that we use so frequently in our homes and in our daily lives.

I was very much impressed recently with the progress in the electronic field evidenced by demonstrations and exhibits presented as a prelude to the High Fidelity Festival being held in Washington this week. The initial event of the program last Saturday night in which the Washington National Symphony Orchestra participated before a large audience was a most convincing testimony of the great advances made in recent years in the electronic reproduction of sound.

Some 2,500 music lovers thought they were hearing trumpeter Lloyd Geisler during the solo portion of Purcell's "Trumpet Voluntary." Actually, he was simply going through the motions of playing while the audience was listening to a recording he had made on tape earlier in the day. Reproducing this recording for the audience were high-fidelity amplifiers and speakers such as are found in many homes today for the faithful reproduction of recorded sound.

To complete the illusion, a second rendition of the Purcell composition was given. This time the orchestra on stage remained silent while trumpeter Geisler played to the accompaniment of a recording made by the National Symphony earlier.

This demonstration of the new great advances made in sound reproduction, which is called stereophonic sound, was the opening event of the 4-day International High Fidelity Music Festival, which begins this Thursday, February 5, at the Hotel Shoreham.

An exhibition area, comprising some 50 rooms, has been set aside at the Shoreham where more than 250 different items of high-fidelity equipment for the home will be shown, including phonograph records, amplifiers, speakers, radio tuners, tape recorders, turntables, and other music reproduction products.

This is not Washington's first high-fidelity music show. Last year's showing attracted some 16,000 visitors to the Shoreham. This year's music festival, however, marks the first time that a nationally known symphonic group participates actively in an exhibit of this kind.

Other cities such as Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York have very successful high fidelity shows, which attract thousands of visitors. This week's music festival in Washington, however, brings together our great National Symphony and the newest in sound reproducing equipment in an association which may be the start of a musical trend for other parts of the country.

I hope that some of my colleagues in the House will have the chance to visit the International High Fidelity Music Festival during this weekend at the Shoreham. An exciting experience is in store for them as it is for everyone who hears stereophonic sound for the first

time. At the same time, they may gain firsthand knowledge of woofers, tweeters, crossover networks and other equipment dear to the heart of the high fidelity devotee.

I would be remiss if I do not bring to the attention of my colleagues three exhibitors from Massachusetts: the H. H. Scott Co. of Maynard, which is in my district; High Fidelity magazine of Great Barrington; and Acoustic Research of Cambridge.

The H. H. Scott exhibit should be of particular interest because the products of this company are well and favorably known throughout the electronics industry. Acoustic Research has developed a new speaker system, which has attracted wide interest and much favorable comment in music circles. High Fidelity magazine pioneered in its field and has grown in influence and scope in the world of high fidelity.

Permit me to close with one word of warning: Music will never sound the same, especially from a small radio or old record player, once a convincing demonstration of stereophonic sound is experienced firsthand. We are in truth living in a fabulous world and I am very proud that my district and State through the growing electronics industry are contributing so much toward this impressive progress.

Conservation: A Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the St. Marys (Kans.) Star. Mr. R. E. Robinson, Jr., is publisher and editor of the newspaper.

I cannot improve or add to the comments contained in this excellent editorial. I strongly recommend that every Member of Congress take the time to read this very fine editorial:

CONSERVATION: A WAY OF LIFE

A few short years ago this country was a virgin land over which Indians roamed, supported by a bounteous Nature. The population was too scant to make a dent in the resources which abounded here.

Then came the white man with his gun and his plow and the other appurtenances of civilization. Game was slaughtered—the buffalo, which had been counted in the millions, became almost extinct. Prairie land, which had supported life for countless years, was broken with the plow and delivered to the wind and rain. In the honeymoon years, conservation was unheard of. The early settlers couldn't imagine a time when the natural resources of these fruitful hills and prairies could so erode away that life could not exist upon them.

Fortunately, man awoke before the ruin became complete. Not too many years ago, too few in fact, some men realized that unless our resources were conserved, they soon would disappear forever. They saw that a human being could no longer act like a child in a candy shop, taking indiscriminately, without eventually having to face the consequences. And the consequences would be death.

Then, too, developed the idea that we, today, owe something to the generations which follow us. It isn't Christian or moral to dissipate the wealth of our country and turn over to our children a barren and denuded land.

The bounties of Nature are great but they are not without limit. Nature is like a woman. Treat her well, pamper her a little, and she will smile and produce. Mistreat her and she turns cold, ugly, and unproductive.

All of us have an interest in the conservation of the soil. Whether we are farmers or town dwellers, the food we eat and the clothes we wear depend largely on the productivity of the soil. It is with this in mind that we dedicate this issue of the Star to the interest of conservation. We hope that it will, in a small way, increase the interest in and enthusiasm for, the conservation of our natural resources.

Hood River Electric Cooperative Can See No Reason To Increase Electric Power Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently read with a great deal of interest a letter from Willard I. Johnson, manager of the Hood River Electric Cooperative, which was addressed to all electric consumers in the Hood River Valley in Oregon.

The letter is self-explanatory and provides a rather telling commentary on power development in the Pacific Northwest. I am hopeful that my colleagues will closely examine this correspondence and bear it in mind when next the House considers the authorization of a public power project.

The letter follows:

HOOD RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,

Hood River, Oreg., January 20, 1959.

Subject: Request for rate increase filed by Pacific Power & Light Co. in selected areas of Oregon and Washington.

To All Electric Consumers in Hood River Valley:

Since the newspaper announcement regarding proposed rate increases of 15 percent in Oregon and 10 percent in Washington, we have been repeatedly asked if our rates would go up too. We see no reason to increase our rates; 1958 has been the best year in our history, in spite of the fact that labor, materials, and everything else we buy, except wholesale power, has gone up.

The reason is increased sales per customer. Our members are finding that electricity will do the job better, safer, and cheaper and are buying more and more. We have learned that low prices bring more sales and more sales bring lower prices. The two go hand in hand.

We get our labor from the same union, at the same price as does any other utility. The same is true of transformers, meters, poles and wire; but volume increases offset these items for us and should do likewise for any other utility.

This rate increase request is for a system-wide increase of 15 percent in Oregon with the exception of Hood River rural area. The Dalles, Springfield, part of Umatilla County,

and Tillamook. In each area excepted, there is an active cooperative, PUD or municipal system in direct competition. It could be that Portland, Astoria, Albany, Hood River City, and others will bear the cost of this competition. It seems to us that the signers of the petition last June, which kept HREC lines out of Hood River City should reevaluate the wisdom of that signing. Their loyalty is now to be rewarded by a rate increase of 15 percent while their country neighbors will have no increase at all. HREC rates are now approximately 17 percent below Hood River City rates. Add 15 percent to this and you get 32 percent, nearly one-third more than the city customer will pay than does his country neighbor.

Outgoing PUC Commissioner Howard Morgan saw these and other discrepancies in the rate filing and ordered it suspended for not to exceed 6 months until the entire matter could be thoroughly studied. His successor will take final action on the matter and no one knows what the outcome will be.

Meanwhile, we take pride in pointing out to the people of Hood River Valley the direct and indirect benefits to them from the existing local cooperative. It is truly the yardstick in electric rates.

Very truly yours,

HOOD RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
WILLARD I. JOHNSON, Manager.

Berwick (Pa.) Plant of ACF Industries To Build Cars for Subway in U.S. Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news story from the Wilkes-Barre Record of January 31, 1959:

BERWICK TO BUILD CARS FOR SUBWAY IN
SENATE

After 45 years of shuttling U.S. Senators the 760 feet between their offices and the Capitol, the monorail cars of the Senate subway are being retired in favor of new two-rail trolley cars.

A spokesman for the Office of the Architect of the Capitol said four cars have been ordered from the American Car and Foundry Division of ACF Industries, Inc. They will be installed this summer after completion of the new Senate subway system between the Capitol and the Old and New Senate Buildings.

The new system, according to the spokesman, comprises two separate subways. The new line to the Old Senate Office Building is 650 feet long, with the line to the New Senate Office Building measuring 1,200 feet. Two new cars will be installed in each subway. The old monorail subway, a point of interest to tourists through the years, will continue in use as a utility tunnel.

Charles Venrick, vice president of railroad sales for the ACF Division, said the \$363,180 Government contract covers four cars, an overhead conductor system and a power supply substation.

Mr. Venrick described the cars as four wheeled, with open tops and partly enclosed sides. Each car will seat 18 lawmakers or tourists 3 abreast in 6 seats. He said the cars will be made at the Berwick plant of ACF.

Appendix

Sam P. Harben, the Grand Old Man of the Texas Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the grand old man of the Texas press, Mr. Sam P. Harben, has recently retired as editor-publisher of the Richardson Echo, an outstanding weekly newspaper in north Texas. His illustrious 58-year career is notable for his many contributions to his community, his State and Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, from the Chronicle-Journal, on the retirement of Mr. Harben.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Floresville (Tex.) Chronicle-Journal, Jan. 30, 1959]

SAM P. HARBEN SETS SOME RECORDS; RETIRES AFTER 58 YEARS AS PUBLISHER

RICHARDSON.—Things are not the same here in the Richardson Echo office. Not for anybody. And especially for Sam P. Harben, the grand old man of the Texas press, who just retired after an illustrious career of contribution to his community during 58 years as a weekly newspaper editor-publisher.

All week long, Mr. Harben has been coming to his office as usual. Just sitting and reflecting. For him, there's no gaiety in being a guest of the world, even in restful retirement. But he sold out last week to his partner, O. A. Spotts, an associate with the printing-newspaper firm since 1929. And when you scan some of his achievements during his 80 years, it's easy to see why—out of harness—he feels like a country printer without a lineage.

Take this for instance:

In 1900 he founded the Echo in the back end of his drugstore.

He built the first telephone system in Richardson.

He was one of the founders of the Citizens State Bank.

He was one of the founders of the Texas Press Association.

He was secretary of that organization 32 years.

When I started out as a printer's devil back in Teague, I was beginning school, too. That's when I first heard of Mr. Harben. Even then, he was a power in the country press, always preaching the might of the grassroots minds. And its good influence in a free world.

Few men in Texas—perhaps none—have ever equaled the 58-year record of this man who loves to be called a country editor. He has been in business longer than any other Richardson merchant, helped found the Rotary Club here, and has an almost perfect attendance record. Since 1895, when

he first picked up his "stick" and started handspiking type for patent medicine ads in the Rockdale Messenger, this pioneering printer has been a builder.

When he sold his first 150 subscriptions to the Echo back in 1900, Richardson had 6 businesses and 113 residents. But he stayed and stayed, and has never missed an issue of his paper.

Said Maurine Cook, one of his reporters: "He deserves time now to just take it easy and feel his time has not been spent in vain, but has been of service to his home and country. He has fought (with all the tools he had) for the preserving of the freedom of the press as a part of the American way of life, an invaluable contribution to the people of a free country." (The Dallas Times Herald).

News of Sam Harben's retirement naturally will bring sorrow and joy alike to the countless hundreds of friends of this beloved country newspaperman, who spent over half a century in the profession. Some sorrow, because those of us who have known and loved him through the years, well know what it meant for him "to drop the traces." It brings joy to us all, to know that if ever there was a member of the fourth estate who is entitled to retire and enjoy the evening of life without the humdrum of press days, busy workdays, and all that goes with the life of a country publisher and printer, that man is Sam P. Harben. He has made a great contribution to Texas journalism in general, and the Texas Press Association in particular, and in his long and active life as a Texan devoted to the upbuilding of his State. We shall always cherish the happy press conventions, hours in his home, and personal associations, with Sam Harben, our friend for nearly 50 years. All the joy and happiness to him in the days ahead and in this we know we are joined by scores of newspapermen throughout Texas and members of their families.

Rise in Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a member of a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee dealing with the problems of juvenile delinquency, I am increasingly concerned by the unfortunate rise in the number of delinquency cases.

In 1957, for example, these cases had reached an alltime high of 603,000; involving 520,000 of our youth. This is, indeed, a tragic situation.

We recognize, of course, that this epidemic of delinquency knows no boundaries. Large and small cities, as well as our rural communities, unhappily face an increasing problem in this field.

We also recognize that the problem of delinquency is not one that can be

solved entirely at the Federal level. Rather, constructive efforts must be made by the State and local communities; and particularly the American home bears a basic responsibility in helping to assure that our young folks are trained and brought up to lead good, constructive lives.

We realize that, very often, the delinquency problem obscures the fact that the vast majority of our youth are participating in, and contributing to, worthwhile programs in their community. In this way, they are laying the groundwork for leadership in the Nation of tomorrow.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the startling and lamentable increase in the number of delinquency cases. Recently, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare furnished my office with a report of the latest figures concerning the continued rise in juvenile delinquency. To give my colleagues the benefit of this data, I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEW REPORT ON INCREASING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

According to reports from juvenile courts to the Children's Bureau for the calendar year 1957, juvenile delinquency cases have continued to rise for the ninth consecutive year (1948-57). In 1957, these cases reached an alltime high of 603,000 cases involving 520,000 children. The increase in the number of these cases coming before juvenile courts was almost five times greater than the increase in the child population of juvenile court age (10 to 17) during these 9 years.

The continuing rise in juvenile delinquency extends throughout the Nation. It is not confined to any one group of States. Nor is it confined to any one geographic area. Rural and urban areas alike are confronted with this problem.

Not only the number of cases, but the proportion of children involved, has steadily risen. In 1948, about 12.6 out of every 1,000 children (10 to 17) came to the attention of juvenile courts for alleged juvenile delinquency. By 1957 this rate had mounted to 23.5 out of every 1,000 children—almost double the 1948 rate.

Even if juvenile delinquency remains fixed at the 1957 rate, the number of juvenile delinquency cases may be expected to increase by 140,000 in 1962, and by 205,000 cases in 1965, simply because of the known increase in the number of children aged 10 to 17 that will occur by these years.

A much greater number than come to the attention of juvenile courts—perhaps as much as 1.7 million children—are dealt with by the police for misbehavior. About three-quarters of these are not referred to juvenile courts but rather are handled directly by the police. In such cases the police officers take whatever steps they think might alter the delinquent behavior of the children. This means referring some of these boys and girls to social agencies for help.

Police arrests of children as reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation also show increases in recent years, following closely the pattern evidenced by the juvenile court delinquency cases. The following table shows the percentage change from one year to the next in both series:

	Percent change from preceding year	
	Police arrests of children ¹	Juvenile delinquency court cases
1949	+4	+7
1950	+5	+3
1951	+8	+9
1952	(1)	+11
1953	+8	+13
1954	+2	+6
1955	+11	+9
1956	+17	+21
1957	+10	+16

¹ Police arrests of children up through 1951 are based on fingerprint arrest records; for 1952 and thereafter they were based on reports of all persons arrested whether fingerprinted or not and therefore are not comparable to the earlier data. Percentage changes are based on a varying number of cities participating each year—not on a comparable group throughout as in delinquency court cases.

The increases are not limited to the large congested urban areas as is so often supposed. On the contrary, the increases seem to be greater in the smaller and rural areas. For example, the FBI reports that the increase between 1956 and 1957 in arrests of persons under 18 years of age was 16 percent in cities under 25,000 population while it was only 8 percent in cities of 25,000 or more. Juvenile court statistics also show greater increases in rural and semiurban areas than in large urban areas. Even though increases have been somewhat greater in the smaller areas, juvenile delinquency is still primarily an urban problem. For it is in the large cities that most delinquency is concentrated.

The Texas Water Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there appeared in the Denver Post of January 28, 1959, a very interesting article, by Mr. Roscoe Fleming, entitled "The Texas Water Challenge." Mr. Fleming discussed the efforts made by Texans to control and utilize Texas' water resources, and spoke of our reclamation and flood control projects as "defensible in terms of that wholly conserved America that I am coming to think should be the Nation's most sought interior goal."

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TEXAS WATER CHALLENGE

(By Roscoe Fleming)

Texas may have ceded first place to Alaska in size, but she is challenging for first place in water utilization. She is undertaking the

Nation's most ambitious water-development program outside of California's. The Texans voted a \$200 million bond issue for this purpose, part to match Federal contributions, part to build State water projects that dovetail.

Adjusting for differences in wealth and population, Colorado to match this would have to appropriate at least \$40 million. But as we all know, Colorado spends almost nothing in State funds on water.

Such a program will surely pay Texas, as it pays her to have the two leaders of the two Houses of Congress.

But that isn't the whole story. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who takes great personal pride in the Texas program, has steadily urged Texans to do more for themselves in this regard, even while he works for more Federal aid.

The results are really something. Texas has recently gotten a complete Federal-State survey of its water-project possibilities; and by special enactment of the 85th Congress, it now has the Nation's only Federal-State Commission devoted permanently to solving the water problems of a single State.

Texas therefore has a very fine chance to see full implementation of its water-salvage program, to be built over many years at a cost of much more than a billion dollars. When it is complete, Texas will have about as full use of its immense water resources as is possible for a State.

A yearly average of about 40 million acre-feet of fresh water flows unused into the Gulf of Mexico from a dozen river systems, most of which are wholly, or almost wholly, inside Texas.

The grand scheme is to interconnect these basins by a huge canal running southwestward from humid east Texas to the drier regions, and to pass the water along and redistribute it, until fullest possible use is attained.

This requires a degree of interbasin cooperation which, of course, has not yet been fully realized. But Texas has organized a board of water engineering to work on nothing but better water utilization. And as we say, the Texans have the fullest cooperation of Federal agencies.

They've done all right by themselves so far.

Nearly 500 of the individual contracts for droughtproofing individual farms and ranches under the special Great Plains program of 1956, or almost half the present total, are in Texas. About one-third of all the money obligated so far—or more than \$2 million—has been obligated for Texas.

Texas already has some 18 projects qualified under the special Flood Prevention and Water Control Act of 1954-56, with an estimated total expenditure of about \$34 million, of which about \$13 million is Federal.

Its Harlingen (small projects) Act program was the first in the Nation to qualify under the law by which the Federal Government makes interest-free loans up to \$5 million to local agencies. Texas also has two of the largest single projects under the Flood Control Act of 1944, which alone cover more than 13 million acres.

All this is in addition to the large flood control and navigation programs of the Corps of Engineers, of which Texas has about \$400 million worth underway with another \$190 million authorized.

None of these should we resent. All are defensible in terms of that wholly conserved America that I am coming to think should be the Nation's most sought interior goal—to match peace on earth as its exterior one.

The Texas example of aggressive local and State participation and spending to match Uncle's dollars might well commend itself to other States with huge water problems such as Colorado.

Pastoral Letter of Archbishop of Montreal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the evil that is unemployment has been discussed many times in this body. Many of the measures which will come before us in the weeks ahead properly must be weighed in part in the light of their effect on the Nation's unemployment. The problem of unemployment remains among the most urgent of our time.

His Eminence, Paul Emile Cardinal Leger of Montreal, in a pastoral letter in January, takes up the same problem in the great nation to our north; describes the effects of unemployment in the powerful terms of a man of deep thought and deep feeling; and offers some fresh approaches to the question.

Highlights and background of his letter were contained in an article carried January 20 by the N.C.W.C. News Service. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARDINAL CALLS FOR UNITED EFFORTS TO CUT UNEMPLOYMENT; ANNOUNCES SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

MONTREAL, January 20.—His Eminence Paul Emile Cardinal Leger has called for management, labor, and the state to combine forces against the scourge of unemployment.

The archbishop of Montreal announced in a lengthy pastoral letter that a special collection would be taken up monthly in archdiocesan churches to finance construction projects aimed at relieving the surplus of workers.

The cardinal also urged the formation of commissions of labor and management representatives to propose solutions to unemployment, then to be aided by the state in carrying them out.

In Montreal there are about 80,000 persons unemployed. Canada's jobless were estimated to total about 440,000 on December 13, according to the most recent survey of the Canadian Bureau of Statistics and the Labor Department. This was a hike of about 79,000 over November.

The cardinal said his pastoral was prompted by the thousands suffering, materially and morally, and placed in social conditions which render difficult a life in conformity with Christian principles.

"How can we reconcile the paradoxical picture of thousands of citizens without work in a country which is immensely rich and in full development?" he asked.

"Who would dare to pretend, faced with such a situation, that unemployment is normal and constitutes at the most a necessary evil? Such a pretension would be as little in accord with morality as it is with present-day knowledge," he asserted.

"The Christian cannot remain indifferent before a situation which engenders such sorrowful consequences. Beyond the statistics and figures, he must recognize men, women, and children and aged reduced to poverty and exposed to the terrible temptations of despair.

"Deprived of all the moral advantages assured by work, the unemployed get the impression of being useless or being superfluous in society," the cardinal continued.

"This situation upsets the family and compromises its harmony. The father is humiliated by not being able to acquit himself of his responsibilities for his family; he feels himself impaired and sinking. Discouragement can take hold of him and idleness exposes him to all sorts of temptations. Crime which increases considerably during times of unemployment underlines further the gravity of this evil," the cardinal stated.

Lippmann Clears Up Some of the Confusion in the Missile Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, once again Mr. Walter Lippmann has made an objective and penetrating analysis of a confusing controversy. In his column in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "McElroy's Troubles," he puts his finger clearly on the basic issue in the present controversy over whether or not we are ahead or behind the Soviets in the missile program. He points out that this is an issue that cannot be settled definitively because neither side of the argument knows precisely what the Soviets have. Mr. Lippmann correctly states that the basic error of the administration is equating the national security to a balanced budget at the existing level of taxes. This casts suspicion on military estimates because the real measuring stick of the military estimates is not the national security but what we can afford in terms of the budget level the President has selected. I agree with him that Congress should make it clear in no uncertain terms that the national security has the first priority.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 5, 1959]

McElroy's Troubles

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the swirling controversy over the Eisenhower-McElroy budget the inquiring bystander must, I believe, accept the fact that the basic issue is not one which can be settled definitively. There is a race of armaments. But who is ahead now, and who will be ahead 2 years from now is not something that can be measured quantitatively, even if there existed perfect intelligence with exact and complete knowledge of the quantity and quality of all the weapons on both sides. What statesmen really have to estimate is what is likely to be the judgment of other statesmen about the existing balance of power. In making these judgments they have to listen to the calculations of the experts in various specialties. But they must be able to make the necessary discount in these expert calculations, remembering that

they are essentially about war games and not about the whole reality.

For these calculations are invariably theoretical abstractions—what for example, would happen if there were a war in which one side had X number of missiles and the other had X plus Y missiles?

At bottom the argument between the administration and Senator SYMINGTON is whether the balance of power should be calculated in terms of intercontinental missiles or whether it shall be judged in terms of the whole complex of armaments and of the international political situation.

My point in all this is not to say that Mr. McElroy and the administration are right. I think they are very wrong. But I do not think they are deliberately misleading the country. What they have done is to argue their case so badly that they are losing the confidence of the public.

The fatal error lies in the decision of the President to make the paramount issue of the present time a Federal budget balanced at the existing level of taxes, along with a promise of a reduction of taxes before the next presidential election. We are approaching one of the great climaxes of the cold war and the President's decision about the paramountcy of the budget reflects a failure to understand the nature of the cold war.

It makes suspect all the military estimates in the budget. For it is no part of the law of the land, or of that moral law which the President frequently invokes, that the existing tax structure cannot be raised and should be lowered. To insist on such a dogma about taxes is to tell the people and the world that national defense is not the first but only the secondary consideration in this Government.

From this it follows inevitably that Secretary McElroy's assurances about our overall strength are quite unconvincing. For nobody is prepared to believe that by a wonderfully lucky coincidence the money needed for national defense is just the amount of money we can afford to spend if the budget is to be balanced without raising taxes.

This initial error about the budget has forced Mr. McElroy into making the disastrous announcement that the United States has withdrawn from the missiles race. He may well be right that with fewer missiles there will still be an overall balance of power. But it is not good for the Russians and it is bad for our allies to be allowed to think that the richest nation on earth is unwilling to pay what it costs to stay in that part of the race of armaments which has the most horrible prospects. Secretary McElroy's announcement is a most lamentable way to prepare for the impending negotiations which Secretary Dulles is now dealing with in Europe.

What should be done about it? It should be said in no uncertain terms that defense has the first priority. If the President will not say it, perhaps Congress itself should say it by resolution. There should then be a substantial increase in the military appropriations, an increase sufficient to put us back into the missiles race. Then an increase of taxes should be voted in order to balance this larger budget.

I am aware that the extra money invested in making more of the existing missiles may be "wasted"—wasted in the sense that these missiles will soon be obsolete and good only for the junk pile. But the race of armaments is in the same sense inherently wasteful since the objective is to make weapons which will never be used and will soon be obsolete.

Nevertheless we are in a race of armaments. It would be a great day for mankind if it could be ended. But if the race is to be ended, this will be done only if and when we are able to reach general political settlements with the Communist powers.

The race of armaments cannot be ended or suspended merely because we wish to balance the budget without raising taxes or because it would be good politics to reduce taxes before the next election.

Committee Chairmanships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my remarks on the floor of the Senate Monday regarding the obvious weakness in adherence to strict seniority in committee chairmanships has prompted a considerable and encouraging response from many parts of our nation. I have also received an interesting and generally favorable reaction from some of my Senate colleagues.

Letters and wires, according to the present count, are running about 50 to 1 in favor of my position on Seniority Rules. I intend to go into this matter in some detail in the future. I am delighted with the favorable response.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two typical responses to the position I have taken. One is a letter from Maryland; the other, a wire from Cleveland.

There being on objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER SPRING, MD., February 4, 1959.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I have read with great interest and care your statement on the floor on February 2, 1959, relative to the designation of committee chairmen. Although I am not one of your constituents—indeed, I have not had the pleasure of meeting you—I should like to express my deep appreciation for your very accurate, courageous, and exceedingly timely statement.

May I recommend that you ask the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare and publish an historical analysis of the selection of committee members and committee chairmen in the Senate? I have the decided impression that the seniority system is of relatively recent origin. I recall from reading history that frequently outstanding Senators were selected as committee chairmen in their first term as late as the end of the 19th century. It seems to me that the information which the Legislative Reference Service might bring together would be of great value in the educational phase of what I hope you will undertake as a long-range attack on the unfortunate and almost completely indefensible seniority system to which you directed your remarks on Monday.

SOUTH BEND, IND., February 4, 1959.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Congratulations on your effort to change Senate procedures resulting in Dixiecrats always heading important committees. In this effort you are ably representing all of us.

FRANK HENSON,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Wisconsin Conservation Expert—Age 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, Wisconsin has developed an outstanding constructive conservation record. The program has included soil and water conservation projects, reforestation, development of watersheds, and a wide variety of other constructive activities for protecting and improving our natural resources.

Recently, the University of Wisconsin sponsored a Farm and Home Week. During the week, special programs were held at the university to cover such subjects as: Utilization of basic natural resources wisely; farm and home management; research and its impact on agriculture; special meetings on product marketing; social problems; homemaking; and a variety of other topics of interest.

During the activities, there were of course, a number of addresses delivered by authorities in various fields. Interestingly, a fine report on conservation was presented by an 11-year-old farm boy, George Gullickson. A prizewinner in a statewide speaking contest, George gave a report of soil conservation and preservation, including the planting of 1,000 pine trees, that won the warm applause, and the hearts, of the crowds attending Farm and Home Week.

A recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal carried an article about this young man's achievements—illustrative of the importance of instilling early in the youth respect for, and the necessity for, conservation of our natural resources.

I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 30, 1959]
CONSERVATION EXPERT, ONLY 11, BEST OF ALL—
CHEERS FOR FARM BOY FROM POLK COUNTY
ARE THE LOUDEST AT UW PROGRAM

(By Lewis C. French)

MADISON, Wis.—A pint-sized Polk County farm boy, just 11 years old, Thursday made the best speech of the whole University of Wisconsin farm and home week program.

Reading his dime store notebook manuscript, little George Gullickson, who comes from crossroads Cushing in the sand-blown country near Bass Lake, told a simple but challenging story of soil, water, and timber conservation. An overflow crowd cheered so loudly that it almost lifted the rafters of Great Hall in the Memorial Union.

There had been a dozen speeches on the need for faster and more scientific work to protect natural resources. D. A. Williams, the administrator of the soil conservation service, and professors with a long list of degrees spoke on the problems of anchoring enough of the eroding topsoil so that this Nation could continue to be the land of abundance.

HE STRIDES BOLDLY

The soil conservation district supervisors and others endured all this and more. Then,

near the end of the program, the youth from Polk County, a prizewinner in a statewide speaking contest, got his chance.

He told how the early colonists found rich soil and grew cotton and tobacco until the land ran out of fertility and eroded down to red clay. Then they moved West, raiding new country rich in pine and forests and clean water—always new land. Then the new land gave out and there was no more.

"Little by little there was less of that rich soil, there was less of the wildlife, less of the fish, less of the clean water. And then settlers began to wake up," said this sixth grade farm boy. "Erosion was a silent thief stealing our topsoil."

BISON DESTROYED

He gave an account of the ruthless destruction of the bison and other wildlife.

Then George Gullickson took his spell-bound audience right up to Polk County, where storms of flinty sand cut down crops, where drought blistered crops that farmers needed to buy socks and shoes for their families.

"There was a continued loss of that rich and dark blanket of soil your dad and mine need to raise crops for the cows, the pigs, and chickens," said this lad.

Then he told how in 3 years he and his twin sisters, Marion and Marilyn, a year older than he, planted 1,000 pine trees on rough land near a quarry on their farm. And how even now the Norways are higher than his head.

TREES PLANTED

And he told how the county and the town of Sterling took 9,996 acres to plant 600,000 trees.

"Now the township has not had to make a tax assessment for township purposes for years," said George. "The forest paid the township costs."

He told of seeing muddy roads with topsoil slopped down from the slopes and the gullies. "Do not do this to our country. Leave a heritage of abundance, soil, clean water, and timber," he said.

The throng got up and cheered and after the Polk County champion got his \$50 bond prize they broke out in a second round of applause.

Airport Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of recent date entitled "Airport Aid Is Needed."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRPORT AID IS NEEDED

In mustering its forces to oppose the re-submitted bill calling for a billion-dollar airport construction program, the administration is putting economy ahead of the country's best economic interests and national defense. This measure, which was pocket-vetoed last September 2, would grant the States a total of \$575 million in matching money for airports during the next 5 years.

Mr. Eisenhower believes that a transitional program, in which \$200 million would be allocated during the next 4 years, is sufficient. With the jet and turbojet airliners just beginning to come in, and major airports all

over the country needing to be extended and strengthened, is it wise to withdraw Federal aid at this moment?

Only a few airports are now equipped to handle the jet airliners safely and efficiently. The air lines, committed for more than \$2 billion of jet planes and under severe restrictions that keep them from fare increases, have no ready cash surpluses. Some cities and States are also financially unable to make the swift improvements needed.

The military value alone of the new jet airliners more than compensates for the Federal aid that would be granted. Under emergency conditions the civil reserve air fleets could provide more than 9 billion ton-miles of airlift annually. It is estimated by the Air Transport Association that this reserve air fleet would represent a billion-dollar saving to the taxpayer in military planes that otherwise would be necessary.

Missouri and St. Louis share in this vital problem. Just last October the Federal Airport Use Panel, after long study, reported that the St. Louis metropolitan area should provide at least one additional all-weather civilian airport.

Under the new bill sponsored by Senator MONROE, of Oklahoma, and Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas, Missouri would be eligible to receive \$1,736,412 in Federal airport aid. In rank according to the amount of money the States would be eligible to receive, Missouri stands ninth. Texas is first, California second and Illinois fifth.

The airport aid bill is desirable and necessary. We hope Congress adopts it by a wide enough margin to override a second veto.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Chicago Daily News of February 2, 1959. It deals with the subject of inflation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUT FEDERAL SPENDING—INFLATION CAN BE LICKED, EXPERTS AGREE, BUT CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE MUST QUIT PLAYING POLITICS

President Eisenhower has declared a "relentless war" against inflation.

In his economic report to Congress January 20 he warned that U.S. economic health is jeopardized by spiraling wages and prices.

But can inflation be stopped?

And if it can, then how?

The joint congressional economic committee, under Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, has undertaken still another inquiry to get the answers.

But the fact is, inflation can be stopped. And the Senate finance committee, headed by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, already has all the necessary formulas for stopping it.

They came from 71 of the keenest brains in the country—industrialists and bankers, economists, and professors.

The 71 men gave their expert views on curbing inflation early last year in answers to a questionnaire sent out by the Byrd committee.

These formulas were printed in a 758-page report.

The economic experts quoted made clear that they believe no formula can whip inflation until Congress and the executive branch stop playing politics and do the job.

President Eisenhower has named a seven-man Cabinet committee headed by Vice President Nixon to plan a battle against inflation.

Its continuing job, according to the White House, will be to study how to maintain reasonable price stability.

HERE'S THE WAY TO DO IT

What is the single, most important step necessary to curb inflation? The 71 experts answer with 1 voice: "Cut Government spending."

The prescriptions are there in abundance for Congress to act on to rescue the dollar.

Stop the ballooning of Government spending by turning a deaf ear to pressure groups that demand more and more and more.

Strip labor of its monopoly control over wages.

Make corporations consider the Nation's good when they establish their price and production policies.

Revise the tax laws to put a premium on thrift rather than on waste.

Restrict consumer credit when it threatens to get out of hand.

Some of the recommendations, their sponsors admit, would be painful on segments of the economy—segments with votes—but they are urged nevertheless for the good of the whole Nation.

GOVERNMENT ADDS MOST TO INFLATION

On the need for economy, Gerhard Colm of the National Planning Association said:

"In 1957 the total expenditures of governments (Federal, State and local) in the United States amounted to \$114.1 billion."

This mammoth sum, representing 26 percent of all the goods and services produced in the country, is said to be the biggest single source of inflation, even in years when the budget is balanced.

But wouldn't it be just as inflationary if the same money were left in the hands of taxpayers and spent by them?

No, said Arthur F. Burns, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. His reasons:

Government officials, not given to bargain hunting, are less efficient shoppers.

A high proportion of their buying is on a cost-plus basis, that is, the contractor gets his percentage profit regardless of how high he lets his costs soar.

Government contracts are required by law to include provisions on minimum wages and other labor standards (which, no matter how desirable, increase costs).

Frank E. Jerome, a Seattle bank president, added that if the same money were left in the hands of the taxpayers, part of it would be saved—and savings are deflationary.

Carl E. Allen, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, recommended this approach to Government belt tightening.

He said officials should ask themselves not "Is this something we would like to have?" but "Is this something we can do without?"

WANTS SERVICES ON LOCAL LEVEL

Pressing for action on a favorite proposal of President Eisenhower, Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric Co., urged:

"Transfer as many Government services as possible from the Federal to the State and local levels.

"The construction of schools, highways, and public buildings by the Federal Government adds to the inflationary potential of the public debt."

The reasons for this are technical. Local governments finance their projects by long-term bonds, the sale of which takes money out of circulation and thus is deflationary.

(Much of the Federal debt is financed by short-term obligations which, sold to banks, become a reserve for expanding credit. This is inflationary.)

Recommended for immediate action by Frederick W. Ecker, president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.:

1. Put into effect the economies called for by the Hoover Commissions, which would save many millions.

(Of the 1947 Hoover Commission recommendations, 72 percent have been adopted by the Government; of the 1953 ideas, only 53 percent are in effect.)

2. Enact the McClellan bill, which calls for a joint, expertly staffed, budgetary watchdog committee in Congress.

3. Give the President the power of "item veto" in appropriations bills, a power that 40 State Governors now have.

(When a pork-barrel bill now comes before the President, he must reject or accept it all—the good projects and the wasteful. Item veto would allow him to reject the worst features without killing the whole bill.)

Ecker added, "Unwarranted increases in social security benefits add to inflationary forces."

One expert after another shook a finger at farm price support policies, which are inflationary in a double way.

First, farm product prices are kept at an artificially high level, and secondly the Government spends billions annually to keep them there.

HOW TO MANAGE HUGE U.S. DEBT

In other Government fiscal recommendations, the economists and industrialists were in general agreement on how the gigantic Federal debt should be managed so as to cause the least inflationary harm.

The principle behind their ideas, though long known to economists, frequently has been violated by Treasury action.

Frederick L. Deming, president of the Federal Reserve bank of St. Louis, stated the principle:

"Sale of long-term securities and retirement of short-term issues during inflation would tend to reduce liquidity and hence inhibit bank loan expansion."

Other sources urged that Treasury securities "should be placed as far possible in the hands of investors other than banks."

The idea here is not too complex for general understanding.

When a private investor buys a bond, the money passes out of circulation. When a bank gets it, the bond is used as a base for new loans and the money is spent over and over again.

When more money circulates in the economy and the things available for purchase by the public remain static, prices of course go up. This is the basis of "classical" inflation.

The chief arm of the Government in regulating the supply of currency in circulation is the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The Fed, as it is called, was widely—if not unanimously—praised in the reports to the Senate committee for wisdom in the way it has used these monetary controls.

But several economic specialists said that it can't do a fully effective job because its powers reach only into a fraction of the banking system—the banks that are Federal Reserve members.

Howard Ellis, professor of economics at the University of California, urged that all commercial banks, members or not, be brought under the credit-limiting powers of the Fed.

Others went further and recommended that the controls be extended to cover non-bank lending institutions—such as savings and loan associations and installment finance companies—which have grown phenomenally in recent years.

H.R. 1012, Liberalizing the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, Should Be Approved Immediately

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of proposed amendments to the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, including my own bills, H.R. 1370 and H.R. 1373.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 3, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTS

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and the members of this committee in support of bills I have introduced to amend the Railroad Retirement and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

The legislation has been introduced by me in previous Congresses and has the support of many individuals and groups among the railroad population of my congressional district in Pennsylvania and of the Nation.

The bills are as follows: H.R. 970 provides retirement on full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years, and further provides that such annuity shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings, and so forth.

H.R. 971 provides that an annuitant be permitted to continue to perform compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue. H.R. 971 covers the situation where an employee about to retire is required to resign a clerical position with a church, civic, fraternal, or social organization.

H.R. 972 repeals the prohibition against the payment of both earned social security benefits and spouse benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. At the present time a spouse entitled to earned social security benefits is penalized by deductions from the amount payable as spouse benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

H.R. 1374 is a bill to provide a 20-percent increase in all widows' annuities. In this connection, the 1956 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act granting an increase of approximately 10 percent did not include all persons receiving retirement benefits, with the result many widows were denied the increase.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1370 and H.R. 1373 represent my version of the Harris bill, H.R. 1012, with H.R. 1370 providing for an across-the-board increase of 10 percent in railroad retirement benefits and H.R. 1373 amending the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by providing an increase from 130 to 195 the maximum number of days of unemployment within a year for which unemployment benefits may be paid. The bill also liberalizes other provisions of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and is identical to those provisions of the Harris

bill, H.R. 1012, that affect the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

I want to go on record at this point of expressing my support of H.R. 1012 because I think it is a step in the right direction in recognizing the urgent need for amending the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts. I should like to comment on H.R. 1012 and mention briefly some of its principal provisions.

In amending the Railroad Retirement Act, H.R. 1012 will provide:

1. A 10-percent increase of all monthly benefits effective January 1, 1958.

2. Female employees with less than 30 years of service or the spouse of a retired employee will be able to obtain retirement benefits at age 62 on a reduced annuity. This option is already in effect under the social security system.

3. Maximum creditable compensation for determining benefits and earnings subject to taxation would be increased from \$350 to \$400 a month for the purpose of broadening the tax base to secure the additional revenue needed to pay the cost of the proposed amendments and to liquidate almost entirely the present actuarial deficit in the railroad retirement fund of \$213 million.

4. With the taxable base of earnings broadened to \$400 a month or \$4,800 annually, the tax rate on employers and employees will increase January 1, 1959, from 6¼ to 6½ percent. On January 1, 1962, the tax will increase to 7¼ percent each.

In the field of railroad unemployment insurance benefits, H.R. 1012 would provide:

1. An increase in daily benefit rates of 50 cents to \$1.70 a day higher than present rates.

2. A new schedule of rates ranging from a minimum daily benefit of \$4.50 for annual compensation of \$500 to \$699.99 to a maximum benefit rate of \$10.20 for annual compensation of \$4,000 or more.

3. Unemployment benefit periods would be extended for employees with 10 or more years' service by 65 to 130 days, depending upon length of service beyond the 130-day maximum provided in the present law.

4. To finance the cost of additional benefits and to take care of the current deficiency, the tax base after 1958 would be increased from \$350 to \$400 and the tax rate would be increased so that it would range from a minimum of 1½ percent to a maximum of 3½ percent contingent upon the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account. Minimum annual earnings needed to qualify for benefits would be increased from the present \$400 to \$500.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the 2d session of the 85th Congress increased social security benefits 7 percent effective January 1, 1959. In addition, for those unemployed whose insurance benefits terminated during 1958, an extension of 13 weeks was granted them.

Therefore, should H.R. 1012 become a law, the 10-percent increase in railroad retirement benefits provided for would become effective January 1, 1959, and for those unemployed railroaders whose unemployment insurance benefits terminated in June 1958, they would be eligible for benefits from 65 to 130 additional days, dependent upon length of service.

The bill actually gives to retired and unemployed railroaders the same treatment accorded persons retired under the Social Security Act or unemployed under the State unemployment compensation laws.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to dwell briefly on the situation facing retired and unemployed railroaders in my congressional district.

First, from a population standpoint I represent one of the largest railroad districts in the Nation. Therefore, I know the full impact of the cost of living on retired railroaders as well as the hardships of unemployment that exist in the railroad industry.

As an example of unemployment conditions in the railroad industry and the urgent need of extending the benefits period for railroad unemployment insurance benefits, I wish to call attention to the fact that in the 3 counties comprising my congressional district a total of 2,101 employees have already exhausted their eligibility for railroad unemployment insurance benefits.

At the present time 1,048 employees are receiving unemployment insurance benefits, and, of this number, 861 will exhaust their right before the new benefit year begins on July 1, 1959. At that time it is estimated by the Railroad Retirement Board that a total of 1,681 employees in my congressional district will be unable to qualify for railroad unemployment insurance benefits in the new benefit year because they did not earn sufficient wages during the calendar year 1958 to qualify for such benefits.

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing my efforts during my congressional career to give adequate service to constituents affected by the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, I have been greatly aided by the members and employees of the Railroad Retirement Board not only at the Chicago headquarters but also at district and regional offices in Altoona, Pa., and Cleveland, Ohio, as well as the liaison representative assigned to the Washington office of the Railroad Retirement Board.

In December of last year I visited the headquarters office of the Railroad Retirement Board in Chicago to discuss with the chief executive officer cases of my constituents that came under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, and also to obtain an evaluation of the actuarial condition of the railroad retirement fund and the effect on the fund of legislation that has been suggested to me for introduction in this Congress.

While in Chicago, I also met with members of the Board and some of the staff. I was not only impressed by the way the information I requested was readily made available to me, but I was also impressed by the keen sense of interest and responsibility those Government employees had in administering the provisions of both acts and their consciousness of the existing inflationary trend.

The Board is also well aware of the economic changes that are going on in the railroad industry and of the possible effect of such changes on operations of the Railroad Retirement Board. With this in mind, they are continually reviewing operations to keep expenses at a productive minimum.

I learned that even before the request of the Bureau of the Budget was received requesting that a 2 percent reduction be made in personnel expenditures for 1959, steps had been taken to hold employment levels well below budget limitations so that there was no problem in adhering to the request.

It was pointed out to me that although the retirement load of the Board has increased greatly since the inception of that program in 1937 and will continue to increase for some years in the future, every effort is being made to find new ways of performing necessary services to prevent an increase in the present employment levels of the Board and if possible to reduce the level of employment.

This is already reflected by the fact that there were 87 fewer persons employed on January 1, 1959 as compared with January 1, 1958, even though the work volume was substantially increased.

It is a pleasure to conclude my testimony by paying this well-deserved tribute to the members and employees of the Railroad Retirement Board for the efficient manner in which the administration of the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts is accomplished and at a minimum of expense.

Such economy of operation is appreciated as efforts are made to find means of wiping out the deficiencies in both the retirement and unemployment compensation funds and to finance the cost of the much-needed amendments to existing laws contained in H.R. 1012.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1012 is needed and needed badly. It is the fervent wish of my constituents who will benefit from its enactment that it will become a law at the earliest possible date.

As I stated previously, the Harris bill, H.R. 1012, contains in one package the provisions of my bills, H.R. 1370 and H.R. 1373, and I sincerely hope the legislation will be enacted as quickly as possible and that at a later date the committee will consider the other bills I have introduced to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

Providing Additional Funds for Direct Loans to Veterans

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2256) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans, to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. At the present time the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs allocates each regional office four times a year sums of money to be used for the direct-loan program. From time to time some of those mortgages are sold. The money that is received from the sale of those mortgages then goes back to the Veterans' Administration and is redistributed from the central office proportionately to all the district offices, not in the area where the mortgages were originally placed, only a small portion of it goes back into that area.

The purpose of this amendment is to see to it that if in any area you have people in the Veterans' Administration who have enough energy to get out and sell their mortgages they will have the money realized from the sale of their mortgages to reinvest with veterans' mortgages in the same area. That is the purpose of the amendment. It was rather technical to have it drafted, and I can say to the members of this committee that had the staff had the amendment ready it would have been adopted by the committee at its regular meeting.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished lady from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the Veterans' Administration would be very glad to have this amendment adopted.

Mr. SAYLOR. The Veterans' Administration would be very delighted to have this amendment adopted.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Shorter Workweek Urged by General Electric and Westinghouse Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting letter received from Mr. Albert J. Fitzgerald, general president, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, in New York, urging Congress to adopt legislation establishing a shorter workweek, and to investigate the relationship between the rising rate of corporation profit and the increasing number of the unemployed:

UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND
MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., February 3, 1959.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: On January 31, 1959, a meeting of UE delegates, employees of the General Electric and Westinghouse companies, voted to ask Congress to adopt legislation establishing a shorter workweek, and to investigate the relationship between the rising rate of corporation profit and the increasing number of the unemployed.

We, like the huge majority of all Americans, must depend for jobs upon employment by a corporation. In recent years the General Electric and Westinghouse Electric companies have discarded by layoff 60 to 70,000 of their employees. Thousands of these employees have long years of service. These companies have embarked on a policy of systematic layoff of employees and abandonment of whole plants and communities as a means of pushing profits to record-breaking levels.

The corporations are wholly free to employ workers or to lay them off. They take the profit that they have made from the work of thousands of employees in one community to build a new, modern plant, employing hundreds in another, and completely abandon both workers and community which made the new plant possible. This enormous and unrestrained economic power over the lives of our citizens is exercised without consideration of humanity or social responsibilities. The corporations disclaim responsibility for the plight of their discarded employees and the blighted towns they abandon.

The General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Co. have abandoned or are about to close plants in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Indiana, Massachusetts, and elsewhere. In other established plants in these same areas, where thousands of workers have been laid off in past months, the companies are continuing layoffs.

While this is going on both corporations are announcing higher profits on drastically reduced employment.

Vice President Jack S. Parker, of the General Electric Co. declared in September: "We see business picking up pretty generally, but through economies we have made,

our employment level won't get back as high as it was at the peak."

Mr. Parker's economies are jobless GE workers and blighted communities. This Union, the UE, has addressed itself seriously to the problem of returning tens of thousands of General Electric and Westinghouse workers to their jobs. In collective bargaining negotiations, this past fall, with both corporations the union proposed a 2-year program to shorten the work week to 35 hours without reduction in weekly earnings. This would have returned some 50,000 General Electric and Westinghouse workers to gainful employment. The seriousness of the proposal by the union is marked by the fact that the General Electric and Westinghouse workers offered to apply two annual wage increases contractually due them toward the cost of instituting the shorter work week. This offer by General Electric and Westinghouse workers would have covered approximately half the cost of the program. No other program for returning the jobless to work was offered by either company.

To date neither company has given the slightest indication that either recognizes its responsibility to the workers and communities which its present policies are destroying. Two days after the proposal for saving jobs had been made, the General Electric Co. publicly announced its total rejection.

The problem placed before you largely in terms of the plight of General Electric and Westinghouse workers is one that affects every industrial worker in the Nation.

Today, with gross national production virtually back to its prerecession level, only 30 percent of the decline in non-farm employment has been recovered since the low point last April. Unemployment today consistently under-estimated by the Department of Commerce stands near 7 million if proper allowance is made for those on short time and short earnings and the million new workers who annually come into the labor market.

We believe that Congress should direct its most serious attention to the problem of grave continuing unemployment, a labor problem that far transcends in importance other labor matters that are currently receiving far more attention from Government.

Congress can and should give leadership to the American people in helping solve the problem of unemployment. We ask specifically for:

1. Legislation to reduce the length of the standard work week to not more than 35 hours a week. This should be done in a way that will not simply re-distribute the present inadequate share of the national income among the employed and unemployed workers of America.

2. Congress should conduct open hearings and an investigation into the matter of the rising rate of profit in relation to the constantly increasing number of the unemployed.

We submit that this is a minimum course necessary not only from the most profound humane and social considerations, but an absolute necessity for the economic health of the Nation.

We call to your attention a few reported facts drawn at random out of many hundreds which compel the same conclusion:

The U.S. Treasury Department currently estimates that 1959 corporation profits will set a new record of \$47 to \$48 billion. This is far higher than the 1956 peak of \$45½ billion in a year of relatively full employment. Federal Reserve Board and private business analysts foresee 1959 corporation profits as high as \$50 billion.

The magazine Business Week of January 3, 1959 declares: "The only question seems to be how much more abundant the gravy will be."

Fortune Magazine reports: "Man-hour productivity has resumed a dramatic climb. . . . The spurt in productivity also affects

the outlook for employment . . . profits margins are widening as output advances faster than man-hours."

Business Week writes:

"Rising productivity is having a two-fold impact on the economy: it's reducing labor unit costs and, with companies doing a bigger volume of business, is already boosting profits."

"It's slowing the rehiring of laid off workers, creating fewer job openings for new entrants to the labor force and keeping unemployment at higher levels than during earlier post-war recoveries."

The Wall Street Journal says: "New plants pay off in soaring output with less manpower. Today's 11.9 million workers turn out 35 percent more than 12.7 million did in 1948."

The New York Herald Tribune says: "About six hundred thousand jobs disappeared during the 1953-54 recession and another 1 million are due to vanish during the current down-turn. That means that almost one out of every seven factory production workers will have been chopped from the country's industrial payrolls."

We believe that the fact of continuing unemployment with high levels of production and profit show that the shorter work week is overdue. As the corporate employers of America reject responsibility for the economic welfare of the American people, responsibility for immediate and constructive action clearly lies with Congress. We sincerely hope that Congress will rise to the occasion and act in this most serious crisis.

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT J. FITZGERALD,
General President.

Abraham Lincoln's Message to Congress Concerning Labor, December 3, 1861

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely article which appeared in Steel Labor, the voice of the United Steelworkers of America, published in Indianapolis, Ind., issue for February 1959:

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed.

Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any rights, nor is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between labor and capital, producing mutual benefits.

The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him.

This is the just, and generous, and prosperous system, which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequent energy, and progress, and improvement of conditions to all.

No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned.

Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which, if surrendered, will be surely used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost.

The struggle of today is not altogether for today; it is for a vast future also. With a reliance on Providence, all the more firm and earnest, let us proceed in the great task which events have devolved upon us. (Abraham Lincoln in his message to the Congress, Dec. 3, 1861.)

Shall We Repeat the Mistakes of the 1920's?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many of us have constituents who, by their insight and capacity for creative thought, from time to time impel us toward solutions of major national problems. One of my constituents who has a well-earned position in this category is Louis W. Douglas, a former Member of this body, who is presently chairman of the board of Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, and, not so long ago, was our Ambassador to the United Kingdom.

In a speech to the Life Managers Association of Greater New York last month, Mr. Douglas discussed the problem of preserving stability in the foreign exchange market. His thesis was that if we are to achieve orderliness and stability in our own financial markets over the long run we must in turn allow others to earn dollars which will enable them to discharge their obligations to the American Government and its business concerns. Drawing on the lessons of the 1920's, Mr. Douglas asserted that unless there is a free flow of international commerce—combined with stabilizing factors such as our foreign-aid program—other countries will not have the capacity to discharge their debts, and that the distortion of the world exchange structure will ultimately bring chaos and economic disaster everywhere.

I would suggest that Mr. Douglas' observations should be weighed carefully by those who formulate our international economic policies, and I commend his speech, which I include under unanimous consent, to our colleagues.

The speech follows:

I appreciate very much indeed the cordial invitation you have extended to me to be with you this evening. It is not at all clear that you will feel toward your officers the same sense of gratitude that I feel toward them.

If we review objectively the course of history over the last half century, I think we must conclude that the period is one of the most revolutionary in modern times. The changes in the structure of society, within the frontiers of each nation state, we can identify without exaggeration as being fantastic in both magnitude and character. Within the orbit of international affairs the

environment has changed no less strikingly. Never in such a short span of time has the international order of things been so completely uprooted. Never in such a short span of time has there been such a migration to the East and to the West of the centers of power. Never in such a short span of time has there developed such a sharp philosophical chasm between two such large segments of the world. Never in such a short span of time, between the two, have the amenities of diplomatic conduct been so profoundly debased, if indeed there are any amenities left at all. And never in such a short span of time have the international monetary and financial system and the international movement of commerce in the channels of trade undergone such revolutionary modifications.

It is in connection with the effect, on our vital national interest, of these changes that I should like to speak tonight.

I am confident that, within the limited period of time at our disposal, what I say will be an oversimplification of the matter; but I am equally confident that it is a subject which touches the lives of each one of our countrymen—whether he be butcher, baker or candlestick maker; whether he be engaged in the business of insurance, the manufacture of automobiles, of mining non-ferrous metals, of extending credit, of healing the infirmities of the ill, or indeed of any other useful occupation.

One of the greatest difficulties of relatively conservative-minded men and women—indeed, of all people—is to accommodate their intellectual processes and their judgments of policies and measures, both private and public, to the changes that have occurred in this, the most revolutionary period of history since the disintegration of the holy Roman Empire. Far too frequently, the person with the conservative bent of mind continues to think and act as though this own conception of things were a true reflection of his environment, and as though forces that have been created during this revolutionary period—so intensified and aggravated by two great wars and their aftermath—did not exist at all. The problem of the conservative is to identify these novel forces that are operating, try to direct them and to control them in order to preserve the best and, indeed, the fundamental principles upon which American society rests. Such, for example, as the right of the individual to save and to expend, to invest, to make a profit or sustain a loss, to enjoy the basic human privileges of speaking one's mind, of seeking redress, of worshipping the God of one's own choice, of owning property, of preserving the rights of minorities, indeed of all the basic concepts that are embedded in our Constitution.

An example of the sort of problem to which the conservative should attempt to adjust his mind finds its image in the general view held by many people that it is the function of government to intervene in economic affairs in order to attempt to arrest or modify the exaggerated movements of the business cycle. Whether over long periods of time government successfully can achieve this objective without creating problems far greater than the ones governments undertake to solve is a matter which only the years and experience will adequately test. But any government which asserts that it is not a public responsibility to try to prevent the appearance of wide-scale unemployment will shortly lose the enthusiasm and the confidence of its supporters. The problem is not, therefore, how to avoid doing what people expect governments to do, but rather by the enactment of what measures and the employment of what devices governments will attempt to reach the objective.

Dr. Arthur Burns has spoken pointedly and wisely about this question.

There are many other examples about which the conservative should adjust his in-

tellectual processes which could be cited if he is to preserve some measure of influence in the development of public policies. It is within the context of a society much modified over the last 50 years by violent pressures of change and revolution that many matters could be discussed with you tonight. There is, for example, the question of taxation and the volume of public expenditure; the weight of the former upon the individual and the country's institutions; and the vast enlargement of the area of economic activity into which the latter has insinuated government authority. There is the long-term problem of inflation and the highly contradictory series of public policies which necessarily limit the power of the Federal Reserve System to control it. There are many questions of international affairs, especially with the apparent advent of another Berlin crisis, which should not have come upon us as a surprise. But it is of the international monetary system, the wide changes that have occurred in the commercial relationship of our own country with the rest of the world and the consequent extremely fragile stability of the international financial system that on balance it would seem to me more interesting and more of a novelty to speak about.

It is perhaps not obvious to the person in Keokuk, Iowa, in Elgin, Ariz., or Memphis, Tenn., or even to many in the heart of the financial district of New York that their economic welfare and the internal health of our country are profoundly influenced by variations in the value of foreign currencies, particularly of world currencies against the dollar.

I should, at this point, draw the distinction between a hard currency and a world currency. The Swiss franc, the Canadian dollar, and perhaps one or two other currencies can well be labeled as hard currencies, but the volume of world trade will not be substantially influenced and historically has not been much affected by a fluctuation in the value of these currencies against our own dollar, despite the large trading account we enjoy with Canada. Sterling, on the other hand, which enjoys at the moment a tenuous strength, and in which more than 50 percent of the total international commercial transactions are conducted, cannot be identified as a hard currency. Yet should there be a deterioration in the value of sterling expressed in terms of dollars, the volume of world trade would shrink, prices would be adversely affected, our internal structure of values would be undermined, and the vitality of our internal economic affairs would be subjected to enervating influences. The historical evidence on this particular point is unimpeachable. The strength and vigor of our internal economic system are affected favorably or unfavorably as the stability and orderliness of sterling in relation to the dollar are preserved or undermined. It is perhaps well to be reminded of the experience which commenced in 1929, and which lasted until the threat of war and wartime activities reduced to a manageable figure the permanent and massive body of our unemployed that was one of the unique phenomena of the thirties. The depression which started in 1929 with the stock market collapse, intense though it was, was manageable until in September of 1931, the British were forced to abandon gold payments, and sterling depreciated against the dollar. Within 6 months of this historic milestone, unemployment rose by over 5 million—it almost doubled—the price of commodities went tumbling down, the stock market plummeted downwardly a greater percentage than had been its fall during the entire preceding 2 years. All values began to wither. The volume of world trade shrunk; and the foundation was laid for the banking crisis and credit demoralization which we experienced in the early months of 1933 when unem-

ployment rose to the alarming figure of over 14 million.

I refer to this historical experience to punctuate the frequently demonstrated—but unhappily not widely understood—relationship between our own internal economic welfare, the vitality and the strength of our industrial activity and the maintenance of a sound world currency. Why, you may well ask, did this catastrophic financial debacle occur? The answer to this question is to be discovered in the far-reaching changes that occurred in the position of the United States vis-a-vis the rest of the world in commerce and finance as a result of World War I. Before this violent disturbance, in what had been the general tranquillity of human life throughout almost a century of experience, we had been a debtor nation. Since the close of the Civil War, with but two brief intervals, we had been adopting a progressively protectionist policy. Provided we owed sterling and French francs to investors from Britain and France and other European countries, the question of stability of international exchange rates was never critical, so long as the great creditor, Britain, pursued a policy of free trade. We could exclude imports. We could protect many of our industries—as indeed we did—because our problem was not how to permit others to earn dollars to service their debts to us or to produce a return on our equity investments abroad, but rather how to obtain foreign currencies in order that we might discharge our debts to others and that others might earn a return on their equity investment in our own country. We, for example, needed sterling and francs. The British and the French did not need dollars.

But World War I completely reversed the position. We emerged from this first great world conflict since the Napoleonic wars as a great creditor nation. Moreover, our industrial system had gathered weight and strength and vitality which were to make it one of the most impressive economic systems in modern history. Accordingly, we developed, throughout the period of the twenties, a surplus of the trade account which, combined with our position as a great creditor, made it imperative that we allow others to earn dollars in order to service their debts to us and to redress their adverse balance of trade and thus preserve stability in foreign exchange markets.

At the very time when, in our own interest, this became imperative for us to do, we followed precisely the opposite course. We reversed the tendency toward lower tariffs established under the provisions of the Underwood Tariff Act. We enacted the emergency tariff legislation of 1921, and supplemented it with the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act which provided for the highest protective barricade American industry had ever had before in our history.

The fundamental weakness in the exchange position, which was caused by the policies we pursued and by the inflexibilities that had developed in the internal economies of other countries, was for many years concealed by the large volume of capital invested by us on private account, principally in South America and central Europe, throughout the decade of the twenties. But despite this large export of capital by private investors in foreign countries, gold flowed almost continuously throughout the 10-year period in a westerly direction to the United States. It was only through this westward movement of gold that the imbalance in international accounts could be redressed. It was this westward current of gold which was to make sterling so vulnerable when at last the illusion of the 1920's vanished and the stark naked fragility of the situation became apparent. When the stock market broke in the fall of 1929, the exportation of dollars on private account as well as public account came to an abrupt

halt. The fundamental weakness in the exchange position then began to become sharply silhouetted. But we stubbornly clung to the same policy. The Smoot-Hawley Act further restricted imports and further restricted the ability of others to earn the dollars necessary to service their debts to us. The migration of gold westward continued at an accelerated rate; the termination of the loans that had been made to central Europe created a crisis which forced the Credit Anstalt suddenly to withdraw its short-term balances from the Bank of England. The gold reserve of the sterling area evaporated, and by September 1931 Britain had no option but to discontinue gold payments. Sterling fell sharply against the dollar.

The international monetary machinery lay in ruins, international trade withered and shrunk as it had not shrunk since Waterloo. The depression was upon us with an intensity heretofore unexperienced throughout the course of more than a century.

Now our position—not necessarily for today but for long term—is even graver than it was in the twenties, and our surplus on trade account, after all the subtractions are made on account of foreign aid, is probably the largest of any country in modern history. Others must, therefore, earn more dollars than was ever necessary in the twenties if orderliness in the exchange markets is to be preserved, and if we are to avoid the consequences of a deterioration in the value of sterling against the dollar. And yet the paradox of the situation is that, despite what moderate downward adjustments have been made in our impediments to imports, our public policy prevents others from earning the dollars that, in our interest, it is so essential that they earn.

It would, I suggest, create internal difficulties of great intensity were we to reduce too suddenly our protectionist policy.

How then, if we will not, in the immediate future, allow others to earn dollars in order to maintain orderliness in the exchange markets, can there be achieved the orderliness and stability which are so important to the lives of our countrymen?

If we won't permit others to perform services for us, and to import enough to collect dollars from us and thereby to lay a solid foundation for confidence in exchange rates, then we must, on public account, export the dollars that we will not allow others to make. Instead of calling the program which, heretofore, since the close of the war has been called foreign aid, it should, in fact, be called a device to preserve stability in international exchange rates—for this is now the basic purpose of the exportation of dollars.

This problem of preserving stability in the foreign exchange markets would be with us if the Soviet and ourselves and the Communist world and ourselves were living in complete amity. This problem would still be with us if there were no chasms that divided the world into two parts. This problem of exchange stability would still be with us were there no international threat whatsoever to our security.

I recognize that there has been an outflow of gold during the course of the last 12 months, but this has been in large measure a product of the difference in interest rates and the more favorable terms of trade which the decline in the price of basic raw materials has established for the United Kingdom. It is in some measure, too, the product of perfectly normal, natural, temporary deviations from the long-term trend.

I recognize also that the volume of American exports has fallen more than has the volume of foreign imports. But even after making all the adjustments, the brute fact still remains that there is a very large and ominous deficit in the balance of payments. If this deficit continues and is not made up,

either by an improbably large and permanent volume of imports, or by a corresponding export of dollars, we can expect a period of exchange disequilibrium and confusion at some time in the future. This deterioration of other currencies, and particularly of sterling against the dollar, is apt to produce here at home a serious economic convulsion not unlike the one that was produced in the early thirties when the same sort of deterioration occurred for much the same reasons.

It would be deceptive to deny that there have been some infirmities in the administration of the foreign aid program, or to deny that frequently it has failed to make friends. But even the validity of these criticisms—if they are valid—of foreign aid does not destroy the case, or lessen the need for the exportation of dollars necessary to preserve a stability of exchange rates. Our own national interests require it.

An alternative solution to the problem would be to become free trade and to eliminate foreign aid. This course is philosophically logical, and it is logically philosophical. But to expect that this will happen within any reasonably limited period of time is, to quote Adam Smith, to expect Utopia. Moreover, if it were done too suddenly it would cause serious dislocations here at home. It is perhaps cynical to argue that, because large segments of our private economy are being subsidized through tariff quotas and other restrictions on imports, they should receive a double subsidy by insinuating dollars on public account, and therefore from the taxpayers, into the channels of foreign trade which the tariff and other restrictions on imports and services prevent others from earning. But this, for a creditor nation, is the cost of protectionism. The alternative—a shakeout in exchange rates which could, during a period of deflation, rock us on our economic foundation—is far more alarming and distressing picture to contemplate.

There are, of course, other aspects of the problem of the exportation of dollars. We do live in a perilous world. We are under the potential threat of external attack with the most frightful lethal weapon. We do, therefore, need allies that are strong in an economic sense and that can muster some military might. It is not debatable that the Communist world is attempting to capture the more primitive and undeveloped parts of the world and to imbue them within their own Communist dominion. On these scores the American dollars are necessary. But I have deliberately divided the problem up into segments tonight and have tried to confine the major weight of the case to the economic situations that touch vitally our internal national economic welfare. I have so divided the whole problem and have dealt with the economic considerations, because others have dealt so adequately with other aspects of the problem. I have done so, also, because administrative officers and legislators, in their highly commendable efforts to save dollars, may strike at one of the very items in the budget which might, in a certain economic environment, cause this country the greatest pain and suffering, and which might upset our position in the world, diminish our prestige, and even cause a lamentable weakening of our North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, if indeed it might not shatter it to bits. This would be a frightful catastrophe, for the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance is the heart, the bone and the sinew of our national security and the foreign policy of most of our Western allies.

There are a number of factors such, for example, as the progress of others toward making their currencies convertible, the extent to which we, in fact, reduce our impediment to the flow of international trade and investment, and the effectiveness of measures taken here and elsewhere to restrain and check the powerful inflationary forces that

have been pressing prices upward. All these and several others might form a realistic basis for determining the amount of dollars that the Congress should authorize to achieve exchange equilibrium.

I can do no more than to plead for a re-examination by everyone of his own conception of reality and of the environment in which he lives. For, as a great historian has put it, "There are times when we can never meet the future with sufficient elasticity of mind, especially if we are locked in the contemporary systems of thought."

This is one of those times.

Legislation To Create a Coal Research and Development Commission Will Prove a Boon to the Nation's Coal Industry and Should Receive Favorable Consideration by the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 7 I introduced H.R. 1179 which would create a Coal Research and Development Commission as an independent agency. A number of other Members of this House on both sides of the aisle have introduced like proposals. It is our hope that this legislation can be acted upon expeditiously and that the coal research body can be put into operation soon.

This legislation is identical to bills which were introduced in the 85th Congress. In the Senate the bill was passed and sent to the House. In this body the legislation was approved by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, but was caught in the rush of legislation during the final days of the session.

The creation of the independent Coal Research and Development Commission is the only type of coal research legislation which has met with the approval of both management and labor in the coal industry. When a subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, of which the present chairman of the committee was a member, hearings were held on this type of research agency. In addition to witnesses representing the coal operators and the United Mine Workers of America, the committee heard advocates for the legislation from the railroads, the mine machinery suppliers, industrial consumers, Governors and other officials of coal-producing states, and representatives of coal communities. All were in agreement that the type of research agency as proposed in this legislation would be a boon to the coal industry.

As a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, I have personal knowledge of the vast sums of money which have been and are now being spent on the experimentation of an atomic reactor designed to produce commercial power. Certainly if we can afford to spend such astronomical sums on a source of energy which is now in

the experimental stage, we can well devote a small percentage of that amount to further research developments of a fuel that has been the principal source of our economic power in every emergency that this country has faced.

I sincerely hope that for the benefit of the thousands of unemployed mine workers and railroad workers in my district that we can have early committee action on the various legislative proposals to establish the much-needed and essential Coal Research and Development Commission.

Army Cheeseparing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent news article which was published in the Baltimore Sun of January 25, 1959. It is entitled "Army Cheeseparing," and was written by Mr. Mark S. Watson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY CHEESEPARING

(By Mark S. Watson)

ENLISTMENT OF 30-CENT-A-MONTH KOREANS RESORTED TO FOR THRIFT

WASHINGTON, January 24.—Newer members of the Senate Armed Services Committee have learned with surprise that in order to keep combat divisions in the Far East at required strength, the Army has filled them, to a very considerable degree, with Korean personnel.

The exact percentage is not considered properly publishable, but it is more than is generally suspected.

This is one of the means by which the Army is forced to adjust itself to the administration's economy program of the past 2 years, still underway in the limited authorizations of funds both to buy needed new equipment and to keep major combat forces at or near true combat strength.

TWO KOREAN DIVISIONS

Without the Katusas (Koreans attached to U.S. Army) the two divisions in Korea would be very far below requirements.

The Koreans are well regarded by Americans who have served as Katusa officers, they are thoroughly integrated with the American soldiers in their units, and are given identical responsibilities.

There is one important difference, which is the reason for their being in the United States divisions; they are a financial bargain if there ever was one.

An American soldier gets \$78 a month for his first four months, thereafter \$83, and then \$85.80. His Korean companion gets from 15 cents to 30 cents a month—and even if some day he should get to be Korea's Chief of Staff or Defense Minister he would get but \$40 a month. The Korean private's main benefit is not in cash but in receipt of full Army subsistence.

ONLY ONE REVELATION

If this is the most dramatic revelation to date in the testimony of Gen. Maxwell D.

Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, before the new Senate committee that has been holding its first hearings this week, it still is but one item. Other economies in which the Army is engaged, in order to stay within the administration's allowance of men and dollars include the following:

1. New weapons: General Taylor lately stated that any genuine modernization of the Army (both the President and the Defense Secretary have stressed modernization, in principle) would require annual appropriations of \$3 billion a year for 5 years. This would be made up of \$1,400 million a year purely to cope with the processes of mere wearing out and absolute obsolescence of equipment (10 percent a year for the \$14 billion inventory) and \$1,600 million a year for actually new-model equipment, comparable to that with which Russia is renovating its own Army resources.

TO DEVELOP TANK

The new defense budget allows Army procurement totaling \$1,190 million for mere replacement, plus \$180 million for admitted modernization.

This permits, among other things, a small start on the new light rifle and machinegun; development of the very important new M-60 tank, marking our belated embarkation on diesel power with its great increase in range, reliability, noninflammability; a new anti-tank ammunition with much greater power; field adaption kits permitting swifter and more efficient interchange of nuclear and conventional warheads for three types of weapons; and a start on the "Davey Crockett," a revolutionary bazooka type, permitting use of tactical atomic projectiles by two very mobile soldiers.

The essential fact is that the prescribed total for both mere replacement and actual modernization in these important items is actually less than Taylor's recommendation for replacement alone.

NEW MONEY NEEDED

2. Ammunition: Taylor pointed out that normal training activities call for about \$200 million a year in ammunition of all types. Up to now this has been met largely by drawing down stocks accumulated during the Korea war but we must now put new money into ammunition to forestall depletion of certain critical categories, and also to procure certain new types.

It is standard and proper practice to use for field training the older stocks of ammunition from the shelf—but also to replace it, as called for, by newer stocks. The latter step has not been taken. Accordingly, in such critical areas as shells for medium artillery, it appears, the economy-bedecked Army now is approaching the very condition of which an extremely rigid congressional committee complained fiercely only a few years ago when the post-1945 economies had left the Nation short of shells gravely needed in Korea.

What the present congressional committees will do about the present between-wars situation will be worth watching.

TWO DIVISIONS WREAK

3. Personnel: General Taylor explained the necessary reduction of the much-admired Strategic Army Corps from four to three divisions, plus corps troops. STRAC is supposedly ready to go. But two of the four divisions are so far under strength that they are simply not ready. That is why one is dropped altogether, to help build up the other to a combat-ready state.

Now ordered because of personnel economies to reduce from the present 15 to 14 divisions, the Army must keep its 8 oversea divisions at or near full strength (that in Hawaii is shy 1 combat group and the 2 in Korea, as noted, are at strength only because of Katusas).

DISCRETION ON CUTS

Subtracting 8 from 14 leaves 6 divisions, of which STRAC has 3. The remaining three, politely called STRAC reinforcement, are in plain terms training organizations which are not remotely close to combat readiness.

4. Reserves: Upon this latter—the ordered reduction of both National Guard and Army Reserves by 10 percent, despite congressional refusal to permit it last year—General Taylor spoke most discreetly.

But on this issue is expected some of the fiercest of all congressional opposition to the President's economy package. Both guard and Reserves have made clear their indignation and both have ardent friends in Senate and House committees. The battle on this score therefore is expected to be noisier than on all other counts.

A hint came today when Maj. Gen. William H. Harrison, Jr., president of the National Guard Association, described the administration's new budget as pennywise and security foolish. He added that in 1957 the Defense Department spent more on publicity to build up the Army Reserve than it will save in the coming fiscal year by cutting it down.

Federal Tax, Spending Policy Biggest Danger Facing United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, from reports in the press, it is becoming obvious that once again the American people are beginning to express themselves as opposed to vast public spending, and despite the claims of some of the liberal forces I feel that the vast majority of the American people do not want their Government to continue a program of deficit spending nor are they willing to raise taxes in order to finance such public welfare measures.

Among those in my section who are most concerned about this is Mr. A. Robbins, Jr., editor of the Hopewell News, at Hopewell, Va. Mr. Robbins has been warning for years that deficit spending and nonessential expenditures would bring great danger to America and he is continuing his advocacy of sound fiscal practices.

I wish to include herein in my remarks a splendid editorial which appeared in his paper on Monday, February 2, 1959, in which he calls attention to the great dangers which face us unless the present trend is curbed.

I commend his editorial to the Members of the House:

FEDERAL TAX, SPENDING POLICY BIGGEST DANGER FACING UNITED STATES

Local persons attending the chamber of commerce banquet could feel they were almost getting a peek at this past week's headlines as Russian boss Nikita Khrushchev in a jovial mood Tuesday told a cheering Communist Party congress that it was Soviet economic power which would win the cold war and not a bomb.

The Hopewell audience on Friday heard T. Coleman Andrews, former Director of the Internal Revenue Bureau, say that while a hydrogen bomb might be the way to start

the world all over again, that he personally was not afraid of the bomb, but of economic ruin brought on by our Federal Government tax and spend policies and our inflationary rate of wages and prices.

This Federal spending and tax policy is not only being watched with glee by Russian leaders, but is being abetted in any way possible by Communists within our own borders.

We find ourselves in agreement with Mr. Andrews on many points, but particularly when he says we, the American people, have lost the capacity for indignation which stood our forefathers so well as they carved out this Nation.

We are afraid that too many people both in and out of Government no longer take the Communist menace from within seriously enough. But, as Mr. Andrews added his voice by saying that, in daily living, it is hard to tell who is a Communist, he assured his audience they were all around us and it was up to us to check the false ideologies they have brought into our American way of life.

We are afraid that voices of men who know, like Mr. Andrews, and even that strong voice of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, are not being listened to enough, either by Government in Washington or by the voters.

FIRST LINE

There is no overlooking the voice of Russia in the fact that economic battle is the first line of offense. Read his words and see what he thinks of our economic future.

In announcing a new 7-year plan, Khrushchev said, "The 7-year plan is a decisive stage in the economic competition of socialism and capitalism. This plan will greatly influence the entire international situation and prove a new triumph of Marxism-Leninism. Our successes in the fulfillment of the plan will attract to the side of socialism millions of adherents. They will lead the strengthening of the forces of peace and the weakening of the forces of war."

In plain, simple words the top Red leader is saying to the world that Russian economy will grow so strong and the capitalist world so weak there will no longer be a cold war, for Russia will dominate the world.

MUST BE CHECKED

Words will not make it so, but we cannot overlook the growth recorded in Russia nor the warning signs of inflation, overtaxation, overcentralization by our Federal Government; all are signs that many sound-thinking persons feel will bring economic ruin if not checked and checked soon.

Some of the examples cited by Mr. Andrews in his speech here more than bear repeating as examples of what the American people pay attention to and insist that their Congressmen do the same.

Among the examples cited by Mr. Andrews included the paying of \$30 million to teach farmers how to get greater egg production and then spending \$36 million to buy up the surplus egg production.

Or the TVA project in Tennessee. Mr. Andrews reminded his audience that this grab for public power to ruin private power had been sold on the basis of better navigation and flood control. But after it was completed there were 100 recorded trips up that river in 10 years and more good farm land was covered up than could ever be flooded by a natural disaster in 500 years. And the TVA boys aren't through yet, they are after additional steam plants to pave the way for the extinction of private power.

NOBLEST BATTLE

On the matter of the growing centralization of Federal power, Mr. Andrews told a story of what he calls the noblest battle ever carried on. It concerns the battle between a small farmer in Michigan, Stanley Yankus, who did not have an acreage allotment but raised enough to feed his chickens. He was arrested and fined more than \$4,000, but he put up a long battle against the fine

and for his rights as an American citizen. But finally he was forced to give up, "an awful indictment of you and me," according to Mr. Andrews. In giving up he said that he can't fight all of those who want something for nothing.

In putting security first, which is well on its way to being proved false, Mr. Andrews warned, the old America is dead and we are headed for security and slavery for everybody.

Inflation and Federal spending will lead us down the road to economic ruin before 1975, if they are not checked in the opinion of Mr. Andrews and he cited some figures that should have an eyeopening effect. These were the comparison of salaries in 1939 against 1957 and what will be needed in 1975, if inflation continues only at the present pace and there are no new taxes. Neither possibility which seems likely, as Mr. Andrews sees it. He pointed out that the value of the dollar has dropped to 50 cents and doubling wages is no answer because that throws him in a higher tax bracket. The figures shown below are the salaries needed to match that made in 1939.

1939	1957	1975
\$2,000	\$4,800	\$10,538
5,000	13,000	33,240
10,000	30,097	92,141
20,000	83,000	283,748

To match a \$50,000 income in 1957, by 1975 if things continue on their present road it will take nearly a million dollars.

But in a way those figures are worthless, according to Mr. Andrews' views for we will never reach that point in one piece but will have an economic collapse first.

Mr. Andrews is right, Congress could save the day, but first the American people must see the light and insist on less Government, more self-reliance and gain back their capacity for indignation over the wastefulness of the tax dollar and the lack of concern over the Communist subversion of many of the ideals on which America was founded.

If we don't wake up Mr. Khrushchev may have a point when he predicted this week that Russia would catch up with and outstrip the United States in 12 years and take over first place in the world.

We don't happen to think Mr. Khrushchev can live up to all his big words in the time allotted, but there is much to think about in the fact that the Reds feel their big weapon is economics.

It is time for us to take our medicine in the matter of forcing prices up and then trying to catch up with wage increases. Even if this is possible, it can't be done with the current tax policy of the Federal Government. It is time for the American people to call upon a halt to the growth of this Government in the fields of private endeavor where it has no place being.

Or Mr. Andrews put it, "We have got to have the courage to take the medicine needed to stem this tide and give America back to us."

Hon. Michael V. DiSalle's State of the State Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I

commend to my colleagues the following "State of the State" message delivered last week by the Honorable Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of the State of Ohio, before the 103d general assembly.

From all indications, in a few short weeks Governor DiSalle has demonstrated a capacity for imaginative and dynamic leadership which will be a welcome change to the people of Ohio. Ohioans everywhere wish Governor DiSalle every success in dealing with the knotty and weighty problems which face his administration in the months ahead.

I am confident that the citizens of Ohio will have reason to be proud of the record which Governor DiSalle will make during his term of office.

The message follows:

STATE OF THE STATE MESSAGE BY GOV. MICHAEL V. DISALLE BEFORE THE 103D GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF OHIO

The State of Ohio has been fortunate in the fact that enlightened citizen interest has produced over the years many capable public officials and I believe that it has had, over the period of time, a responsible type of leadership in its legislative halls.

Twenty-two years ago, as I stood before this rostrum being sworn in as a member of the legislature, I looked forward with great anticipation to the session and what might be its accomplishments as far as the well-being of the citizens of this State was concerned.

At that time the legislature was overwhelmingly Democratic. Frank Uble was the speaker. Jacob Davis, of Pike County, was the majority floor leader, later to be replaced by Bishop Kilpatrick, still a member of this house. Bill McCulloch was the minority floor leader, and the late Harry McGregor was his whip. On the senate side, Paul Yoder was presiding as Lieutenant Governor, with Keith Lawrence acting as majority leader, and the late Vern Metcalf as the minority leader. Only two of these men have left this life. The rest are active, respected citizens in various walks of life, but with only two of them still active in public affairs.

There are not many people still around who would be able to name the leadership of that particular assembly, but yet, in their own way, they fashioned a program that served the needs of that particular day. The Republican minority was then so hopelessly outnumbered that many of us from time to time felt it necessary, in the interest of militancy and complete discussion, to join with them in giving voice to an essential of democracy—free and open debate of the issues.

Today, in this assembly, the lines are more closely drawn so there will be very little need of closing party lines for the purpose of opening up the debate. But as was the case in 1937, it remains vital today that the leadership of both the majority and minority parties employ ability and responsibility. I am certain that on those occasions which affect the welfare of the State and its future, that partisanship will be disregarded and that each of us, in his or her own way, will contribute constructively to building a better State, a better hope, and greater opportunities for our fellow Ohioans.

In the course of this message, it may be necessary from time to time to refer to the past. I do so only in the sense of making comparisons and drawing upon those experiences for the purpose of attempting to demonstrate improvements which will contribute to a better type of government for the times in which we live.

Each generation, each assembly, each administration, owes an obligation to fashion new and better methods and techniques which draw upon the experiences of the past.

We face many complex problems and were I to attempt to discuss each one of them in detail, we would be here for too long a period and I am sure that the importance of each would be lost in the length of the total discussion. Consequently, it is my purpose only to outline the problems we face as a people, as a State, and as individuals bound by a solemn contract to have courage and conviction in meeting squarely the responsibilities which are ours. I will send for your consideration in future days individual and more detailed discussions of items within the areas sketched here today as well as of other matters which, while of importance, cannot be covered in this address.

There is no doubt that we face a new era of governmental finance in the State of Ohio. For the first time in nearly 20 years, we cannot come before you pointing to the accumulation of balances in the State treasury. As the accumulation of funds in the State treasury was largely a result of the events and conditions of an abnormal period in our history, so was the dissipation of those funds largely a result of obligations which grew at a concurrent time.

In the late 1930's upon Gov. John Bricker's recommendation, the legislature adopted a program which removed the earmarking of the newly levied sales tax. This course of action as it turned out prevented the wartime flow of revenues from accumulating automatically at local levels of government.

With the advent of the Second World War—yes, even in the early days of possible entry into war, restrictions become so pronounced that the State was effectively precluded from meeting even minimum needs for capital improvements in the form of highways and institutional construction. This created the rather paradoxical situation of increased revenues and accumulating balances but an inability to keep pace with the obvious needs of our State.

It was anticipated that these increased balances would provide for Ohio's needs during the postwar period. This situation continued during the first Lausche administration and through a part of the subsequent administration of Governor Herbert. After Governor LAUSCHE had taken office for the first of his four subsequent terms, the Korean United Nations action intervened and again certain restrictions on the use of steel resulted in the further postponement of construction programs. In all of these days, the accumulated surplus was zealously guarded and inroads were made only for capital improvements.

In the meantime, the passage of the \$500 million bond issue for highway construction and the subsequent Federal highway bill provided funds for a stepped up highway program and the \$150 million bond issue provided funds for an institutional public building and school construction program.

However, the recession of 1957 and 1958, the end of which is not completely in sight, caused a dropoff in sales tax revenues, but at the same time, increased burdens were felt in the school program, in poor relief, and in certain other areas. New institutions have brought with them a necessary increase in operating costs. The result now is a virtually complete erasure of the balances which have been our cushion for many years. While there are many people who have indicated confusion as to the conflicting statements made with reference to the fiscal situation, those who will study the factual situation will find that the record demonstrates with clarity that the deterioration of the State's fiscal position is real and critical.

My definition of a surplus is that amount of money you have remaining after your commitments have been taken care of. If we were to accept without question the last administration's budget document, we would find that at the time of its submission, when no thought was given to a possible recession, this document showed on its face that rec-

ommended general fund expenditures were expected to exceed general fund revenues by some \$40 million. Thus the fiscal problem is not of current origin nor did it find its source in the recent recession.

It is true that certain revenues, principally those of the sales tax, declined as a result of the recession and also certain costs increased as a product of the Nation's economic decline. But, it also must be noted that for the greatest part of the present biennium, the government of Ohio has operated below appropriation levels and, in many cases, below the minimum standards required by decency. Not only has the State been unable to provide those goods and services which are so obviously needed in terms of the future wellbeing of our people, we have not been able to meet present needs—we have not met basic requirements of medical criteria and accepted social standards.

This, at least in part, serves to bring into focus the major problem that we now face. For the present biennium, we are definitely underappropriated for poor relief, for aid to the aged, and for the school foundation program. The amount necessary to meet these deficiencies will approximate \$20 million plus the costs resulting from the flood emergency.

Only with carefully applied restraints, can we end this biennium with any cash balance at all. Might I say in clarification of the conflicting balance statements, that the best illustration is the individual himself. The money he has fluctuates from day to day. The balance he has on payday is usually not the balance he has the day after payday. His financial picture only becomes clear at the end of the month when he collects all the money he has coming and pays all of the obligations he owes. The State of Ohio has been supplementing its current pay by withdrawals from a savings account previously built up and it is now without further savings upon which to draw.

Our future insofar as finances are concerned and my recommendations for that future will be clearly spelled out in the budget message now in preparation.

We know that the department of mental hygiene and correction, even with the addition of more funds, will still be below reasonably accepted standards, but this is not something we can continue to postpone, it is a need and obligation that must be met. We know further that some of the programs outlined herein, such as the removal of the \$65 ceiling on aid for the aged payments, will cost more money, but this is also an obligation which must be met in the interest of decency. We know that the school program, the need for increased teachers' salaries and benefits will produce increased costs, but this, too, is a responsibility that must be met.

Actually, the new programs suggested herein, in addition to those for which we are now responsible, will be minimal in the need for funds and these funds can be considered in the nature of investments which will produce returns that will help spread and meet these costs as far as the future is concerned.

In our budget message, we will demonstrate beyond a scintilla of doubt that efforts have been and will be made to eliminate duplication, waste, and extravagance and the sums of the financial program are those required to take care of the genuine needs of Ohio. It is our intention to proceed with a minimum of imposition on our citizens and the continuance of the conditions which have made Ohio's industrial climate the envy of many of its sister States. But we will be frank with you, the people of Ohio, and with ourselves.

While it is my intention to set out a recommended fiscal program in the budget message, I would like now to make clear my position with respect to one area which is the subject of much discussion. I recognize

the possible design of an income tax structure which might serve as an equitable vehicle for the raising of needed moneys, it is now my settled position that to presently employ such a device would be too disruptive of State-local relationships in light of the present utilization of such sources at the local level. I will not, therefore, recommend that this body enter the State into the field of income taxation.

INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

As the State's population grows, and we know that it will, the problems of government can be met only with an increasing economic expansion. This expansion is not one that can be taken for granted.

Today, nearly every State in the Union is anticipating the need for growth. New techniques for subsidizing and attracting new industry and industrial growth are being developed.

Here in Ohio, we need such a program on a statewide level.

Presently, we find our communities pitted against whole States in their quest for new industry. We find our large communities vying with small communities, which are at great disadvantage because they do not have the financial resources to present the marketing and economic data necessary to support their bids.

In many cases, this local competition works to the disadvantage of the State as a whole.

These local community programs must be coordinated and bolstered.

With this in mind, I propose the establishment of a department of industrial and economic development.

Into this department, I propose to incorporate the existing economic development and publicity commission, now in the Department of Commerce. We also will propose to include the State atomic energy advisory board and the capital planning division, now in the department of finance. It is our hope that this department will serve as an arm of the State in the industrial development field. It should be staffed so that it can assist the State in a needed central planning function which will attempt to anticipate the needs of the State and provide the data necessary for us to meet those needs.

It is our hope that soon we will be able to bring together in Columbus representatives of the public, labor, and management, and those communities which now have industrial development committees in order that our specific program may take into full consideration their recommendations.

RESEARCH

In this modern age, we are constantly being amazed by new developments in the fields of science and medicine. We can envision more improvements in every area.

The State is spending, and has spent, millions of dollars in the treatment of disease. It will spend more.

It would be wise and provident to invest a small percentage of these dollars in the area of research. In this way, we might contribute to discoveries that will lift the burden of treatment from the shoulders of future generations.

We are spending millions in the treatment of the deaf and blind and a mere \$50,000 for research into the causes of these illnesses. The same is true for the mentally retarded. Look at our expenditures for treatment of chronic illness of the aged.

It is my hope that we may be able to establish small funds, at the beginning, for research at our State universities in the various fields of human suffering.

While on this subject, might I say that Ohio is doing fine work in agricultural research.

This program, too, must be stimulated in order that we may be in a position to assist in maintaining Ohio as one of the Nation's great agricultural States.

POLLUTION

We must pursue an aggressive policy in order to prevent the pollution of our water supply and our air.

It was thought, at one time, that an inexhaustible supply of water permitted us to be careless and reckless. We have learned that water for human consumption as well as for industrial and farm use must be carefully nurtured and kept clean.

Air pollution presents a real danger to the health of our people. The State must begin—at least—to authorize the entry into compacts between community air pollution groups in Ohio and those of other States.

CONSERVATION

Although we do not deal in the intangibles of research, conservation, too, is a program that needs more vision and stimulation through education.

We must husband our resources. We know that they are not inexhaustible. We know by our population growth that the need for them will become greater with each succeeding generation.

Consequently, great care must be exercised in the preservation of our forests, our water supply and the recreational facilities that continue to disappear rapidly before the onrush of the human elements in civilization.

Hunting and fishing and boating have served as instruments to create a greater awareness of our fight for conservation.

I propose that we proceed as quickly as possible to acquire the 40,000 to 50,000 acres in Ohio practically abandoned as a result of being despoiled before the adoption of our strip mining law. This land serves as a depressing influence on the valuation of surrounding property.

Over a period of time, we can, after acquiring this land for little or nothing, reclaim forests and restore it for future generations.

We can envision great recreational uses for this land which is now lying idle, ugly, and wasted.

Not only do I recommend acquisition of this despoiled property, but I would invite the contribution to the state of any property which, in size, would lend itself to future development.

In order to prevent recurrence of the conditions that made this situation possible, I would advocate the review of the strip mining law and use of the fees collected for reclamation purposes only.

LABOR

The labor-management relationship in a State such as Ohio plays a leading role in determining whether that State will continue to grow. We must, whenever possible, encourage labor and management to resolve their day to day differences without resort to industrial warfare.

We must, whenever possible, contribute to the more mature relationship that exists when each realizes his responsibilities to the other party in the contractual relationship.

We must encourage labor and management to recognize that their paramount interest is to the public welfare.

In this necessary economic marriage, the more the parties help each other in the resolution of economic problems resulting from maladjustments, the less the burden will be on the public generally.

SUPPLEMENTAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

I feel that when labor and management, through collective bargaining, arrive at an agreement which is not contrary to the general welfare, these agreements should be interpreted liberally.

They should be encouraged and given incentive rather than being halted, interfered with, and made more difficult.

The law covering existing contracts under which labor and management have agreed to establish a fund to supplement unemployment benefits should be clarified as soon as possible.

There should be no question as to their legality.

The benefits of this progressive innovation should be made available to the people of Ohio at the earliest possible moment. Unemployment compensation on the State level must keep pace with increased cost of living. The status of the trust fund is such that if we are to fulfill the minimum requirements, as originally intended by law, we cannot indulge in extreme revisions of the benefit schedule.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

It is better to give some protection to all than to dissipate the fund quickly.

We must expand the benefits derived from workmen's compensation. The workman and his family must not be penalized as a result of injury over which he had no control and which results in the loss of his earning ability either permanently or temporarily.

Death benefits must be increased in order that dependent children might be protected in the legitimate aspirations that were those of the parents while the breadwinner was still alive.

The revision of the law in order to provide statistically for the possible influences of inflation in the future, insofar as awards for permanent disability, is also a necessity that must be anticipated at this time.

In this revision, provision must be made for the permanently totally injured worker of the preinflation days whose limited income now makes him a recipient of relief and a burden on society in general.

Thought must be given to including the total cost of administration of the program as part of the expense chargeable to the fund rather than to taxation generally.

ANTI-RACKETEERING

The last point on this subject is the adoption of legislation designed to punish those individuals who violate a position of trust for selfish purposes.

There is no room in a decent labor movement for racketeers of any kind. The large number of respectable people who lead their fellow workers along legitimate organizational lines, seeking to protect their economic interest as well as the public, must have their reputation protected by the elimination of men whose only purpose is to serve themselves.

This cannot be left to the labor groups themselves, for their best weapon is suspension of an organization, leaving that organization free to continue its preying upon the public generally and the membership which, of necessity, remains a part of the suspended group.

Although most elements of organized labor, under its present leadership, is doing a commendable job in ridding its own ranks of these venal leaders, there is no guarantee that the present leaders will not be replaced or that the new leaders will have the same high motives.

This is a matter that must be handled by law and, regardless of what the Congress might do, there is no reason for the State of Ohio to wait.

We must act and act now.

HIGHWAYS

So-called crash programs are extravagant and wasteful. It is our purpose to continue a highway program which will meet the present and future needs of the State on a pay-as-you-go basis. Emphasis will be

placed on the safety of the traveling public, elimination of traffic bottlenecks and the maintenance of a balanced system which will not neglect a part of the system in favor of another.

The financial picture at the present time is clouded. We hope that by the time we send up the budget message, it will be clear enough to give the assembly a sound program.

PUBLIC UTILITY RATES

There has been a great deal of controversy over the existing formula for setting rates for public utility services. We will present a revision of this formula which will be designed to be fair to the consumer and, at the same time, provide a reasonable return for the investor.

Regardless of what formula is used, the essence in any system designed to protect the public must rest in a department staffed and able to present the public view whenever an increase of rates is before it.

It might be well, in this instance, to place greater reliance on the reorganization of the public utility division through improved administrative procedures than on a system of ratemaking which can prove ineffective if a utility's case is to be made by highly skilled and highly paid representatives in opposition to a poorly prepared statement on behalf of the public.

CIVIL RIGHTS

It is my hope that the 103d general assembly will be the one to bring to the people of Ohio a complete guarantee that the constitutional provisions for the civil rights of all individuals be implemented and given life by the creation of a commission which will have complete powers of mediation, conciliation and proper enforcement authority when education and other methods have failed. There is no valid reason to wait any longer. This is again an area in which we should have action now.

MENTAL HYGIENE

Much has been said on the subject of the treatment of our mentally ill. Setting aside the debate that goes on constantly, here, too, the difficulty rests in the improper emphasis on the program. We need people, trained people, skilled people—psychologists and psychiatrists and nurses. In order to obtain them, we need funds and we need training programs. Yet, I would not ask these funds to be provided until we have demonstrated that the administration of the department is improved, that reasonable standards have been established, that the elementary care of persons and property are being provided. This, too, will be treated more fully in a special message dealing with the legislative needs of this program.

PUBLIC HEALTH

In a State such as Ohio, there cannot be two types of programs for the protection of health. The health of our citizens is certainly as precious in our less populated districts as it is in those with higher densities of population.

Our health program must proceed from the basic, fundamental principle, that its purpose is to protect public health and to act against contagion and elements that may result in danger to health whenever it might exist. The legislative program of the Department of Health is a reasonable one and one that I believe will merit your support.

LIBRARIES

Nothing—no one single endeavor—contributes more to the cultural development of our citizens, young and old, than the public library system. We should, in every way possible, attempt to extend uniform library service throughout the State.

AID FOR THE AGED

The present \$65-a-month ceiling imposed on old-age assistance is unrealistic. We must remove this artificial barrier which has no relation to reason or practicality and establish old-age assistance on a needs basis.

We will begin the administrative work necessary to establish the program. With your help, it is our hope that we can put the new system into effect with the beginning of the coming biennium or shortly thereafter.

EDUCATION

As our population continues to grow—creating the need for more classrooms and more teachers—we must begin an orderly reassessment of the part the State must share with local communities in the support of an educational program at all levels.

We can no longer continue to improvise from session to session.

We must become definite as to the State's responsibility. We will have some specific recommendations in the budget message.

STATE OF OHIO SCHOLARSHIP ENDOWMENT FUND

We do propose, at this time, the establishment of a State of Ohio Scholarship Endowment Fund, with trustees to be appointed from all segments of our economy.

The fund would be financed in part from public subscription and the balance would be contributed from public funds by the State of Ohio.

The ultimate objective of this fund would be 1,000 scholarships a year, to be awarded on a merit basis. The trustees will write the rules, changing the type of scholarship to be awarded at their discretion in anticipation of the needs of our society at a particular time.

These scholarships will be in the amounts determined by the trustees, but limited to the amount earned by the investment of the capital account. The objective will be to raise the capital account to \$20 million in the space of 10 years with the State providing 25 percent of the total amount over this period of time.

This will provide a continuing source of the talents needed by the citizens of Ohio and make available to worthy individuals an education which they might otherwise not be able to obtain.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Here again is a subject that needs a new approach. No longer must we consider that we are subsidizing our local political subdivisions. We must either give them the right and authority to finance their own government or to spell out the services primarily rendered by local governments on behalf of the State as a whole.

Once having ascertained what these services are, then we must arrive at a formula for compensation for those services. We will offer specific suggestions and hope that, with your cooperation, we will find a final answer to this ever vexing problem.

LAW AND ORDER

In addition to the legislation proposed regarding certain labor-management practices, I propose the strengthening of our criminal code. I recommend enactment of a law making it a conspiracy, punishable as a felony, for two or more people to enter into agreements to conduct gambling ventures, prostitution, and the sale of narcotics.

Included as a party to such conspiracy will be those public officials who participate by becoming a part of such agreements.

No longer can we continue to take the petty gambler who fronts for a syndicate, punish him with a nominal fine or a few days in the workhouse, while permitting individuals who profit most from this enterprise to

sit in the background and reap their unlawful harvest.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

The State of Ohio is achieving maturity. We have been a State since 1803. During this period, we have used capital punishment in an attempt to deter the murderer. Year after year, we electrocute, and in the past, we have taken to the gallows, individuals charged and convicted of the crime of murder.

But murder continues as a crime, along with robbery, burglary, and all the related ills of organized society.

I would recommend the repeal of the death penalty in Ohio and substitute life imprisonment—without hope, without parole, without pardon.

I believe that the State, by its refusal to take the life of a human being, would be setting an example of proper morality which would serve its citizens in good stead. I will present a special message on this subject completely covering the history of it and further reasons for this position.

In conclusion, I want to discuss the State employee. If we are to provide efficiency in our government, intelligence in its administration and courage in carrying out its responsibilities, we must have dedicated public servants and public employees.

If the State should be left in a position where only those that cannot obtain other employment find themselves in the category of career public servants, the purposes of democracy will be poorly served.

Consequently, I advocate the constant review of classification and proper compensation for public employees, the strengthening of the civil service and greater adherence to the concept that public employment and public service is a sacred and integral part of society.

We are awaiting anxiously the report on classification and suggested State employee policy now being prepared by a subcommittee of the legislative service commission. My preliminary information on this indicates that a sound and thorough study has been made and that the report will map out a pattern of procedure which will be beneficial for many years to come.

I hope that this may be the beginning of a development of morale and pride on the part of the State employee which will assure the State of their undivided loyalty and service.

In this achievement, I hope you will agree with me in the need for legislation that will spell out clearly the public employees' undivided obligation to his public trust and the writing in law what certainly ought to be our ethical and moral obligation in not engaging in an activity for profit or for friendship which conflicts with a person's obligation to his public employment.

We cannot permit a conflict of interest to exist with the public employees if we are to attain the highest degree of efficiency and responsibility.

Thank you for your kindness in giving me the opportunity to be with you today. There will be other messages, on other subjects, in the future.

In deliberating the recommendations made to you today, there will be differences of opinion. There will be differences as to the need or timing of these proposals. When those disagreements are present, let us conduct ourselves in the debate with an earnest desire to inform the public of the reason for our varying positions. Let us not permit the greater areas of agreement to be clouded by the violence of the smaller clouds of disagreement.

We shall continue to work together in that service to which we are committed; the building of a better state for all.

Sellers' Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting analysis and a suggestion for dealing with inflationary depression has come across my desk. It is the work of Prof. Abba P. Lerner of the Department of Political Economy, Johns Hopkins University. It will serve us well if it only stimulates our thinking about this important problem.

The analysis follows:

SELLERS' INFLATION: AN ANALYSIS AND A SUGGESTION FOR DEALING WITH INFLATIONARY DEPRESSION

(By Abba P. Lerner, Department of Political Economy, Johns Hopkins University)

The United Automobile Aircraft and Agricultural Workers of America (or the UAW) International Union, has invited the three big automobile corporations to take a first step in checking the inflationary process from which our economy is suffering. Not unnaturally, the corporations have in effect replied, "After you, my dear Alphonse." In its invitation the UAW has pointedly concentrated on the prices set by the corporations for motor cars and in their replies the corporations have pointedly concentrated on the price or wage demanded by the UAW for labor, and the level of politeness will no doubt deteriorate rapidly as the debate continues. Nevertheless, the proposals and counterproposals must be recognized as something more than sparrings for better future bargaining positions. They clearly demonstrate three phenomena of the first importance: (1) A genuine concern, on both sides, with the dangers of inflation; (2) a readiness, again on both sides, to cooperate in checking the inflation (provided that such cooperation is not exploited and diverted for the benefit of the other side); and (3), perhaps the most important, a recognition, once more by both sides, that the inflation we have upon us is based not on competition by buyers trying to buy more of everything than can be supplied, but on pressure by sellers asking for higher prices.

A NEW KIND OF INFLATION

Others also have recognized that our current inflation is not the more familiar and more thoroughly investigated kind that is caused by excess buyers' demand—by too much money chasing too few goods—by buyers bidding up prices in trying to get more goods than the economy is able to supply. President Eisenhower recognized this in making his appeal to labor and to business to help the fight against inflation by exercising restraint and refraining from demanding higher wages and prices.

If our inflation were indeed caused by excess buyers' demand, not only would the UAW proposals and the corporations' rejoinders be without interest, but President Eisenhower's appeal would be pointless. Free market prices would still be bid up by competing buyers, and sellers who exercised restraint would merely be making presents to the buyers (who would often even be able to resell at the higher free market prices). Such an inflation could be cured only by removing the excess buyers' demand via the well-known policies of tight money and restrictive fiscal measures, and the restraint called for by President Eisenhower would be unnecessary. If inflation in general could be caused only by excess demand for goods by buyers,

restraint by sellers (of products or of labor) would always be irrelevant. In the presence of excess demand by buyers restraint by sellers would be ineffective, and in the absence of excess demand by buyers restraint by sellers would be unnecessary.

But excess demand by buyers is not the only possible cause of inflation, and our inflation is not the kind that is caused by excess demand by buyers. This is shown by the failure of our output to keep up with our growing productive capacity. It does not seem to be the case at all that we are unable to supply the current overall demand for goods and services. On the contrary, we are able to supply more than is being demanded of almost everything, and efforts by sellers to persuade the public to buy are as strenuous as ever (though they hardly ever take the form of lowering prices, or we would not be suffering from our inflation). Prices are rising not because of the pressure of buyers who are finding it difficult to buy. Prices are rising because of pressures by sellers who insist on increasing prices (even though they are finding it not so easy to sell). We may say that we have not a buyer-induced inflation but a seller-induced inflation—or more briefly, we have not a buyers' inflation but a sellers' inflation. That is why restraint, or the absence of restraint, by sellers in raising the prices they ask is of the essence, and President Eisenhower's appeal for restraint is far from pointless. (Whether the appeal is or can be effective in bringing about the restraint is quite another question).

INFLATION WITHOUT EXCESS DEMAND

It should be noted that in this suggested terminology the word "inflation" is used in its popular meaning of a state of affairs in which prices are rising. Some economists (including myself) have extended the word to cover all cases of excess demand (which is what causes the price increases of a demand inflation or buyers' inflation) even where prices do not rise, in spite of the excess demand, because price control of some kind prevents them from rising. This switch of the meaning of the word "inflation" from a state of rising prices to a state of excess demand seemed perfectly legitimate, as well as very enlightening, as long as excess demand was believed to be the only force that could cause prices to rise. It helped economists to point out that the damage done by excess demand was not avoided by suppressing the rising prices. The rising prices are only the result, or the symptom, of the underlying cause—the excess demand which would have caused prices to rise if it were not for the price control.

INFLATION WITH DEPRESSION

But if sellers' inflation is possible as well as buyers' inflation, it is not such a good idea to use the word "inflation" to stand for excess demand. That use of language tends to suggest that if there is no inflation in the sense of excess demand, there can be no inflation in the sense of rising prices. It leaves us with no way of describing the kind of situation in which we find ourselves today. Prices are rising because of upward pressure by sellers, and the authorities, in endeavoring to stop the inflation, have taken steps which have been very effective in removing excess demand, but which have not removed the upward pressure on prices from the sellers' side. Indeed these measures of budgetary restraint and tight money have been so effective in removing excess demand that they have overdone this and removed some demand that was not in excess. They have brought about a condition of deficient demand, so that there has not been enough demand to enable us to make full use of our productive potential (and the visible appearance of symptoms of recession has even led to a slight loosening of the tight money policy). Nevertheless, prices keep on rising. The net result is that we are now suffering at the same time from both inflation and

depression—prices are rising and at the same time we are not fully utilizing our available labor force and productive potential.

This appears paradoxical only because of our habit of using one word, "inflation," to represent two different things, rising prices and excess demand, that do not necessarily have to go together in the actual world. It is only our inadequate language, a bad speech habit, that makes us think of them as necessarily together so that we have a feeling of paradox when we observe them departing from each other. We are like my son when, as a baby, he first saw our kittens move away from their suckling mother. He cried out in consternation, "Look, Mummy, the cat broke." When he had added the word "kitten" to his vocabulary he was better able to deal with reality because he was then able to speak of the cat without assuming that the kittens were included and he was able to talk about kittens without talking of the cat. In just the same way we will be able to deal more effectively with reality if we stop saying inflation when we mean excess demand and stop saying excess demand when we mean rising prices.

This will not prevent us from pointing out the evils of excess demand that remain, or are even aggravated, when price controls prevent present prices from rising—thus suppressing or repressing the inflation. We can do this quite simply and directly in terms of the bad effects of excess demand and price control, without calling this condition inflation, keeping that word to be used only to describe a condition of rising prices, whether the rising prices are caused by excess demand or by anything else.

INFLATION IS INFLATION

Many influential people still seem to argue as if the only kind of inflation possible is demand inflation (which I am here calling buyers' inflation). Although they cannot deny that they see excesses of potential supply much more often than they see excesses of buyers' demand, they insist that "There ain't no such animal" as sellers' inflation. They declare that "inflation is inflation" and they sternly dismiss all talk about a new kind of inflation that does not respond to the orthodox treatment of monetary and fiscal restrictions as diversionary tricks by naughty children who are trying to dodge their medicine.

CREEPING INFLATION CAN LEARN TO GALLOP

Unfortunately, such sternness is only too understandable. Some of the economists who were early to recognize the nature of sellers' inflation have been so impressed by the impossibility of dealing with it by the orthodox instruments of monetary and fiscal policy that they have capitulated to the temptation of dallying with mild or moderate inflation as part of an acceptable policy. The orthodox economists quite rightly point out that such a capitulation is indefensible either on moral or on practical grounds. Even a mild inflation accumulates, at compound interest and robs pensioners, fixed income receivers, and many other unfortunate victims, while it sabotages the proper calculations and accountings necessary for wise economic decisions. In time many of these faults could be corrected by institutional adjustments to a mild inflation, but to keep the inflation mild is more difficult than to prevent the inflation from starting in the first place, or to stop it before it gets less mild. The very same reasons for accepting a creeping inflation instead of maintaining price stability would apply with greater vigor for changing from a creeping to a walking inflation. Still stronger would be the pressures for changing from a walking to a running inflation and proportionately more powerful would be the forces turning a running inflation into a galloping one. Stability is a much more defensible position against inflation than is creeping against walking or

walking against running. This is a case where retreat only induces further retreat. Firmness is required and not appeasement.

RECOGNITION IS NOT APPEASEMENT

But the naughtiness of appears of inflation does not in the least diminish the importance of recognizing the existence of sellers' inflation, for it is not the recognition of the existence of the disease called sellers' inflation that opens the gates to the enemy. On the contrary, it is the denial of its existence, and the attempts to treat it with the inappropriate medicines that work only on buyers' inflation, that is so dangerous. The belief that the medicines appropriate for buyers' inflation are the only medicines available (because inflation is inflation just as fever is fever), when joined with the discovery that these do not work, gives rise to defeatism and appeasement. A clear recognition of the nature of sellers' inflation is the prerequisite for finding the medicine that can cure it, or better still the vaccine that would prevent it.

COST INFLATION AND PROFIT INFLATION—THE CHICKEN AND THE EGG

Another reason for reluctance to recognize sellers' inflation is that it has often been called cost inflation or cost-push inflation or wage-cost inflation and has given the impression that the whole of the blame for it falls on labor or on trade unions. When trade unions raise wages by more than can be absorbed by increasing productivity, costs rise. The employer then seems to be completely innocent of "profit inflation" in passing on the increase in costs as long as he does not increase his rate of markup, i.e. as long as he does not increase the prices he charges for the product in a greater proportion than his costs have increased.

There is, however, no essential asymmetry between the wage element and the profit element in the price asked for the product. A sellers' inflation could just as well be started by an increase not in the wage asked but in the percentage of markup of price above cost. Prices would rise and wages would then be raised by workers in attempts to maintain (or restore) their original buying power. Business would then "innocently" raise their prices again only in proportion to the increase in their costs, and we would have the inflation upon us as well as boring discussions about who started it first and the famous chicken and egg.

TRYING FOR MORE THAN 100 PERCENT

The "who started it first" debate is a complete waste of time because there is no original situation in which there was a "just" or "normal" distribution of the product between wages and profits. Any increase can be seen either as the disturbance which bears the full responsibility for the inflation, or as nothing but the correction of an inequity perpetrated in previous history—all depending on the point of view. The term "sellers' inflation", by treating wages and profits on exactly the same footing, avoids the fruitless game of mutual recrimination. Sellers' inflation takes place whenever wage earners and profit takers together attempt to get shares that amount to more than 100 percent of the selling price. When the sum of what they try to get comes to more than 100 percent of the selling price, it is futile to ask whether this is because the wages demanded are too high or whether it is because the profits insisted on are too great. No matter where justice may lie between the two claims, the only significant thing for our problem is that the sum of the claims is more than 100 percent. That is what causes the inflation.

It is of course impossible for the two parties to succeed in getting more than 100 percent of the proceeds between them, but it is precisely on an impossibility such as this that any continuing process depends. Buyers' inflation is similarly built on an attempt to reach the impossible. In that

case it is the attempt of buyers to buy more than 100 percent of the goods that can be made available. There attempt bids up prices, but since that does not (and cannot) succeed in enabling them to obtain more than 100 percent of the goods that there are available to be got, they continue the attempt and we have the continuing process of buyers' inflation. In our case the impossibility that generates the process is the attempt of wage earners and profit takers between them to get more than 100 percent of the money proceeds from the sale of the product. Each increases the part he tries to take, by increasing wages or by increasing prices. Since they cannot succeed, they keep on raising wages and prices and so we have the continuing process of sellers' inflation.

OBJECTIONS TO SELLERS' INFLATION

1. There must have been excess demand

The resistance to recognizing the possibility of sellers' inflation sometimes takes the form of saying that there must have been some excess buyers' demand or prices could not have risen. This begs the whole question since it assumes, without apparently thinking it necessary to provide any support for the assumption, that the only possible cause of rising prices is excess buyers' demand, the argument assumes what it wants to prove.

2. There has been an increase in spending

A more sophisticated version of this argument points out that if output shrinks by less than the increase in prices, and this is usually the case during a sellers' inflation, there must have been an increase in the total amount spent in buying the output. The arithmetically irrefutable increase in expenditure is then triumphantly exhibited as the excess buyers' demand that is responsible for the inflation. Expenditure is the same thing as buyers' demand, but an increase in expenditure is not the same thing as excess buyers' demand. An increase is not the same thing as an excess. An excess of demand by buyers induces the price increases—it is the cause of the price increases. An increase in expenditure could be induced by—it could be the result of the increases in prices brought about by the pressure of sellers. If there is no increase in expenditure the number of units of goods bought must fall in the same proportion as the price per unit is raised by the sellers. A 10 percent increase in prices would thus result in a fall in output of about 10 percent. This involves depression and unemployment that the authorities naturally seek to remedy by monetary and fiscal measures. Such remedies all involve increases in money expenditure, so that even if only a part of the unemployment is corrected (and this is usually the case because of the authorities' reluctance to undertake inflationary measures when prices are rising), we would observe an increase in total expenditure. Buyers' demand, however, instead of being excessive, could still be deficient, i.e., it could still be insufficient to enable the potential output of the economy to be sold (at the prices demanded by the sellers). An observed increase in total expenditure is therefore no proof that the price rise is due to excess buyers' demand. The increase in expenditure could have been induced by attempts by the authorities to keep down unemployment induced by price increases imposed by the sellers. In a sellers' inflation an increase in expenditure is perfectly compatible with deficient buyers' demand.

3. Demand was not held down enough

A still more sophisticated argument along the same lines goes on to claim that even if prices are being raised by the insistence of sellers rather than by the pressure of buyers, the orthodox measures of reducing total demand would still check the inflation. By reducing total expenditure, or perhaps by

merely refusing to permit the increase in total expenditure needed to accommodate the increased prices, the authorities would bring about depression and unemployment. This would stop the sellers from increasing prices. The question then resolves itself into how much unemployment would be necessary to stop the sellers' inflation, and whether it is morally desirable or politically possible for the authorities to induce or permit unemployment of the required volume and duration. This is a much more respectable argument, but before we can consider it more fully it would be desirable to get a perspective on the whole problem by a quick look at the general theory of inflation and deflation.

FOUR THEORETICAL MODELS

A. The classical model

A somewhat schematic formulation of the development of thought on this subject shows four theoretical models.

Model A assumes perfectly flexible prices and wages, so that any excess of buyers' demand makes prices and wages rise, and any deficiency of buyers' demand (through the unemployment that results) makes prices and wages fall, until price stability and full employment are restored. Monetary and fiscal policy is unimportant. As long as the volume of money is kept fairly stable by some automatic device such as the gold standard, the price level will automatically adjust itself so as to yield full employment with price stability and without inflation.

B. The Keynesian model

Model B embodies the recognition that we do not have the degree of price flexibility in the downward direction to make complete *laissez faire* a satisfactory monetary and fiscal policy. Unemployment does not reduce the wage and price level quickly to the level needed to restore full employment. The process is rather complex. To achieve the task unemployment must reduce the price level to the degree necessary to increase the value of the existing stock of money (as each dollar becomes more valuable) to the extent necessary to increase expenditure in real terms (as each dollar spent constitutes more real purchasing power) to the volume necessary to give a satisfactory level of employment. This process can last for years, during which time prices and wages are falling as different resistances to the reductions are gradually overcome. Meanwhile there continues an expectation of price and wage reductions still to come. This expectation induces investors as well as consumers to postpone their expenditures as long as prices are still falling, so that buyers' demand is reduced still further and the depression can get much worse before it gets better.

The recognition of the nature of such a process leads to the abandonment of *laissez faire* in monetary and fiscal policy. Instead of waiting for the price level to adjust itself to the volume of money expenditure, a policy is developed of adjusting the volume of money expenditure to the existing price level so as to reach and maintain a satisfactory level of employment.

This switch from *laissez faire* to an active monetary and fiscal policy is also applied in the opposite direction to deal with excess buyers' demand. Although there is not the same resistance to price and wage increases as there is to price and wage decreases, the necessary adjustment to excess buyers' demand by rising prices still takes time. It is no instantaneous adjustment (if only because of the existence of long-term contracts, and attempts to stop profiteering by preventing the necessary price increases) and so it causes disturbances that are unjust and reduce the efficiency of the economy. The policy is therefore applied in both directions, providing for increasing the volume of money expenditure whenever necessary to prevent an insufficiency of buyers' demand and for de-

creasing the volume of money expenditure whenever that is necessary to prevent the emergence of excess buyers' demand. The volume of expenditure may be adjusted either by working on the stock of money (by monetary policy) or by working on the velocity of circulation of money (by fiscal policy) or by some combination of the two.

Model B, which is, of course, the Keynesian general theory of employment policy, differs from model A primarily in incorporating a policy of increasing or decreasing demand if it should become too little or too great. (It has a "steering wheel" there being no rails to keep the car on the road.) Because of this difference a secondary distinction arises. With policy coming into the picture it becomes important which of two instruments of policy is to be used, monetary policy or fiscal policy. Model B makes use of both instruments. (The car can use either kerosene or gasoline).

C. The anti-Keynesian models

Model C is not really a new model. It rather consists of a series of publicity releases of model B dolled up to emphasize one or another of its qualities as if this were a new invention that made model B obsolete. One very crude pamphlet of this series emphasizes the ability of Model C to cut down on demand if it becomes excessive or threatens to become excessive, seeming to imply that Model B was a depression model which could work only in the direction of increasing demand. (Model C has a steering wheel that can be turned to the right.)

A more refined variant of model C, let us call it model C*, is concerned with the relative effectiveness of monetary policy and of fiscal policy in different circumstances. An economy may be so saturated with money so that further increases in the stock of money would not be effective in increasing expenditure, and reductions in the stock would have no significant effect in reducing total expenditure. (This is sometimes expressed, though not explained, by saying that changes in the money supply would be offset by opposing changes in the velocity of circulation). Monetary policy is then useless and expenditure can be increased or decreased only by fiscal policy—by the government increasing or decreasing its own expenditure, e.g. on public works, or permitting others to spend more by reducing taxes or forcing them to spend less by increasing taxes.

It is then suggested that model B works only in this case which is called the Keynesian case. It should more properly be called Keynesian special case (of the Keynesian general theory) when it is appropriate to concentrate entirely on fiscal measures to increase or decrease expenditure on consumption and investment. (Only gasoline can be used.)

In this kind of situation even extreme price flexibility is unable to restore or maintain the desired level of real demand because it operates, after all, as nothing but a roundabout way of increasing or decreasing the real volume of money in terms of buying power. It is a kind of automatic monetary policy which is useless for the same reasons as other monetary policy is useless.

When the economy is at the other extreme from being saturated with money, and money is very tight, the situation is naturally reversed. Fiscal measures for increasing expenditure on consumption or investment are ineffective because an increase in expenditure anywhere in the economy, say in Government expenditure on public works, results in an increase in demand for money to hold in connection with the increased volume of transactions. In the very tight money situation this raises the rate of interest, or in some other way reduces expenditure somewhere else. Similarly, a decrease in expenditure anywhere releases holdings of money which permit an increase

of expenditure somewhere else. Fiscal policy then is helpless, and what is called for is monetary policy to increase or decrease the money supply. (Only kerosene can be used.) This case is then called the classical case, as if it were one in which the Keynesian theory does not apply and where model B should be replaced by model C* (which uses kerosene instead of gasoline). This case should more properly be called the classical special case (of the Keynesian general theory). Since the Keynesian theory (model B) covers both situations in which fiscal policy is strategic (when model B uses gasoline) and situations in which monetary policy is strategic (when model B uses kerosene) as well as the more normal situations when both policies are effective (when model B can make use of both fuels, mixing the proportions to suit the terrain).

D. The sellers' inflation model

Model D is a genuinely different model in which unemployment not only fails to make prices and wages fall quickly enough but is even unable to prevent them from continuing to rise. When we have strong trade unions with the power to raise wages, strong corporations with the power to set prices administratively, and a general atmosphere in which it is considered normal, natural, and only fair for wages to be increased regularly, and by amounts greater than the average increase in productivity or in the share of the product that labor can obtain, prices increase, and the economy is subject to sellers' inflation. It is now no longer a question of whether fiscal policy or monetary policy is more effective in regulating the volume of buyers' demand or expenditure, since the inflation is caused not by excess buyers' demand but by the existence of powerful institutions and mores that enable sellers to insist on and obtain continually higher prices. The widespread and generous feeling that workers are entitled to the increases in wages that they get is made much easier by a recognition that any raise need not be taken out of profits, since it is possible, as well as proper, to pass it along to the ultimate purchaser in higher prices. Indeed, it is usually considered only right that profits, in dollars, should be increased so as to protect real profits from the declining value of the dollar.

DEPRESSION AS A CURE

We have already mentioned the argument that a really firm refusal on the part of the monetary authorities to prevent the volume of money from increasing, no matter what happened, would bring the sellers to their senses. Realizing, or discovering, that they will not be able to sell so much if they raise their prices, they will refrain from raising prices and they will not grant, or ask for, wage increases that raise costs by more than can be squeezed out of profits.

There are several reasons why this is not practical. In the first place, the policy of firmly or obstinately holding the money supply constant does not prevent excess buyers' demand from coming about. It does not even prevent an increase in total expenditure. This is because this policy is essentially a kind of monetary policy and we may be in the Keynesian special case where monetary policy is not effective. That we are at the present time in such a situation is suggested by the fact that while the supply of money has been held fairly stable in recent years, the volume of expenditure has continually increased. (Another way of expressing this, which is more common, perhaps, because it sounds like an explanation, is to say that the velocity of circulation has increased and that this has frustrated the restrictive monetary policy.)

HOW MUCH DEPRESSION WOULD BE NEEDED?

There is, of course, a limit to the degree to which expenditure can increase without an accompanying increase in the money stock, and if the inflation were a buyers'

inflation it would come to an end when this limit was reached (i.e., when the velocity of circulation could not increase any more). But where the inflation is a sellers' inflation it does not stop at that point. After the increase in prices has absorbed all the increase in expenditure that is compatible with a constant money stock (i.e., that can be attributed to any increase in the velocity of circulation), it continues to increase. The increase in prices goes on further until it has reduced real expenditure and employment sufficiently to overcome the institutional forces that enable sellers to demand higher and higher prices. The question is how strong are these institutions? or, in other words, how severe a state of depression and unemployment would have to be maintained in order to destroy these institutions or to induce sellers not to use their power to raise prices; and how able and willing the authorities would be to bring about and maintain this degree of depression and unemployment?

An interesting indication of the strength of the most important element in the setup—the general feeling of the propriety and inevitability of continuing wage and cost increases (to be passed on in increased prices) is provided in the very debate about automobile prices and wages with which this article begins. The UAW had asked the automobile corporations to reduce the prices of their 1958 automobiles to \$100 below the 1957 prices in return for the UAW promising to take this into consideration when presenting their 1958 demands for wage increases. In rejecting this suggestion the largest of the corporations put forward a countersuggestion which must clearly be considered as an extreme position, leaving some room for retreat (i.e., for conceding bigger increases in wages) in the forthcoming negotiations. This unrealistically extreme proposal, made, it must be remembered, in the course of a debate in which everyone is deeply concerned with the dangers of inflation, includes the continuation of the present contract which (apart from a cost of living adjustment) calls for a regular wage increase of 2½ percent per annum. This is more than the average increase in output per head in the American economy, so that there is a significant piece of sellers' inflation right at the lower end of the range subject to negotiation.

In such an atmosphere it would require, one would think, a quite severe depression to change people's notions of what is the proper development of wage rates and of the corresponding prices (since the right of wages to increase goes together with the right of profits at least not to fall). It would take perhaps an even more severe level of unemployment to destroy the power of labor to force the wage increases on more reluctant employers who grant wage increases only when they feel they are forced to—i.e., that they would lose more from the strikes and other weapons of the trade unions than they would lose by agreeing to the higher wages (and passing them on).

At the same time a policy of full employment seems to have won a firm place in the country's economic policy, not only because of the general acceptance of the desirability of prosperity, for human as well as for international political reasons, but because neither political party can afford the blame for even a mild depression. With such a setup there is no need to worry whether the cure is worse than the disease—whether the depression would be more harmful than the inflation that it would prevent. This cure is not one that any government would carry out or even seriously attempt to carry out. This brings us to yet another objection to the sellers' inflation analysis.

A firm policy was not announced

It has been suggested that even if the authorities are not really prepared to bring

about the degree of depression necessary to negate the pressure of sellers' inflation, they could still do the trick by solemnly announcing a policy of refusing to provide the increase in expenditure called for by a continuing sellers' inflation. The threatened unemployment would then sober the sellers into calling off their inflationary wage and price increases.

It seems to me pretty certain first that such declarations would not be believed, and secondly, even if it were believed as regards the economy as a whole, that would not prevent any specific wages or prices from being raised while the local conditions still permitted this. It would perhaps even aggravate the wage and price increases as each tried to get his increase quickly while the local going was still good.

YOU CAN'T STOP SELLERS BY BULLYING BUYERS

All this brings us to the perhaps only too obvious conclusion that sellers' inflation cannot be cured or prevented by measures directed against excess demand by buyers. It can be successfully treated only by attacking the pressure on prices by sellers.

THE CURE MUST BE FAIR

The present debate in the automobile industry indicates where the solution may be found.

In an outstanding article which concentrates on showing the inadequacy and superficiality of proposals to prevent inflation by monetary and fiscal policies and declarations, Prof. Sumner H. Slichter seems to suggest that the distinction between buyers' inflation and sellers' inflation is a futile fantasy. Thus he says (using somewhat different terminology): "Much time has been wasted in recent years in discussing whether inflation is demand-inspired or cost-inspired. (Some 70 or 80 years ago the Austrian theory of value produced a similar debate as to whether demand or cost determines the value; the argument ended suddenly when it dawned on the economists that each blade in a pair of scissors cuts.)" ("On the Side of Inflation," Harvard Business Review, September-October 1957, p. 32.)

However, the inapplicability of this analogy jumps to the eye in his very next sentence which shows that it can make sense to distinguish between the blades, since he goes on to say "Thus changes in the price level may originate either with shifts in the demand schedules or with shifts in the supply schedules," and in another article, Professor Slichter definitely aligns himself with the sellers' inflation blade in declaring that "There is no evidence that prices are rising ahead of costs and are pulling costs up. The evidence is all the other way: that prices are being sluggishly adjusted to slowly rising costs." ("Government Spending Can Reduce Taxes," Harvard Business Review, July-August 1957, p. 106.)

Workers feel that if they exercise restraint in their wage demands this would only increase the residual going to profits, while employers feel that if they should lower the price they charge for the product, wages would not be reduced proportionately, so that, instead of a general benefit from the avoidance of inflation with everybody gaining and nobody losing, there would be an unjustified or even an intolerable transference from profits to wages.

This was admirably brought out by the Ford Company which, in its reply to the UAW, turned the UAW proposal completely around and proposed, with more sarcasm than seriousness, that "if you will accept an immediate reduction in wages to the prevailing level at the introduction of our 1957 models, we will take this into consideration in determining how much we will increase prices in our 1958 models." In effect each says "you take the first step and trust me to play fair and do my part too." Such invita-

tions are as futile as invitations for unilateral disarmament in another field—and for the same reason: neither party trusts the other not to exploit the opportunity offered to him. Agreement can be reached, if at all, only if there is a clear definition of what is to be done by both parties, and if neither party will lose, but both gain from a fair arrangement.

In the negotiations that take place between employers and labor, agreements are reached which are both clearly defined and mutually agreeable. But in the course of reaching such agreements the objective we are concerned with here—the avoidance of inflation—is lost. Both sides recognize that everybody would be better off if inflationary increases in all wages and in all profits were avoided. Real wages and real profits would be not lower but even higher to the degree that the efficiency of the economy was saved from inflationary damage. But each party tries to increase or to protect his share by asking for more money for himself and not by insisting on less money for others. Each party is, furthermore, represented by negotiators who have to show they are earning their keep by pressing as hard as possible to increase their party's share, so that there is a balance of upward pressure on the prices demanded. The result is sellers' inflation.

SELLERS' INFLATION RESTS ON ADMINISTERED PRICES

This does not happen on a perfectly competitive market because on a perfectly competitive market we cannot have the institutions and mores that give sellers the power to push prices up. On a perfectly competitive market all that is needed for stability of the price level is a monetary and fiscal policy to keep buyers' demand from becoming either excessive or deficient. No one holds back any product from the market—or can establish a price which results in some of the potential product or the available labor not being taken off the market, so that unless there is excess buyers' demand prices cannot rise, and if there is a deficient buyers' demand prices must fall. Unless there is full utilization of resources we cannot have inflation, and if there is a depression (or recession) we will have deflation (i.e. falling prices). In a perfectly competitive economy we cannot have inflation and depression at the same time.

But where prices are administered by decrees of large firms, and wages are administered by point decrees of powerful unions together with powerful employers or employer groups, the situation is different. Sellers' inflation is a byproduct of the process, and together with sellers' inflation we can also have depression—indeed we will have depression with our sellers' inflation if the authorities try to cure the inflation by reducing ("excess") demand.

These byproducts of administered wages and prices have important similarities to, and are no less socially harmful than, the monopolistic exploitation that would result from the administration of excessive prices by public utilities. We have gone a long way toward eliminating the latter evil by the regulation of prices that may be set by public utilities for the services they supply. The same kind of device can be used to eliminate the former evil. Just as the public utility prices can be and are being regulated so as to prevent monopolistic exploitation, so administered prices and wages can and should be regulated so as to prevent sellers' inflation and the depression it may bring with it.

ADMINISTERED PRICES MUST BE REGULATED

The regulation of administered prices and wages so as to prevent sellers' inflation would have to follow somewhat different lines. It would not be directly concerned as to whether there is more than or less than a fair rate of return on investments. That

would be left to the strong competitive forces that still prevail in our economy. Nor would any other regulations whatsoever be involved other than price regulation. The function of the regulation here proposed would be only to prevent restrictive prices or wages from being administered. A restrictive price is one that results in the demand for a product falling below capacity output. A restrictive wage is one that results in less than full employment in the specific labor market to which it applies. With a monetary and fiscal policy concentrating on the maintenance of adequate buyers' demand for full employment at a constant price level, while preventing buyers' inflation, it would be possible for wages per hour to rise on the average at the same rate as productivity per hour, with aggregate profits rising too at the same pace as aggregate wages and aggregate output (except that increases in the degree of competition, which might be induced, could reduce the share going to profits and increase the share going to labor.)

PRINCIPLES OF REGULATION

The regulatory body would therefore have to follow a set of rules which would do the following things:

1. They would permit an administered price increase only when production and sales are at capacity. Such price increases should not be withheld on account of profits being high.
2. They would enforce decreases in administered prices whenever production and sales are significantly below capacity. A price decrease should not be waived on account of profits being low, or even negative on this item in the firm's output, as long as the price more than covers current operating costs—more strictly short period marginal costs.
3. They would permit increases in administered wages in general at a rate equal to the average trend of increase in national productivity.
4. They would permit increases in administered wages greater than this wherever the labor market is tight—with, say, less than half the national average rate of unemployment.
5. They would permit only smaller increases in administered wages, or no increases at all, where the labor market is slack—with, say, more than twice the national average rate of unemployment. (The expected continuing increase in product per head makes it possible to avoid reductions in money wages, although it is unavoidable, for price stability, that some prices must fall if others rise.)

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

This is, of course, not a fully worked out solution ready for immediate application. There remains much to be developed—such as generally acceptable criteria of capacity of different firms and industries and generally acceptable measures of slackness or tightness in particular labor markets, or measures for dealing with possible attempts by monopolistic industries to restrict the installation of capacity if they are prevented from restricting the utilization of existing capacity. (This would bring out the existence of a specific monopoly situation that calls for treatment quite apart from the problem of inflation.) The intensification of competition which the regulation would enforce would also, in some instances, lead to the elimination of high-cost competitors. While the public would benefit from the increased efficiency of the economy—in higher wages and lower prices—such elimination of competition would conflict with certain existing so-called antitrust policies that have become in effect anticompetition policies and need to be reconsidered.

There remain also important problems of organization and administration of the regulatory body as well as the need for wide-

spread and intensive public discussion to bring about the familiarity with, and the understanding of, the nature of the proposed regulation which is essential for its effective operation in a democracy. And in the course of such examination and debate important developments, changes and improvements are to be expected. Nevertheless the general lines indicated seem to be inevitable if sellers' inflation is to be attacked directly and if we are not to depend on irrelevant nostrums or pious exhortation because we do not dare to attack the problem at its roots.

In anticipation of the necessary discussion I would like to make only two points.

PRICE REGULATION IS NOT PRICE CONTROL

First, it is to be expected that one of the most effective debating points against the proposal will be the charge that it means price control against which there are a thousand cogent arguments, as well as a powerful popular appeal. I would like to go on record as an opponent of price control second to none. But price regulation is not price control. There is all the world of difference between them.

Price control consists of an attempt by authority to establish a price below that which clears the market, i.e., a price so low that the amount available is insufficient to satisfy fully the demand by all the would-be buyers. At the controlled price there is therefore excess demand. Buyers try to buy more than is available for them to buy. This results in disorganized supply, waiting in line, tyranny of sellers over housewives and other buyers, selling under the counter, gray markets and black markets, evasion of and disrespect for the law, corruption and gangsterism, and finally, as a lesser evil, the installation of rationing with all of its administrative burden, economic inefficiency and public inconvenience. The original sin from which all the evils stem and to which all the objections apply is the setting of a price below that which clears the market and the consequent creation of excess demand.

Price regulation does not attempt to set a price below that which clears the market. It only prevents the public utility, or whoever else determines an administered price or wage, from setting it above the level that would clear the market at the optimum output.

In the case of public utilities the price regulation results in greater output at lower prices and a more efficient use of the resources of the economy. The owners of the public utility are indeed deprived of their opportunity to make monopoly profits, but that is more than offset by the consideration that the monopoly profit could have been obtained (in the absence of the price regulation) only at the expense of a loss to the consumers much greater than the gain to the monopolists. Since there is no attempt to set the price below the level that would clear the market, everybody can buy as much as he wants to of the product—the railway travel, the electric current or whatnot—and none of the evils of price control come into the picture.

In fact price regulation is more properly seen as the opposite of price control. The function of a price is to clear the market. Price control is bad because it interferes with this function by attempting to establish a different and lower price which does not clear the market. Price regulation restores the function of price by adjusting the price so that it does clear the market at the optimum output. It interferes only with interferences, preventing the monopolists from fixing a price above that which would clear the market at the potential supply, which is the socially most desirable supply.

In the case of the proposed regulation of administered prices and wages, the suggested rules are specifically such as would always

maintain prices and wages which would clear the market at full employment with price stability. Nowhere would it result in a price or wage below that which would clear the market so that the cry of price control would in no way be any more justifiable than if raised against the established policy of regulating the price of water supply or telephone service—perhaps even less justifiable, since the regulation of the prices charged by public utilities do prevent these from obtaining monopolistic gain, while the proposed regulation of administered wages and prices would only prevent the inflation from which practically nobody gains.

APPROPRIATE REGULATION INCREASES FREEDOM

The second objection I would like to anticipate is that the regulation of administered prices and wages so as to prevent sellers' inflation is in conflict with the traditions of free competitive capitalism. It is possible that the trade unions would easily see all the social benefits from keeping the prices of products down to the level needed for capacity production and full employment, but would denounce the regulation of wages as an intolerable interference with the fundamental right of collective bargaining. It is possible that employers would quickly appreciate the desirability of curbing excessive wage demands but would reject the regulation of prices as an alien and unthinkable interference with the free economy and an impious infringement of the sacred rights of management in setting prices.

Such responses would indicate that "after you, my dear Alphonse" really means "include me out of it," or "let George do it," and we will not have the bilateral cooperation that is necessary. But if the protestations against the general evil of inflation are genuine, and each side can be satisfied with an agreed fair share of the overall benefit, we may be spared all the rhetoric.

The true interests of labor are not damaged by the trade unions' relinquishing the right to institute inflation, or even by their giving up the right to use inflation as an instrument for attempting to increase real wages at the expense of profits. The true interests of capital are not betrayed by surrendering the parallel right to start (or keep feeding) a sellers' inflation by restricting output below capacity so as to raise prices (or by raising prices where this has the effect of restricting demand and output below capacity). The justification of the free economy and its institutions rests ultimately not on any ancient divine rights but on its efficiency in satisfying the needs and the desires of a free people. The price mechanism is the central instrument for approaching such optimum output, and it does this only to the extent that the prices (including wages) are those that clear the market while corresponding to the value of the alternative products that have to be sacrificed (at the margin) in order to produce the current output of any commodity or service.

Monopolistic restriction of output, causes resources to be shifted from the production of more useful to the production of less useful goods and services. The regulation of public utility prices is justifiable because it works in the desirable direction of correcting this distortion.

Inflation damages the economy as a whole. The restriction of output that results from attempts to curb sellers' inflation by reducing buyers' expenditures is more damaging than monopolistic restriction. The latter shifts resources from producing more useful products to producing less useful products, while the former shifts resources from the production of useful products to producing nothing at all—except the human frustrations and suffering from unemployment.

The full utilization of existing capacity may sometimes lead to inadequate profits, or even to losses, but that is the nature of the

competitive profit and loss system. It shows that an error was made in the past in producing too much capacity in the industry, but that is no reason for compounding the error by refusing to make use of the capacity once it has been produced. The low profits or the losses are then performing their proper function of discouraging further investment in such industries.

In other cases the prices that clear the market at full capacity output will yield very large profits. These large profits are then performing their proper function of encouraging more investment in such industries (unless there is a monopolistic restriction on such investment, which would call for antimonopoly action or price regulation in the corresponding investment industries). Just as the low profits are no excuse for monopolistic restriction of output so the high profits are no excuse for enforcing price reductions below the level which clears the market. This would be price control and is to be equally condemned whether it is imposed by government or whether it is due to "restraint" on the part of producers who are powerful enough, and rich enough, to be able to do this. If the existence of excess capacity in steel and in automobiles means that current prices are set too high, the emergence of gray and black market prices during and after World War II meant that prices were then too low. The generosity of the corporations at that time in selling too cheap (in part to privileged suppliers of the black market) is no justification for selling too dear now. A genuine defense of the free market system is not appalled at the emergence either of profits or of losses. In this spirit the proposals here made will be seen not as infringing on the principles of the competitive profit and loss system, but as protecting this system from the power of sellers to raise prices and wages above the levels compatible with full employment and price stability. He is not a true friend of free society who defends the flaws in it that permit inflation and unemployment to persist.

It has been very fashionable for some time to deplore inflation and to quote Lenin's declaration that inflation is the Achilles' heel or the Trojan horse of capitalism. Recently it has become even more fashionable to preach restraint as a remedy for inflation to parties who are unable to respond, even if willing, because they have no assurance that the others will play their part. The most recent statements by labor and management in the automobile industry include public declarations of conversion to a readiness to exercise the restraint, provided the other parties cooperate. The time has come to wind up the deploring, the quoting, the preaching, and the declarations of conversion and instead, by regulating administered prices and wages, to provide the restraint needed to protect the free economy from sellers' inflation.

Boston Chamber of Commerce Protests Transfer of Customs Processing of In- bound Foreign Parcel Post Packages From Boston to New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to include a statement released by the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce on January 22, 1959:

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce vigorously protests the announcement of Mr. Maynard Hutchinson, collector of customs in Boston, that customs processing of inbound foreign parcel post packages will be transferred from Boston to New York.

William J. Bird, executive vice president of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce said that in August 1958, this chamber was represented by its transportation manager, Paul K. Lambert, in a conference on this matter held in the offices of the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson.

At that time, Treasury officials assured all Boston representatives that there would be diversion from Boston until difficulties occasioned by previous diversions from Philadelphia and Baltimore had been rectified to the complete satisfaction of those communities. "Under no circumstances," Treasury officials stated, "would there be diversions from Boston without substantial advance notification thereof to this chamber of commerce and other interested organizations."

"Such notification would have permitted independent and impartial investigation by this chamber but no such notification has ever been received by the Greater Boston Chamber," Mr. Bird said.

"In his announcement, Collector Hutchinson emphasized there would be no loss of jobs in Boston. This is good, to be sure, but where are the savings of this plan to come from? Meanwhile, the good service which our importers now receive may be in jeopardy," Mr. Bird stated.

The Grab Bag of Americana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to the leading Republican newspaper of my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., the *Herald-Dispatch*, and under unanimous consent ask to include an editorial from the February 3 issue of the *Herald-Dispatch*.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to the defense of the writer of this editorial, Raymond Brewster, the able editor of the *Herald-Dispatch*, who has given our community outstanding service down through the years. I know that my fellow Members will not be offended by Mr. Brewster's remarks about that great grab bag of Americana, the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In defense of Mr. Brewster, I wish to state that he is basically a constructive person with a wonderful sense of humor and I trust that his remarks will be taken in a constructive spirit.

Anyone who desires to be active in public life, Mr. Speaker, must, above all, have the ability to laugh at himself and not to take himself too seriously. Congress as an institution, likewise, has survived and become stronger because its Members have not only revered the institution but have been able to take criticism of it in the proper spirit.

On the morning after election day last November, Mr. Speaker, one of the officials of the *Herald-Dispatch* bemoaned the fact that very few voters had followed the editorial advice of Mr. Brewster on November 4. Nevertheless, Mr. Brewster and the *Herald-Dispatch* are great forces in our community and I hope they will always be read carefully, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, so far as the Democratic Party in my area is concerned, if Mr. Brewster did not exist we would have to create what would be a poor substitute, I am sure.

Keeping one's constituents informed is central to the function and mission of a Member of Congress. I could not afford to buy the splendid advertising which the *Herald-Dispatch* continues to give me. I desire publicly to thank the *Herald-Dispatch* for their continuing efforts to publicize my activities on behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia.

The editorial follows:

DR. HECHLER DISCOVERS THE RECORD

The Honorable KEN HECHLER, U.S. Congressman from the West Virginia Fourth District, and a man who does not spare the written word to let his constituents know of his multiple activities, has discovered the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a bulky, verbatim account of the thousands of words uttered daily in the U.S. Congress. The Appendix is devoted largely to an extension of remarks by its Members. The word "extension" is used advisedly.

The Appendix is composed of reprinted texts of previously published syndicated columns, tributes to local luminaries, special groups, home, mother, and just endless words.

Dr. HECHLER has found the Appendix.

Probably the most important fact about the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that it is printed with your money, at a cost of \$75 per page.

Since the current session began, Dr. HECHLER has taken leave to extend his remarks on at least three occasions.

The West Virginia Congressman used more than a third of a \$75 page to laud the appointment of Roger W. Jones to membership on the Civil Service Commission. It took that much space to come to the fact that "a West Virginia Democrat rises to pay tribute to a Connecticut Republican."

Dr. HECHLER's constituents who may not see the RECORD will be pleased to know that he has fought valiantly for tobacco supports. Although the intelligence previously had been conveyed from the Congressman's office, the RECORD extension on the subject is folksy and full of puns based upon cigarette slogans—for another third of a page or more.

Last Saturday Dr. HECHLER extended his remarks to recognize the Des Moines Republican strategy meeting under the title "Can the Republican Elephant Be Whitewashed?"

At the Des Moines meeting Republican leaders took a searching look at a foregone conclusion—the overwhelming defeat last fall—and discussed plans for the 1960 campaign. The problem was viewed realistically with party leaders calling for stepped-up political activity on the part of the President, and Mr. Eisenhower himself urging unremitting effort. From the meeting came plans to scrutinize the party's objectives.

From this open soul-searching Dr. HECHLER deduces: "The Republicans are trying to put a coat of whitewash over their elephant, but the elephant will still look as if it were made of gold." There followed tributes to

Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman, and the common man.

Thus far Congressman HECHLER has extended his remarks only about \$200 worth, a minute sum considering his party is pledged to spending. But we have a sneaking suspicion that seeing one's utterances extended for posterity on the pages of the RECORD could grow into an almost unbreakable habit.

Problems Confronting the Hand-Blown Glassware Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my district is vitally interested in the successful and prosperous continuance of the Flint glassworkers to maintain their employment, I deem it important that the following analysis of the escape clause provisions be inserted in the RECORD.

Most of this material appeared in a comprehensive statement delivered by O. R. Strackbein before the U.S. Tariff Commission for the American Flint Glass Workers' Union, January 27, 1959.

The American Flint Glass Workers' Union in whose behalf I appear before this Commission speaks for a majority of the employees engaged in the manufacture of hand-blown glassware in this country.

This union has not itself filed an application under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as amended, but wishes to go on record in support of the application filed by the handmade table and decorative ware division (division H) of the American Glassware Association.

The welfare of the industry that employs the members of the American Flint Glass Workers Union is of vital concern to these members. Injury to the industry from imports means injury to our membership. In fact, the workers are usually in the first line of defense wherever imports strike the market in competition with the goods that are manufactured in this country.

One of the first steps that the manufacturer takes when imports seriously interfere with the sale of his products, reducing either the margin of profit or sales volume, or both, is to curtail employment. This he does in one of several ways, or a combination of them.

He may lay off a part of his work force; he may reduce the number of hours of work per day; or he may go on a short workweek. His purpose will be to avoid adding more output to his stock when the goods are slow moving and high priced, hoping thus to adjust his inventory to the downtrend of his sales. In order to do this he must reduce the flow of goods from the factory; and the only normal way of doing this is to curtail man-hours of production.

The worker thus becomes a buffer between the manufacturer and rising imports. Whether the manufacturer succeeds in stopping the import tide by the measures he takes toward retrenchment depends on the character of the import competition. Should the foreign manufacturers of sources of the imports be well equipped for long-term competition on an upward trend, the efforts to make an inventory adjustment would be of little avail.

In that event, any successive temporary expedients resorted to by the domestic manufacturers would be utterly inadequate. The failure of such efforts to adjust stocks to a lower level of demand by reduction of man-hours of work would then call for a permanent readjustment. Of course, imports might continue to rise in spite of more drastic new steps and it might be necessary to repeat them. In the end the situation would become chronic and some manufacturers would become desperate. Here and there a close-down would occur, possibly with the hope of reopening when the outlook might turn for the better.

The hand-blown glassware industry has experienced many difficulties of this character; and the outlook continues to be discouraging. Not only have imports continued to increase in the past 10 years but the trend of the domestic industry is downward in terms of the share of the market supplied by it.

A declining share of the market is important among the criteria of injury found in the escape clause. Indeed, a relative decline in a domestic producer's share of the market removes all doubt about the whereabouts of the competitive advantage. It means simply that the domestic industry is on the run.

Now, it is assumed altogether too often that inability to hold its own competitively with imports marks a domestic industry as inefficient. This assumption lacks even the virtue of fairness. It is like blaming a horse that carries a heavy handicap for not winning a race. American producers carry burdens far greater than foreign manufacturers. Most of this comes from the higher wages that set off our economy and standard of living from those of other countries. Should our wages be reduced to the level of those prevailing in other countries our producers, we may be sure, would have no difficulty competing. They need then be no more efficient than they are now in order to compete. Indeed, with still lower wages, they could come into a position to drive the imports from the market. But we would lose our high standard of living in the process.

Numerous economists, imbued with much beside practical experience, persist in saying that our higher wages are offset by our higher productivity. In repeating this fallacy, they exhibit a stubbornness that might be put to better uses in the land of make-believe. The very facts of daylight belie what these economists say. They refuse to credit the words of those who have daily experience in the marketplace. Imported goods are constantly underselling those of our own manufacture. The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Why should this process of underselling be in any way surprising? Since the last war, billions of dollars worth of modern machinery and equipment has gone overseas from this country and has been installed in many hundreds of factories. Also more than 8,000 productivity teams from abroad have come to this country to study our production methods.

Beyond this it should be clear now, notwithstanding the peculiar notions of the academic economists, that the American industrial system has no corner on the technological arts nor on science, nor therefore on high productivity. Other countries are capable of developing and installing modern machinery on their own and are doing so.

From these considerations and others it follows that the indictment of inefficiency will not lie against American industry merely on evidence of inability to compete with imports, nor on the mere word of unseasoned economists.

In the case of hand-blown glassware the direct labor cost is high. Because there is little or no mechanization in this branch of the glass industry in this country, and lacking also in other countries, we witness virtual barehanded competition between labor here and abroad, with not much cushion between them. It would be expected that the domestic industry would find great difficulty in competing with imports, and the facts support the expectation.

It should have been obvious that no tariff reductions should have been made in the first instance; but they were made nevertheless.

The evidence of serious injury is to be found in the trend of imports compared with the trend in domestic production. Imports have come to equal and then to pass domestic production. This is shown by statistics that will be furnished to the Commission by the industry and may be verified by investigations of its own by the Tariff Commission.

The American Flint Glass Workers Union has ascertained from its records in 10 unionized companies manufacturing hand-blown glassware that employment of skilled workers was 979 in April 1949 compared with 667 in April 1958. Miscellaneous workers declined during the same period from 2,526 to 1,625. The respective totals are 3,505 in April 1949 and 2,292 in April 1958. This represents a decline of 35 percent in employment in 10 years in these plants. Imports, on the other hand, increased threefold or more.

To the union this has the appearance of serious injury. To the industry it spells desperation, and the industry will submit other compelling evidence of serious injury.

Since the sole function of the Tariff Commission in an escape-clause action is a finding on injury and recommendation of a remedy, it will be in order to inquire how far this carries us.

In 1943 an escape clause was indeed inserted into a trade agreement for the correction of any injury that might develop; and such a clause was placed in all subsequent agreements. In 1947 the clause was given greater recognition in the form of an Executive order. In 1951

a statutory-escape clause came from congressional action. It says simply that—

No reduction in any rate of duty * * * or other concession * * * shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result * * * of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

The President himself has said:

The President has the responsibility of considering, not only the question of injury to a domestic industry * * * but also the other fundamental questions bearing on the security and well-being of 165 million Americans. The President's final judgment in each case must represent the best composite evaluation he can make of these questions.

This statement may be found in the Bicycle case decided August 18, 1955. He listed five issues that must be decided in an escape-clause case and limited the Tariff Commission's function to the question of "injury and relief to a domestic industry."

The four issues falling in the President's sole jurisdiction and free of any testimony that might be given in public hearings were asserted by the President to be, first, our national security interest in the economic strength of valued allies in the world; second, building export markets for products of our farms, factories, and mines; third, compensation to other countries for withdrawal of concessions; and, fourth, protection of the American consumer against unnecessary and unjustified price increases.

Mr. Speaker, the wide open prairies of the West could hardly offer wider avenues for circumvention of what should be due process of law than the practice thus followed by the President in the administration of the escape clause. This, let me emphasize, is no fault of the Tariff Commission itself.

How have the four factors other than injury intruded themselves upon the scene? By what justification? The escape clause is in the nature of a reservation that permits withdrawal or modification of a concession if a certain contingency develops in fact, namely actual or threatened serious injury. That is what Congress has provided in its wording of the escape clause, quoted above. The only remaining question should be one of fact; and the finding of such fact is the function of the Tariff Commission. The law contains not one word that calls upon the President to gather an unknown volume of additional evidence outside the hearing process and with it to swamp the Tariff Commission's recommendation at will and without compunction.

Unless the Tariff Commission's recommendations should call for a duty higher in its protective effect than that from which it was reduced in a trade agreement, or a proposal for a quota that would rob the country extending a reciprocal concession, as a quid pro quo, of its bargain, such recommendation should be proclaimed without question by the President. He should regard it as representing the invocation of a reser-

vation in keeping with the widely-proclaimed policy of avoiding or preventing serious injury to industry. Only if judicial review disclosed improper procedures or insufficient evidence or similar failures of the Commission, should its findings be set aside. The President should stand by his own appointed Commission. The propriety of its findings and the adequacy of its procedures should be left to the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, under the publicly avowed policies, many times repeated, as documented in the review offered for the record, stating in effect that the trade agreements program is not to injure our industries and that a sure remedy is at hand if injury nevertheless takes place, there is no place for supplemental evidence and trumped-up issues beyond the evidence taken at hearings before this Commission on the question of injury.

It would be difficult indeed to find any support in law or elsewhere for the practice of treating delegated power as authority to skirt not only the law itself but other elements of due process. Yet this is precisely what has been done by the executive branch of the Government in its disposal of Tariff Commission recommendations under the escape clause.

Mr. Speaker, that abominable practice should cease; and the findings of the Commission in the question of injury from imports should be the last word.

Outstanding Citizens From Holly Springs, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, there are few if any towns and cities in the United States which have produced the number of outstanding citizens that have come from Holly Springs, Miss., in my district.

With this great record in history, today it is carrying on in every modern way; they continue real progress. Truly the people of this fine city are carrying on in the fine tradition those of past left to them. I include herewith a pamphlet listing many of these outstanding citizens:

HISTORIC HOLLY SPRINGS AND MARSHALL COUNTY, MISS., PRODUCED THE FOLLOWING ILLUSTRIOUS PEOPLE

Generals: Samuel Benton, Winfield S. Featherston, Edward Carey Walthall, Absalom M. West, James R. Chalmers, Claudius W. Sears, A. J. Vaughn, Daniel C. Govan, Christopher H. Mott, and Alexander B. Bradford.

Adjutant generals: Thomas Falconer, Kinloch Falconer, and Harvey W. Walter.

Nominated for Vice President: Absalom M. West, National Party 1880; Anti-Monopoly Party 1884.

Members of Confederate Congress: Alexander M. Clayton, Jeremiah W. Clapp, Samuel Benton, Harvey W. Walter, Orlando Davis, W. M. Lea, John W. C. Watson, Alexander B. Bradford, and James F. Trotter.

U.S. Senators: James F. Trotter, Joseph W. Chalmers, Hiram Revels, Edward C. Walthall, and Wall Doxey.

U.S. Congressmen: James R. Chalmers, Absalom M. West, Van Manning, G. Wiley Wells, Winfield S. Featherston, Joseph W. Chalmers, and Wall Doxey.

U.S. Attorneys: G. Wiley Wells and Lester G. Fant.

U.S. marshals: George M. Buchanan and John S. Burton.

Governors of Mississippi: Joseph W. Matthews, Lt. Gov. Sam Lumpkin, and Lt. Gov. Kinloch Falconer.

Secretary of state: Kinloch Falconer, Henry Myers, James Hill, and George M. Govan.

Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit: Jno. D. Martin.

State supreme court judges: James F. Trotter, Mississippi; Wm. Yates Gholson, Ohio; Alexander M. Clayton, Mississippi; L. A. Smith, Mississippi; and Hamilton H. Chalmers, Mississippi.

Attorneys general: David Chambers Glenn and Roger Barton (attorney general of Tennessee).

Speakers of the house: James Lockhart Totten, James L. Autry, and Sam Lumpkin.

Executive secretary to the President (of Confederacy): Robert Josselyn.

Ambassador to Kentucky: W. S. Featherston (1860).

Chancellors: L. A. Smith, Sr. and Jr.; L. G. Fant, Sr. and Jr.; and Joseph W. Chalmers.

Circuit judges: Alexander M. Clayton, James F. Trotter, James Thornton Fant, John W. C. Watson, Winfield S. Featherston, and Hugh K. Mahon.

President of Louisiana State University: Francis L. Hawks.

Counsel to Havana: Alexander M. Clayton. **Hawaiian Islands:** Judge Ed Watson.

Corporation counsel, city of New York: Arch R. Watson.

Mayors of Memphis: Jeremiah Clapp, Ed Crump, and Harry Litty.

President-elect Huguenot Society of America: Mrs. Miller Keith.

Nuclear scientist: Martha S. Parks.

National historian of the Colonial Dames of America, and vice president general of National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution: Mrs. Egbert R. Jones.

Artist: Kate Freeman Clark, who left her fortune, home and 300 pictures to Holly Springs and Marshall County.

Authors: Sherwood Bohner, Francis L. Hawks, Joseph Holt Ingraham, Prentiss Ingraham, and Robert Josselyn.

Industrialists: Oscar Johnson, Jackson Johnson, Andrew Johnson, Lee Johnson, Oscar Johnson, Jr., Frank Rand (International Shoe Co., St. Louis), R. L. "Red" Taylor, Hope P. Sullivan, J. P. Norflett, Price Curd, and F. M. Crump.

Poets: Robert Josselyn, Samuel M. Patton, and Rev. F. N. Atkin.

Education: In 1860 Holly Springs spent more on education than the rest of the State combined except the University of Mississippi. General Sears and General Bradford taught here. William Yates Gholson and A. M. Clayton aided in organizing the University of Mississippi and were on its first board of trustees. We educated Hon. Hugh White and prepared him for the university and a great career. Mary and Jane Mills were the first two women in America to graduate from a college. This was in 1833 and the college was Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss.

For over a hundred years the Fant family have had lawyers in Holly Springs. One family, the Gholsons, had doctors serving this community continuously for 113 years.

We believe no small town in the Nation can surpass such a record.

Bank Merger Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills which would ban any bank merger or consolidation whose effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The first of these bills would amend section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act. It would:

First, Expand provisions of existing banking laws so as to require prior approval by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation of every bank merger or consolidation involving insured banks.

Second, Prohibit the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency from approving any bank merger or consolidation where the effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

Third, Make it necessary for the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to obtain the views of the Attorney General respecting the competitive phases of the transaction and require the Attorney General to submit his views within 30 days.

Fourth, Require the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to give notice and opportunity to be heard to the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State in the event the transaction involves State banks.

Fifth, Incorporate a so-called antitrust savings clause for bank mergers similar to that governing bank holding companies thus making it clear that applicable provisions of the antitrust laws pertaining to banks are not to be superseded.

The second bill would close a loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950, and prevent bank mergers achieved by acquisition of assets where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended in 1950 by the Celler-Kefauver Act, covers bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions, but fails to cover bank mergers accomplished by means of asset acquisitions. This gap in existing law has no logical basis in view of the fact that the purchase of assets has an even more enduring effect than a purchase of stocks and thus is even more inimical to competition. The bill would plug this gap in existing law and provide the Federal Reserve Board and the Attorney General with the same enforcement authority under the Celler-Kefauver Act to move against asset acquisitions by banks as against stock acquisitions.

All bank mergers whether accomplished by acquisition of stock or assets

are circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize or monopolization of trade or commerce. Illegality under section 1 of that act is established by proof that the merger has actually resulted in an unreasonable lessening of competition. Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act, requires, on the other hand, only a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition. Hence the bill would enable the antitrust enforcement agencies to cope more effectively with the mounting trend of bank merger activity. The bill is similar to H.R. 5948 which was introduced by Mr. CELLER in 1955 and approved by the House of Representatives that year without dissent. The Senate did not, however, take final action on the measure.

Amendment of both the banking laws and the antitrust laws would assure that Federal officials apply the same competitive test to all bank mergers. In general, the bills would make applicable to the acquisition of a bank by another bank competitive principles which, under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, now govern the acquisition of banks by holding companies.

These bills would establish a uniform competitive test for all bank mergers and forestall approval of any whose effect might be substantially detrimental to competition.

Legislation of this kind is vitally needed in view of the rash of mergers that has been taking place among banking houses in recent years. In the period from 1950 through 1958, for example, a total of 1,232 mergers have been completed, resulting in the disappearance of many strong, competitive, sizable financial institutions.

In large part because of bank-merger activity, concentration of the Nation's banking facilities has reached a point where a few large banks control a disproportionate share of total loans and deposits. Thus the 100 largest banks control more than 48 percent of the Nation's bank deposits. What is more, in 10 of the Nation's 16 leading financial centers, 4 banks own more than 80 percent of all commercial assets. Indeed, in each of the 16 leading financial centers, the first 2 banks own more than 40 percent of all the commercial assets; the first 4 banks, 60 percent.

The bank-merger trend has become, as the Federal Reserve Board stated, a matter of deep concern, particularly since competition is one of the strongest single factors which safeguards a sound banking system. The proposed merger of Guaranty Trust-J. P. Morgan exacerbates this situation. Permitted to be consummated, it would seriously affect the competitive banking structure of New York City. Our Antitrust Subcommittee will continue to keep a watchful eye on all developments in this matter. It is gratifying that another proposed merger in New York City between Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust has been called off. This transaction would have had equally grave consequences.

The President, recognizing the seriousness of the bank-merger problem, has in his recent Economic Report transmitted to the Congress in January 1959, repeated his recommendation that Congress act favorably on legislation to authorize Federal regulation of the merger of banking institutions accomplished through the acquisition of assets.

The measures I have introduced not only would carry out this recommendation, they would provide an effective accommodation as between the requirements of the banking and the antitrust laws.

Floods Again Plague Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I represent an area of the great State of Indiana which abounds in rich farmland, in great industrial potential, and people who are reasonable and proud. We do not make unreasonable demands upon our Government and whenever possible prefer handling our own problems. However, when we are in a position where the magnitude of our problem reaches beyond our own resources and abilities we do not hesitate to seek the help which only our Federal Government can give. We have such a problem now. Indiana has been plagued with floods for many years. Floods which have cost our people millions of dollars in flood damage. Floods which have swept away some of our richest farmland, floods which have destroyed property, floods which disturbed the economy and well-being of our people.

Last year our President signed into law a bill authorizing the construction of three reservoirs in the upper Wabash River Valley. This authorizing legislation was wise. It was not a hit-and-miss thing. It was an acceptance of the recommendations of agencies of authority who had spent years studying our problem. "At last," we thought, "we have made progress. We now have relief for our problem." Not so. Although recognition was readily given to the fact that we have a need in Indiana for flood control, this need was ignored when it came to supplying necessary funds for the final planning of these projects. The Presidents' budget ignored our request for \$50,000 for the planning of the Salamonie River Reservoir and \$150,000 for the Mississinewa River project.

Mr. Speaker, Indiana should not be denied the protection the construction of these projects will afford to the lives, property, and well-being of our people. At this very moment floods are sweeping away our topsoil, destroying our property, and endangering the lives of our citizens.

It is difficult for us Hoosiers to understand why we have been deprived of funds which would alleviate one of our most pressing problems.

Representative Wright Patman, of Texas, Given Award of Merit for His Key Role in Recognizing the Problems of Small Business and in Seeking To Aid in Their Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, occasionally one of our colleagues in the House of Representatives receives an award that is particularly appropriate, and one that meets with wide general approval not only in this body but among the citizens of our country.

Honors come easily and numerous in the U.S. Senate to its Members with endless newspaper columns, magazine articles, radio, television, and other motion picture film footage devoted to telling the story and chronicling the event.

The path is harder in the House and one has to be particularly outstanding to be acclaimed.

It is, then, with special pleasure that all of us welcome the bestowal of the much-coveted Award of Merit on the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] by the national coat and suit industry recovery board. This trade body is a national organization representing 1,200 manufacturers of women's and children's coats and suits and 70,000 garment workers. Member companies belong to 16 trade associations, dedicated to ethical business standards and fair labor standards, who work in conjunction with the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL-CIO.

I include a news story from the New York Times of February 3, 1959, giving the details of the bestowal of this highly merited Award of Merit to our beloved colleague, who is so richly deserving of it:

PATMAN SCORES ABUSES IN PRICING—SAYS SMALL BUSINESS MUST RESIST INEQUITABLE PRACTICES OF BUYING SYNDICATES—SEEKS TO BOLSTER LAW—GARMENT PRODUCERS WARNED POWER IS CONCENTRATED IN FEWER CORPORATIONS

(By Herbert Koshetz)

MIAMI BEACH, February 2.—Small business was warned today it would lose further ground in its fight against big business monopoly unless it stood firm against pricing abuses and the demands of large buying syndicates.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, who issued the warning, also declared that the rising trend of mergers, coupled with monopolistic pricing, had placed control of the Nation's economy in the hands of a few large operators.

Representative PATMAN spoke at the opening of the annual meeting of the national

coat and suit industry recovery board. This trade body is a national organization representing 1,200 manufacturers of women's and children's coats and suits and 70,000 garment workers. Member companies belong to 16 trade associations, dedicated to ethical business standards and fair labor standards, who work in conjunction with the International Ladies Garment Workers, AFL-CIO.

The board presented its award of merit to Representative PATMAN for his "key role in recognizing the problems of small business and in seeking to aid in their solution."

He is coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act, which requires sellers to offer equitable terms to all buyers. He also is chairman of the House Small Business Committee.

REVISIONS NEEDED

Mr. PATMAN said that certain sections of the law needed to be strengthened. He said that he would again seek to achieve passage of an amendment that would make it mandatory for sellers to make known and available to all customers the favorable terms given to anyone. After the meeting he expressed the opinion that this so-called disclosure amendment had an excellent chance being passed in the present session of Congress.

"There can be ominous meaning to you," he told the meeting, "in the fact that the disparity in size between your firms and the chains, syndicates, and buying combinations, purchasers of a large part of your product, is growing at a steady rate."

In 1952, he said, a few corporations, having more than \$100 million of assets each, owned 51 percent of all the assets of manufacturing corporations in the United States. At the end of 1955 this percentage had grown to 57 percent. In 1956 their share had increased to 59 percent. It is now estimated that one-half of 1 percent of all manufacturing corporations had 57 percent of total sales, leaving 43 percent for the many thousands of other manufacturers.

ACT IS DEFENDED

The 10 largest companies purchasing goods produced by the garment industry, according to Mr. PATMAN, increased their annual volume by 60 percent in the last decade. These 10, he said, did about 10 times the total business of the 1,200 companies manufacturing women's coats and suits.

He defended the Robinson-Patman Act as an instrument to fortify the smaller producer and seller against "intolerable exactions as to terms and conditions."

Moreover, he said, the refusal of industry members to compromise their trade practice standards in such matters as advertising subsidies, discounts, transportation charges, consignment transactions, and other matters, was essential not only for preserving their own business but also that of all their fair-minded customers.

Max E. Weinstock, chairman of the board, told the meeting that more apparel could be sold this year if quality and value were stressed instead of price.

Isadore Nagler, manager of the New York joint cloak board and a vice president of the ILGWU, urged the manufacturers to continue to support New York's fashion institute of technology now operating in the Needle Trades High School, West 24th Street, between 7th and 8th Avenues.

Shirley Goodman, executive secretary of the school, gave a detailed report of the new building, which will be on West 27th Street. The institute was unique, she said, as the only junior college in the Nation offering production, merchandising, and management courses in the apparel trades. It is jointly sponsored by the University of the State of New York, the New York City Board of Education, and the Educational Foundation of the Apparel Industry.

More Thought Being Given to Repeal of the Income Tax Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, more and more thought is being given to the repeal of the income tax amendment. Bills have been introduced at the last two sessions of the Congress to repeal the 16th amendment.

Just a few years ago, to talk about repealing the 16th amendment, stamped anyone so doing as a "crackpot."

It is most gratifying to note the solid substantial organizations that endorse the repeal. Recently the American National Cattlemen's Association at Omaha, Nebr., adopted such a resolution. I append hereto this resolution and an editorial from a great newspaper, the Omaha World-Herald, in regard to this resolution:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION AT OMAHA, NEBR., CONVENTION JANUARY 17, 1959

Whereas the American National Cattlemen's Association has frequently and consistently taken a firm position in matters of principle; and

Whereas the need for support of an equitable system of taxation, consistent with our Constitution and Bill of Rights, is paramount in the performance of essential governmental functions; and

Whereas our Constitution provides methods for amendment, and precedent has been established, following a procedure of referendum: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to take such immediate action as is required which will permit the American people the opportunity made possible under the Constitution to vote upon the question of whether the 16th amendment to the Constitution is to be continued or repealed; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge and request elected representatives to support an equitable tax system restoring portions of the Bill of Rights.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald, Jan. 20, 1959]

HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

Just about every member of the American National Cattlemen's Association would be regarded as a responsible, substantial citizen of the United States. Two-thirds of them at their annual convention in Omaha last week stood up to be counted in favor of a resolution which asked that the American people be given an opportunity, by vote, to get rid of Federal income taxes.

This was not a hasty action; the cattlemen had been mulling it over for some time. But it was, to say the least, extreme. And it was something to which, we think, the political powers that be had better pay some attention.

What the cattlemen said, in effect, was this:

Uncle Sam is taking our money and spending it like a drunken sailor. He is throwing it away in every port of the seven seas, and here at home he is using it to impose upon us a big variety of welfare schemes which

we don't want. And since he has refused to heed our advice to slow down, we may have to shut off his funds altogether.

We don't expect that the Government spenders will start shaking in their boots because of a resolution passed by a comparatively few cattlemen. But there are other signs, as well, that people are beginning to think seriously about their wasteful and too big Government. The handwriting on the wall looks mightily like an admonition to put on the brakes—or else.

Our Puzzling Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Journal-American of January 22, 1959, illustrates the futility of our present program of farm support prices, and advances the theory that our agricultural policy is our enemy's best weapon.

With our agricultural problems now, as ever, in the forefront of political debate, the subject is most timely and may be of interest to my colleagues:

OUR PUZZLING FARM POLICY

(By Bob Considine)

Eugene P. Kane, farm authority from Summit, N.J., takes me to task for a recent piece here which might have been entitled, "How You Gonna Keep 'Em Down on the Farm After They've Seen Parity?"

He writes:

"Your article cannot go unchallenged. In the first place, the theory of Agri-Dynamics is not new. It started when artificially high price supports forced farmers to produce more per acre in order to circumvent acreage restrictions. For example, in 1932 farmers planted 36,494,000 acres of cotton. The crop amounted to 13,002,000 bales. The average yield was 173.5 pounds per acre. In 1958, the figures were 12,375,000—11,581,000—and 469, respectively. Agri-Dynamics is new?"

"In the second place, the expanded production of the farmers must be paid for by the consumer twice. Once when the processors pass along the artificially high price which they must pay in order to compete with Commodity Credit Corporation. Again when, as a taxpayer, the consumer is gouged to make up the losses of CCC.

"In the third place, there is little or no free enterprise in American agriculture today. The Government decides how much each farmer may plant, and at which price CCC must buy from the farmer.

"Khrushchev warned the grain collectives of Russia that their costs were too high. He combined some 30 farms near Moscow into one unit to reduce costs. Thus, he paid homage to the rule that selling price determines cost.

"In the United States, this axiom is not applied to agriculture. Parity is the measure of the farmer's cost of living and operating. CCC must buy from the farmer at a stated percentage of parity. As parity goes up, the farmer's selling price to CCC goes up. Hence, cost determines selling price.

"Who is more capitalistic in regard to agriculture—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the Republic of the United States of America?

"Our agricultural policy is our enemy's best weapon."

Mr. Kane encloses CCC reports in which the Government agency, which has piled up the most colossal surpluses in world history, announces that realized losses on all commodities from 1954 until this coming spring will amount to \$5,294,449,872. Total losses since the plan was first introduced by Henry Wallace in the early days of the New Deal—\$12,330,632,228. We are now paying \$1 million a day rent for storage of our surpluses.

Poison in Your Water—No. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News and Telegram which appeared on May 26, 1958, entitled "Clean Up—On Sickness."

That article, an editorial, discusses the relation of sewage to the disease known as infectious hepatitis, more commonly known as yellow jaundice. The article points out that clean up of sewage and construction of adequate sewage abatement works will do much in Utah to reduce the incidence of this disease which has risen in a period of 1 year from 26 to 96.

This is just another reason why the full \$50 million authorized under Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress should be appropriated for grants to municipalities for construction of sewage abatement. Actually, it is a good reason why the amount of the grants should be at least doubled.

The article follows:

CLEAN UP—ON SICKNESS

For a long time now, experts in sewage and water treatment have been saying Utahns are living on borrowed time. This week the meaning of that warning becomes much more clear.

This week, the State is facing an alarming increase in the incidence of infectious hepatitis. This disease, commonly known as yellow jaundice, is a serious, debilitating one that takes months, sometimes years, to throw off. It is usually associated with polluted water or inadequate sewage disposal. Utah has seen 96 cases so far, compared with 26 at this time a year ago.

This is a disgrace for a State living in the 20th century when methods of prevention of this and other diseases associated with unclean water are thoroughly understood.

Methods of prevention were, in fact, being discussed by official groups even as the hepatitis report was released. One group of officials called for a new Federal study of water pollution in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons in relation to growing recreation pressures on the canyons. And another group released a report after extensive studies of four Utah rivers. Three of them are serious health hazards, carrying raw human sewage through populated areas.

The two problems are different, of course. No one knows just how much recreational development can be allowed in the canyons without endangering the Salt Lake Valley water supply. A fine treatment plant is finished at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon and construction will soon begin on a plant for Little Cottonwood. How much additional recreation these plants will make possible, if any, is not known. Of course pure water comes ahead of any other consideration, but we certainly should have a competent study to find out how much recreation we can have in the canyons and still be sure of pure water.

But there's no doubt at all about the other problem, that of the shocking pollution of the Jordan, Price, and Weber Rivers, and of other streams in the State. Any raw sewage dumped into a stream is too much.

To this problem, there's just one solution. Money is at the root of it. Utah's growing communities simply cannot continue letting their sewage go untreated.

A number of Utah County communities have shown the way. Sick and tired of the way the recreational possibilities of Utah Lake were being lost by its use as a cesspool, they took action, built sewage treatment plants and are on the way to rehabilitating the lake.

What they can do, others can do—and must do. And now is the time to do it. Building now can create much-needed jobs. The recession means that contractors are sharpening their bids. The bond market is good. Inflation shows no sign of ending. A time may never come when sewage treatment can be obtained as inexpensively as it can right now.

The growing threat of shameful pollution-caused disease should be a most effective warning to hurry up.

George H. Christopher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, all of us were saddened by the passing of that great patriot, George H. Christopher. Knowing him was one of the pleasant associations in the Congress. He was a great friend of the veterans, the farmers, and the American who earns his livelihood by honest toil.

Those of us on the Veterans Committee loved and admired George Christopher. We could count on him to do the right thing for our country and those who served our Nation in time of war. As a younger Member, I profited much by the experience, the advice and understanding of Mr. Christopher. He understood our agricultural problems as few other contemporary Americans. A successful farmer himself, he devoted a great deal of his time and energy to improving the lot of the farmers.

George Christopher raised a fine, upright family. Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to them. George Christopher will be greatly missed by those of us who knew and loved him. His great service to our country will always be, to me, an admiring reminiscence.

Report of Committee on Industrial Water Use, Pollution Abatement, Wildlife, and Recreation to the 45th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the report which was made to the 45th annual national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress by the permanent committee on industrial water use, pollution abatement, wildlife, and recreation.

I have served for many years as vice president of the congress for the State of Minnesota and was honored to be asked by President Brooks to act again as chairman of this committee which it is agreed by all has rendered a distinct service to the people of the United States.

The committee met with a full attendance on May 14, 1958, and continued in session throughout the day, reaching complete agreement on its proposed report. On May 16, at the final session of the congress, I presented the committee's report which was unanimously agreed to by the convention.

I was again impressed by the keen interest shown by the committee members representing the many diverse geographic areas of our country and it was obvious that there is a growing awareness throughout the country of the increasing importance of this complex problem of sound water-use and pollution-abatement policies and programs.

The report of our committee is as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL WATER USE, POLLUTION ABATEMENT, WILDLIFE, AND RECREATION

The committee reviewed its report adopted at the Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held May 16, 1957, and reaffirmed the broad and constructive principles for development of adequate water supplies set forth therein, emphasizing particularly the need for constructive policies relating to conservation, municipal and domestic use, pollution abatement, flood control, irrigation, recreation, industrial use, and other beneficial purposes.

The chairman reported outstanding progress made under the provisions of Public Law 660, providing for Federal assistance to communities for the construction of pollution abatement works. He called attention to the fact that the construction program under Public Law 660 has stimulated the greatest treatment plant construction in our history, noting that in the years prior to adoption of this statute, beginning in 1952, only 3 to 5 States had had record construction years in this area, but beginning in 1956, 13 States had had a record treatment plant construction year and the number had increased to 19 in 1957 as the program gained momentum. It is the sense of the committee that even the limited program permitted by Public Law 660 has been an outstanding success.

The chairman reported further that official communications had been received from the Bureau of the Budget and the President advising that in the future, budget estimates would include no funds for implementation of the program provided for by Public Law 660. Discussion of these matters indicated the increasing urgency of pollution abatement work and the growing need for larger Federal assistance to the States and communities affected. The committee deplored the attitude expressed by the Bureau of the Budget and the President in this regard and their failure to recognize the clear Federal responsibility for participation in solving a national problem.

Accordingly, upon motion of Mr. Marshall N. Dana, chairman, Commission of Public Docks, Portland, Oreg., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved:

"1. That this committee compile the record of accomplishment made under the administration of Public Law 660;

"2. That this committee recommends an appeal to the Congress from the decision of the Bureau of the Budget and the President for reconsideration of the decision heretofore announced to include no funds in future budget estimates for Federal assistance in the construction of pollution abatement works in accordance with the principles of Public Law 660;

"3. That Public Law 660 be modified and strengthened by increasing the total amount authorized for Federal assistance for the construction of pollution abatement works from \$50 million to \$100 million annually;

"4. That this committee requests each member of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to enlist support from Members of Congress for the action proposed in the next preceding resolution."

Reports from representatives of all sections of the Nation contained dramatic evidence of growing water problems. It is clear that the population of the United States will continue to grow rapidly, that the needs of industry, agriculture, and the general public for adequate supplies of water will continue to mount; that with improved means of transportation and greater leisure time, demands for recreational facilities for hunting, fishing, boating and related forms of enjoyment will grow apace, and that the growth of industry and population will aggravate and intensify the already serious pollution abatement problem confronting the Nation. Accordingly, the committee reaffirms its conviction that all uses of water are interrelated and are of concern to the public generally, and that conservation, control and equitable disposition of our water resources are matters of profound interest to the development of the national economy and the welfare of all the people. It is evident that the water problem will become as vital to the national interest in 10 years as the missile program is today.

In view of the growing importance of water resource development, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Resolved:

"1. That the committee recommends recognition by the Congress in the evaluation of water resources projects of the full economic values derived therefrom including public water supply, low flow augmentation, industrial use, irrigation, pollution abatement, fish and wildlife and recreation, as well as flood control and navigation and that such values be established and taken into account in computing the benefit-cost ratios of such projects;

"2. That the committee strongly approves the principles embodied in section 205 of S. 497 authorizing the provision of storage in reservoir projects, (a) for present and anticipated future needs for municipal and

industrial water supplies under the method of reimbursement when contract for use of such impounded water is made; and (b) to increase needed low flows downstream without reimbursement to the extent warranted at present or during the economic life of the project with such low flows determined on the basis of widespread general benefits;

"3. That the committee recommends improved coordination among the agencies at all levels of government for the more effective development and use of water resources; and

"4. That the committee recommends a more adequate program to ascertain, assemble, and disseminate in useful form basic data relative to surface and ground water resources."

Poison in Your Water—No. 8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the San Francisco News of June 30, 1958, describing further the problems of pollution, this time in the lovely State of California and on our Pacific coast. The article is as follows:

ALL IS NOT LOST

The Downtown Association has protested to the State water pollution control board over the "big stink" at Candlestick Cove.

Anyone who has driven past that area along Bayshore knows what the association is talking about. The nostrils are assailed by the most obnoxious odors which contrive to invade passing automobiles even with the windows up.

The News is pleased to report that something is being done about it. The process will take months, scant comfort to those who daily traverse the reeking acres of "Candlestick Cove." But with patience and the possible use of a spray deodorant in their cars, we think these sufferers may be able to endure their olfactory misfortune.

The villains are two: Raw sewage and garbage.

Works Director Sherman Duckel reports that the city is negotiating with the Bayshore Sanitary District, to pump its sewage into the San Francisco sewage system for treatment—for a price. Final agreement awaits approval by Chester MacPhee, the new chief administrative officer. We are sure that Mr. MacPhee will act with dispatch.

The raw sewage from the Brisbane Sanitary District is another and more complicated matter, but the State water pollution control board is painfully aware of the problem and meets this week to seek a solution.

It has the authority to force one.

Another source of the scent is the 1,100 tons of San Francisco garbage which is dumped there daily. When garbage is dumped on sea water, it produces hydrogen sulfide gas. Whew.

The city and the pollution board have advanced several suggestions and the Sanitary Fill Co., which runs the operation, has a few ideas of its own. Unfortunately, some of the ideas cost money, which no one likes to spend, but we are sure the outcome will be happy.

We intend to follow the developments, because we know a story when we smell one.

Remarks of Hon. Carmine G. DeSapio, at the Editors and Publishers Luncheon, New York, N. Y., February 2, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include, with pleasure, a logical, powerful, courageous address, and a most appropriate one that should be of great interest to all and, in particular, to publishers and editors of our newspapers, made by Hon. Carmine G. DeSapio at the editors and publishers luncheon, at Hotel Plaza, in New York City, on February 2, 1959. The publishers and editors of the newspapers of our country should pay heed to the friendly but pointed remarks made by Mr. DeSapio.

The address follows:

Let me, at the outset, thank you for inviting me today and for fulfilling for me a dream which, in recent years, has almost bordered upon obsession. I am sure that you will understand my telling you that it becomes increasingly difficult for me to read your newspapers without wishing—indeed, without a wistful longing—for the opportunity to reply, to rebut, to tell you nice people where to get off.

But I don't own a newspaper, and I don't have hundreds of thousands of readers and, come to think of it, I don't even have a typewriter. And I must confess that this opportunity to deliver an editorial to you editorialists is one which I warmly cherish, at the same time that I am considerably awed and not a little apprehensive.

So, with your gracious permission, here is by editorial. It is entitled "The Responsibility of the Press."

Today's tragedy in Italy, where many political parties are unable to agree upon a coalition government, reminds me of similar repeated chaos in France and in other parts of the world, and emphasizes the great blessing which is America's two-party system.

Good or bad, America's political parties accept their responsibilities. They face the challenge of the voters on election day. And they provide for our municipalities, States, and Nation a system of government acknowledged by all honest minds to be the best in the history of civilization.

The two-party system of government in our country has survived wars, depressions, crises, and the American press. With God's help—and with suitable vigorous editorial reform—it will continue to survive.

The men and women of the United States who own and produce our Nation's newspapers are universally acknowledged to be persons of high moral character, patriotic integrity, and extraordinary intelligence. This is indisputable. They are also men and women of firm principle, intense determination and, to a very large extent, unbridled partisanship. They have great power, and they know it. They wield enormous influence, and they know it. They enjoy unique positions of trust and responsibility, and they too often forget it.

The publishing business today—at least that segment of it which is chiefly concerned with reporting and interpreting current affairs—has lost the quality of independence which once was its most distinguishing and most valuable asset. Our Nation's press, to

a deplorably large degree, has rejected its historic role as a nonpolitical arbiter of public opinion. It has become, instead, an instrument for the expression of partisanship and for the selling, rather than the feeding, of ideas.

Now, it is one thing for the editor and the publisher of a newspaper to hold personal political views. Indeed, it would be catastrophic if they did not. Partisanship is the handmaiden of citizenship, and it is the obligation of every citizen to hold, to express, and to fight for a political opinion.

Yes, it is one thing to hold and to express political views; but it is quite another to color, to camouflage, to emphasize, to omit, and, yes, to distort news on the altar of partisanship.

How many newspaper publishers would tolerate a Republican electric company or telephone company, or a Democratic railroad? The analogy is clear. These organizations, like our newspapers, are public utilities. But, happily for our country, our newspapers are not regulated public utilities. Democracy would die and liberty would be destroyed if there were governmental control of our newspapers.

But, just as the people of the community must depend upon the other utilities for vital services, so must they also depend upon their newspapers as a reliable source of information about local, State, National, and international affairs.

And although the editorial pages and the opinion columns of our Nation's press traditionally and properly reserve the right to present partisan opinions on all subjects, too often—much too often—you can pick up the first page of a newspaper and from the mere presentation of news, determine at a glance the political philosophy of that paper's owner or editor.

Here in New York City, if a reader does not like his newspaper's views, you may argue, he can buy another paper. I could debate that with you, but it will have to wait for another occasion. Nevertheless, in community after community throughout our State and country, just as there is only one light and telephone company, there also is only one newspaper. And very frequently, where there is more than one newspaper, they are owned by the same person.

So here we have a vital utility, concerned with the well-being of every man, woman, and child in the United States, regulated—and, I emphasize—this is as it should be—only by the conscience of its owners.

Now let us see how this awesome responsibility is fulfilled by the distinguished men and women who own our great American press. As a politician, I know from my intimate first-hand experience over a period of many years of the great influence which the newspapers exercise upon the voter, upon public officials and upon politicians.

I must confess that much of the program of political reform which I have instituted as county leader in Manhattan was either inspired, agitated or needed into being by our newspapers. I am proud of what we have achieved and grateful to the press for encouraging me to achieve it.

But I am not proud of everything that the American press has achieved. I am not proud of the stigma which our newspapers have given to politicians—of the grotesque and untrue picture of politicians which they have painted and which has discouraged countless able decent men and women from entering politics.

Ask Mayor Wagner, ask Governor Rockefeller, ask President Eisenhower why it is so difficult to get outstanding people to accept important governmental posts. The reason is simple and terrible. It is because when a man enters politics or Government, a large section of the American press immediately brands him as a person who does

not quite belong to the community of decent human beings.

Certainly, corrupt politicians and public officials should be exposed and ferreted out, just as the misdeeds of corrupt labor leaders, businessmen and even newspapermen should be exposed and punished.

Yet, there is a delicate problem of balance which must be met forthrightly. The sensational escapades of the corrupt cop, for example, are newsworthy and make for interesting reading. But it is so very necessary, in evaluating such a story, also to recognize that many thousand other policemen go about their jobs quietly, efficiently, courageously—without fanfare, glory, or publicity. And injudicious emphasis has seriously undermined popular respect for those charged with the enforcement of law and order, particularly among our highly impressionable young people.

Similarly, when you paint a complete picture around a handful of bad apples in the political barrel; when you add sinister hints of general political corruption to that picture; you create not only a distorted picture, but one which does incalculable disservice to our country, to our people, and to our system of government.

The nation's press, by and large, was up in arms over Franklin Roosevelt's quest for a third term. And when he sought a fourth term, the bitterness of much of the press was almost hysterical. And so there came forth an unprecedented campaign—unprecedented in vigor, in intensity and in determination—to limit the tenure of the presidency to two terms. That campaign—an anti-monarchy campaign it was called—was successful.

But was it?

For it has resulted in the pathetic spectacle of a President of the United States, not an overly strong leader to begin with, but now completely deprived even of bargaining strength; a lame duck who cannot even rally his own party behind his program because everybody—including himself—knows that at the end of this term, he is through.

The simple fact is that Khrushchev, McMillan, Mao-Tse-Tung, De Gaulle, and the heads of all other governments, know that President Eisenhower speaks only with temporary authority and that he doesn't even have his own partisans in Congress behind him; this, in a period in American history when the atom has balanced the world upon the precipice of disaster and when the whim of a single man can plunge us into holocaust.

Who is our leader? Who is our spokesman?

What have we done?

Yet, entirely apart from such situations, all Americans can take enduring pride in, and enjoy a sense of profound respect for, the press of our nation which daily produces the most remarkable facility of communication in recorded history—and which serves with zeal and distinction as a firm defender of our freedom, as an uncompromising guardian of our morality and as a dedicated custodian of our faith.

It has fought injustice. It has repressed bigotry. It has destroyed fear. It has given the American people a sense of security in the awareness that a vigilant press will protect their interests. But it has failed to fulfill its political responsibilities.

As a political leader, I have consulted frequently with the policymakers of our newspapers on the designation or nomination of people for positions of public trust. I have sought their guidance and, more often than not, I have respected and accepted their recommendations.

But see how difficult the press frequently makes the job of the political leader who wants best to reflect the thinking of the

people and to assure the highest caliber of government. Can the Democratic Party in this State, for example—and I might say parenthetically that the Republican Party faces the same problem in other areas—can the Democratic Party in this State ever hope that whenever it nominates the best qualified person for State office the majority—or even a reasonable minority—of the press will support that candidate? Experience says no.

I tell you, my friends, if this situation continues to prevail, political parties throughout the country will be forced to select candidates solely on the results of screen tests and on the basis of personality, rather than by evaluation of ability and beliefs.

They will have to rely on the talents of the candidates for projecting themselves through the medium of television, rather than on their ability to project their views and philosophies through the medium of the press.

My good friends, just as we stand on the brink of despair, so too do we stand on the threshold of new wonder, of new glory, of new achievement.

The barometer for success in 1960 is what we Democrats are able to do in the Congress, in statehouses, and in city governments between now and 1960.

At the Democratic National Convention next year my personal position will be the same as it was in the New York State Democratic Convention in Buffalo last year—I'll try to carry out the wishes of the majority of our delegation. They do the bossing. I just try to do what they want done.

However, I feel that when it comes to selecting a Democratic Presidential candidate the country's interest transcends that of the party. It isn't enough just to pick a man who can win—we should know that he will make a good President, that he will be a great and successful leader for America. If the Democrats don't face up to this high issue squarely, they're not keeping faith with our Nation. As a political candidate the present White House incumbent was quite a success. He did well at vote-getting. And nobody doubts his sincerity. But in meeting the rigid demands of these parlous times for truly great leadership, with force, courage, vision, and firmness, that's been quite another story.

I am sure our New York delegation will be ready to make a vigorous fight at next year's national convention, for the nomination of not just a good vote-getter, but a man who can be the great President and great leader America and the free world needs in these most dangerously critical times our country has ever faced.

For, just as the space age threatens to be an age of destruction—so, too, does it promise to be an age of new creation.

Which of these it shall be depends entirely upon the decisions which are to be made during the next few years. It is perfectly true—and it has been true through the ages—that the people need only to be armed with the facts to give expression to their inherent sense of goodness.

And this poses for you—you who are gathered here in this room today—as it poses for every political leader, for every labor leader, for every business leader, for every spiritual leader, for every teacher and scientist in America—but particularly for you—this poses a responsibility of great immensity.

The people read you. They are influenced by you. They accept you as authority. They look to you for objective guidance, for accurate portrayal and for honest leadership.

I submit that the responsible spokesmen for both parties want to work with you and to be guided by you. They want you to help them—through government—to fulfill

the wishes, the needs, the hopes, the aspirations, and the prayers of the people.

Do not damn us because we are of a different political faith. And do not praise us merely because we are of your political faith. But, rather, work with us toward the realization of a universal faith. Build with us and serve with us—and let us build and serve with you—in the cause of human justice and with the dream of a better world.

Thank you very much.

Poison in Your Water—No. 9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Providence (R.I.) Journal on June 27, 1958, telling of dumping of raw sewage and other waste into Narragansett Bay. I am satisfied that this article is another good reason why the full \$50 million authorized in Public Law 660 for grants for sewage abatement works to States and municipalities should be continued and carried on.

The article follows:

WOONSOCKET CONTINUES TO POLLUTE
NARRAGANSETT BAY

If the city of Woonsocket does not undertake soon to cooperate in the antipollution drive on Narragansett Bay, the State ought to use its authority to act in the city's name and charge the bill to the city's account.

In a recent report to Rhode Island on the progress of the clean-waters campaign, the Pollution Information Committee identified Woonsocket as the worst remaining source of pollution in the State. Providence, the greatest of the "Faltering Few," the committee said has just graduated to cleanliness.

But Woonsocket continues to offend today just as it has for the past 11 years, ever since the antipollution program was adopted. The northern city, the committee charges, is the only sizable community in the State that is dumping sewage, breaking the laws, and doing nothing about the grave situation.

The saddest thing about the committee's findings is that the size of the problem has been known for years in Woonsocket itself. A thoroughly inadequate sewage treatment plant cannot cope with the discharge from homes. Many industrial plants still discharge industrial wastes directly into the Blackstone River.

As recently as 1956 the question of sewage treatment improvements was discussed. But the city shelved the job of building a new sewage treatment plant on the grounds that other needs were more imperative and had to be met before it undertook to do its fair share toward cleaning up Narragansett Bay.

The city planning board proposes to give top priority to a new sewage treatment plant in the next series of capital improvement bond issues. There is no indication when the series will be submitted to voters, but about 2 years would pass between voter approval of a plant and operation of new treatment facilities.

As the information committee observes, there are no votes in sewage but a great deal of heavy spending. And really penurious taxpayers could argue that since the city wastes are sent along downstream from

Woonsocket, the city has no pressing responsibility to build a new plant and extend its services.

The argument would be shortsighted. There always is danger to a community from untreated sewage dumped in waters that pass through it. But there is an area of wider responsibility which Woonsocket is ducking; cleaning up the bay is the job of every community which contributes to the fouling of the waters.

How long does Woonsocket expect to escape the wrath of downriver and bay communities which have been spending heavily on antipollution only to have their efforts almost negated by the millions of gallons of raw wastes dumped daily into the Blackstone River to dirty the whole bay?

The State would win few friends in Woonsocket if it ordered a sewage treatment plant built and then collected costs from the city. But communities which have spent willingly to keep up their end in the antipollution drive would waste little sympathy on Woonsocket taxpayers.

Woonsocket enjoys a large measure of home rule under its new charter. But with the privileges and rights of home rule go responsibilities to the State and sister communities. If Woonsocket won't meet them, the State must see that it does.

The Townsend Plan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, for many years legislation embodying the principles of the Townsend plan "pay-as-you-go social security for all" has been before Congress. In the 85th Congress I joined with Representative BURDICK, of North Dakota in sponsoring the Townsend plan bill.

I have introduced H.R. 4000, which is identical with the Townsend plan bill I sponsored in the 85th Congress, and which differs from other bills embodying the Townsend plan, in former years, only in terms of legislative form and in respect to technical construction. It does not differ in respect to any basic principle, objective, or standard. The gentleman from California [Mr. GUSSEN] has introduced a companion measure, H.R. 4001.

The 1959 Townsend plan bill is specially drafted as an amendment to the Social Security Act, repealing or suspending, as the applicable case may be, the various provisions of old-age and survivors and Federal disability insurance and instituting in place thereof the Townsend plan program under title II of the act.

Under this bill, a smooth transition from the present system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance is provided for. No persons entitled to or receiving benefits under the present system will lose a penny of those benefits—because benefits under the 1959 Townsend plan bill will overlap those of the present system until all benefits under the present system are totally ab-

sorbed by the benefits under this bill. To the extent that some benefits paid under the present system exceed those initially provided for under my bill, the difference will be paid from the reserve funds of the old-age, survivors, and disability system.

Within 2 years, after the effective date of this Townsend plan program, it will have totally absorbed all benefit obligations of the present system.

This smooth, equitable transition is provided for by these provisions: Six months after its enactment the gross income—gross receipts—tax, upon which H.R. 4000 is based, will go into effect at the rate of 1 percent for a period of 6 months. Then, it will be advanced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each succeeding calendar quarter until it reaches the full tax rate of 2 percent. It will reach this rate of 2 percent as of the 16th month after its effective date.

The initial benefits financed under the 1 percent tax rate will be approximately equal to the average primary benefit paid under the present system—so that, right from the start, present benefits up to the amount of average primary benefits will be absorbed by the Townsend plan program. Then, as the tax rate advances quarter by quarter, benefits will proportionately advance to a level estimated at between \$130 and \$150 per month.

Thus, virtually every possible benefit-liability of the present system, under title II, will be smoothly absorbed by the Townsend plan program. If there prove to be some few beneficiaries entitled under the present system, who do not qualify for some unforeseeable technical reasons under the Townsend plan program—they are certainly provided for many times over by the approximately \$23 billion reserve funds of the present system. Under my bill, nobody will lose any benefit—and in a short time all will receive better benefits than the present system will afford them. At the same time, once full benefits have been achieved under my bill, we will no longer have people trying to live on benefits capable of affording them nothing better than severe poverty. My bill will really solve the social security problem.

The problem of providing for equitable and smooth transition from the present program has been one of the foremost obstacles in Congress to adoption of the Townsend plan. This bill completely removes this obstacle.

The 1959 Townsend plan bill specifically defines its objectives. It provides that each year the Department of Commerce, under its Census Bureau work of annually surveying the distribution of money income, in the U.S. population, will report to Congress each year, specifically, what rate of the gross income tax would have been necessary during the preceding year, under the program, in order for the overall income of the aged population to have compared favorably with that of the younger, adult population. This feature is designed to create a situation whereunder the Congress—and everybody else—will henceforth know, as a matter of clear record, exactly

what the relative position of the aged is economically.

This feature is designed to provide each year a defined basis on which everybody can henceforth deal with the primary problem of just how much pensions should justly be in the light of authentic facts. Up to now, this question of exactly how much pensions really ought to be has not been officially dealt with. The Townsend program is fundamentally predicated upon exactly that study and approach to the whole problem. My bill provides, in the Social Security Act, the legal requirement that this question be authentically reported on each year, to Congress by the Department of Commerce.

Now, there have always been a long list of arguments—in principle, academic arguments—about the workability of the gross income tax on which the Townsend plan is based. This bill provides, in its definition of gross income, the conclusive end to this whole field of confusion due to these purely theoretical and academic arguments, as well as an end to the waste of time and effort in dealing with such unrealistic claims and counterclaims, in a very simple way. Since 1933, a genuine gross income tax has been operating with unchallenged efficiency and practicality in the State of Indiana. Correcting jurisdictional references, the precise text of the definition of gross income contained in the Indiana State gross income tax act of 1933, as amended up to, and including, 1953, is incorporated in the 1959 Townsend plan bill.

It is specifically to be noted that this does not constitute any change in principle or departure in policy by the Townsend organization. The tax proposed in the Townsend bill has traditionally been exactly what is now proposed. However, there have always been those, in and out of Congress, who insisted persistently that the Indiana tax really was not the same, was in reality quite different from the Townsend proposal. This specious argument stands abolished since the 1959 Townsend plan bill contains precisely the same definition of gross income as the Indiana law.

The 1959 Townsend bill provides for old-age retirement at the age of 60 years; for full benefits to persons disabled between ages 18 through 59; for full benefits for female heads of family groups with one or more dependent, minor children; and for proportionate benefits of one-third of the full benefit rate for such dependent children under 18. This last is new coverage.

H.R. 4000 does not require complete and outright, all-or-nothing retirement by beneficiaries, but encourages their participation in the Nation's productivity. At the same time, it provides a deterrent sufficient to prevent pensioners from selling their services so cheaply as to constitute unfair competition with other work-seekers. The provision is that above the amount of \$75 per month, adult beneficiaries would lose \$1 of their benefit for each full \$2 earned in employment or self-employment. For the secondary beneficiaries, the children, they, too, would lose \$1 for each full \$2

per month earned in excess of \$50 in employment or self-employment.

When accorded serious study, the above provisions will be seen—not only as providing reasonable inducement to beneficiaries to supplement their benefits by appropriate participation in the labor force without risking frustrating reductions in their benefits—but, also, as aiding greatly in enabling workers to "ease" into retirement over a period of time and in the rehabilitation of the disabled and "easing" them back into full occupation over a period of time.

The 1958 Townsend bill requires that any person over 18 years of age must have resided in the United States for a total of not less than 10 years in order to qualify for benefits. The reasons for this provision are manifold; but, suffice it to say that very rare would be the citizen of the United States who would not have satisfied this requirement before his childhood was over. At the same time, this requirement, imposed on our own citizens, will abridge the difficulties involved in treaties we have with various nations reciprocally agreeing that we treat each others' nationals exactly as we treat our own citizens; and it will conclusively bar persons from becoming simply retirement emigres to the United States, since all will have to have been here long enough to support the system quite substantially before becoming eligible to draw its benefits.

The bill exempts persons under 18 from this residence requirement even if the adults upon whom they depend may be barred by this residence requirement.

THE NEED FOR TOWNSEND PLAN LEGISLATION

The need for this type of legislation is embodied, first, in the fact that we have a Social Security Act, in the first place. This means that in 1935 Congress recognized the social security problem to such a degree that the act was adopted. This realization extended to the level of the problem being recognized as, in principle at least, a national, not a local or regional problem—a problem requiring Federal legislative action. This legislative action, itself, certified the ruling conviction that privately the problem could not be handled. Legislating the entirely Federal program embodied in old age and survivors insurance recognized that the problem was beyond the capabilities of local and even of State governmental scope. The subsequent actions by Congress after 1935—up to and including 1958—certify unanswerably that this conviction as to the solid, national nature of the problem has continuously solidified and strengthened.

When it is all summed up, the truth is this: We have a social security problem simply because the great majority of the Americans reach old age only to find themselves lacking the financial ability to command income and living standards reasonably comparable to the general standards of living prevailing around them. The present system of old age, survivors, and disability insurance has done good as far as it has gone, or could go. However, in recent years it has become clearly evident that the present system is not altering the above stated reason for our having a social security

program, in the first place. All we have done has been to prevent the originally deplorable economic position of our aged from becoming still worse. Since the end of World War II, we have not bettered the comparative economic position of our senior citizens. As a group, their income share has remained unchanged while their comparative numbers have increased over three times as rapidly as any other part of our adult population. In fact, in the overall, despite all our efforts under the present system, the comparative income position of our elderly people remains a continually declining one. I repeat, the present program is good—as far as it goes—but, far from solving the social security problem, it continues actually failing to prevent the problem from getting slowly worse.

The bill I have introduced today is squarely based on the belief that the Americans desire and should by all means enjoy economic sufficiency and independence as the final result of life. Obviously, if they are ever going to achieve this result, we have no alternative than an entirely new approach to the problem. That new approach is the substance of the bill I have introduced.

Let us look at the facts about the economic position of our elderly people. In February 1954, the Social Security Bulletin carried an article by Jacob Fisher of the Social Security Administration's Division of Research and Statistics, namely, "Postwar Changes in the Income Position of the Aged." This report shows the population aged 65 and over increased 17 percent from 1947 through 1952—while the total population aged 14 and over increased only 5 percent—but their share of total personal income increased from 7 percent in 1947 to only 8 percent in 1952.

Analysis of Census Bureau data shows the share of the elderly to have been 7.3 percent in 1953, 7.7 percent in 1954, 7.9 percent in 1955, 7.6 percent in 1956, and 7.4 percent in 1957. By 1957, the aged population increased 36.9 percent over the 1947 number, while the total population 14 and over, including the aged, increased only 11.5 percent. Thus, the comparative income position of the average aged person declined, seriously, from the admittedly unjust levels of 1947 to an even more inferior level in 1956.

The increase of the aged as a part of our total population continues unabated, while their total share of income remains unchanging. This has taken place despite congressional action in 1950 increasing OASI benefits by 70 percent and in spite of congressional actions each 2 years ever since. It has taken place despite the dramatic increase in private pension systems and the liberalization of just about every existing public and private retirement system, as well.

Since the end of World War II, OASI has not only failed to solve the social security problem; but, it has even failed to prevent it from getting worse.

Furthermore, a 1955 report from the Social Security Administration warns that to establish even so modest a minimum OASI benefit as \$75 a month would

entail payroll tax rates so high as to endanger public support and acceptance of its contributory principle. This conclusion has repeatedly been urged by this same authority in the discussion of benefit increases ever since.

The facts clearly place before us the unavoidable conclusion that we do not yet have anything resembling a Federal social security program capable of affording the American people the kind of social security they richly deserve. It is in the light of these facts that I have introduced today H.R. 4000 which is designed specifically to provide such a completely desirable social security program under title II of the Social Security Act.

Our ever-increasing ability to produce goods and services dictates that we must keep buying power amongst our population abreast of our ability to produce or suffer again and again the losses in wealth and human welfare so recently experienced because of business recession. It has become more than clear to me that unless we stop destruction of the average American's buying power upon his reaching old age, we can never do this. It is what OASI has clearly failed to do. It is exactly what H.R. 4000, the Townsend plan, will do.

Added to what we authentically know the American people can do privately for their retirement, Townsend plan benefits will end poverty and dependence in old age, establish the aged, as a group, on reasonable income parity with the rest of our adult population—thus amplifying buying power, the only way prosperously to absorb surpluses.

Therefore, the Townsend plan should be adopted immediately, in place of the present system of old-age and survivors and disability insurance.

HOW THE 1949 TOWNSEND PLAN BILL WILL WORK

On the first day of the sixth month beginning after the enactment of this bill, the program will go into effect. For the purposes of simplicity, let us assume that the effective date is January 1.

Then, as of January 1, the tax proposed in this bill will go into effect and the present payroll tax supporting old-age and survivors insurance and Federal disability insurance would cease. For the 6-month period—January through June—the gross income tax will operate at the rate of 1 percent. For the 7th, 8th, and 9th months, the rate will be 1¼ percent; for the 10th, 11th, and 12th months 1½ percent; for the 13th, 14th, and 15th months 1¾ percent; and for the 16th and all succeeding months 2 percent.

Meanwhile, beginning with the seventh month—July—the revenue collected from the first month—January—less, specifically, administrative costs, will be distributed as benefits to the qualified beneficiaries. The amount of benefits will be determined simply by dividing the available revenue—after administrative costs—by the number of primary beneficiaries plus the number of primary beneficiaries represented by the secondary beneficiaries—with each primary beneficiary receiving the resulting

sum and each secondary beneficiary receiving his appropriate fraction thereof.

As of the first of the eighth month the revenue from the second month would be so distributed; and, thereafter, as of the first of every month the revenue collected from the sixth preceding month would be so distributed as benefits.

Thus, as the tax rate matures and as beneficiaries qualify, the program will ease into full effect in between 1½ and 2 years of its effective date.

Statistical studies show that as of the 7th through the 12th month, the first benefits under this program would amount to between \$60 and \$70 per month. Then, based on the advancing tax rate described above, benefits would progressively increase to averages of twice that amount.

H.R. 4000 provides that benefits under old-age and survivors and disability insurance will continue to be paid to whatever extent they might be greater than benefits provided by the Townsend plan, and to whatever extent OASDI benefits so continue to be paid they shall be paid out of the OASDI reserve funds.

However, since the average benefit to retired workers under OASDI is less than \$70 a month—and since dependents' and survivors' benefits are but fractions of the workers' primary benefits—it is obvious that the greater part of present beneficiaries will almost immediately be absorbed under the Townsend plan. As this new program matures, under the full 2-percent rate of the gross income tax, there can be no doubt whatsoever that all benefits under the present program would be absorbed.

Nobody can seriously doubt that the \$23 billion reserves of the present system are far more than adequate to finance the benefit-load incumbent upon them under this bill during this period of transition to this new program.

Let me repeat, at no time will any beneficiary of the present system ever lose 1 penny of any benefit because of the adoption of H.R. 4000; and all will end up incomparably better off than they will ever be under the present system.

The benefit-coverage provided by H.R. 4000 certainly takes account of all who can possibly qualify under the present programs under title II of the Social Security Act; and it takes under its coverage those few elements still excluded under the present programs. It is, indeed, very hard to imagine persons who will be able to qualify under present programs who will not qualify under the Townsend plan. Whatever possible cases there may be are obviously so few and infrequent that they will not constitute anything of such magnitude as to be classed as a problem.

The Townsend program, once operating under the full support of the 2-percent rate of the gross income tax—as indicated by statistics on the population, the distribution of income, and the volume of business in the United States—will provide primary benefits of \$130 to \$150 a month. This level of benefits, under the coverage provided for in the Townsend bill, will involve a revenue of at least \$2.5 billion a month. The im-

mediate question becomes this: How can so large a number of beneficiaries at these benefit-levels be justified? In other words, the immediate question to be settled is that raised by those who are forever denouncing anything that is going to cost money. Obviously, this is a program the financial features of which really raise their dander. However, the answer is not difficult to set forth.

The first fact is a simple one: As of 1956, the group aged 65 and over lacked by just about one-half an equal share of income as compared with younger adults—aged 25 through 64. They endured this lack—about 20 percent of them having no income whatsoever from any source—despite all the programs presently in force under the social security system as it is, despite all other public and private programs, despite the expanded rates of savings and investment that recent times of unprecedented prosperity have afforded.

The answer is that less than the Townsend plan will not fill the gap, will not eliminate the economic inferiority of the aged. Less will not secure the future of the younger people from the fate of economic deterioration when they reach old age and so forth.

So, it comes down simply to this: Is the solution of the social security problem a beneficial thing to our society or not? If it is a beneficial thing to do, then it is worth the price. The Townsend program is simply the only one ever designed and put forth actually to eliminate, fully solve this problem. If the problem is ever to be solved in any other way than through the Townsend plan, it will have to be by providing the same standard of benefits for the same number and classes of people as are provided for under the 1959 Townsend plan bill. That is all there is to it, in reality. Either the problem is a valid one and should be solved, or it should not.

To those who say the financial magnitude of the problem has been overestimated, I say that economic sufficiency and independence should be the final reward in life for the people of the United States; that this requires two things: First, that retired people, retired in this context of social security benefits, be not subjected to an income level that involves poverty, insufficiency in terms of the actual, general standards of the times; and, second, that as an overall group retired people should enjoy an up-to-date share in income and living standards as compared to those enjoyed by younger adult people. Less than this constitutes inferiority, lack of freedom and independence, curtailment of the ability to participate fully in the social, economic life of the day—injustice, in short. The Townsend plan is calculated on the basis of those convictions and standards.

Now, if somebody feels, in their own view, that less than this is really an answer, let them state how much they believe should be the share of the aged. On this basis the whole matter can be settled; but, the burden of proof is theirs. The Townsend bill alone is based upon

the square question: How much should an old-age pension be? The Townsend bill provides the ways and means of providing that pension—whatever it should be.

Since it is self-evident that whatever the final decision of Congress turns out to be as to what an old-age pension ought to provide for, there still remains the unassailable truth—"It will require just as much money to be raised for just as many people under any other plan as under the Townsend plan." Therefore, the whole question reverts back to the primary one: Is the genuine solution of the social security problem desirable or not?

To those who feel that it is desirable, we present the Townsend plan, embodying the defined ways and means of solving it. To those who do not wish its solution we say: "It is time you frankly said so." This is the essence of H.R. 4000 the Townsend bill.

Off the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Lancaster (S.C.) News of February 2, 1959:

OFF THE RECORD

Termites is what the Detroit automobile manufacturers now have. Seventy-eight varieties of foreign cars are now chewing away at the foundations of American prosperity because sales figures and customer surveys indicated these little imports were just a fad, a bad dream that would go away when the 1959 models hit the market.

Detroit was satisfied that the average American wanted the biggest, fastest, fanciest chariot that could be built and that he would willingly place himself in bondage for 24 to 36 months to possess the latest model. America brought the motorcar to perfection and it was nonsense to assume that Americans would forego the prestige, comfort, and service facilities of the domestic creation in favor of half-pint imports of doubtful ancestry and long-distance servicing.

This was not the picture at the annual convention of the National Automobile Dealers Association in Chicago. There was a definite feeling there that Detroit had missed the boat. Last year 340,000 small foreign cars were sold in this country and the figure is expected to reach 550,000 this year.

The dealers do not like it. Their profit margin on the imports is low and, Detroit theory to the contrary, they can't look forward to any fat fees for repairs and service. As one dealer put it:

"The service and parts required per 1,000 miles by foreign cars is negligible compared to domestic cars. The reason is, in my opinion, because the foreign cars are smaller, simpler, and better balanced."

Now this is nothing less than treason. So were other reports heard by the dealers. Detroit's idea that only kids and sportscar fans would be interested in the imports did not stand up. The average buyer was 37

years old, fairly well off financially and the head of a household. Furthermore, a majority of the 10,000 foreign-car owners questioned said they would have preferred buying an American car if Detroit would build something of similar size, price, and quality.

An Appropriation for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER W. BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an appropriation bill of \$6,565,000 to replace wornout and obsolescent facilities at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn.

The bill provides money necessary to carry out the recommendations of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, which were contained in a report to Congress on May 2, 1953.

In its report, the board expressed its concern over the "continued existence and use of World War II wooden buildings for various activities of the Coast Guard Academy."

The board reported that immediate replacement of the outmoded structures would result in long-range savings by removing excessive maintenance costs and would eliminate hazardous occupancy.

Mr. Speaker, I think none of us needs to be reminded of the valuable and courageous contribution of the Coast Guard in times of war. They were in the thick of battle as an integral part of the Navy, sailing the same seas and running the same risks.

Nor have they been any less active in times of peace. In addition to patrolling our shores, they perform valuable rescue work, they keep open the sea lanes of the North Atlantic, and they are making water travel safe for surging motor and pleasure boat activities.

Yet if we do not provide sufficient funds, we will be striking at the very heart of the service—the Coast Guard Academy. This is where the new officers are trained; this is where the young service minds are shaped. We must not allow their welfare and training opportunities to deteriorate.

It is my sincere belief that as long as the United States recognizes the need for a Coast Guard, it has the obligation to maintain the service in a state of preparedness equal to the efforts made in behalf of the other armed services.

Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard Academy is only 19 miles from my home and I know it well. It is under excellent management and it has close and most cordial relations with the New London community.

I might add that the New London Chamber of Commerce recently made a special study of conditions at the Academy and concurred in the recommendations made by the Board of Visitors.

Undoubtedly many Members of the House recall that last year a sum of \$2 million was appropriated to replace the wooden cadet barracks. All friends of the Academy were gratified by this step forward. But, as the report indicates, much still remains to be done.

Therefore I have introduced a bill based on the report which would provide money for:

First. New barracks, new classroom and administration buildings for the officer indoctrination and candidate schools.

Second. Additional cadet classroom space to accommodate the increased enrollments.

Third. An auditorium for the Academy to replace the present wooden structure which the Board called a fire hazard and too small for corps purposes.

Fourth. Major repairs to the Academy docks and causeway that have badly deteriorated.

Fifth. The construction and improvement of other Academy structures that are presently inadequate, outmoded, and hazardous.

The cost of these improvements are based on estimates prepared by the Coast Guard Academy. I would like to point out here that the sum of \$6,565,000 does not include an estimate for the construction of officer candidate school facilities. I have specifically stated in the bill that part of the money be used for that purpose because the operation of the school is an integral part of the Academy.

The money will have to come out of other projects, upon which the estimate was based. So even this sum of \$6,565,000 may not be fully adequate to meet the entire need. Yet this is the very least we can do.

Mr. Speaker, since this sum was not included in the Treasury's budget for the fiscal year 1960, despite my pleas and those of others, I have introduced this bill in the earnest hope that the Appropriations Committee will take these pressing needs into consideration.

Although I realize that separate appropriation items are almost never reported to the floor of the House, I will be deeply grateful if this bill alerts the committee to what I believe to be a most urgent situation before it reports out the final Treasury appropriation bill now under consideration.

A Realistic Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address I delivered at the open forum of the New York Hotel Trades Council, AFL-CIO, Friday, January 30, 1959, in New York City. The address follows:

It is a pleasure and a privilege to discuss with you the problem of how we can provide decent housing for our people.

As with all big problems, it is not only degree which is important—that is, how much we can or should do about housing but also the approach—how we should go about it. In this respect I especially wish to congratulate you. Your approach here today has been most commendable. First, you have taken up the problem from the point of view of self-help. What can your own organization do about housing? Secondly, you have considered the question in terms of local government. And, finally, you have come to the question of what should the Federal Government do?

It seems to me that there is a great deal that the Federal Government can and must do in this field. This is through no fault of forward looking local agencies like the New York Housing Authority. Nor is it through lack of efforts by the unions to bring about better housing for their members. The plain fact is that the legitimate demands of our people for decent housing have exceeded the ability of commercial enterprise, labor organizations, and local government to satisfy those needs.

There is a variety of reasons for this. The biggest single factor is the growth of our population. It is expected that within the next decade, the population of the United States will increase by 25 million people. Within the next 20 years, approximately 56 million people will be added to our population. More than 1 million new families will be formed every year in the 1960's. Each of these families will seek and should have suitable housing. Fresh air, sunlight, adequate space for family living, modern appliances, recreational areas are fortunately no longer luxuries in 20th century America. They have come to be regarded as necessities, and rightly so.

In a country as large and as varied as the United States, it is obvious that the housing problem will take many different forms. Consequently, the programs upon which the Federal Government is embarked are equally varied. In much of the country—and especially in the large suburban areas—decent housing is best provided by encouraging home ownership. Through a series of acts passed in the 1930's Congress formulated programs of Government insurance and credit reserves designed to generate a flow of mortgage money at reasonable rates. The Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Authority, the Federal National Mortgage Association were all born of the great social and economic purposes of the New Deal. In one form or another those programs have been continued up to the present time. They have been expanded and additional programs like VA guaranteed loans have been created based on the same underlying principles.

What has this alphabet soup of housing accomplished? Let the figures speak for themselves. The FHA has insured mortgages on 4½ million homes. Of these, 2½ million were new construction. Twenty to thirty percent of the new homes built each year are facilitated by FHA insurance.

The VA has guaranteed home loans to almost 5 million veterans since 1944 alone.

The Federal National Mortgage Association, or Fannie May, has purchased mortgages amounting to almost \$6 billion and has thus increased the availability of mortgage credit to the homebuilder.

It is a source of enduring satisfaction to me that I had the opportunity to vote for every one of these programs. As I travel around the United States, I can see in the living conditions of our people what we have accomplished through FHA, the VA, Fannie May, and others. I shudder to think of the situation we would be in today without them.

Not only have these programs brought decent housing to our people, but they have transformed homebuilding from a craft to an industry which, since World War II alone, has contributed about \$140 billion to the national product.

And this has been done, amazingly enough, at little cost to the taxpayer. If we were today to liquidate all housing assets held by the Government we would find that except in public housing and urban renewal, these programs have not only paid for themselves but have shown a profit. Long-term, low downpayment home financing has been demonstrated to be realistic, sound, and effective.

Remember the cries of Socialist and Bolshevik which we heard when the New Deal fought for decent housing? Yet, today not a single responsible leader of the housing or banking businesses would have the temerity to advocate repeal of most of the Federal housing programs. On the contrary, I think they would actually insist that the continued operation of the Federal housing programs are essential to the health of banking and the housing industry.

The argument today is rather over how much we can afford. I say that in the area of home loan guarantees and secondary market operations there is no limit on what we can provide for the simple reason that these programs have cost us nothing and, soundly administered, will continue to cost us nothing.

Legislation has already been introduced in the 86th Congress to raise FHA mortgage ceilings on sales housing and to reduce down payment requirements. It would also reduce the equity required of builders in rental housing, thus stimulating construction of rental units. Authority to increase the total of FHA guaranteed mortgages by \$8 billion for the next 2 fiscal years has also been proposed. This is sound legislation and I will wholeheartedly support its passage.

The enormous increase in home ownership under FHA and related programs has, however, been responsive to only part of the national housing problem. Special conditions which could not be handled under the National Housing Acts have necessitated special programs such as military housing, defense housing, cooperative housing, college housing, and public housing.

I should like to say a few words about the public housing program. Some of you will recall that the first public housing, consisting of about 22,000 dwelling units, was built by the old PWA back in 1934. Additional units were built under the United States Housing Authority which lapsed in 1940. The program was revised in 1949 and is now in effect but on a very modest scale.

The purpose of public housing is, of course, to provide decent low rental housing to those who could not otherwise afford it. Under the terms of the program, the Federal Government lends funds to locally established housing authorities for the construction of publicly owned projects. The Federal Government also pays the local authority an annual subsidy of the difference between the rent charged and the cost of carrying charges and operation.

I am aware that a number of serious problems have developed recently in the operation of public housing. Rundown projects and problem families have made public housing less attractive than it can be. I believe that it is up to local authorities to be more vigorous in maintaining the appearance and habitability of these projects.

The poor are still with us and their demands for decent housing must be met. In the budget which the President submitted he requested no new low-rent housing units but merely an extension of time for con-

tracting for units already authorized. An expanding nation cannot afford a holding operation on public housing. I believe that authorization for fiscal year 1960 should be increased by 27,500 units. I also believe that the frequently unrealistic maximum income limits for occupancy should be raised.

Of all the Federal programs, however, the one that has completely captured by imagination is urban renewal. I know the cities and their problems best. I was born into the city; I grew up in the midst of its crowded tenements, and I have lived and worked in the city all my life. Slums, overcrowded tenements, blighted areas have taken a heavy toll in human misery and degradation. Fine men, good citizens, have come from the slums, but so have more crime and disease than we should have. The cost, however, is not only in human values, it is also in dollars and cents.

In a typical city the taxpayer pays an average of \$7 each year for services rendered in a blighted area. The area pays back only \$4.25 in taxes. In a good area the average cost per citizen is \$3.60, and the area pays back \$11.30.

Slums and blighted areas make the largest demands on the cities' services—hospital care, fire, police, welfare services. One city finds that 40 percent of its police calls, 40 percent of its relief funds, 30 percent of its city hospital expenses are used for 6 percent of its people—those living in blighted areas. With their financial structures already weakened by the movement of industry and taxpayers to the suburbs, and as a result of the increasing cost of services, the cities just can't afford the indefinitely continued existence of slums.

Under the urban renewal program which developed from the Housing Act of 1954, the local community is encouraged to formulate a workable program of urban redevelopment. This program must include sound local housing and health codes, a master plan for the community's development, and an analysis of neighborhoods and the treatment needed. It must include evidence of financial capacity to provide the necessary local contribution. It must also include plans for rehousing displaced families. Presented with a workable program the Federal Government will, on its part, make loans and grants to pay the bulk of the net cost for clearing slum areas or for replanning blighted areas for rehabilitation. In addition, special FHA mortgage insurance is made available to encourage private investment in rebuilding these areas.

The principles governing the urban renewal program are sound ones. Emphasis is placed upon the initiative of local government in bringing about a solution of its own community problems. Assistance given by the Federal Government is realistic and effective. But we must have more, not only of Federal aid but of local enthusiasm and initiative. Urban renewal presents what is perhaps the most difficult housing problem in America today. Costs are high. Rehousing displaced families often presents a real bottleneck to otherwise effective programs. However, the goal of clean, well-planned cities and decent homes for city dwellers is too exciting, too important to be frustrated by anything less than sheer impossibility.

I believe the program should be pushed as far and as fast as we possibly can.

The President has requested \$225 million a year for the next 6 years. In a period of high national income, I believe that the United States can and must do more to clean up its cities, to alleviate the misery of the slums and to provide decent city housing for our increasing population. I believe the annual appropriation requested by the President is inadequate and should be in-

creased to anywhere from \$350 million to \$600 million a year.

In housing, as in public works, in medical research, in industrial development, and social security this country will either advance and create a better life for its people, or it will stagnate and die. A nation's course in history is very much like a skier going up a steep slope. He keeps going up of he slides to the bottom; there is no standing still.

In the 36 years I have spent in the Congress of the United States, this country has made great progress in insuring better social and economic conditions for our people. The Nation has moved considerably from the place near the bottom of the hill where we were 50 years ago. I am convinced that the new 86th Congress will, in the field of housing, as in other areas, make it possible for this country to climb still further up the slope of our national aspirations.

Peorian and 11 Texas Brothers Making Career in Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1958, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON inserted into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extension of his remarks concerning the Ripowski family of Dayton, Tex. The Ripowski family is truly a remarkable group in that the 12 brothers of this lineage have seen active service in the Armed Forces. This is an outstanding example of sincere patriotism and of a family's supreme devotion to their country.

However, I have learned from Mr. George J. Marker of the Army Times that Senator JOHNSON may have overlooked another fine group of Texans who have a great deal to be proud of in that they are the 11 brothers of an exceptional Illinois boy whose enlistment enabled the family to equal the Ripowski record. Pfc. Jimmy L. Melton, whose wife continues to reside in my district while Jimmy serves in Korea, is one of 12 brothers currently serving in the Armed Forces, and, in addition, all intend to make a career of the service. Moreover, this family, which is originally from Missouri, will have accrued the amazing total of more than 250 years of service at the completion of the individual careers.

Mr. Marker is of the opinion that the Meltons offer a far superior record to the claim of being the Nation's First Family from the standpoint of service and in view of their multitudinous contributions to the Armed Forces. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following release from the Information Office of the 1st Cavalry Division dated January 22, 1959, which most certainly substantiates Mr. Marker's statement:

HEADQUARTERS, 1ST CAVALRY DIVISION, KOREA.—According to Pfc. Jimmy L. Melton, cook in Company A, 7th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division, when he and his brothers, all born

in Quilin, Mo., complete their military careers, they will have donated more than 250 years of service to their country.

He said 5 of the 12 are soldiers, 3 are in the Air Force and Navy each, 1 is a Marine, and together they have served in practically every country in the world. Each has participated in either the Korean war or World War II.

Pfc. Melton stated that the brothers have a family meeting as often as possible, "but there is always someone who can't make it." The last get-together was held for Robert, at the Melton's farm in Houston, Tex., in 1943, and "more than 100 people were present," he added.

Other than Jimmy, the only one overseas is Maj. John Melton in Germany, the oldest of the 12, who, according to Jimmy, was the first one of them to enter the service, enlisting in 1939. James T., Michael, and Robert J., all NCO's, make the family's representation in the Army complete, he reported.

The three brothers in the Air Force, Robert F., Bill, and William E., are each assigned to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex. Robert and Bill are master sergeants, and William holds the airman second class rank, said Jimmy.

Also assigned together are the three sailors, Marcus, Micus and Silus, who are stationed in San Diego, Calif. Marcus and Micus, twins, entered the Navy 8 years ago just a few days apart, said Jimmy, and since then have been assigned together several times.

The only marine of the 12 volunteers, according to Pfc. Melton, is Robert T., a corporal assigned to Camp Pendleton, Calif.

Jimmy, who was the last one to enlist, said that the brothers had no idea they would all enter the service until it was up to him and, "I hated to be the only civilian among us," he recalled.

At one time, reported Jimmy, when only 11 were in the service, each was assigned overseas. This was during the Korean war in 1952, and a few months later Jimmy enlisted in the Marines. He said he was then assigned with his brother in the 1st Marine Division near Pusan, Korea, where each was in the 7th Regiment but in different companies. Both were involved in heavy fighting and each received a Purple Heart, according to Melton.

Asked how the Meltons keep in touch, Jimmy replied, "It's pretty hard to keep up with each other, but we manage somehow. We try to write each other regularly, but usually there is at least one of them with whom I have lost contact because we move around so much."

Each of the brothers calls Texas his home State, with the exception of Jimmy, whose wife resides in Peoria, Ill. All of them grew up on the same farm in Quilin, Mo., and their mother, Mrs. Marybelle Melton, resides in St. Louis, Mo.

Abandoned Strip Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during my 10 years in Washington scores of colleagues have commented on the beauty of the fertile farmlands, the rolling hills, and the inspiring mountains of western and central Pennsylvania. You have been most generous in your praise of our natural attractions. You have also been very frank in calling attention to a mon-

umental blight on Nature's handiwork that is inescapable to travelers—the abandoned strip mines so prominent in our part of the country.

We who live there are not insensitive to these pockmarks on a fetching native landscape. You do not accept such conditions, no matter how close you may be to a situation, any more than you would tolerate a fault in your front yard or chipped plaster in your living room. When you are a conservationist, the abandoned strip mines are even more appalling.

Each time I pass one of these hideous excavations I think of the economic and cultural losses involved. I conceive its transformation into a recreational site—where spiritual and physical comfort awaits those with troubled mind and tired body. I visualize playgrounds for children who may otherwise be deprived of facilities to play ball, to skate, or merely to indulge in family walks and picnics. I think of the rich fields of grain and vegetables, of fruit trees, and berries, of grazing cattle that would grace these areas if reclamation were brought about.

Our people are disturbed about this violation of our countryside. They did not protest when the huge shovels and draglines were assigned to the mission of pawing deep into the earth to lay bare the soil that covered veins of needed coal, for the time was during World War II when all available fuel was required in the interest of national defense. But as the years pass by our patience becomes exhausted. In many cases human lives are involved, for those mines which have filled with water are an extreme hazard to young children who live in the vicinity.

It is time for action. Today I am introducing a bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior and a report to the Congress concerning strip-mining operations in the United States. The survey may include but need not be limited to such matters as the nature and extent of strip mining in the United States, the ownership of the land involved, the use if any that is now being made of such land, the effect of such mining operations with respect to safety and health from such operations, the effect of strip-mining operations upon highway programs, scenic features, fish and wildlife and other resources of the United States and the several States, and the public interest in and public benefits that may be realized from appropriate use and development of areas that have been subjected to strip-mining activities.

At this time I should like to include in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Perry E. Walper, chairman, conservation committee, Allegheny County Sportsmen's League, Inc., and the preliminary data for proposed reclamation which he has submitted to me. The letter and enclosure follow:

ALLEGHENY COUNTY
SPORTSMEN'S LEAGUE, INC.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., December 22, 1958.

Congressman JOHN SAYLOR,
DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: This is to request your participation in bipartisan sponsorship of Federal legislation to recover abandoned strip mined areas in Pennsyl-

vania. The enclosed brief explains the anticipated advantages to the Commonwealth.

As I am writing to you, a letter and brief are also being sent to Congressman THOMAS E. MORGAN. Similarly, Senators JOSEPH CLARK and HUGH SCOTT are being requested to introduce identical legislation in the Senate.

This is not a random request, but rather the result of intensive investigation by the league. Our contacts have included Fred Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation; Ross Leffler, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife; and Mr. Young, Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service.

Information from these authorities clearly indicates that new legislation would be necessary to accomplish the restoration. There is no provision for such work under existing law.

During World War II, in the interest of national defense, the Federal Government requested coal at any price and in disregard of Pennsylvania law. We won the war, but the abandoned strip mines created as a result, stand as mute evidence of values lost. Certainly there is a definite Federal responsibility in this restoration.

Large appropriations have been spent by the Federal Government for reclamation of lands in Western and Midwestern States. Here is the east, comparable benefits have been trivial. With our booming population, it is high time that the welfare of our eastern lands was considered for the future of our country.

The league's only concern in this matter is the accomplishment of restoration of abandoned strip lands. The Allegheny County Sportsmen's League, its officers and members, invite your investigation of our sincerity of purpose at any time.

For the benefit of our State, your cooperation and leadership is requested. It is our thinking that you and Mr. MORGAN can be of immeasurable service by collaboration, preparation, and presentation of an effective bill in the House of Representatives to accomplish this vital land restoration.

Of course, I am at your service at any time to further discuss this matter.

My best wishes for your success in the new Congress.

Very truly yours,

PERRY E. WALPER,
Chairman, Conservation Committee.

PRELIMINARY DATA FOR PROPOSED RECLAMATION OF STRIP MINED AREAS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Area: Best estimates obtainable from experienced strip mine operators indicate 70,000 to 100,000 acres of unreclaimed land resulting from operations since World War I and continuing to the Pennsylvania Act of 1945.

Exact nature, area, and ownership of lands could be determined only by survey. Lands subsequent to the act of 1945 are not considered in this proposal.

As the lands now are: They are minimal or nontax producing to the township and county concerned. This increases the taxation burden upon resident landowners, and deprives the Government of a taxable source of revenue. Many of the lands are held by the township for taxes, and hence produce nothing.

They are of no value or potential value in productivity of minerals or surface products. They are not now feasible for agriculture or reforestation. Pools of water, residual from past operations, are in the majority acid in character with some few exceptions. In their present state, such waters are detrimental if discharged into the streams of the Commonwealth. Present recreational values of the pools are nil. As a

hazard to people, there is ample proof of drownings resulting from falling over high walls or swimming in dangerous areas.

If reclaimed, these lands would provide: Ample employment to the coal mining industry through use of available machinery and manpower. The coal industry is presently in an economic slump and reclamation would provide definite employment in this critical period. Increased tax values to the areas in which located. Land productivity for reforestation, pasturage or farming of several types.

Anticipated objections: If the reclaimed lands were returned to true or reasonable contour, this would set a pattern for land restoration which would be in excess of present legal requirements in Pennsylvania. Strip mine operators could view this as a pattern which would become a requirement for the industry as a whole. Objections could be voiced against restoration of stripped lands which are in private ownership; that assurance of such a program could bring about land speculation.

Summary: Regardless of concerns of the strip mining industry, present Pennsylvania law¹ is inadequate to assure land restoration for reuse and taxation purposes. Good land restoration will become mandatory as land values continue to rise with increasing populations.

Whether lands would be in private or public ownership upon restoration is of little consequence since these lands would once again be tax producing as well as productive in surface products. Further, in many instances, pure waters would return to many Pennsylvania streams, as restoration covers sites of mine acid drainage and hence pollution.

¹The act of 1945, known as the Pennsylvania Bituminous Coal Open Pit Mining Conservation Act, calls for land restoration to this extent: That the operator shall place 3 feet of earth over the face of the exposed coal seam, round the tops of spoil piles, and plant grasses, trees or shrubs to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Mines. If these conditions are met, the bond is refunded to the operator following inspection and approval.

Address by Senator Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening, February 3, I was privileged to attend a dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at which the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, was presented with an award in recognition of his public service.

I think that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, ever mindful of the security of our country, could not have made a more appropriate and more deserving choice for this signal honor than Senator JOHNSON, who is also chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Senator JOHNSON's record in Congress is well known to all of us. He is a man of deep convictions, courage, and vision.

He is without question the most outstanding personality in Congress today and has filled the void of leadership existing in Washington, which leadership our Nation so sorely needs in these trying days in order to withstand the onslaught of Communist aggression. Senator JOHNSON did not hesitate to sponsor civil rights legislation such as he introduced recently, despite the criticism he knew he would have to face in his home State.

Mr. Speaker, in accepting the award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Senator JOHNSON delivered a most timely address dealing with the problems of national security as we face them today—an address which I believe every citizen will want to read. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert this address in order to bring it to the attention of all our colleagues and to the American people. It is as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATE DEMOCRATIC LEADER
LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C.,
FEBRUARY 3, 1959

FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, for this award—and for the honor of this occasion—I am most grateful to you. While your recognition is to my public service, this moment is one of deep personal meaning to me.

I accept this award in the sense of a representative of the million of Americans who have joined in a partnership to provide for the common defense.

This includes those who faced the enemy in combat.

This includes those who have produced the tools of preparedness.

THE THOUGHT OF PREPAREDNESS

This includes those who, like the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have banded together to keep alive the thought of preparedness in the hearts of our citizens.

The VFW is not just an organization founded upon memories of events which become nostalgic as we get farther from them. It is a vital force upon the American scene today.

For 22 years now—as a Member of the House and as a Member of the Senate—I have served in the Congress. Throughout that period I have served continuously on those committees charged with the most direct responsibility for our national security.

DECISION AND RESPONSIBILITY

National security—in these times—is complex. National strength is costly.

The burdens of decision and responsibility are trials.

But when these matters are approached in terms of individual human lives, the complexities become simple, the cost becomes cheap, and the trials cease to matter.

The question today has not changed since 1942.

Can freemen ask their sons to defend freedom with less than the best of weapons or less than the maximum of willing support wherever the line of battle may fall?

For myself—and, I am sure, for you—I say that the answer is forthright and simple, "No."

NO AREA OF COMPROMISE

On this, there is no area of compromise. There is no alternative. There are choices. Either this is to be our standard and the purpose of our efforts, or it is not.

In terms of principle it is simple. It is not simple in terms of application. Twenty years ago—when we were beginning to mo-

bilize for World War II—we used what weapons were needed to protect our freedom. Where we did not have those weapons on hand, we could afford to make substitutions. We handed our sons broom handles with signs attached to identify them as guns. We posted signs on old trucks and called them tanks. We simulated artillery with water pipes.

SUBSTITUTES FOR THE REAL THING

Those weapons that mattered so much to us in 1940 are basically obsolete, and even the broom handles are obsolete.

The demands of national security—and the change of our national position—no longer permit us the leisure of outfitting ourselves with substitutes for the real thing.

This is the first—and the greatest—single change in our concept of national security. Time is no longer our friend. Time is no longer on our side.

Security is no longer a point at which we may hope to arrive 1 year, 2 years, or 10 years hence. Security—in the modern world—is a condition we must maintain each hour of each day.

This underscores another matter of great importance.

CHANGES IN MILITARY CONCEPTS

Twenty years ago—in our period of mobilization against the threat afforded by the Axis Powers—you will recall the profound changes we were forced to undergo in our military concepts. At the beginning of mobilization, armored divisions and mechanized divisions were unheard of. Paratroops and dive-bombing and landing craft were unknown concepts. The most romantic branch of our services was the horse cavalry.

VICTORIES—THE PRODUCT OF CHANGE

Our victories in World War II were the product of changes we were forced to make in our thinking after the war in Europe had begun.

Today—and for so long as the Nation shall endure—we do not have and will not have that same margin of time.

THE EDGE OF CAPABILITY

For more than a decade, peace has been maintained because—as men such as Winston Churchill have pointed out—we of the United States have held a continuing edge in capabilities. What we often overlook is that American science gave us the lead in the nuclear age. This lead—won by the invention and creativeness of our minds—served the world as the greatest single deterrent to aggression. The fact that we had unquestioned leadership in this realm made it unnecessary to use atomic energy in any military form.

THE TIME OF DANGER

This demonstrates the point that needs making now. Our greatest time of danger in the world is at times of transition.

When we come to a phase in which old concepts are obsolete and new concepts are not yet perfected, there is where the danger lies.

SECURITY FOR THE FUTURE

If American science had not been the leader in bringing freemen to the atomic age, the cost of national security these past 15 years would have been prohibitive beyond our imagination. The parallel challenge of the opportunities of space is identical.

The weapons of the past are obsolete. The strategies of the past are obsolete. Along with this transition, we must face another fact of change.

ONE GOAL FOR AMERICA

We are working now in the Senate on the job that is foremost for the members of the legislative branch—getting the facts. We must have those facts to discharge our duties. It is my hope, though, that out of this can come the search for a new way and a

better way to bring together—rather than to keep apart—our joint pursuits of the same goal.

There is—and must be—only one goal for Americans: To provide our Nation with security and, through that strength, to be leaders for peace.

A TIME OF GREAT POTENTIAL

We have come to a time of great potential. Never has there been so great an opportunity for us as that opening now. If we move with vigor into the leadership of space, we shall turn those wild fields into the meadows of peace. The opportunity to achieve a creative peace is the opportunity before us now, and the challenge to our lives, our talents, our will. With this before us, let us so work that it shall never be said again that we did too little, too late.

Shelbyville Reservoir Will Serve Many Useful Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress legislation authorizing the Shelbyville Reservoir was passed and an appropriation of \$125,000 in planning moneys was approved by the Senate. But in the closing days of Congress the conference committee eliminated this project because the House conferees had not yet had an opportunity to consider this appropriation.

The construction of the Shelbyville Reservoir on the Kaskaskia River is needed to adequately carry out the plans of the Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers has recommended that two reservoirs be built on the Kaskaskia River, one at Shelbyville and the other at Carlyle. They have indicated that one reservoir is as necessary as the other since to build just one would only half-way do the job. Therefore, I am hopeful that the Congress will appropriate planning money for this project.

A reservoir built in this area will serve many purposes. In addition to providing flood control and providing adequate water supplies, it would also have many recreational features.

I have today received a letter from the Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs expressing their interest in this phase of the benefits derived from such a reservoir. They have also indicated other programs in which they are interested, and I am very pleased to include this letter as part of my remarks. The letter is as follows:

ILLINOIS FEDERATION
OF SPORTSMEN'S CLUBS,

Champaign, Ill., January 30, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been instructed to solicit your support of the following major projects our Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs is sponsoring for congressional action in 1959.

1. Des Plaines Wildlife Area: Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has introduced S. 747, a bill which directs the Administrator, General Services

Administration, to convey to the State of Illinois, without consideration, the area requested by our department of conservation, known as Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area. We believe this bill deserves support as this public land should be permanently maintained for public use and not sold for private use. In this heavily populated area of Illinois there is an acute shortage of recreational lands.

2. Shelbyville Reservoir: This second reservoir on the Kaskaskia River should be started immediately as it is supplemental to the Army engineer Kaskaskia project. It will serve not only flood control and navigation but will provide much needed recreational water for central Illinois. We believe it will serve a real economic need by developing new recreation business.

3. Indiana Dunes: We hope that Congress will set aside the unique Indiana Dunes area for the future recreation of a rapidly growing population in the immediate vicinity of the Dunes.

4. Hennepin Canal appropriation: We urge that Congress appropriate at least \$2 million for use by the Army engineers in making certain improvements on the Hennepin Canal so that this potential 100-mile recreational area can be turned over to the State of Illinois ready for public use.

Our 50,000 member sportsmen in Illinois will certainly appreciate any effort you extend to see these proposals forwarded.

Sincerely,

ROYAL B. MCCLELLAND,
Executive Secretary.

Can Rural Development Solve the Farm Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the magazine *Better Farming Methods* serves thousands of agricultural leaders throughout the Nation. Its influential readership includes many of the dedicated men and women who are advising our farm people day in and day out as they strive to produce food and fiber for a growing Nation and to improve their rural homes and communities.

In the January issue of this valuable magazine there appeared an article, "Can Rural Development Solve the Farm Problem?" This article is the clearest, most objective statement I have seen on the rural development program, which is having a growing impact in wide areas of the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this interesting and informative article for the RECORD:

CAN RURAL DEVELOPMENT SOLVE THE FARM PROBLEM?

(By Joseph C. Doherty)

Forty or fifty years from now when historians review the record of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, the present controversy over farm price support programs and other well-known issues may take second place in his championing of the rural development program as a fundamental solution to much of the farm problem.

Although only about 2 years old as a working program, and still on a pilot or demonstration basis, the rural develop-

ment program (or "resource development in rural areas," as some States call it) has already had considerable impact on the work and planning of many farm and non-farm groups.

Agricultural leaders—extension workers, vo-ag teachers, FHA credit advisers, SCS technicians, and others—are in the forefront of the new program. In counties and areas taking part, these leaders are meeting tough problems of organization and project development with energy and imagination.

The rural development program started in 1955 with three main goals: To help families with ability and interest in farming gain the necessary tools, land, and skills; to widen the range of off-farm jobs; to provide better educational opportunities, especially for young folks.

Backing up the Secretary's decision to launch the new program were some hard statistics that had sometimes been lost in the debate over rigid versus flexible price supports, and other big issues.

In 1949, the year on which statistics in the Secretary's report were based, one and one-half million farm families, about one-fourth, earned a thousand dollars or less in cash income. (This number is now down to about one million, somewhat less than one-fourth.)

Fifty-six percent of the Nation's farmers produce only about nine percent of marketed farm products; one-third of the income on all farms comes from non-farm sources—wages, pensions, etc.

As commercial family farmers improve their efficiency, the total number of farms continues to decline. According to U.S. Labor Department studies, there will be 15 percent fewer farmers and farm workers in the next decade. (However, professional and technical openings in agriculture and related industries will grow by leaps and bounds.)

THIRTY STATES PARTICIPATING

Thirty States are now utilizing the rural development approach in order to carry into action the three-point program. In each of these States, interagency committees have been formed to tie the work together.

A total of 102 pilot counties (including those in multicounty trade areas) were selected to get the program underway. They're located in almost all sections of the country.

Rural development is a complex program involving farm and nonfarm interests, Government agencies, and private groups. However, the core of the program is easily defined: Helping rural people, farmers, and townspeople, take a fresh look at where they stand, decide what they want to do about present conditions, and carry forward their plans.

Each county taking part in the work has formed a committee representing farm, business, civic and church leaders and other local citizens. Farm agency workers are either on the full rural development committee or have a separate group acting as advisors to the committee. In some places, health, education, welfare, and county government representatives are also on the agency advisory committee. Here you have the pilot county team: Local leaders plus agency workers.

To help land-grant colleges and universities and other agencies in the 30 States get the program under way, the U.S. Department of Agriculture makes special grants for the pilot work. Some 160 extension agents or specialists are at work on the program full time. FHA also strengthened its staff in a number of pilot counties. And SCS in 1957-58 contributed 58 extra man-years of professional time in 63 pilot counties.

This doesn't tell the whole story by any means. Other extension, SCS, and FHA personnel in these States work on the rural development program as part of their regular responsibilities. And many other agen-

cies—ASO committees; research services; vocational agriculture departments; health, education, forestry departments; employment agencies, and others are putting time and skills into the program.

In the pilot counties, nongovernment leaders and workers representing the above agencies have joined together in a long-range campaign to build a better balance between agriculture and industry. Developing farms able to compete in modern agriculture is a big objective.

A PLAN OF ACTION

Projects in these counties are no different from projects everywhere in rural areas. But there are more of them, more people involved, and in some cases, faster progress.

Most important, in the rural development counties, leaders try to tie everything into a long-range plan adapted to the practical resources at hand.

A few examples:

Reinforced extension staffs in many program areas are helping rural development committees plan and carry forward surveys of farm family living, natural resources, health conditions, education needs. A survey just completed in Florida's two pilot counties has totaled up the most complete picture ever assembled of rural living, natural resources, and improvement opportunities.

Extension and land-grant college specialists are helping strengthen rural industries. In Watauga County, N.C., they did much of the spadework on development of a 200-employee clothing plant.

Vo-ag teachers are working right alongside other agencies in the program, setting up special classes, helping with crop and marketing projects. Kentucky's vocational education department assigned eight instructors to farm and T and I (trades and industry) projects in that State's rural development program.

A fruit and vegetable market, first one in the county, went up in Bertie County, N.C. Local people contributed the \$40,000 it cost; rural development extension agents and committee members did the planning and organizing.

SCS has stepped up its work in program areas, mapping soils on farms; preparing conservation plans on small farms; advising in drainage, industrial zoning, and irrigation problems. In 1 South Carolina county 66 new farm conservation plans have resulted from the program.

In a Mississippi county, 350 families have improved their diets and general health through a joint health-extension RD project.

IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM

These few examples, from hundreds in the pilot counties, show the practical dollars-and-cents value of the rural development program.

More important, however, is its impact on the thinking of policymakers in and out of government, in short, how rural development will affect traditional ways of helping rural towns and small farms.

This is something intangible—hard to judge. But here are some of the probable effects, as seen by neutral observers in Washington and the States:

National and State leaders outside the field of agriculture now have a much better understanding of the important part played by nonfarm jobs in rural area prosperity.

Service and educational agencies in some States have begun to take a hard look at their own work, to see how they can help low-income rural people more effectively.

The trend in land-grant and other college programs toward technical assistance on area economic problems has been speeded up.

Work of citizen committees in the rural development program is stimulating more interest in developing improved cooperation between private individuals and agency workers to gain community goals.

Cooperative extension workers in all counties taking part in the program have had to step into many new fields. This is bound to have an effect on the long-term educational planning of this important agency.

Perhaps Secretary Benson summed it all up when he said recently, "Our educational and service programs, not only in agriculture but in other fields as well, must be adapted to help rural people take advantage of opportunities in an expanding economy which is rapidly changing the face of both rural and urban America."

A Better Understanding of Government Contract Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, there are many small companies throughout the country that do not understand the methods of dealing with Government agencies, and consequently, automatically exclude themselves from potentialities available toward expanding business.

Conversely, there are many of these companies which enter into contracts with the Government and are penalized because they do not fully comprehend the requirements of such contracts.

One of the most simple, and yet comprehensive, explanations which would provide direction to such companies was written by F. Trowbridge Vom Baur, General Counsel for the Navy. The article to which I refer follows:

HOW TO DEAL WITH THE NAVY IN THE FIELD OF BUSINESS LAW

Today one may tend to visualize the Navy in terms of fast aircraft carriers ranging the seas of the world, jet planes and atomic submarines. Silhouettes of gray-hulled ships at sea with guided missiles pointing to the sky may readily spring to one's mind. And rightly so.

But there is something else in the Navy. Standing as a solid logistic base behind these dramatic items of military hardware is the Navy's enormous industrial or business organization. The Navy's buying of ships, planes, ordnance, electronics, petroleum, construction, etc., now runs to some \$6 billion a year, requiring some 49,000 contracts above \$1,000 in Washington and another 20,000 in the field. The Navy disposes of vast amounts of surplus property. It manages a real estate establishment valued, on the basis of cost, in excess of \$12 billion, and which, for scope, activity, and variety of problems, might stir the imagination of any corporate executive. It runs a shipping organization (the Military Sea Transportation Service) some four times larger than any other shipping company in the previous history of the world. And it enters into a wide variety of other business transactions.

It is the purpose of this article to portray how a person outside the Government can deal with the legal aspects of this business side of the Navy.

THE GOVERNMENT IN ITS PROPRIETARY CAPACITY

Its proprietary capacity distinguished from its regulatory capacity

Members of a regulatory agency, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, for

the most part sit in a quasi-judicial capacity as an arm of Congress, having as their major purpose the determination of facts, the decision of questions of law, and the application of statutory mandates to particular cases and parties. They hold such proceedings, usually adversary in character, to those ends as may be necessary. They also promulgate regulations which have a far-reaching effect of a regulatory character.

The Navy is a very different organization. It is wholly within the executive branch of the Government and it operates rather than regulates. Its main purposes are to administer the laws of Congress that implement the constitutional provision, "To provide and maintain a Navy," and to carry out the orders of the President as Commander in Chief under article II of the Constitution.

In turn, much like a corporation, the functions of the business side of the Navy are divided into what might be called a Requirements or Consumption Division, and a Production Division. The Secretary of the Navy presides over this entire complex, and personally manages the Requirements Division with the assistance of the other members of the Secretariat, the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps. They decide what and how many ships, planes, guns, missiles, electronics, etc., are needed to provide for a naval defense. In turn, the Production Division of the Navy is run mainly by the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries with assistance from the Chief of Naval Materiel and the bureau chiefs, and with legal advice from the General Counsel. Their job is to see that the various items of military hardware needed by the Requirements Division are produced effectively, expeditiously, and economically.

In its proprietary capacity, the Navy acts much like any businessman or corporation. It makes the best deals for itself that it can, subject to the limitations of applicable constitutional and statutory provisions and within the limit of reasonableness which necessarily inheres in the standard of conduct of every governmental administrator. It deals with corporations and other business concerns, not in any paternalistic capacity, but at arm's length. The legal relationship which our Government establishes with its contractors is substantially the same as those which private contractors establish among themselves. But the Government is, nevertheless, in a preferred or superior position with regard to such things as the inapplicability to the sovereign of statutes of limitation and laches, the irrevocability of bids or offers made to the Government and the inapplicability of the doctrine of apparent authority to Government officials. In addition, Government contracts have certain distinct peculiarities which will be pointed out hereinafter. All in all, however, Corbin and Williston on Contracts, Williston on Sales, etc., are just as much standard guides for Navy lawyers in the contract field as they are for private practitioners representing business clients.

Strangely enough, however, these facts are not generally understood. There appears to be a disproportionately large number of contractors who actually come into the Navy Department, usually after their contracts get into trouble, stating an expectation that the Navy is going to take care of them; or that they were under the impression that the Navy has guaranteed them against loss. See *von Baur, Government Contracts; Small Business and the Law*, 43 A.B.A.J. 605 (1957). Recently one contractor unsuccessfully argued before the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, though this was not a Navy case, that he should not be assessed excess costs of procurement of the hardware on his contract (which had been terminated for default) on the ground that the Government should have determined appel-

lant's ability to perform before awarding the contracts. (*Interstate Box Co., ASBCA Nos. 4180, 4181, 4182, CCH Government Contracts Rep., par. 75,019 (1957).*) Instances of this kind reveal the serious misapprehensions and the lack of understanding which exist among contractors and even the bar generally as to the nature of the Government's dealings in its proprietary or business capacity.

Yet nothing should be more clearly established than that under the Constitution ours is a government of laws and that, under article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution, it is Congress—not officials in the executive branch of the Government—that has the power to dispose or authorize the disposition of Government property, including money. In general, the policy that Congress has expressed in authorizing the expenditure of Government moneys for the procurement of goods and services has been a policy, not of largesse, but of endeavoring to obtain value in exchange for money. Thus, in its proprietary capacity, under the applicable provisions of law, the Navy must protect itself; it must bargain at arm's length with business concerns; and contractors must protect themselves as if they were dealing with another business concern. A contractor cannot expect the Navy to hold its hand out like Santa Claus or a big brother with a large pocketbook, to possess an easy disposition or to have an unrestrained omnipotence for dispensing the taxpayers' moneys.

The crucial requirement of authorization

Ours being a government of laws and the requirement of congressional authority to dispose of Government property being absolute, the attitude which can be taken by the lawyer representing the Government in its proprietary capacity contrasts markedly with that of the private practitioner representing a business concern. The latter is apt to ask himself: What things can my client do without running afoul of some prohibition? The Government lawyer must approach his problems from the reverse position by asking himself: On what authority may I proceed? For, he represents an administrator or contracting officer who has only delegated powers and who lacks either the full powers of a natural person or the broad management authority of a corporate officer, the usual clients of the private practitioner. Thus, beginning with the Constitution itself, the requirement of authorization to act is always fundamental to the thinking and position of the Government lawyer.

The vital need for education in the field of Government contract law

It is no secret to us as lawyers that our system of law is undergoing constant growth and change. Perhaps its greatest initial period of growth was in the 13th century, in the time of Bracton, when there was, following the creation of the centralized courts in 1178 under Henry II and a great increase in litigation, a special development in the field of mercantile bonds, wills, and conveyances. Later there was the development of equity. In our own time—the last 75 years—we have witnessed in the field of administrative law what is perhaps one of the most spectacular developments that has ever taken place in the whole history of law. The legal profession should frankly face the facts that there is yet another field of law which is in the midst of boom, expansion, and change—the field of Government contract law—and that the legal profession, and indeed the Government itself, have been somewhat tardy and remiss in keeping up with it.

The principles of Government contract law go back to the last century at the time of the Civil War and an 1863 contract for the construction of the ETLAH, "an iron-clad steam battery." (See *McCord v. United States*, 9 Ct. Cl. 155, *aff'd sub nom., Chateau*

v. United States, 95 U.S. 61 (1873).) However, the field got its real start in life and became an area of major importance only with the beginning of World War II. In the Navy, for instance, certain bills were enacted by Congress shortly after the fall of France in June 1940, in reaction to the wave of shock which then suddenly struck the world. They provided for the construction of a two-ocean Navy, and companion bills, designed to expedite such construction, radically altered the course of the Government contract field, probably forever. These new laws introduced into the procurement field the requirements of speed and action on a grand scale, including an expansion of the concept of procurement by negotiation. As a result, there occurred an unprecedented development in the field of Government contract law.

Today, some 15 years later, ignorance of the field in many quarters is still disturbing. This ignorance exists among contractors and, to be very frank, in many quarters of the bar itself.

For one thing, it should be generally known as an elementary principle of law that a bid must be responsive to the invitation for bids in order to be considered. Yet every day the Navy receives a substantial number of bids which are simply not responsive. Under existing provisions of law these bids cannot be considered for award of a contract. The results from this elementary type of mistake in terms of thousands of dollars wasted in preparation of a single bid are startling.

Other types of instances testify similarly. Once a contract has been entered into, many contractor representatives will take action based upon communications with persons in the Government other than the contracting officer, and then express surprise when the contracting officer advises that the action taken was not authorized. Many contractors appear to have no real familiarity with the changes, default, and disputes clauses. And many claims are inadequately presented, both to contracting officers and to the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals.

Many contractors do not believe that they have to read their contracts with care to understand with that bell-like clarity the legal machinery thereby set up, or, indeed, even to read the contract, with its mass of printed matter, at all. Some, indeed, feel vaguely that they can somehow muddle through by playing things by ear and hoping for the best. Yet the printed provisions of Government contracts are all there for a purpose, and every sentence, virtually every word, has some legal significance.

Indeed, government contract law has now become a distinct legal subject with its own principles, structure and peculiarities, worthy of separate recognition by the legal profession, and worthy of day to day attention by practicing lawyers. Only through the bar, really, can such elementary principles as the need for responsive bids be made clear to clients, let alone the more complicated principles involved in the changes, default, disputes, and appeals clauses.

Finally, the mistakes which result from this ignorance of government contract law seriously interfere with and slow up Navy administration and cost the taxpayer money. They result in trouble, friction, claims, lawsuits with the Navy and in hurt feelings; and they disrupt that smooth performance of contracts and those good relations with contractors which are the earnest objectives of people in the Navy.

The need for a broad educational program in the field of government contract law is still fairly serious. The key to such an educational campaign appears to lie clearly in the area of better distribution of written materials in the field, plus a recognition of the need to read them. Just as contractors cannot become educated on the subject except through the bar, the bar in its turn can

only become educated through the availability of adequate written materials. And the Government must undoubtedly bear some burden of responsibility for making the written materials available.

The Navy has been trying to do something about this during the last decade. In 1949, "Navy Contract Law," written by lawyers in the Office of the General Counsel under the leadership of Hudson B. Cox, then General Counsel, was the first legal textbook to appear in the field. Although issued for internal Government use, a number of copies found their way into private hands, and the publication has been extensively cited in law reviews and other legal periodicals. Undoubtedly it has been of some help in making the principles of this new and fairly complex field more understandable to the private practitioner as well as to Government lawyers and administrators. The Office of the General Counsel is now revising "Navy Contract Law." At this writing, the manuscript of the revised version is virtually complete, and the publication should be available to the bar as well as to Government lawyers within 6 months through the Government Printing Office.

Most troublesome, perhaps, has been the lack of availability of the decisions of the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, which are undoubtedly the best single source of Government contract law as its principles are applied in the Department of Defense. Until recently only excerpts from selected decisions were printed by a commercial service, the "Government Contracts Reporter," published by the Commerce Clearing House. The decisions themselves were issued by the Board in mimeographed form, some 300 copies being distributed to selected recipients. Thus, while Government lawyers kept their own private files of these decisions and regarded them as primary sources of the most valuable kind, and a few corporations were also on the mailing list, the decisions were not generally known by or available to the bar and contractors. This state of affairs, it so happens, had long troubled the writer, and in a speech to the Wyoming Bar Association made back in September 1954, the general publication of these decisions was strongly advocated. That portion of the speech was later reprinted in the February 1955 issue of the Harvard Law School Bulletin; and finally arrangements were made in 1956 for the issuance of a new publication, "Contracts Appeals Decisions" (BCA), by the Commerce Clearing House. This loose-leaf service is coupled with the issuance every 6 months of a bound volume containing all the decisions of the ASBCA for the period, plus a useful topical index. Another good publication is Lupton, "Government Contracts Review."

In addition, the law reviews, with increasing tempo, have been picking up gradually the orphan stepchild of government contract law. Many of the articles have been outstanding and have gone far to assist with the needed educational campaign. See for example, Pasley, "The Interpretation of Government Contracts: A Plea for Better Understanding," 25 Fordham L. Rev. 211 (1956).

The lawyer who has a problem with the Government will find it to his advantage to be familiar with these publications before approaching officials of the Government.

DEALING WITH THE NAVY LAWYER

In order to deal with the Navy in the field of business law, the lawyer outside should know what the lawyer inside the Navy does, the scope of his responsibility, and how the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) is organized. In addition, the private practitioner should know that there are two law offices in the Navy, that of the General Counsel and that of the Judge Advocate General. The jurisdiction of OGC is that of business and commercial law, covering the great bulk

of the field of civil law. OGC represents the Navy in its capacity as a large industrial organization. JAG's jurisdiction includes military justice, military law and tort claims.

Comparability in approach to the private practitioner

From time to time I have heard stories about the Government lawyer being standoffish, uncooperative and noncommittal, if not sometimes downright hostile and disagreeable. Lawyers of those dispositions no doubt may be found in the Government and in private practice. But I can say that in my own experience the average Government lawyer is not like that, and certainly not in the Navy. We strive to avoid it.

The Office of the General Counsel for the Navy, first known as the Procurement Legal Division, was founded in 1941 by H. Struve Hensel, head of the division, and later the first General Counsel for the Navy. He had been trained in a large metropolitan law firm. In those early years of wartime, the office was staffed by lawyers who had come from leading law firms throughout the country and whose basic approach was that of the private practitioner. They could not quite see why their role as counsel for various Government administrators should prompt them to act very differently from the way they had acted at a time when representing clients outside the Government.

As a result, the standards of private practice have been maintained in OGC ever since. First, OGC lawyers follow the private law firm principle of group effort. That is, different lawyers work closely with different clients and give them, to the fullest extent practical, final on-the-spot legal advice, rather than expecting every legal decision to funnel through the head of the office or go through a multiple review procedure from the Navy lawyer originally faced with the problem up to the General Counsel and back down again.

Second, we obtain uniformity through personal relations rather than through regulations. As in a private law firm, the initiative is usually left to the subordinate to come to the superior when there is something the superior should know, or when help is needed. Personal relations are close and informal; and there is a constant striving to maintain that atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence which is such a striking efficiency measure in any organization. The result is that large areas of responsibility are given to every lawyer, including the young lawyers, and, as in a private law firm, each lawyer is loaded up with about as much as he can take. In turn, this gives each lawyer a chance to participate in a project as a whole from beginning to end, and so tends to give him a greater feeling of responsibility and personal satisfaction.

In addition, a Government lawyer should be courteous and cooperative; and OGC lawyers strive to afford to persons outside the Government the courtesy and cooperative spirit which are inherent in the traditions of the legal profession. While no OGC lawyer proposes to give away rights of the Government, OGC lawyers do work cooperatively with lawyers in private practice, helping them to meet their deadlines, as private practitioners representing different clients ordinarily work with each other.

Organization of the Office of the General Counsel

Implementing these principles of private law firm management, OGC is highly decentralized in its operations; and it is also integrated so as to provide uniformity in thinking and centralized control.

First, there is the central office which is OGC's highest echelon, the supervisory unit and administrative core. It contains the general counsel, two deputy general counsel,

and three assistants to the general counsel. There original legal work is done for the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, and the Office of Naval Materiel.

At the next level are the bureau counsel who are counsel for the various bureaus and offices of the Navy who have business law problems. There is a counsel for each of the following bureaus: Aeronautics, Naval Personnel, Ordnance, Ships, Supplies and Accounts, and Yards and Docks. In addition, there is a counsel for the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and a counsel for each of the following: the Comptroller of the Navy, the Military Petroleum Supply Agency, the Military Sea Transportation Service, and the Office of Naval Research.

Each bureau counsel with his staff handles the great bulk of all commercial legal work for the bureau or office. Help and guidance to the bureau counsel are provided from the central office. Top-level legal problems move upward to the central office, and the closest personal relations are maintained with the bureau counsel by the General Counsel, his two deputies, three assistants, and others in the central office. A so-called bureau counsel meeting is held every Thursday morning for 2 hours, where problems of common interest are discussed much as in a weekly meeting of a private law firm. The central office issues a bimonthly publication, the OGC Newsletter, to keep all lawyers in OGC abreast of current legal developments. In addition, the counsel for the Bureau of Yards and Docks issues a monthly newsletter to its field counsel, and the counsel for the Military Sea Transportation Service issues a similar weekly publication to its field lawyers.

Field counsel are stationed at 34 field offices. These lawyers are there to give, so far as is possible, final on-the-spot legal advice to their clients of a particular naval activity; and uniformity within OGC is again attained through personal relations. The great bulk of each field lawyer's legal problems are solved finally by him. But if he has a problem which should be passed on to higher levels or on which he wishes help, advice, or guidance, he has a direct line of communication to the particular supervisory bureau counsel or to the central office and the General Counsel. There are two OGC branch offices, in New York and in London, which report directly to the General Counsel. All other field counsel are under the immediate supervision of counsel for one of the following bureaus: Aeronautics, Supplies and Accounts, Yards and Docks, the Military Sea Transportation Service, or the Office of Naval Research.

The legal profession is built around essentially informal relationships, and no particular magic or protocol is required to deal with any OGC lawyer, whether in the central office, the office of the bureau counsel, or a field counsel. The various lawyers are listed at the various naval activities under either "Office of the General Counsel" or as "Counsel" for a particular activity. They can accordingly be reached either by letter or on the telephone, and they correspond directly with lawyers in private practice.

Finally, the field lawyers in a particular geographical area, such as a naval district, are loosely banded together under the leadership of a regional counsel. While the regional counsel does not provide another echelon of review over the work of the other field lawyers in a particular area, he is expected to provide inspiration, leadership, and coordination, and to keep the lawyers in a particular area working together as if they constituted a small law firm handling all business and commercial law problems arising there. He also serves as a focal point for requests from naval activities which do not have lawyers regularly assigned. Upon receiving such a request, he will either perform the legal work himself, or parcel it out

to the lawyer in the area best able to perform it. Thus, the private practitioner with a legal problem to take up with the Navy in Washington should consult the counsel for the bureau or office concerned, or the General Counsel, Deputy General Counsel or an assistant. With respect to activities in the field, he should consult the regional counsel or the nearest available field lawyer. A listing of all the field lawyers that includes their business addresses and telephone numbers can be obtained either from the nearest OGC lawyer or by writing to the Office of General Counsel, Department of the Navy.

What the Navy lawyer can do for the private practitioner

As has been said, the Navy lawyer is not out to give away the rights of the Government; not by any means. On the contrary, just as with the lawyer in private practice, he is out to represent the interests of his client in every reasonable and ethical way. He has a particular usefulness to the lawyer in private practice, however, for ordinarily he can tell the private practitioner in relatively few words what procedural steps are available to him in connection with any particular problem. However, the Government lawyer is subject to the statutory prohibition of the United States Code, title 18, section 283 that he must not assist in the prosecution of claims against the Government. The private practitioner should not expect the Government lawyer to do for him what he can easily do for himself.

MAJOR AREAS OF INTEREST TO THE PRIVATE PRACTITIONER

Bidding on or negotiating contracts

If a private practitioner is to understand this field, he must always be aware of the legal authority on which the Government lawyer and administrator are proceeding. Specifically, he should be familiar with the basic authority of the Armed Services Procurement Act contained in United States Code, title 10 sections 2301-2314. He may also have occasion to be familiar with the "Armed Services Procurement Regulation" (the "ASPR"), which implements the act; and, when the matter concerns the Navy, with the "Navy Procurement Directives," commonly called the NPD. While the ASPR provides guidelines on problems common to the three military departments, the NPD's, in effect, fill in the gaps for particular Navy problems. The Army and the Air Force have similar departmental publications called the "Army Procurement Procedures" and the "Air Force Procurement Instructions." All of these publications are available through the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Private practitioners should also have some familiarity with the types of contracts which the Government enters into. "Navy Contract Laws" contains an extended discussion of types of contracts and the reasons for their use. In addition, certain contract clauses are required by law in a Government contract, and these clauses are described in some detail in a chapter of "Navy Contract Law."

Contract administration

The administration of a Government contract of any size or complexity has now grown into a subject of such distinct importance that the phrase "contract administration" has virtually acquired a secondary meaning that relates to Government contracts. A great variety of legal questions may arise in connection with the administration of Government contracts. Most large contractors who do a regular and substantial business with the Government have experienced, gimlet-eyed staffs of lawyers continually watching their Government contracts. All too often, unfortunately, we have found contractors getting unnecessarily into trouble because a contractor, usually a smaller concern, did not consult a lawyer or

did not consult him early enough. Thus, the role of the private practitioner can be a very important one in the administration of a Government contract.

The first of the questions likely to arise in contract administration is that of the interpretation of the contract. Does the contract require the contractor to perform a particular item of work? Can he charge an additional sum for it under the changes and extras clause? Questions of the construction of a contract are legal questions. So here a private practitioner should consult, as Navy lawyers do, not only the books on contract interpretation and statutory construction, but also the decisions of the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals. Many of these decisions construe particular Government contract clauses. The chances are that by consulting these decisions you may find an authoritative interpretation of a clause that is also in your contract.

Next come questions on the important changes and extra clauses. As items procured have become more complex, it has become necessary for changes in design and specification to be made in the course of construction. Ever since the construction of the *Etah* in 1863, certain Navy contracts have authorized the contracting officer to make changes within the scope of the contract during its performance. The changes which can be made are confined to changes within the scope of the contract. It would not be right for a contracting officer by use of a change order to try to convert a contract for a hundred radio sets into a contract for the construction of an aircraft carrier. But under the applicable clause in general use, the contractor is required to proceed with performance no matter how many or what changes are made within the scope of the contract. This may well lead to additional financial, personnel, and technical burdens that will have to be carried by the contractor, and before he undertakes the contract at all, he should be prepared to carry those burdens. Also, if subsequently a dispute arises as to the amount of the equitable adjustment to be paid for as increased cost, the contractor may not be able to be fully paid for the cost of the change until he has processed his claim through the contracting officer and possibly also through the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals (ASBCA). And a lawyer should review the drafting of a contract amendment, if his client is to be protected.

Other questions which may come up in contract administration will arise under the inspection and guaranty clauses. All these questions are treated in some detail in "Navy Contract Law."

Contract termination

This is an area of crucial importance for the contractor, and an area where a lawyer with some knowledge of Government contract law is particularly needed. There are two kinds of termination under Government contracts: (1) termination for the convenience of the Government, in connection with which the Government agrees to pay costs reasonably incurred and profit for work done by the contractor; and (2) termination for default, with its requirement that the contractor must pay for any excess costs involved in reprocurring the article involved, with possible additional liability for liquidated damages and damages otherwise obtainable under common law principles. A contract may also be terminated with a no-cost settlement.

A termination for default may be an extremely serious thing for a contractor. However, a contractor who has failed to perform has one possible escape. Under the applicable contract provisions, a termination for default may be treated as a termination for convenience if a case of excusable delay can be made. Thus, if performance of the con-

tract is getting into trouble and the contractor thinks that he has a case of excusable delay, he, and preferably with his lawyer, should be in close communication with the contracting officer and his counsel so as to acquaint them with the facts in advance of a possible termination. This is a communication problem. If the contractor and his lawyer do not remain in sufficiently close communication with the contracting officer and acquaint him with the relevant facts, they may find that the contracting officer will terminate the contract for default because he is unaware of a case of excusable delay. Even though the ASBCA may eventually treat the termination for default as one of convenience, that result will be obtained only after having gone through a lawsuit.

Disputes

The crucial disputes clause provides that any question of fact arising under the contract will be determined by the contracting officer and that this determination will be final, except upon appeal to the Secretary or his delegate, which, in practical terms, is the ASBCA. Thus, of the two kinds of claims possible under Government contracts, those arising under the contract must, by virtue of the disputes clause, be presented to the contracting officer, and on appeal to the ASBCA. Claims for breach of contract may not be determined by the contracting officer or the ASBCA and can be allowed only by the Court of Claims, or, if for less than \$10,000, by an appropriate district court. The two kinds of claims are mutually exclusive: Claims arising under the contract can be determined only within the Department of Defense, and claims for breach of it can be determined only by tribunals outside the Department.

What of the presentation to the contracting officer of claims arising under the contract? If the claim is of any complexity, the assistance of a lawyer is essential. His presentation should be similar to the presentation of a comparable claim before any court or tribunal. All appropriate documents should be presented; affidavits are possible; and briefs may be useful.

Appeals

A contractor who is dissatisfied with a final decision of a contracting officer on a question of fact under the disputes clause may appeal within 30 days from receipt of the final decision to the ASBCA, the delegate of the Secretary of the Navy to hear the appeal. The ASBCA is an administrative tribunal. Its rules of practice are largely modeled on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Present revision of the rules of practice was formulated with the aid of an American Bar Association committee.

The proceedings before the ASBCA compare to trials in the courts vested with judicial power and to hearings before the major administrative tribunals outside the Department of Defense. Cases are tried through the classic question and answer method and the proving of documents.

Unless a case is a very simple one, lawyers are just as essential as in the trial of any other adversary proceedings. In a case of any complexity, a contractor without counsel will be badly hampered in the presentation of his claim. From the Government's standpoint, I can frankly say that much Government (and the taxpayers') time and money has been wasted because the Board was compelled to try to sort out the facts, items, and details of a claim presented without the preparation, the sharpening, the separation of the wheat from the chaff, and the organization of material provided by legal representation.

The procedure before the Board provides for the filing of a complaint and an answer, and certain interlocutory mechanics such as interrogatories, discovery, and pretrial hear-

ings. The Navy panel makes extensive use of pretrial hearings in an effort to expedite, shorten, and clarify the trial. Trial briefs are often requested, and briefs after trial are frequently submitted. It presently takes a contractor who will proceed expeditiously about 6 to 10 months from the time of filing the notice of appeal to obtain a decision from the Navy panel. A motion to advance a case may be made for good cause shown. But it should be made only if the contractor is prepared to proceed immediately and, in the opinion of the writer, is represented by counsel.

If you have a case involving a dispute, do not seek to bring pressure on the Board through a Senator or Congressman, or by harassing the Secretary, Under Secretary, or an Assistant Secretary of the Navy. These claims are legal in nature; they have been assigned for decision by the Board; and they can only be resolved by going through a legal proceeding before the Board. The Board makes its own decisions. The Secretary of the Navy does not tell it how to decide cases. It is a quasi-judicial tribunal which acts impartially. The best course for the contractor is to see that his case is presented to that tribunal in true, lawyerlike fashion.

Real estate matters

Legal matters relating to the Navy's real estate establishment are handled primarily by OGC lawyers in the Office of the Counsel for the Bureau of Yards and Docks in Washington and by lawyers serving field activities of the Bureau. The latter are stationed in the various naval districts as counsel for the district public works officer.

SUMMARY

The Office of the General Counsel represents the Navy in its capacity as a large industrial organization much as a law firm or legal department handles the affairs of a large corporation. While the Navy is larger than any corporation, the Office of the General Counsel is organized and managed as much like a metropolitan law firm as possible, and, indeed, with a high degree of similarity. Outside persons can by and large deal with OGC lawyers as they do with lawyers in private practice.

Government contract law, a large area of OGC's work, is still inadequately understood by the bar and the public, although OGC has taken such steps as it can to make essential written materials generally available. However, lawyers can only deal effectively with the Navy in the field of business law if they sufficiently understand the subject. And the bar generally should assist in furthering the education of the legal profession in this important field. A complete educational program is still needed.

It's up to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, is something that we as Members of Congress can take to heart and consider.

In this article Mr. Shuman points out our responsibility, and it is ours alone, to keep our country sound financially and to stem and halt the tide of inflation. We cannot pass the buck on this one.

In Mr. Shuman's words, "It's up to Congress":

[From Nation's Agriculture, February 1959]

IT'S UP TO CONGRESS

(By Charles B. Shuman)

A new year, a new session of Congress, new faces in the Congress, new promises—but many old, unsolved problems. Continued inflation, excessive Government spending, farm program failures, a ruthless labor monopoly and further concentration of power and authority in the national Government are a few problems that demand attention. Only Congress can initiate action to cope with these situations. Wise administrative decisions and recommendations as well as court decisions which recognize basic laws and the Constitution will be helpful. However, after all, it's up to Congress.

The Constitution of the United States wisely provides for the separation of the powers of the State—executive, legislative, and judicial. During recent administrations there has been a tendency to ignore these fundamental principles. The courts have tended to legislate and the President and his staff have often assumed legislative responsibilities.

Often the balance of power between the two parties has been such that it was easy for Congress to avoid the full responsibility for initiating legislation. This is no longer a valid excuse for Members of Congress to shift their responsibilities. The Democrats have a very substantial (two to one) majority—they control all committees in both the Senate and House—they can and should accept this opportunity to initiate legislative action to meet the serious problems that concern all citizens.

Farmers believe that inflation is our most serious economic problem. The dollar has lost more than one-half of its purchasing power during the last 18 years. We cannot check this inflation if the Federal Government continues to spend in excess of its income. The President is under constant pressure from the bureaucracy to maintain spending at high levels, and Members of Congress are tempted to turn to the Treasury for pet projects for their home districts. The reckless, inflationary spending of recent years must come to an end. This new Congress can and must take effective measures to regain control of Federal expenditures.

The voting delegates at the recent annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation took a good look at the farm program legislation that has brought so much trouble to agriculture during recent years. They reaffirmed our objective "• • • to create conditions which will make it possible for farmers to earn and get a high per family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and eliminate Government regulation of individual farming operations."

We believe that Members of Congress should have the same objective. They should recognize that surplus production is our most serious problem and that it is aggravated by present legislation. Most of the panaceas now proposed—such as production payments and multiple price schemes—would encourage inefficient and unneeded production, add to production costs, and increase Government intervention in the farmer's business.

Many Members of Congress have been very critical of the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Actually, legislative policy should not be the responsibility of any Cabinet officer. It's up to Congress. Farmers have a right to look to the agricultural committees of the House and Senate for sound, constructive action.

The concentration of economic power in labor unions has progressed to the point where it is a very dangerous monopoly threat to our Nation. The continued exer-

cise of such monopoly powers by any segment of our population—industry, labor, agriculture, or Government—weakens our competitive enterprise system and will finally destroy individual freedom. Congressional committees have thoroughly documented the need for legislative action.

It's up to Congress.

International Pancake Day Race at Liberal, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, in old England it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell to be shaven of their sins. In 1445 a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang, but she hurried off to the shivering carrying her griddle and pancakes with her. Thus an annual sporting event was born.

In Liberal, Kans., we heard of this 500-year-old event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church, and in 1950 the challenge was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, vicar of Olney. In the running of the first international pancake day race over identical courses, times of the winners in both Liberal and Olney were compared by transatlantic telephone.

Mrs. Breeding and I and the citizens of Liberal, Kans., cordially invite the Members of the 86th Congress to attend this world-famous celebration in Liberal, Kans., on February 10, 1959:

LIBERAL, KANS.—One of the strangest events in the realm of athletics will take place in Liberal, February 10, when housewives will run 415 yards through the main streets at 11:55 a.m. flipping pancakes in skillets in a traditional race with the housewives of Olney, England. In the 10th annual race, Liberal housewives will be trying to even the score. Olney leads 5 to 4.

It all started more than 500 years ago in England when on Shrove Tuesday, the day before lent, housewives used up accumulated cooking fats before fasting by baking pancakes. Legend has it that one day a housewife baking pancakes lost track of time until suddenly she heard the church bell ring, calling everyone to the shivering service in the church. In her haste she ran to the church, clad in her apron and with her skillet in hand, and this was the first pancake race.

Other women of Olney in following years, not to be outdone by their neighbors, got into the act. The one who beat the others to the church was kissed by the vicar, and the kiss came to be called the kiss of peace and is still the traditional prize for the winner of the pancake race here and in England.

Liberal got into the competition in 1950 after a picture of the Olney racers appeared in a magazine. Liberal Jaycees decided that their housewives might be just as fast on their feet as the Englishwomen. They dispatched a letter to the Vicar of Olney, who ramrods the race over there, challenging the English to an international race. Vicar Col-

lins quickly accepted and the race was on. Each year since then on Shrove Tuesday thousands of cheering spectators crowd the streets in each town to watch the apron-clad housewives flit and flip their way merrily down the village streets in this sporting gesture of international good will.

In spite of any temporary diplomatic differences between the United States and England, the race has always been carried out in a spirit of friendly competition and has remained a strong and permanent link of international friendship between the people of the two countries.

In Liberal the race course is over brick and asphalt streets. In Olney the setting is cobblestone streets, thatched-roofed cottages, and the old bull inn. Both races, according to age-old tradition, end at a church, where the kiss of peace is administered—in England by the church verger and in Kansas by the British Consul. The accompanying whirl of television cameras and the general hubbub of a major celebration are background additions to the traditional kiss, brought on by intense news coverage of the event.

Approximately a dozen housewives are in training now to recapture the trophy. Various methods of training are used, usually under husband's advice, most of the would-be contestants practice running in the later afternoons or evenings. And it is nothing to see a woman running round and round the block where she lives flipping her pancake in a skillet, cheered on by members of her family.

One more serious contestant in recent years would eat nothing for breakfast but a cereal guaranteed to give you the utmost in pep and energy, and would eat no fats for months before the race. Others give up chocolates and cigarettes or go for long daily walks to build up their wind.

The police were alerted one evening when rural residents saw a man in an automobile apparently trying to run down a woman on the road. As it turned out, she was practicing for the pancake race, in the lights of the car while her husband timed her efforts.

Athletic attire is prohibited in the race. Regular housewifely garb of housedresses, apron, headscarf, and oxfords or regular street shoes are required.

The best time ever turned in for the race was 1:05.1 by Mrs. Binnie Dick in 1955. She won the race here 3 consecutive years, and was international champion twice. After three local victories, a contestant is disqualified.

With a tradition of 500 years of racing behind them, Olney housewives jumped off to a quick lead, winning in 1950 and 1951. Liberal women soon caught on and won in 1952. Olney avenged their loss in 1953, but Liberal girls found the winning combination and swept the 1954, 1955, and 1956 races for a record string of consecutive victories, but lost again to Olney in 1957 and 1958.

Interest will run high in the February 10 event in both places. Liberal will be trying hard to even up the score. The whole town is pitching in with feverish excitement making ready for the day-long celebration which accompanies the event. Festivities here include a parade, beauty and amateur contests, dances, and parties honoring the visiting celebrities who crowd into the small town of 12,000 for the unique spectacle. Liberal, not normally well known for its athletics, will shine if pancake racing is ever added to the Olympics.

PANCAKE DAY SCHEDULE, LIBERAL, KANS., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1959

6:45 a.m.: All Civic Club breakfast.
9:30 a.m.: Pancake Day parade.
11:15 a.m.: Kids Pancake Day race.
11:55 a.m.: International Pancake Day race.

12:55 p.m.: Telephone call to Olney, England.

1:00 p.m.: Kiddies free matinee, Plaza.
1:30 p.m.: Five-State beauty contest.
4:30 p.m.: Sixth annual all-American Pancake Day race.
7:00 p.m.: Finals of amateur contest coronation of international and all-American race winners.

President's Approach on Agricultural Legislation Is Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the President's recommendations for new farm legislation, which were transmitted to the Congress today, make sense. We all know that the present price support and production control program is not working. The program has been costly to taxpayers; it has not helped the farmers who need help the most, the little fellow; and it has stimulated production of tremendous surpluses that will be a millstone around the neck of agriculture for a long time to come. The President offers solutions to the most pressing farm problems. I sincerely hope that his suggestions can be enacted into law during this session of the Congress.

It would take too long to discuss all the difficulties now faced by agriculture. Therefore, I am going to zero in on just one facet of the overall agricultural situation, the burdensome surpluses of farm products under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

At the end of November the Corporation's investment in commodity inventories amounted to about \$8.3 billion, which is not far under the record \$8.9 billion established in early 1956. The Department of Agriculture estimates that a new record investment of \$9.1 billion will be set by this coming July 1. And by July 1, 1960, the Department says, about \$10.5 billion could be tied up in commodity stocks.

At the end of this past November the Corporation's investment in price support—inventory stocks plus nonrecourse loans extended on price supported commodities—amounted to about \$8.3 billion. The record was \$8.9 billion, reached early in 1956. Now the Department of Agriculture estimates that a new record investment of \$9.1 billion will be set by this coming July 1. And by July 1, 1960, the Department says, about \$10.5 billion could be tied up in commodity surpluses.

Let us take a close look at the makeup of the November 1958 commodity stockpile.

In November the Commodity Credit Corporation had over \$6 billion tied up in four grains—wheat, corn, grain sorghums, and barley. The total for upland cotton was \$873 million. Tobacco accounted for another \$616 million. The investment in only six commodities,

therefore, was \$7.5 billion—or 91 percent of the total outlay.

Do not these figures support the President's contention that most of the price-support dollars are now being channeled to producers of a few crops? Not only do the dollars go to producers of a few crops, but they also go to big producers of the few supported crops. For example, for producers having allotments of 100 acres or more, net budgetary expenditures per farm for the present fiscal year are, for wheat, \$7,000 per farm; cotton, \$10,000; and rice, \$10,000. While all this was going on farmers producing unsupported commodities, such as cattle, hogs, poultry, fruits, vegetables, and many other essential farm products, have experienced growing markets rather than a buildup of stocks in warehouses.

There is enough wheat in this country right now to fill all available outlets at present price levels for 2 full years, with a carryover of about 300 million bushels left over as a start on the third year. The feed grain supply also is moving toward unmanageable levels. Crops of 1958 corn, grain sorghums, barley, and soybeans were all at record highs. Added to big carryovers, these 1958 crops meant record total supplies, both in volume and in supply per animal unit. The bulk of the surplus stocks are owned by the Government.

But, whether a surplus is in Government bins or in private hands, it puts pressure on market prices. And it costs money—large sums of money—to store farm products. At the present time storage costs are well in excess of a million dollars a day. There is always the danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage. That is especially true of such perishable products as butter and cheese.

The President's suggestions encompass two basic steps aimed at solving the surplus problem. First, his program would cut down surpluses which already have accumulated; and, second, it charts sound policies which will avoid building up new surpluses. The President's program is a sound program. I endorse it. I am sure that the Congress will endorse it.

Here It Belongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial "Here It Belongs" as it pertains to the National Air Museum in Colorado.

The editorial is as follows:

HERE IT BELONGS

The National Air Museum should be brought to Colorado, to be placed on Air Force Academy land or adjacent to it.

At the moment it is an orphan, housed in the Smithsonian Institution in Washing-

ton. What exhibits the Air Museum has on display must compete with all the other historical displays in the giant Smithsonian, a place where you could spend a couple of weeks without even glancing at everything.

But even worse, most of the Air Museum's exhibits are now in storage because the Smithsonian, where there is considerable competition for display space, hasn't room to show them.

The presence of an Air Museum at the Air Force Academy would do much more to inspire the cadets and teach them the traditions they are heirs to than some of the stunts tried at Colorado Springs to create tradition at the academy.

It would also give much more meaning to a visitor's tour of the academy.

Since the National Air Museum was created by Congress in 1946, many groups and individuals, including Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and the American Legion, have attempted to win for the museum a home of its own, without success.

Creation of separate facilities at Colorado Springs would serve the purpose even better than in Washington. Here the museum would receive the undivided attention it deserves; while in Washington it would still have to compete with the Smithsonian, as well as with the hundred other historical sights the Nation's Capital has to offer.

West Side Jewish Community Center, of Los Angeles, Offers Lesson in Community Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 5 years in the history of mankind is a brief span. But when 5 years span the lives of thousands of persons, each and every year becomes more important and valuable than the mere number of days they indicate.

I make this above observation because there is an organization in Los Angeles, Calif.—and I am more than pleased that the activities of this group take place in my district—which gives factual proof to this contention. The organization to which I refer is the West Side Jewish Community Center which, during its first 5 years of existence, has offered service and brought happiness to thousands of persons.

The record of the West Side Jewish Community Center is already an impressive one, and presages for the future the enriching of many more lives.

Mr. Speaker, I offer some facts and figures about the humanitarian undertakings of this organization, behind each of which is a human being, young or old.

Built at a cost of \$2 million, the West Side Jewish Community Center opened its doors on March 1, 1954, and now celebrating its fifth anniversary, the center proudly points out that it serves almost 7,000 members each year. The aggregate attendance has been approximately 2½ million, a figure equal to the

estimated population of the city of Los Angeles.

The center serves as a threshold to community life for many newcomers to Los Angeles, particularly young adults and is open to all members of the community. Inability to pay is no bar to membership, as budget plans are possible and several scholarship funds are available.

The significance of this undertaking is focused on the fact that persons of all ages are able to get together to learn from each other and to find a spirit of camaraderie in a highly populated, broadly-spread community.

Through the activities offered—in the fields of athletics, art, dancing, swimming, crafts, music, to mention a few—adults are afforded the opportunity to develop both professional and social skills. More than 700 children have learned to grow up in a new and ever-changing world through the guidance of a skilled nursery school; over 2,000 children have experienced the opportunity to go to camp sponsored by the center.

The community spirit of the West Side Jewish Community Center has been further demonstrated by its action of opening its facilities for meetings and events to other community groups including, among others, Community Chest, Girl Scouts, and Red Cross.

I am sure that there are many others who join me in congratulating the Center on its fifth anniversary and in wishing it all success in the years to come.

Next Question, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I know from conversations with a number of my colleagues on our side of the aisle that they have had numerous questions in their minds regarding President Eisenhower's true position on the matter of public revenues and Federal programs. To inform their innocence, or rather, as I was saying, to straighten out certain things in their minds, I present the following excerpt from the President's press conference yesterday before he left to shoot quail in Georgia:

Question. Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News: Mr. President, you said that you did not think the American people wanted higher taxes. You also said that you thought localities ought to do some of the things.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Question. Lisagor: Such as the airport. Governor Rockefeller, of New York, has found it necessary to move to get more taxes for what he regards as desirable programs.

Do you think the American people would be willing to accept tax increases from the State, rather than from the Federal Government? Do you think this is a better approach?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I do not know, because I don't know the rate of that taxa-

tion for these several States. This is what I was talking about.

The Federal rate of taxation and what I see as the American reluctance to accept higher rates, unless they can see that there is a clear emergency demanding now current action for which they can be persuaded to make the sacrifice, and I believe they will, if you have got an emergency thing. But now, let's remember we are planning for 20 years, 30 years, 40 years. We have got to live with this thing.

And as we know, as the population grows, we get more revenues, but we also get in some of these things very much higher costs. So let us not—when we remember that our taxes run from down to—we have got a \$600 exemption, and we run up to 92 percent, I believe it is, in the very top ones—I think that income taxes, which are the things that the Federal Government mainly lives on, that they are getting about as high as you can keep them on the indefinite basis.

Now, I believe you can, for emergency, tough problems, I think you can do more than that.

Question. Sterling F. Green, Associated Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(Whereupon, at 10:29 a.m., the press conference was concluded.)

History Repeats Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, a group of Southern Senators proposed a constitutional amendment that would give States exclusive power to decide whether their school systems should be integrated. It specifies that nothing in the Constitution shall be construed to deny the States the right to determine for themselves the manner in which their public educational facilities shall be administered. The apparent purpose of this is to maintain segregated schools, to discriminate among students because of color. Such a plan is undemocratic and completely contrary to the recognized duty of our States and the Federal Government, to provide education for our youth on an equal basis, free from bias or discrimination.

The prevailing opinion is that the proposed amendment is given no chance of getting the two-thirds majorities needed for approval, but we must not lose sight of the fact that it is one more attempt to allow discrimination and undemocratic practices to flourish.

Let us recall another time of internal crisis in our history. In 1861 the following amendment relating to slavery was proposed:

Article 13: No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State.

This proposed amendment to the Constitution failed of ratification by the States.

The amendments discussed are analogous in that both would place certain fundamental human rights in jeopardy; each would curtail the powers of Congress to uphold and preserve the national ideal; each would make it possible for the States wishing to do so, to inflict indignities upon certain of their citizens—which would be abhorrent to the United States considered as a whole; both would reflect unfavorably upon the Nation in that their motives are undemocratic and a violation of rights guaranteed under our Constitution.

States rights are important, of course, but our Founding Fathers and our wise leaders who have followed in their footsteps have recognized the necessity of curbing a State or several States when undemocratic action by a few would undermine or belittle our Nation. Congress must have the authority to create and to uphold the law of the land in order to protect the rights of all our citizens, when problems of national import are at stake.

The will of the people prevailed in 1861 when they refused to accept an undemocratic amendment to the Constitution, as it will today, in this latest attempt to deny certain inalienable rights.

Flying Farmers 1959 Aviation Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Flying Farmers of Prairie Farmers Land, one of the country's foremost organizations of this kind, recently held their aviation clinic at Purdue University. In past years these clinics have been most fruitful and have made many constructive suggestions for Federal laws in the field of aviation.

On many occasions I have participated in these clinics and although I was not able to attend this year, I was very much impressed by the resolutions passed by the clinic. Since many of the resolutions concern Federal laws, I feel that they should be called to the attention of my colleagues. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am including them to be printed as part of my remarks.

The resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS FOR 1959 CLINIC FLYING FARMERS OF PRAIRIE FARMER LAND, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, JANUARY 24, 1959

I

Be it resolved, That we hereby express our appreciation to our hosts, Purdue University, Purdue University Airport, Purdue Union, Bill Graham, and the Purdue University Extension Service, the Home Economics Department, and Purdue Glee Club for the use of their splendid facilities and the wholehearted cooperation of their personnel in making our annual Flying Farmer Clinic so pleasant; be it further

Resolved, That we express our thanks to the fine people from the Federal Aviation Agency, Weir Cook Airport, State aeronautics commission, Piper Aircraft Corp., War-

ren Martin and Air Transport Association, and all others who gave so freely of their time and talents in making our programs interesting and instructive; be it further

Resolved, That we the membership take this opportunity of expressing our thanks to our hard-working State and Prairie Farmer Land officers for their work in carrying on the activities of your organization.

II

Be it resolved, That we, the Flying Farmers of Prairie Farmer Land, take this opportunity of expressing our affection and thanks to our former leader and executive secretary, Bill Renshaw, now convalescing in sunny Texas. Be it further expressed that we hereby convey to him and his good wife our most sincere wishes for a speedy and complete recovery.

III

Be it resolved, That we appreciate the fine cooperation of the Illinois State Park System in the establishment of landing facilities at the several of the Illinois State parks; be it further

Resolved, That we encourage the park commission to implement airstrips at all State parks; and be it still further

Resolved, That we encourage district, State, and regional flying farmer meetings at such strips as well as individual use of such facilities.

IV

Be it resolved, That we support the Federal Aviation Agency and their representatives on their refusal to increase basic minimum VFR flight standards from the present 1,000 feet and 3 miles to the proposed 1,500 feet and 5 miles in U.S.A.; be it further

Resolved, That we heartily endorse this stand in the pending conference with ICAO (International Commission of Aviation Organizations).

V

Be it resolved, That we urge the creation of weather reporting substations, spaced to give a more adequate weather picture in the area currently reported by our weather reporting stations; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the implementation of the more recorded continuous weather broadcasts.

VI

Whereas we recognize and appreciate the excellent accomplishments of the Indiana and Illinois Aeronautics Commissions and directors. We hereby affirm our continued cooperation with these agencies and whereas we recognize: (1) That we are the heaviest class of property taxpayers in our respective States; (2) and that the continued development of aviation activities at the State level is necessary if air commerce and aircraft utility is to keep pace with the rapidly developing air age: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Indiana Legislature to look with favor upon the submitted budget request of the Indiana Aeronautics Commission in order that this important commission's activities will not be hampered; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor, the president of senate and house, members of the budget and aviation committees.

VII

Be it resolved, That we urge the Federal Aviation Agency to restudy the already established high density zones and to give very careful consideration, in consultation with all segments of aviation, before any further high density zones are established.

VIII

In view of the fact that the development of the aviation industry is dependent upon the increased utility of the airplane as a means of transportation; and as of this date, 60 percent of the incorporated towns in the

United States have no airports or landing facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge FAA to channel a much larger percentage of Federal airport aid toward development of the smaller airports; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the establishment of landing strips along all new and reconstructed Federal aid highways, to better serve the smaller towns, and at stated intervals in isolated areas.

IX

Be it resolved, That we wish to commend the Federal Aviation Agency for implementing the voluntary position reporting system of aircraft of VFR flights and that we strongly urge and encourage our members to cooperate in every way in giving and heeding these position reports; be it further

Resolved, That we feel a popular voluntary reporting system will produce much safer flying than an unpopular compulsory IFR system, as is being advocated by certain other segments of aviation.

X

Be it resolved, That we recommend to Congress that the hastily drawn, panic spawned, 1958 aviation law creating the Federal Aviation Agency be amended with the following changes in mind.

1. Define the powers of the administrator and confine his activities and control to air commerce and operation or navigation of aircraft thereof, within the limits of any Civil Airway as written in CAA Act of 1938.

2. Incorporate regulation and rulemaking in the hands of a board of three appointees with equal powers, and subject to approval by Congress, representing (a) military and defense, (b) air carriers and commerce, and general and private aviation.

3. Define the qualifications of the administrator safeguarding the interests of 90,000 general and private aircraft by specifying that the administrator must be a civilian and not actively identified with the military or defense organizations or their reserve components during the 5 years previous to his appointment.

4. Limit to 50 percent or less, the number of department heads which may be filled with retired or inactive military personnel.

5. Eliminate that part of the law which turns the FAA Agency over to the military in time of war. Civil administration has been adequate in previous wartime periods and there is no reason to believe it would be inadequate in the future.

XI

Be it resolved, That we commend the military and Air Defense Command for taking the lead in the use and research of high visibility paints in avoiding midair collisions. We look with favor on Federal Aviation's interest in this safety device where all aircraft carry some high visibility paint design; be it further

Resolved, That we favor further research on increasing the lasting quality of such paints and also research on most optimum paint design before any regulation becomes mandatory.

XII

Whereas the continued construction of high television, radio towers, and high-tension lines has increased the hazards to low flying aircraft; and

Whereas the majority of past midair collisions have occurred between aircraft operating on IFR flight plans in VFR conditions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in the interest of safety to some 90,000 general aviation aircraft and 36,000 military and air-carrier aircraft, that the so-called positive-control system recognize the following:

1. Control area floor be raised to 3,500 feet.

2. All aircraft operating below 10,000 feet shall be operated on a see and be seen basis, and at moderate speeds with or without VFR flight plans.

3. Under no circumstances shall aircraft be operated below 10,000 feet on IFR flight plans, when VFR conditions prevail. (Take-offs and landings excepted.)

XIII

Be it resolved, That we commend the Federal Aviation Agency for its part in its direct and indirect support of moderate weight and priced DME (distance measuring equipment) suitable for private aircraft, and operational on present Vortac system.

XIV

Be it resolved, That we urge the National Flying Farmers Association to furnish to the State chapters, on a monthly basis, current aviation news of a national scope as a means of assisting the chapter secretaries with aviation news of interest which may be used to supplement local and State news items in chapter newsletters, thereby keeping our membership better informed on general aviation.

Respectfully submitted by resolutions committee:

L. KENYON WYCKOFF,
Chairman.

VIRGIL JOYCE,
CARL HAGERTY,
JOSEPH KUENZEL,
DEAN SEARLS.

West Virginia Families Hang Onto Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my comments of yesterday concerning the series of articles appearing in the Charleston Gazette concerning the condition of West Virginia's coal industry are equally applicable to the article I would like to insert today.

These newspaper accounts are built around a tour recently made by my colleague [Mr. SLACK], of West Virginia's Sixth District, to distressed mining areas in southern West Virginia.

Once again, this article stresses the starvation point to which a great many West Virginians have reached in many areas. The picture is bleak, the atmosphere is heavy with human dread and anguish.

I feel that there are no Members of this House who would not be distraught if such conditions prevailed among their constituents in their respective districts.

I can appreciate that such conditions are not general throughout the Nation; but, the following insertion is concrete proof that West Virginia is, at present, sorely afflicted and in need of all the Federal advice and assistance it can get:

FAMILIES HANG ONTO LIFE

(By John G. Morgan)

HIGHCOAL.—The mine here was closed a year ago. That meant unemployment for 82 men, the last of a gradually-reduced force of about 500.

Closure spelled economic collapse for this mining camp in Boone County. A large number of deserted or demolished houses testify to the truth of that today.

But here and there in the remaining rows of gray houses caked with coal dust are families hanging onto life. A real estate company rents them the houses at \$16 a month. Among those still here are Melvin Smoot, 37, father of eight; Ernest Taylor, father of six; and Carl Harris, 39, father of seven.

Representative JOHN M. SLACK JR., West Virginia's new Congressman from the Sixth District, entered the house of each of the men and talked to them and their wives.

He sought information that might be helpful in backing a legislative program for relief of unemployed miners.

Smoot, a shuttle car operator until he lost his job December 31, 1957, said he hadn't paid his rent since last July nor his electric bill within the last four months.

His monthly ration of surplus commodities includes 30 pounds of flour, 5 pounds of cheese, 5 pounds of butter, 10 pounds of rice and a small quantity of meal.

"They charge 50 cents if we've got it," he said in reference to the surplus food. The money is used to help pay the cost of local distribution by authorized agents of the State.

By the third week in each month, some types of the allotted food supplies usually are exhausted, he said. If the supplies could be doubled the family would have enough, he added.

Three of the Smoot children are of school age. One attends Sherman High School and the other two go to a grade school in Whitesville. The grade school children get free hot lunches. All of the children are in need of clothes, especially shoes.

Smoot said he went to Cincinnati once to see about a job. A friend was successful in getting one there and is trying to look out for him.

He owns no automobile. His TV set broke down last Christmas.

Asked for his opinion on who should cure the unemployment situation, Smoot said:

"I hope that last bunch they put in there will do something."

He said "bunch" meant legislators in Washington and Charleston.

Taylor, who found work at a small punch mine operation in Greenbrier County from last August to December, is 3 months behind on his rent and only 1 month on his electric bill.

He owns a 1951 Buick, although it has been parked for the past 3 weeks. His TV set has been out of commission about a week, but he has a radio.

"We have about enough of everything to eat, except butter," said Mrs. Taylor, who recently recovered from an illness of a month.

Taylor said the six children are at home and indicated that others had married or found employment elsewhere. His 19-year-old son, Junior, is an amateur boxer.

The Harris home is a religious one. There are four pictures of Jesus on the living-room wall. Mrs. Harris said the family attends the local Baptist church.

She made it plain that the monthly dole of "molligrub" (surplus commodities) isn't enough for her family. Potatoes and beans in addition to the usual fare would be appreciated, she said.

Harris, a machineman, has been unemployed a full year. He recently has been "bootlegging copper"—gathering the metal around abandoned mines and selling it to a junk dealer.

Over the past month he said he sold about 120 pounds at 10 cents a pound, or \$12—enough to pay the utility bill. He said the bill is "due right now," and he is 3 months behind in his house rent.

The family has no automobile, no TV set, no radio, and receives no newspaper.

The Harris children are from 4 to 16. The oldest, an attractive girl, is a senior at Sherman High School. While a Congressman was in her house she took the opportunity to interview him. With pad and pencil she approached SLACK and asked his name and reason for being there.

Harris and Smoot drew the maximum of 24 weeks, plus a special extension of 12 weeks, in unemployment payments last year. They have signed up for resumption of payments in reduced amounts this year. Taylor only recently started receiving the weekly \$30 maximum.

Each of the three unemployed miners has no idea as to what he will do when his benefits are exhausted. Each said he has searched desperately and widely for a job.

In all of the gloom there is one bright light. A doctor visits the families when called and waits indefinitely for receipt of his fees. Credit is available at the nearby Whitesville Clinic.

SLACK attempted to reassure each of the families as he left their homes. His words were to this effect: "We're going to try to give you some help in Congress. We hope that something can be done. All we can do is try."

SLACK drove his car the full extent of the ghostly camp, and turned in front of the closed company store. The abandoned coal tippie could be seen on the mountain.

On the return trip down the creek a member of SLACK's party commented on the better appearance of the houses outside the mining camp.

R. R. (Big Chew) Humphreys, secretary-treasurer of UMW district 17, said the houses probably are owned by retired people who have a steady income, such as a pension or social security.

"They make a corn bread living," he said.

A Catholic Analysis of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Dale Francis which appeared in Our Sunday Visitor, a Catholic weekly, on January 18, 1959, dealing with the questions surrounding the establishment of a new and free government in Cuba:

THE HAPPY CUBANS

(By Dale Francis)

There must have been great joy in Cuba when Fulgencio Batista left. As I've said several times in the last 3 years, the greatest contribution Batista could make to the island of Cuba would be to pack up and leave.

The trouble is, he and his friends are reputed to have packed up some \$800 million to take with them. This would be in keeping with the past for other Cuban politicians have left the island with suitcases packed with U.S. dollars.

But in the midst of the joy there should be many prayers. The exit of Batista doesn't mean the problems of Cuba are solved.

This wonderful island with its wonderful people has never really had a good government. It has had some governments that were not as bad as others, but none of them could be called good governments.

Batista had a kind of popularity among some of the people a few years back, al-

though serious Cubans always resented the fact that he came to power unlawfully after an election defeat. But whatever popularity Batista had, it was largely dissipated in the last year and a half as his police ruthlessly killed and imprisoned those suspected of opposition.

The sins of Batista contributed to the popularity of his opposition, Fidel Castro. The people really don't know much about Castro. He has never held office; he has never been in a position where he could put into effect his political ideas. But the people needed an ideal to become the counter-image of Batista, and Fidel Castro was it. Today he is the most popular man in Cuba.

Is this popularity justified? Will Fidel Castro be the knight in shining armor that the Cubans expect him to be?

Well, first of all, he has the tremendous problem of organizing a government. Despite the fact that Manuel Urrutia is President, Castro still must be the man who forms the new government whether he wants it that way or not.

In forming the new government, he is going to have to show a tremendous ingratitude. Ex-President Carlos Prío and the Aleman family have helped the revolution from Florida with arms and men. Yet Carlos Prío and the Aleman family came to their wealth under circumstances that were, to say the very least, suspicious. It would be difficult for Fidel Castro to eliminate corruption from the Government if he permitted men who had profited from past corruption to have a say in his government.

Then what about the Communists? Those of you who have read this column the last 3 years know that I've expressed concern about some of the men around Castro.

One is Dr. Ernesto Guevara, the Argentine physician who commanded the rebel troops in Las Villas Province and who was the first of the rebel leaders into Havana.

Dr. Guevara has a long background of support for Communist causes. He was in Guatemala when the Reds controlled that country and he was one of those kicked out of the country when the anti-Communists took over. Is Guevara a Communist? Our State Department naively announced that a close friend of Guevara had said he was not. That may be proof enough for the State Department, but knowing something about Communists, I'd be inclined to keep a close eye on this man.

There were other known Communists in Mexico with Castro's group—among them Bayo Giroud, who had a long record of known communism. Even the Castro forces admit there has been Communist support for his cause—but this does not mean the movement is communistic.

Some have claimed Castro is a Communist and cite the fact that he was one of the young Latin Americans who protested a Pan American conference in Columbia a dozen years ago. It is true Castro was there, observers who believe this stamps him as a Communist show a misunderstanding of Latin America that is typical of North Americans. There has long been a revolutionary spirit in Latin America, a spirit justified by the fact that the governments of many Latin American countries have been brutal, corrupt dictatorships. The dictatorships have been on their way out for a long time and eventually the last three will fall to a protest that may be supported by Communists, who are always quick to capitalize on discontent, but which is not communistic.

Fidel Castro, assuming as I do that he is not Communist in his sympathies, will have a difficult time controlling the Reds who gave him support. The Communists are certain to want to get into key positions.

The Catholic Church in Cuba did not enter openly into the struggle. But a year and a half ago Catholic leaders asked for a truce that both Batista and Castro refused. Castro and Batista later refused to arbitrate their

differences through a committee formed largely by Catholic action.

Batista, who was baptized a Catholic, educated by Protestants and practices no religion, took the Catholic efforts as an affront to his government—the hierarchy after all did put the rebels on the same level as the government.

There followed serious reprisals against Catholic leaders. Catholic Action leaders were imprisoned and some were killed. A man we knew, the Grand Knight of the Knights of Columbus in Guantanamo, was murdered and, although the government denied any guilt, claiming he was killed by bandits, many of the people believed he was killed because of his opposition to Batista.

Such nationally well-known Catholic leaders as Jose Ignacio Lasaga sought asylum in other countries. The government brought great pressure on Catholics and the terrorism solidified Catholic opposition to Batista so that in the last year and a half many of the leaders of Catholic Action joined the Castro forces.

With Communist and Catholic influences in Castro's movement unalterably opposed to each other—there is certain to be a struggle for influence. The question is, which will be the stronger?

Well, first of all, Castro is a Catholic. He was educated in Catholic schools and he insisted on priests as chaplains for his army. This was an important thing, for there were no practicing Catholics among the officers of Batista's army and there was a well-founded rumor that no one who was not a Mason could expect to become an officer in that army.

But in contrast, when Castro's forces won out over Batista there were six priests assigned to the rebel forces.

What is even more important is that Castro called Father Amado Llorente to his rebel headquarters to seek his counsel. Father Llorente was not only Castro's teacher when the rebel chieftain was a youngster in a Jesuit school, he is the director of the most important Catholic action group in all of Cuba—Agrupación Católica Universitaria. This is an elite Catholic action movement of professional and intellectual leaders of Cuba, chosen while they were university students and under spiritual formation ever since.

All these are hopeful signs. Another hopeful sign came when the corrupt Batista labor movement was taken over largely by anti-Communists and Christian workers despite the fact that the Communists tried to take it over immediately after the end of the rebellion.

What Cuba needs now is the prayers of all of us. Never has there been such a chance for a good government, never has there been the prospect of a brighter future for that wonderful island.

But there are many hazards ahead; there are many ambitious men to be denied a chance to get in the Government for their own interests. There are struggles ahead in Cuba and your prayers are needed.

Say a prayer for Cuba today that Fidel Castro will be what the people of Cuba hope he will be—the man to finally bring freedom to a country that has been waiting centuries to become free.

Ike's Farm Bill and Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, analysis of the Federal budget for the fiscal year

1960, submitted by the President to Congress on January 19, reveals significant progress toward fiscal responsibility. A very excellent editorial of the Chicago Sun-Times of January 30, points out that the President's farm proposals which were presented to Congress on January 29 continues to emphasize the administration's determination to effect economies if Congress will give favorable consideration to the discontinuance of Federal programs for which emergencies have passed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this thought-provoking article for the RECORD:

IKE'S FARM BILL AND FOOD PRICES

Every housewife ought to call upon her Congressman to support President Eisenhower's farm program sent to Congress yesterday. We include farm housewives in this observation, too.

The President's new farm proposals would mean moderately lower food prices for consumers. His plan would lower food prices by reducing Federal support prices on farm crops.

Why should farm wives support a program that will reduce Federal subsidies on certain crops? There are several reasons.

The first reason is one that should draw support for Ike's program from all Americans: The farm program is stupendously expensive. It costs the taxpayers more than \$5 billion this year. This is a big factor in putting the Government in the red. And, as we have repeatedly demonstrated on this page, when the Government spends more money than it takes in the result is more inflation. Inflation steals dollars from everyone's purse, including the farmer's.

In the past 6 years the Government has spent an average of \$4.7 billion on farm subsidies. During that same period the annual Federal deficit has averaged \$2.7. If Congress had taken Mr. Eisenhower's advice earlier and cut farm subsidies, the Government might have been able to keep in the black.

The enormous outlay of money might have been justified if it had done any good for the Nation. But it has not. The President flatly told Congress yesterday that the price-support and production-control program "has not worked." The money has gone down a gopher hole.

The expenditure has not brought supported farm products in line with demand. It has only succeeded in piling up huge surpluses, worth nearly \$9 billion, in Government ownership. The cost of storage management alone is \$1 billion a year. There is a year's supply of wheat in storage.

Farmers as well as the rest of us are helping to pay these costs. Yet, the billions being paid out in agricultural subsidies are not going to all farmers. The big producers—especially of wheat and cotton—are getting most of the money. Only 12 out of some 250 farm commodities are supported by law at prescribed minimum levels.

And how have these 12 fared in the general market? Not as well as those not supported, or those supported at levels that are discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture. Producers of cattle, hogs, poultry, fruits, and vegetables which are not supported have enjoyed growing markets. Their stocks are not piled up in Government warehouses.

Mr. Eisenhower and enlightened farmers do not advocate abandoning farmers to the vagaries of nature. They favor shielding basic crop producers against crop failures. They favor a floor for them just as industrial workers have minimum wages. But they believe that the farmer's best interests will be served if he relies on the market place rather than on Government handouts. Those handouts last year amounted to 40

percent of net farm income—few of them going to farmers in greatest difficulty.

Mr. Eisenhower asks Congress to give the Secretary of Agriculture greater discretion in setting the level of supports. He asks that standards for pricing be measured against market prices of recent years instead of the nearly half-century-old parity standard now in use. Congressmen recently adopted the market-price standard in an election. There is no good reason why it shouldn't apply to other crops.

The President's farm program is a step toward agricultural sanity. It should be adopted.

The New Leaders In Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following biographies of some of the new leaders in Cuba: Fidel Castro, Provisional President Manuel Urrutia, Prime Minister Jose Miro Cardona, and Minister of State Roberto Daniel Agramonte Pichardo. This material was prepared for me for my information before I went to Cuba on January 20. I feel this information would be of interest to my colleagues who share my concern for the success of Cuba's new government:

FIDEL CASTRO RUZ

Fidel Castro, the victor in a 2-year armed struggle with the administration of President Fulgencio Batista, had been in open, armed rebellion against the Cuban Government since he led his "26th of July" forces to a landing in Cuba's Oriente Province on December 2, 1956.

Born on his father's farm in Oriente Province on August 13, 1926, Castro is the son of a self-made Spanish immigrant and the fifth of nine children. After receiving his secondary education at the Jesuit-run Colegio Belén in Havana, he entered the law school of the University of Havana. He soon became active in campus politics and was elected president of his law school class. He also became active in the Federación Estudiantil Universitaria (FEU), and joined the Ortodoxo Party. In the summer of 1947, while still a student, Castro joined in the abortive Cayo Confites invasion of the Dominican Republic. Upon his return to Havana, Castro was designated by the FEU to attend a student congress at Bogotá, Colombia, in April 1948. Castro was accused of having been involved in the bloody and violent riots which took place in Bogotá during the Ninth Panamerican Congress, but he has always maintained that he attended the congress in the role of an observer and did not take part in the riots.

Upon Castro's graduation from the University of Havana, he practiced law and took an active part in politics within the ranks of the Ortodoxo Party. In early 1952, he conducted a vigorous campaign for election to the House of Representatives on the Ortodoxo ticket. The March 10, 1952, Batista coup disrupted his plans.

He formed a revolutionary group, and on July 26, 1953 (the date providing his forces with a name) he launched the unsuccessful assault against the Moncada Barracks in Santiago de Cuba, in which a number of soldiers were killed and the insurrectionists

were all but annihilated. Captured and sentenced to 15 years imprisonment, Castro was pardoned in a general amnesty declared by General Batista in May 1954. Castro remained in Cuba, continuing his oppositionist activities until July of that year when he went into voluntary exile in Mexico.

In October 1955 Castro came to the United States on an organizational and fund raising tour for his 26th of July movement. After speaking in New York, Tampa, and Key West, he returned to Mexico on December 10 after the Cuban Government had protested his frankly revolutionary activities and U.S. Immigration authorities had cut short his stay. In Mexico Castro declared his intention to invade Cuba if Batista refused to step down. On December 2, 1956, following diversionary activities by his followers ashore, Castro led a band of 82 men in a landing in Cuba's Oriente Province. In the resulting skirmishes he lost most of his men but was able to recruit additional manpower from the countryside. He continued to grow stronger and his forces slowly opened new fronts in Oriente and Las Villas Province. He achieved his objective when it was announced on January 1, 1959, that President Batista and a large number of his followers had flown to exile in the Dominican Republic.

In the early 1940's Castro married Mirta Diaz Balart. Some time after the birth of a son, Fidel Castro Diaz, the mother divorced Castro and married Emilio Nuñez Blanco, son of Emilio Nuñez Portuondo, Batista's chief of the Cuban delegation to the United Nations. Castro is said to have a fair command of English.

MANUEL EUGENIO URRUTIA LEO

Manuel Urrutia was confirmed as Provisional President of Cuba by revolutionary leader Fidel Castro on January 1, 1959. A lawyer and judge by profession, Urrutia came into public prominence when he was presiding justice of the district court of the Province of Oriente in Santiago on May 10, 1957. The occasion was a trial of about 150 persons accused of insurrection and other serious offenses against the Batista government. Although 111 were acquitted by the panel of three judges and 40 were given various sentences, Judge Urrutia stated in pronouncing sentence that he personally had been in favor of acquitting nearly all of the prisoners, strongly attacked the Batista regime, and added that since Batista and his administration had usurped and were illegally retaining power, the defendants had been acting within their constitutional rights. As a result, the Cuban Minister of Justice brought impeachment proceedings against him, but they were later dropped.

Entering the judiciary as municipal judge of Jiguani on January 10, 1927, Urrutia subsequently served in the same capacity at Los Arabos, Limonar and Cienfuegos, Judge of the Cienfuegos Civil Court, Judge of the Matanzas Misdemeanors Court and the Colon Civil Court, and Justice of the Santiago Supreme Court, also serving as President of the Emergency Court. In December, 1957, he went with his family into voluntary exile in New York and Miami, following retirement as a justice after a career of nearly 31 years. He returned to Cuba late in 1958 as Castro's candidate for provisional president. In August of 1958 Urrutia was designated by the Movimiento de Resistencia Civica to be Provisional President of Cuba upon the fall of the Batista regime.

Born at Yaguajay, Las Villas Province on December 6, 1901, and married to Esperanza Gladys de Laguno Aquirre, Urrutia has two sons, ages 20 and 14, and a daughter 8 months old born in the United States. Urrutia is reported to read, but not speak, English. He has been quite active as a fund raiser and speaker for Castro and the 26th

of July movement in the United States and in other countries, and is believed to be at least potentially friendly to the United States.

JOSÉ MIRÓ CARDONA

José Miró Cardona, named Prime Minister of Cuba by Provisional President Urrutia on January 5, 1959, since May 1958 has been living in exile in the United States, and is one of the leading contemporary legal figures in Cuba with a reputation which is both national and international in character. Aside from his select legal practice, he has been prominent in both the National and Havana Bar Associations (having been dean of the latter since 1952), and also occupied a full professorship at the University of Havana in the field of penal law. In the international sphere he has been a delegate to the Inter-American Bar Association conferences of 1941 (Havana), 1946 (Santiago de Chile), 1947 (Lima), 1949 (Detroit), 1956 (Dallas), and 1957 (Buenos Aires). He also represented the National Bar Association at the Inter-American Congress of Odontology, Legal Medicine, and Criminology, held at Havana in 1946.

Miró Cardona entered the political arena late in 1955 via the Society of Friends of the Republic (SAR), formed by elder statesman Cosme de la Torre for the purpose of bringing the Batista regime and its opposition together in working out a peaceful solution to Cuba's political problems. Following the unfruitful efforts of the SAR, Miró Cardona associated himself with an organization known as the Group of Civic Institutions in another attempt to bring about what the SAR had failed to achieve. The successive failure of both these efforts found him gradually moving away from an apolitical position to one of greater criticism of the Batista Government.

Miró Cardona was born in Havana on August 2, 1902. His father, José Miró Argenter, came to Cuba from Cataluña, Spain, at the age of 17 and followed a journalistic career. He was active in preparations for the 1895 revolution, and during the ensuing war of independence rose to the rank of general in the revolutionary army and served as General Maceo's chief-of-staff until the latter's death. His three-volume "Crónicas de la Guerra" continues to be a standard reference work on Maceo's campaigns.

Educated both in Cuba and Italy, Miró received a liberal arts degree from the University of Havana in 1937 and the degree of doctor of civil law the following year. With a scholarship from the university he went to Italy where he studied at the Universidad Real de Roma during 1939. While in Rome he also served as cultural attaché of the Cuban Legation.

Miró is married to Ernestina Torra Obar. Their daughter, Yolanda de la Luz (who is married to the sculptor Sergio López Mesa and the mother of three children) has a doctorate in philosophy and letters and teaches at the high school of La Vibora in Havana. Miró's son, José Antonio (who is married to Silvia Santaella Ponce and the father of two children) is a lawyer, practicing in Havana.

Miró Cardona, who is the author of a number of works on juridical matters, holds the following decorations: Gran Cruz de la Orden de Honor y Mérito "Lanuza"; Comendador de la Orden Nacional de Mérito "Carlos Manuel de Despedes"; Comendador de la Gran Orden Soberana y Continental de Mérito y Honor de la Unión Democrática Interamericana; Condecoración de la Sociedad Cubana de Derecho Internacional; and Colegiado de Honor del Colegio Nacional de Abogados.

Miró Cardona has in the past displayed a basically friendly attitude toward the United States. He has some knowledge of English.

ROBERTO DANIEL AGRAMONTE PICHARDO

Appointed on January 4, 1959, as Cuban Minister of State, Agramonte is without question one of Cuba's intellectual leaders. An important public figure, he had a firm reputation in educational circles and as an author and lecturer before he became an unsuccessful candidate of the Cuban People's Party (Partido del Pueblo Cubano-Ortodoxo-PPC(o)) for vice president in 1948.

Agramonte had been professor of philosophy, psychology, and sociology at the University of Havana from 1926 until he left Cuba in 1957. He also served as its vice rector, and dean of the faculty of philosophy and letters during part of that period. A member of the Ortodoxo Party from its early days, he was vice president of its national executive committee, prior to his nomination as the party's presidential candidate in 1952. Although the elections were not held because of Batista's coup in March 1952, it has been reported that Agramonte stood a good chance to be elected had they been held. In July 1957 he left Cuba for Mexico and remained there in voluntary exile until he returned to Cuba after the departure of Batista.

Quite widely traveled, Agramonte has visited the United States a number of times. A writer of texts in psychology and sociology, Agramonte is said to be an authority on Ecuadorian writers Garcia Moreno and Montalvo. He has lectured widely on his major subjects and his broadcasts have been popular. He was Cuban Ambassador to Mexico during 1946-47 under ex-President Grau.

Born at Villaclara, Cuba, on May 3, 1904, Agramonte is married to Concepcion del Rio and they have an adult son and a daughter. Agramonte speaks English.

Coal by Wire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago a group of businessmen and union officials, all of them confident of the potential of electric heating, met in my office. Among those who took part were representatives of Appalachian Electric Power Co., National Coal Association, United Mine Workers of America, and electrical equipment manufacturers.

My interest in the expansion of electric utilities service is obvious enough. Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is the Nation's greatest coal-producing State, and from the Fifth Congressional District comes almost 30 percent of West Virginia's total coal output. The coal industry, directly or indirectly, is responsible for most of the subsistence of the residents of our district. When the miner receives a pay check, a widespread chain reaction takes place. The grocer gets a good portion of what the miner earns. The landlord from whom he rents or the bank with which he has his mortgage comes in for a regular percentage. The miscellany of other recipients includes the barber, the clothier, gasoline station, service utilities, and our churches. Needless to say, our Federal, State, and local governments come in for important shares of every dollar that the miner earns.

Our railroad industry receives much of its revenue from coal traffic. Without that traffic, both operational and maintenance employees are without work.

Supplying coal mines is a big business in southern West Virginia. Timber, steel products, electrical equipment, petroleum products, and many other items are used in heavy quantity by our mines.

Appalachian Electric Power Co. is itself an essential source of employment for many of our people, both in its offices and on its field staffs. What is more, the West Virginia generating stations of Appalachian Electric consume more than 3½ million tons of coal annually. As electric heating grows in popularity, this order will increase substantially. The Appalachian Co. has been in the vanguard of the coal-by-wire effort. Through its advertisements and other promotional activities, it has helped to make West Virginians more conscious of the economic value of the electric heating program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want anyone to lose sight of the fact that, although the market has declined seriously since the end of World War II, the use of coal in home furnaces is still very important to the industry. Nationwide, some 12 million residential units are kept warm by coal heat. The development of convenient stokers and ash-hauling equipment makes coal all the more attractive domestically, particularly because of its price stability in recent years. We are not suggesting conversions from coal furnaces. We do believe it to the benefit of builders and the public in general to call attention to the advantages of heating by electricity. For this reason, I am always happy when a publication devotes space to the growing popularity of electric heating.

Coal Age, a McGraw-Hill publication whose editor, Iven Given, is a native of Sutton, W. Va., and who is probably one of the best informed authorities on the mining industry, featured an article on electric heating in its January issue. Written by W. A. Raleigh, Jr., associate editor, this comprehensive review of the many facets of electric heat not only captures the imagination of investors, architects, and builders, but also offers an interesting study for anyone who is thinking of buying a new home now or in the future. I commend it to the attention of all who may read these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to say that an excellent series of articles on "Coal by Wire" has appeared over the past few months in the United Mine Workers of America Journal. This effort has resulted in an availability of printed material that will enable any interested home purchaser or homebuilder to make his own choice of heating equipment based upon installation costs and present and future fuel crisis and supply.

From time to time Mr. Speaker, I hope to refer to these informative articles so that a digest of their contents may become an official part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Story of Whitesville Boom to Ghost Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I again today bring to the attention of this House the desperate plight of our people in West Virginia who are dependent upon the coal industry for their daily bread.

Herewith submitted for consideration of the House, another in a series of articles published by the Charleston (W.Va.) Gazette, after one of its staff writers, John G. Morgan, accompanied one of my colleagues, Mr. Slack, of West Virginia's Sixth District, on a tour of these distressed areas. The article is as follows:

STORY OF WHITESVILLE: BOOM TO GHOST TOWN
(By John G. Morgan)

WHITESVILLE.—About 6 years ago the mines were going full blast. Business flowed at high tide, and there was noise akin to tumult in the streets. This was a boomtown.

Fights occurred often when spirits soared too high, and City Police Chief R. W. Pittsonberger had his hands full.

Justice of the Peace Charles E. Casto had plenty of business too. In 1953, for example, he handled about 375 civil cases and a large number of criminal cases.

Today it's a different story.

The estimated total of miners in the Whitesville area has dropped from about 7,000 to 1,000. By rough count, 17 of 26 mines have closed. The remaining nine have reduced their work forces.

Merchants say business is off at least one fourth and that credit accounts are climbing. The stores and streets are never crowded, and there are times when they look deserted during business hours.

Pittsonberger admits that he has an easy job, and Casto has to depend on barbering for a living. Last year his civil cases dwindled to 31 and his criminal cases to 2.

"It's rough," said Nick Halkias, who operates a sandwich shop and two theaters. "I wash dishes, cook, sell popcorn and clean theaters—four jobs, and still I can't make a living."

He said he keeps one theater open nightly and the other only on weekends.

Zachari Karantonis, 69, who came to the United States from Greece in 1912 and who today operates a large supermarket in town, said: "We are making money, but there is no profit."

Nicholas Haddad, clothing store owner, said "Things aren't too critical now, but we can't hold up long."

Ralph Hottle said he had suspended publication of the weekly Whitesville State News, but declared that the reason wasn't necessarily economic.

He said he wanted to devote more time to teaching school, but added that the business decline did have a bearing on his decision.

Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., in Whitesville as part of his tour of areas hard hit by mine layoffs, heard comments of the businessmen here.

The new Congressman from the Sixth District explained that their remarks will serve as basic information in his efforts to formulate some kind of relief program for distressed areas.

The local men were enthusiastic about two possible road projects that would open up trade with surrounding areas on the other sides of mountains.

One would be the construction of a highway through an old railway tunnel to the community of Kayford. The other would be improvement of W. Va. 78 as a connection between W. Va. 79 and W. Va. 3, in the Twilight and Red Dragon vicinities, to make the towns of Van and Wharton more accessible.

Each project would chop off about 50 miles in circuitous driving and encourage an increased amount of through traffic.

Later as SLACK and his small party continued the tour, the Congressman thought out loud about the plight of displaced miners and the communities dependent upon them.

He seemed preoccupied with the thought that industries adaptable to the West Virginia terrain should be attracted to the stricken areas.

"The mountains here offer some natural protection against missiles," he said. "In the future it will be necessary for the Nation to manufacture highly dangerous fuels in larger quantities. Isolated areas surrounded by mountains would be ideal for that."

On another trend of thought, he said:

"It has been suggested to me that the Government should give seeds to these people. But in many places you can see there just isn't any spot for a garden."

R. R. (Big Chew) Humphreys, secretary-treasurer of UMW district 17, recalled that in earlier days when he was a miner and when people generally were more self-sufficient, he had a garden on top of a mountain and went to and from with great effort.

There was an interval of silence, and then Big Chew said softly and with deep conviction:

"The trouble with miners is, they just won't save."

As It Happened: The Big Havana Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Times of Havana of January 22, 1959, with byline "An Old Habanero." This is an accurate and detailed report of the big rally in Havana which I think would interest my colleagues:

THUNDEROUS APPROVAL OF EXECUTIONS ECHOES THROUGHOUT REPUBLIC
(By An Old Habanero)

Placing the blame for misrepresentations of Cuba's revolutionary government trials and executions squarely on foreign press agencies and discounting critical U.S. congressional statements as not representative of the feelings of the American people, Fidel Castro addressed nearly a million people yesterday afternoon from a hastily erected wooden rostrum in front of the Presidential Palace.

The crowd was immense, incredible, imposing. Never has such an enormous mass of humanity gathered in such numbers before the executive mansion to hear Castro, President Urrutia and other revolutionary leaders lambast foreign critics and present their case to the people of Cuba. By 2 o'clock in the afternoon, throngs were pouring down Malecón, gathering in huge masses on Carlos III Avenue and crowding all the

approaches to the Palace on the Avenida de las Misiones.

The people carried signs, thousands of signs, banners and posters all demanding the trial and execution of war criminals of the Batista regime. Samples: "Toothpick Workers Support Fidel Castro." "No Foreign Interference." "Zero Clemency." "Shoot the Assassins of the People." "Fidel! Our Enemies Are Hiding Behind Uncle Sam's Whiskers!" "No U.S. Intervention in Cuban Affairs." One said in English: "Execution For Killers." There were large banners, small banners, white banners, red and black banners, yellow banners, some small posters carried by individuals, obviously lettered by loving hands at home.

It was an orderly demonstration. There were no fist fights, few sudden flurries in the crowd, no angry shouts, no haranguing. Complete order reigned throughout without the need of one cop or one radio car. It was not a hostile demonstration. People had turned out by the hundreds of thousands to see and hear their beloved Fidel.

It was a voluntary demonstration. No one was forced to come. As a spontaneous demonstration of the power of public opinion, it was breath-taking and imposing. As a demonstration of public order and discipline, it was well-nigh incredible. As a mandate of the people to the Revolutionary Government, it was incontestable.

It was not an anti-American demonstration. It was a demonstration for the people of the United States, to let them see how the people of this country stood behind their government and the decisions of that government. It was a demonstration of national solidarity never seen before in Cuba. It was a monster jury for Batista men accused of torture and murder and rape. It was a national condemnation of those men. It was the spectacle of a united people.

Again and again the theme ran through the words of every speaker preceding Fidel: "See, our country, our people have turned out in numbers never before seen to show you that we are not barbarians, that we are only interested in justice, that we want to see criminals punished as they are punished in every country in the world."

President Urrutia, in an unofficial interview before the beginning of the talks at the meeting said, "Cubans are demonstrating that they want their government to carry out justice. What is being done in Cuba is justice. We have said and I repeat, we have nothing to hide. I am happy to see so many U.S. correspondents here. I have a great deal of affection for the people of the United States and I don't want to see that great people fooled into believing anything but the truth."

Several speakers preceded Fidel Castro, like boxers before the main bout: David Salvador, secretary of the CTC (Cuban Confederation of Labor); Guido García Inclán, representing the Cuban press; Juan Ruiz, uniformed, bearded, one of the leaders of the Students Federation; Luis Orlando Rodríguez, Minister of the Interior; Jorge Quintana, also of the Cuban press; and Major Rolando Cubela, of the Directorio Revolucionario, the people that had a spat with Castro, and who was barely allowed to say a few words before Fidel took the microphones.

Fidel Castro's appearance created pandemonium. Thousands and thousands of throats yelled a greeting in a deafening uproar which immediately swelled to the cry "Justicia! Justicia!" chanted over and over again. With a characteristic gesture, Castro faced the crowd and put his right index finger to his lips. He rolled his eyes and held his left hand out for silence. The chant wavered and began to diminish. "Let's see if a million people can keep quiet," he said disarmingly. The noise died down, petered out, vanished. He had a million people spellbound.

I have never seen a public speaker who can so identify himself with his audience. In slow, measured, conversational tones, frequently pausing for his words to take effect, and swerving his body to command all his listeners, Castro spoke to them as he would have over coffee and cigars after dinner. Not once did he raise his voice; not once did he adopt the traditional heroic pose of the political speaker; not once did he rise above the lowest common denominator confronting him.

"This has been the biggest victory of the people of Cuba in the revolution. You are winning a victory without a shot, without arms, but a victory for justice and reason and morals. Those who thought we were simple guerrillas, those who thought we knew only how to shoot, have found out that the Cuban revolution can win the battle of information and the battle of reason," said he.

Castro looked very tired and perspired profusely in the warm afternoon sun. At one point he stopped and sighed. "Fellow countrymen, the next time I'm going to ask for only 10,000 instead of a million Cubans. It is too much. The press is too great. It is almost impossible to make a speech today. I shall have to compress my ideas. Every minute I stay up here can cost the lives of my compatriots. Women are fainting. I shall be brief."

Major Castro was brief. For about an hour and a half he spoke, bringing his case before the people of Cuba, asking the foreign press to truthfully report what they were witnessing yesterday. "Gentlemen of the foreign press, gentlemen of the diplomatic corps," he called, "imagine you have before you a jury of a million people of all classes and races and religions. I am going to ask that jury: Those in agreement with the justice being applied now; those in accord with the trial and execution of the myrimidons now being judged, raise your hands." A "million" hands shot up in the air and a huge shout rose from the packed hundreds of thousands in front of the palace. "Press of the whole continent," Castro continued, "a jury of a million Cubans of all ideas and classes and races has voted. Those who are democrats or who call themselves democrats, I say to you, this is democracy, this is respecting the will of the people."

Castro referred to the frequent concern he had met from people who are worried about his personal safety. He went on to say that the destiny of a people does not depend on one man, and he cannot seek safety by hiding in a bank vault. He declared that no one would stop the revolution, that there are other men behind him; adding as an afterthought, "And I will tell my enemies something, behind me there are others more radical than I."

He designated his brother Raul as his successor, should anything happen to him. "Not because he is my brother. I hate nepotism; but because I consider him fully capable of taking my place in case something should happen to me."

He jabbed at foreign news agencies for having killed him a few days after his landing in Oriente Province 2 years ago. "Not having killed me successfully then, they wish to do so now." He accused the wire services of cabling that merely adherents of Batista, and not murderers and torturers, were being executed.

He charged them with sending stories of mass executions without trials. "They (the news agencies) have not spoken about the conduct of the rebel army or the civilized behavior of our people. No one has been tortured; no one has been beaten. People have not taken vengeance in their own hands (as they did in Machado's time), but have placed the criminals in the hands of the revolutionary courts," he stated.

Castro reserved his heavy ammunition for the end of his talk when he said, "Real crimes have been committed in the name of

peace. I ask the U.S. Congressmen who attacked us: What did you do in Hiroshima and Nagasaki? In the name of peace, 300,000 human beings were killed. We have not shot women, children, and old men. At Hiroshima and Nagasaki 300,000 noncombatant civilians were killed. In the name of what? To find peace * * * to avoid the death of many fighting Americans * * * so I say to these Congressmen (who should keep out of Cuban problems), we are killing Batista's criminals to establish peace, that we might have peace not only today but in the future of this country."

Castro made it very clear that the United States Government had not attacked the Cuban Government directly. He said that some of the American press has defended him, citing Herbert L. Matthews, of the New York Times, as an example. "The American Government is not hostile to us," said he. "We are asking for the support of the American people," he continued. "We have not been aggressors. We have not attacked any people of the world. Yet the Cuban people have been the victim of a dastardly and cowardly campaign; but I assure you that this battle is won. This is everybody's battle."

He referred to the order reigning in Havana today, calling it a city patrolled by Boy Scouts, a city with no police on the street and yet a city where no looting is taking place. He challenged anyone to find a city like that in the whole world, and asked newsmen to tell that story to the people of their countries.

This afternoon at the Havana Riviera Hotel Castro will hold a press conference for 385 visiting newsmen, where, he said, he would be willing to answer any and all questions put up to him.

Fidel Castro's big winner yesterday was the enormous mass of people that attended the meeting. Their order, their discipline, their reason, and the absence of passion, all combined to teach the world a lesson in public behavior.

But did I notice a very slight trace of exasperation in the leader of the revolution. Exasperation at having to explain simplicities to the crowd; exasperation at having to obtain the approval of that crowd? Fidel Castro has said repeatedly that he aspires to no public office and that he subordinates himself to the government of President Urrutia. He yesterday appointed Raúl Castro as his successor. What is Raúl Castro successor to?

The Southern Moderates Are Still There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, events make it more apparent each day that men of moderation are the real hope of the South as it wrestles with the agonizing problems of desegregation. Over the years one of the most consistent and clear-headed southern voices has been that of Ralph McGill, the editor of the Atlanta Constitution.

Last September Mr. McGill wrote an article for the New York Times Sunday magazine in which he discussed the central issues that have emerged in this controversy.

The central truth of Mr. McGill's thesis was demonstrated once again this week in Virginia, I believe. And once

again there is hope that honorable and practical men who, for want of a better term we call moderates, will yet lead the South out of the wilderness.

Mr. McGill's article follows:

THE SOUTHERN MODERATES ARE STILL THERE (By Ralph McGill)

ATLANTA, GA.—After 4 years of being storm-tossed on the seas of segregation, with unusual turbulence and fog prevailing for the past 12 months, the southern moderate now will be able to function more effectively by reason of the United States Supreme Court decision of Friday, September 12, in the Little Rock case.

The Court upheld the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in its reversal of Federal Judge Harry J. Lemley's order of June staying integration at Central High school in the Arkansas capital for two and one-half years.

The Supreme Court decision had the immediate effect of restoring to the issue the sense of inevitability, which with that of law, is the ingredient essential to rational thought on the subject.

For almost 3 years now, but more especially since Governor Faubus began to dominate the southern segregation scene, there has been a heavy attack on the legal image of inevitability. For a time it was blurred and befogged. It was precisely in this period that the southern moderate seemed to some, at least, to have been submerged, or overwhelmed. And, in a sense, he was. But, being man, he endured.

The decision of September 12 provided a further dividend for the moderate. In addition to keeping alive the image of law and the supremacy of the high court in interpreting the Constitution of the United States, the southern moderate had been hard at work creating a new image. It is one of the Negro as a citizen. It is a fact perhaps not well comprehended outside the South that many southerners to this day have never considered the Negro as a citizen in the full meaning of the word. There is no image of such citizenship, for the good reason that it did not exist. It is only in very recent years that the white-primary laws and other barriers to citizenship have been declared unconstitutional.

The latest decision will greatly strengthen the picture of the Negro as a citizen, as well as renew the necessary sense of inevitability in the 1954 Supreme Court decision and its appeal to the moral and reasonable man. Because of this, the southern moderate's real job has been to keep this sense alive in the mind of the practical man of his region.

It is the practical man who is so necessary to an emotionally stirred, disturbed, and confused South. The southern moderate is not the quiet, assured, often scholarly, detached liberal of the East. In the deep South, ugly with reprisals, penalties, and abuses, where all the political controls are in the hands of men pledged to massive resistance, the moderate, like the liberal, learns that there is an immediacy of reaction, often violent, to anything he may say or write. From this he learns patience and acceptance of the fact that frustration is not defeat, though it can be almost as bitter.

It will be the moderate and the practical man who will see the South through this period which is to many one of agonizing readjustment far more acute than can be imagined by those whose liberal position is based entirely on principle without any corollary experience.

This practical man may be a leader on the vestry, a bishop, a clergyman, an executive of a great corporation, an editor, an attorney, or a person in some public position. With the sense of inevitability, this practical man can, and does, influence others in economic and professional positions to attain that

image and to comprehend it and the ultimate meaning to his community.

It is this same image of inevitability that causes many a sincere Christian or Jew to say, "I don't like it, but I must either abandon my faith and its tenets or accept it, and so, with God's help, I will." And there are those who say, "I don't think the Court was right. I hate the decision. I wish it had never happened, but I love my country and I will accept decisions of its courts."

Governor Faubus especially, and numerous other southern political leaders—governors, United States Senators and White Citizens Council orators—had succeeded in greatly weakening this sense of the inevitable. They asserted over and over that the Supreme Court's decision was not legal or binding and was entirely unconstitutional.

It was a commonplace experience of newspapermen to talk with a southern political leader and hear him say, privately, he knew integration to be inevitable, and then, minutes later, hear the same man say to a whooping audience that the "left-wing Supreme Court" had acted unconstitutionally and that States' rights would emerge triumphant.

The citizens councils urged their members to write their Congressmen and Senators. "Just stand up and make yourself heard," they said, "and we'll win. We'll never surrender to those who would usurp our rights."

In addition, there were the fire-eaters who breathed defiance and slandered the court, the President of the United States and all who were not in agreement with them. Their text was "Never."

The effect of this, and the fact of it, were established before the Supreme Court by Richard C. Butler, the able attorney for the Little Rock school board. The people of Little Rock, he told the court, were confused about what was the law and did not accept the court's decision as final, particularly since Governor Faubus "was repeatedly" telling them it was "not the law of the land."

It was not a good argument in a court of law, but it was a factual description of a state of mind widespread in the deep south. There are even now literally thousands of good southern people who believe the court's action to be illegal and not applicable to them, because a governor, a Senator, a Congressman, an editor or some other person of position has so said or written.

The southern moderate, utterly destroyed insofar as any political influence in his State capital was concerned, was pushed out of the center of the picture by early 1955. He was chided and harassed. In some communities he was asked to resign from the vestry or board of deacons. Some teachers—a great many college teachers and some ministers—lost their jobs. There were businesses that warned employees not to "participate" in controversy. For a time various forms of coercions and reprisals flourished, mild and severe.

The Court decision shocked a great majority of the southern people, because their political leadership had failed utterly to prepare them for it. For some years the High Court had been handing down decisions which clearly indicated that full citizenship was the right of all Americans.

Political leaders began a belated, almost frantic, drive to build schools and thereby comply with the long-neglected separate-but-equal Court ruling of 1896. There were those few who spoke out, saying that segregation was on the way out and plans should be made to live with such a decision. But, as people do, they looked to their leaders. And a great majority of these told them not to worry, the Court would not and could not so find.

When it did come there was a great shock. The political leaders soon regrouped and came charging back, crying betrayal. A number of urban school boards that tentatively, and sensibly, had begun to make

plans to comply by gerrymandering school district lines and putting the fewest possible number of Negro children in school as a starter, abruptly were put in their place as legislatures hurried to write new laws and earn delay.

It was Virginia, with her pre-Civil War theory of interposition, that gave certain respectability and stature to these proceedings by throwing the great cloak of her history and tradition about total defiance.

In this period the national administration failed the cause of moderation. The Court had handed to the South, and some bordering States, a decision. But the executive department, which includes the Department of Justice, failed utterly to provide any leadership or to offer any plans for, or assistance in, enforcement.

It is true that all Governors and State officers, including judges, are sworn to support the Constitution of the United States. But in this period some imaginative national leadership and interposition between the moderate and the extremist might have made a different story. But it did not come.

However, the moderate was not as alone as he sometimes felt, or seemed to be.

There were two elections, in particular, that refuted the belief that the southern moderate had been driven from the scene.

In November 1957, Virginia went to the polls to elect a Governor. Nominee of the Democrats was J. Lindsay Almond, pledged to support a State program of "massive resistance" to the court decision. He had, of course, the full support of the Byrd organization. Senator HARRY F. BYRD himself led the Almond campaign. In public speeches he called on the voters to crush the opposition and let the Nation and the Court know how Virginia felt.

The opposition was Theodore R. Dalton, Republican. He had proposed a plan of limited integration. Thus, the sole, major issue was clearly drawn.

Almond won with, in round numbers, 300,000 votes to 188,000 for Dalton. Despite the heavy pressure by the Byrd organization, the emotionalism of the issue and the fact that President Eisenhower's popularity was down, the Republican candidate and limited integration received almost 200,000 votes.

An estimated 40,000 to 50,000 Negro votes were in this total. But of the white votes cast in a heated campaign pressed emotionally by one of the most efficient political organizations in the country, Dalton had a third.

More recent voting, that of the primary in which Governor Faubus won renomination, was one-sided. His two opponents were not well known. Neither had any following. Their efforts were not adequately financed. The Governor's organization went all out to round up the votes.

Governor Faubus received 264,346 votes. Yet, almost 120,000 moderates cast ballots in opposition. Of this vote perhaps 17 percent was Negro. But in a superheated, almost hysterical campaign, about a third of the white voters stood for moderation and due process of law.

Other elections, too, were revealing of moderate strength. In Tennessee a richly financed primary campaign based on defiance of the Supreme Court failed as a move to unseat Senator ALBERT GORE, who was charged with being in favor of abiding by his oath to support the Constitution and the courts. A gubernatorial candidate who favored allowing communities to desegregate if they chose was given no chance to win. He came within a few votes of upsetting the favorite. The moderates in the State were the balance of power in the Gore race and they almost nominated a relative unknown for Governor.

In Texas, liberal Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH was renominated in a primary

otherwise dominated by extreme conservatives.

There is no political campaign, even in the Deep South, where race is the only factor. The extremists seek always to make this the only issue.

In Georgia's primary of September 10, the three candidates were all profoundly pledged to defend segregation. The most qualified, Ernest Vandiver, campaigned on a program of reforming the State government to eliminate corrupt practices that had been exposed. A Baptist minister, who was one of the candidates, promptly and preposterously charged Mr. Vandiver with being "weak on segregation" and carried on a campaign of political abuse that shocked all but the most extreme. The Baptist minister was all but obliterated by the heavy vote for Vandiver.

There is one generality that largely explains the many paradoxes of the South. It is that the climate, or mood, in which the moderate lives and seeks to function reflects the leadership of his State and the background that produces it.

Why, for example, could North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Texas, all former members of the Confederacy, proceed with deliberate speed in school integration this fall while their neighbors in Virginia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama were pledged to total, permanent defiance? They are all the same sort of people. Superficially their culture is the same. Why, then, the difference?

There is a very real explanation. Four States, Mississippi, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia, the heart of the Deep South, have had a continuity of political climate in which the race issue has been agitated in local and State campaigns. Some who have been most prominent in this form of campaigning have attained national reputations in that field. These same States have, on a percentage basis, the largest Negro populations. They also have remaining more of the old plantation type of economy. Industrialization came last to them.

It is neither fair, nor is it helpful in the attempt at solution, to charge the people of these States with being willfully rebellious, mean or perverse. Their political leaders are as pragmatic as those of other areas. They must first get elected. In a sense, they are captives of their past and of the leaders who before them set the pattern of violent racial agitation for political ends.

The Deep South has sent to Congress some of its ablest men. It has such men there today. Some of them have been, and are, fully qualified for the Presidency. One of the most melancholy spectacles is to see such able, intelligent men barred from greater national recognition or from the Presidency itself, not because they are southern but because their region or States advocate a policy that jars with that of the 42 other States. The frustration of such a situation leads some of them to bitterness of spirit and extremes of language and position that serve merely to add to their frustration.

In these States the political leader, or the moderate, practical, reasonable man who takes a stand and says, "Look, the only persons about to be hurt are our children; why can't we do what North Carolina or Tennessee has done—make a slow, token beginning?" is certain to be overwhelmed with abuse and charges of being a "nigger lover," or dangerous leftist, or worse.

If he is in one of the more rural areas of the Deep South he may well be in physical danger. The most preposterous charges are brought against him.

In the urban areas there are abusive telephone calls, threats, and slanderous mail, but there is less pressure for absolute conformity such as some rural areas demand. The moderate man, the reasonable, practical

man, the Christian or Jew who stands on his religious tenets, the moral man of no religious affiliation, all these can, and do, take a stand.

In the elections previously referred to the substantial opposition to extremes came from the cities. But, in general, in such a climate of complete political control, the powerlessness of reasonable men is difficult for those looking on from a distance, and from an entirely different climate, to believe or comprehend.

In contrast to the Deep South, North Carolina and Tennessee, for example, have no past history of reckless political exploitation of race. The leadership there, led by the respective Governors, Luther H. Hodges and Frank G. Clement, weighed the elements involved most carefully and with all deliberate speed.

Once they had surveyed and discussed they assisted the school boards that wanted to go ahead and make a start at compliance. They assured them protection. They went on television and explained the plan to the people.

In North Carolina last year there was no trouble. In Tennessee there was. Prompt and effective police action ended it. This fall there were no incidents in a planned expansion of the program.

Neither this fact, nor the progress made in border States with a southern flavor such as Kentucky, Oklahoma, and Missouri, has made any impression whatever in the Deep South to save to produce harsh criticism of those States.

In candor, it must be said that in the Deep South the future will worsen. The region will continue to be an island of complete defiance while about it the deliberate speed of slow compliance continues. Arkansas, where five small cities have integrated schools, and Virginia, whose traditions and history make her a strange and unexpected companion of the old cotton States, are separate, if related stories.

The melancholy fact is that in the Deep South the future will see more and more schools closed. One's heart goes out to the people who have not been told by their political leadership the terrible price they and their children must pay in this deliberate sacrifice of their school system. Nor has their leadership told them the truth about the private school system that many propose.

Such a plan inevitably will be subject to injunctions and tests of its legality. If a State collects a school tax or provides money for tuition it can be said to be in the business of public education. The fact that such private schools would lack proper accreditation and that their high school graduates would find it very difficult to enter college was another truth not told.

But candor also requires one to say that many, if told the truth, would not change their minds.

Certainly, the moderates in this area, used to dally wrestling with reality, know that the outlook is gloomy and will become more so. But they also know that reaction is certain.

Within days after the Supreme Court's recent ruling there were a few who were beginning to say that, much as they hated the idea, they would rather allow a few Negroes in the schools than to have no school at all. The moderate is aware that none can set a time limit on how long the chaos of closed schools and attempted, hopelessly inadequate private schools will last. It could be a long span of tragic years.

There is one thing for sure. When the reaction begins, and the bitterness of it wells up into politics, the moderate will be needed more than ever to help put the pieces together again.

In those States where the climate of leadership is more sure of itself and, therefore,

more stable, the mood of the people is such that the practical man, the moral man, and the force of moderation will make continued progress. They will grow and prosper in comparison with their neighbors.

Not many new industries will come to a State where public education is in chaos. The young people of these States will go elsewhere seeking opportunity and schooling. That, too, is part of the price to be paid.

Meanwhile, more and more the clergy in all the South is making itself heard, if not heeded, in behalf of reasonableness and against destruction of the public school system. The Southern Regional Council continues a job of factual research and study. The Southern School News Reporting Service, a strictly objective monthly report of conditions State by State, is a continuing thorn in the flesh of extremist distortions of facts.

There are individuals, organizations, and newspapers that patiently, but firmly, point out that the question of whether one is for or against segregation is not relevant. The issue is the children, the country, and the integrity of the American dream—that here is a country which offers equal and full citizenship to all who live in it. The southerner has as much of a stake in that as anyone else.

This, then, has been, and is, the role of the southern moderate—to prevent the image of due process of law and that of the inevitability bound up in the Supreme Court's decision from being blurred. The waves have rolled over him. They will again. The clamor of the angry and defiant men now and then have drowned him out. It will again.

If he is no longer in the center of the picture in the Deep South he is still in it, if at the edge. Sometimes he gets cropped off by the picture editors.

And, in the end, of course, the moderates, the reasonable, practical men, the moral men and those whose convictions are based on religion, will be there to pick up the wreckage left by those who defy the law and the courts and forget their oath to support the Constitution of the United States. The moderates will make it unnecessary to start from scratch.

Proud Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the elevation of Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT to the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is another great source of pride to the people of Arkansas. Our senior Senator, JOHN L. McCLELLAN, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and also chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate Racketeering in Labor and Industry, has brought great honor to our State.

On the House side, Arkansas has two top chairmanships, with our colleague WILBUR MILLS being chairman of the potent Committee on Ways and Means, and our colleague OREN HARRIS being chairman of the very important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

These four chairmanships make all Arkansas proud.

As an indication of this pride, I wish to insert the following articles as part of my remarks: An article in the New York Times of February 3, 1959, by Arthur Krock; and Walter Lippmann's column of February 3 from the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1959]

THE RISE OF A YOUNG MAN WITH IDEAS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—Sixteen years after the following words made history they seem to express no startling national attitude:

"[We favor] the creation of appropriate international machinery, with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and [favor] the participation of the United States . . . through its constitutional processes."

But at the time they were embodied in the public record as a statement of the international aims of the United States they marked the dramatic end of one chapter and the beginning of another in American foreign policy. As the Fulbright resolution these words and their author became famous in all the chancelleries of the world. But not for 16 years did power in the form of the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations come to match the fame of the young Representative from Arkansas who is now Senator FULBRIGHT.

Thirteen years ago the Senator gained fame of a different and unsought kind, with another idea. Unlike the proposition of the resolution, the expression of this idea was unpremeditated. He was musing aloud to oblige a reporter who asked for his thoughts on the election of a Republican Congress in 1946, only a year after President Truman had succeeded from the Vice Presidency. FULBRIGHT suggested that maybe, the times being so critical and the need for executive-legislative accord so vital, it might be a constructive act for President Truman to name a Republican as Secretary of State, the office (there being no Vice President) next in line of Presidential succession, and then resign to permit this Republican to become President.

The arrival of newspapers at the White House has often set off explosions, but none that shook the walls more powerfully than the afternoon edition in which Senator FULBRIGHT's mediation was published as a full-blown project. And, for a while the President more or less adhered to the estimate he then expressed that FULBRIGHT is an "overeducated, Oxford" expatriate. But with growing experience of how chance comments of his own were turned into sensations, he reverted to his appreciation of the Senator's high qualities as a statesman.

Subsequent to House passage of the Fulbright resolution, September 1, 1943, it was approved by the Senate under the sponsorship of Tom Connally of Texas, current incumbent of the Foreign Relations chairmanship to which FULBRIGHT has just succeeded. Then Representative James W. Wadsworth of New York, Wendell L. Willkie and Thomas E. Dewey, who had aided the Arkansan in getting the support of the House, overrode the Republican isolationists at a conference at Mackinac Island, Mich., to put the party on record for a similar resolution. And the United States, which had refused to join Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations, was committed to the principle of the United Nations organization, but with "power . . . to maintain," etc., curbed by one veto in the Security Council.

Less than 3 years after these events in foreign policy, Senator FULBRIGHT, still concentrating on measures to bring about a durable world peace, proposed, and Congress passed,

Public Law 584. This made his name perhaps more favorably known in more countries than any American legislator in many decades. Described by Secretary of State Dulles, in 1956, as "the most fabulously profitable investment ever authorized by the Congress of the United States," it is the legislation by which teachers and students are exchanged between this and many other nations. It is the cultural counterpart to our military and economic collective assistance program through the agency of young people known the world over as "Fulbright scholars."

But, despite this international fame, the Senator at 53 has just attained his first office of direct power in the formulation and conduct of United States foreign policy. The rise was slow because of the operation of the seniority system. But in this instance the Nation is the beneficiary of the system.

FULBRIGHT's immediate objective is to relax the "rigidity and inertia" of the administration's conduct of foreign policy which he sees personified by Secretary Dulles. This conduct, and the mood it reflects, not the basic policies themselves, have been the objects of his effective and intelligent criticisms.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 3, 1959]

FULBRIGHT AND DULLES

(By Walter Lippmann)

Senator GREEN has decided wisely both in resigning as chairman and in remaining as the senior member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Old men, the Greeks used to say, should not be leaders but counselors, and Senator GREEN with his long experience and his vigorous memory will be a good counselor.

Senator FULBRIGHT, who succeeds him, is a much younger man. But he is an old hand. In terms of his interest and active participation in foreign affairs, which date back to the early days of the Second World War, there are few if any Members of Congress who have such long and continuous inside knowledge. In thinking about his differences with Mr. Dulles, it is well to remember that insofar as he has been critical he has spoken as one the pioneers and early supporters of the global policies which have replaced the old isolationism.

And as a matter of fact, a study of his record will show, I believe, that the weight of his criticism has been directed not against the great purposes of foreign policy but against mistakes and distortions in their application.

His advent as chairman of the committee marks a turning point for the better in the conduct of our foreign policy. For the first time since the new era which began with World War II, the administration will have a responsible and articulate and loyal opposition. Until the conversion of Senator Vandenberg at the end of the war, the opposition was sullen and destructive. The Vandenberg arrangement was an emergency device for getting indispensable things done. But for the long run it was not a good method of governing. For instead of promoting debate, which educates the people and refines the policy of the administration, the Vandenberg bipartisan system avoided and evaded debate. The same must be said for the so-called bipartisan arrangement with Senator Walter George, who suppressed debate when the country would have been much better served by a thorough debate.

The time has now come, as the last three congressional elections have made sharply clear, when—within the framework of our world responsibilities—we must move beyond the stereotypes and the slogans of the postwar years. We cannot stand pat forever on all the positions taken in the postwar era. For the postwar era is ending, and here and abroad among our allies a new generation is

on the threshold of power. With Senator Fulbright as the chairman of the committee, the windows of the Senate will be open to the fresh air of a new time.

By coincidence, Mr. Dulles had just about decided to go to Western Europe when Senator Green stepped down. It is no secret that Mr. Dulles will be trying to work out with Dr. Adenauer and our other big European allies, a workable policy about Berlin and Germany. It must be a policy on which the allies are agreed and in which the Russians are interested enough to negotiate. This will not be easy to achieve, and it may well be that Mr. Dulles has now undertaken the most important mission of his whole career.

It will help him, not hurt him, if it is known in Europe that there is building up in the new Congress an insistence that we move off dead center, and do something more than declaim the reasons why we cannot do anything at all about anything. Nor are there so many as once there were in this country who are afraid that the allies will fall apart and that Congress will revert to isolationism if we stop consulting our fears and acting like paralyzed rabbits.

The George Washington Memorial Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, next week the House Appropriations Committee will have before it once again a request from the President to appropriate the Federal Government's share of the funds necessary to acquire right-of-way for the last portion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. In order to acquaint our colleagues with the historical significance of the area through which this 7½-mile stretch of the parkway will travel, I wish to insert in the Record a most interesting excerpt from a historical résumé prepared by Mr. Charles B. MacDonald. It is gratifying to know that historic Harmony Hall and Want Water are now to be included in the parkway. As an item of further interest, I wish to insert an excerpt from a letter received from Mr. Charles Wallace Collins, the present owner of Harmony Hall:

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

(By Charles B. MacDonald)

Twenty-nine years ago the Congress of the United States took official notice that the Capital of the Nation had outgrown the boundaries of the District of Columbia.

Washington, D.C., had, in effect, spread to parts of Montgomery and Prince Georges counties in Maryland and Arlington and Fairfax counties in Virginia. If the Capital was to continue to be a showplace worthy of the nation it represents, some measure was required to assure that development in the adjacent counties did not grip the central city in a concrete and asphalt vise.

To fill this need, the 71st Congress passed into law the so-called Capper-Cramton Act. What the Capper-Cramton Act said was this:

Because of proximity to the Capital, the regions adjacent to Washington have re-

sponsibilities to the Nation not shared by other counties far removed from the Nation's Capital. They owe it to the Nation at large to keep the Capital area beautiful and to preserve the unique scenic, recreational, and historical features of the area.

If they are to meet these responsibilities—the act said, in effect—they will need help. The Nation as a whole therefore agrees to pay one-half the purchase price of lands needed for these purposes if the adjacent territories will pay the other half. The Nation then will develop these resources as required.

The one specific purchase and development program which the Capper-Cramton Act provided for was the creation of a memorial parkway along both shores of the Potomac River, from Mount Vernon to Great Falls on one side, from Fort Washington to Great Falls on the other.

This parkway was not to be just another super-highway. It was to be a scenic route specially designed to preserve as much as possible of the shoreline of the Potomac for the enjoyment of all Americans who come to their capital and to link in a readily accessible manner the sites and monuments along the Potomac of national historical interest.

When the act passed the Congress in 1930, the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway from Arlington to Mount Vernon along the west bank of the river already was under construction. Upon its completion in 1932, it was incorporated into the parkway system, which became known as the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Today, 29 years later, some three-fourths of the parkway authorized by the Capper-Cramton Act either has been completed or is in process of construction. Only one segment, 7½ miles from Washington to Fort Washington in Prince Georges County, remains totally unrealized.

Next week, the House Appropriations Subcommittee is scheduled to act on a request from the President to appropriate the Federal Government's share of the funds necessary to acquire rights-of-way for this last portion of the parkway. If the House denies these funds, public officials in charge of the project believe this part never will be constructed. The \$28 million already spent on the three other parts will have been spent on a project never to be fully realized. When visitors come to Washington, that part of Prince Georges County bordering on the Capital would have to be swept under the carpet.

The danger that funds will be denied is great. It has already happened once—just last year. Yet planning officials and interested citizens have refused to accept what, to them, seems an unrealistic and non-visionary verdict. They will go back to the Hill for one last try.

Mr. Speaker, the request for funds for the Prince Georges County segment has not been delayed because this section is any less needed or desirable than the others. Indeed, the recent mass transportation survey for the National Capital region listed the parkway as an essential part of the area's road system. The delay comes from the fact that not until 2 years ago, in the face of indications that if the land soon was not purchased, private development would have pushed land costs to a prohibitive level, were Prince Georges County officials able to foresee their share of the costs.

The Maryland House of Delegates authorized the county to enter into an indebtedness of \$1 million as the bulk of the county's share for land acquisition. At this point, in 1957, the National Capital Planning Commission asked Congress for the Federal share of the land

costs and for an 8-year loan of \$1 million to Prince Georges County in keeping with a proviso of the Capper-Cramton Act.

This request passed the House. But the Senate Appropriations Committee delayed it until the Interior and Insular Affairs Legislative Committee could study the proposal and determine if a project planned as long ago as 1930 still was advisable.

By the time the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee had studied the project and endorsed it, it was too late for the proposal to be acted upon by the 84th Congress. House approval thus went for naught. The request would have to run the entire legislative gantlet again in 1958.

Unfortunately, the request failed to meet with the approval of the House Appropriations Committee. Efforts to restore the item in the Senate also met with failure. Virtually all agree that this was a distressing mistake and was apparently brought about by reliance upon minority testimony. Little opportunity was given to Government officials and other interested proponents to present once again the convincing case that has been made on so many occasions for the parkway.

Mr. Collins' comments follow:

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY
(Comments taken from letter of Mr. Charles Wallace Collins, Harmony Hall, Oxon Hill, Md.)

This property is in the neighborhood closely associated with the life of George Washington. It is on the Maryland side of the Potomac. Directly across the river from Harmony Hall is Wellington, the home of Washington's secretary, Tobias Lear. It is situated on the original Mt. Vernon estate.

Washington ferried across the Potomac to the Maryland shore at Warburton Manor—now Fort Washington.

Ancient Want Water adjoins Harmony Hall on the north. It was built before 1700 and was the home of Col. William M. Lyles, a personal friend and neighbor of Washington. It is listed in the Historic American Buildings Survey—as is Harmony Hall. Nearby is St. John's Church which dates back to 1692. Washington frequently worshipped here. His pew is marked today with a silver plate along with that of Colonel Lyles.

No part of the George Washington Memorial Parkway is more appropriate to the memory of Washington than the neighborhood of Broad Creek.

Letter by Birmingham Businessman States Case for South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter to the President of the United States from the Honorable Harry B. Lackey, assistant vice president of the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co. in my home city of Birmingham.

Mr. Lackey is an outstanding citizen of our city and, indeed, of the South. One of his more notable civic contributions to our State was made when for 3 consecutive years, 1954, 1955, 1956, he served as Alabama State chairman for the USO, for that organization's fund-raising drives. This is only one of the many ways that he has proved his civic pride and patriotism, and thus his right to be heard with attentiveness when he voices an opinion on a matter of grave concern to our Nation.

Mr. Lackey's letter contains the thought-provoking idea that, if the Federal Government, particularly through its executive and judicial branches, cannot control its insatiable appetite for creating confusion, strife and turmoil within the confines of our Nation and particularly in the southern section of our country—whether on constitutional questions, legal principles, or long-established social customs—that it set up Federal schools in the South where consideration of racial heritage and background would be totally ignored, to be attended by any children whose parents desired for them to have an integrated education. The proposal does not touch the ancient and, until recently, hallowed system of State schools, which system in the South realistically recognizes that racial segregation is of the utmost importance if order, concord, and cultural advancement of the respective races are to prevail.

In other words, there would be two systems of education: the State system, segregated because the State and a massive majority of its citizen-taxpayers want it segregated, and a Federal system, integrated because those currently in control of the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government think, as they view the situation abstractly and pseudo-idealistically, that it should be integrated. Then the people being left that divine right to decide for themselves, should determine which system should properly and most effectively provide their children the desired goal—an education.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal, worthy of the serious consideration of all those who so loudly cry for action, action—regardless of the dire consequences of that action, proves once again that on this crucial issue, the people of the South stand united and militant. It demonstrates, by its thorough reasoning and its calm tone that, in this cause, we are steadfast though not unapproachable, properly concerned though not blindly frantic, right though not arrogant.

The letter follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA. October 9, 1958.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: It is with some reluctance and certainly with great humility that I write you this letter. First, may I identify myself as the former Alabama State chairman for U.S.O. in the annual fund raising drives for 1954, 1955 and 1956. Through some degree of effort on my part, we were able to raise in this State over one quarter of a million dollars during this period. I attended the meeting in Washington when we visited with you on the

steps of the White House in 1956, when the "Viking" Adm. J. L. Hall, Jr., was national chairman. I was in the picture taken on that occasion and later published in the U.S.O. Bulletin, a copy attached. Incidentally, I have framed and treasure a copy of that picture which was sent to me by U.S.O. in New York. Charlie Yates, of Atlanta, asked me to do this civic chore during those years and I feel good for having done so.

The purpose of this letter is far from USO activities and I relate the foregoing only for the purpose of seeking your attention because I know how sincerely you felt about that organization. Those of us who worked for the good of USO, both during and after the war, were only too glad to respond to the call for seeing to it that the objectives of this fine organization were attained. I hope I am not improperly taking advantage of a situation.

During my lifetime, I know of no man affiliated with the Republican Party that caught the imagination of our section of the country more than you when you first ran for the Presidency and were later reelected. I think people in our section, and I have occasion to talk with a number of leaders in our State, still have explicit confidence in you, but, at the same time, recent events, and I have reference to the integration issue, have created keen disappointment and irreparable damage to your political party. The question is: Who is responsible? Generally speaking, the belief is that the actions and events that have taken place were not so much your decision as it was action upon advice of others, which we all recognize is so necessary to the complete functioning of the Presidency.

I shall not attempt to picture for you the shock and disappointment of the turn of events on the part of your administration and the U.S. Supreme Court as it relates to the integration question. I believe that the people of this section are more determined and more united to resist what is now being done by the NAACP, which apparently has full approval of and is being fostered by our present Government and Court. Naturally, I do not know the feeling that existed prior to and during the War Between the States, but I have heard my grandparents relate it and it seems to me that the old sores have been opened and salt poured into the almost healed wounds. To say that the people of this section of the United States are just resistive is putting it mildly. I really believe that our people would bear arms over this issue rather than submit to integrated public schools which we believe would ultimately lead to mongrelization of America. The people of this section of our Nation, largely Anglo-Saxon, want no part of what we see now taking place in Washington, D.C. We believe the people of Virginia where my forefathers, I am told "came to this country about 1780 from Scotland along with the Scotts, Edmontons, Davises, and Campbells," are well within their moral, human, and religious rights in the position they have taken.

I have strayed from what I really want to write about, but I thought you would be interested in this reflection of opinion which I believe can be proved easily. I offer to you a sincere and, what I am told, is a practical suggestion. It is this: In the Friday, October 3, issue of the Birmingham News, an article by Robert S. Allen is headed, "As a Last Resort To Achieve Integration—United States Exploring Idea of Opening Schools in Dixie." Mr. Allen is quoted as saying, "The Justice Department head would have the Federal Government establish and operate integrated schools in these areas." The article goes on to say that you have indicated you may accept this plan "as a last resort."

I believe the people in this area would accept such a plan; that is, have the Fed-

eral Government own and operate such schools and, furthermore, that the people in the South would be willing to submit to a direct tax to support them. These schools would be known as Federal schools and would enable any parent of any child to send them to such schools if he so desired. By the same token, the States should be permitted to operate their schools in whatever manner they see fit, either publicly owned and operated or privately owned and operated. This is not unique, such schools now function without any friction on military reservations in the South. If Congress would recognize the problem and pass the necessary legislation it, no doubt, would receive congressional support in the South.

Those of us who have children in school are unwilling to see the entering wedge of integration in this area because we are fearful of the ultimate result and do not believe that the Supreme Court can change the order of things in our area by the reversal of a long standing decision to the contrary which was made many years ago and with which we have kept faith. No doubt the idea should be tested further and it is my proposal to discuss it with our Alabama congressional delegation, all of whom I know and have dealt with personally. If the possibilities of this idea are explored to the fullest, it should receive approval on the part of the people most affected, that is, in the South, and we could head a grave problem in a different and acceptable direction.

I write this letter as strictly a personal matter because I have three daughters in school and, like many thousands of others, would not agree to sending them to integrated schools. Fortunately, it would not be necessary unless private schools were overcrowded and there wouldn't be room available. Moreover, one is now at the University of Alabama and the twins will be in college next year.

My plea, therefore, is for a solution to the overall problem, rather than to a personal problem. Someday I, like you, may have grandchildren and to that extent I am personally interested.

I would be grateful to receive some expression from you. I am sending this letter with a personal note to General Persons, whose brother, the former governor of the State of Alabama, I know well and hold in high regard. I hope it reaches your desk.

Respectfully,

HARRY B. LACKEY.

Unarmed American Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Department of State today has released a statement detailing the discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union relative to the disappearance over Soviet Armenia of our unarmed C-130 transport on September 2, 1958. The Soviet Union returned 6 bodies from the crew of 17 aboard. On January 15, 1959, I introduced House Resolution 112 which asked that the President "take such steps as may be necessary to present to Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, while that Soviet official is currently visiting the United States, a formal re-

quest for information concerning the whereabouts of the 11 American airmen who are still missing" from that incident.

Both Secretary Dulles and Vice President Nixon questioned Mr. Mikoyan, but no satisfaction was received. Today the State Department has released not only a chronology of its repeated efforts to discover the whereabouts of these men whose status is uncertain, but also three revealing documents which confirm our darkest fears.

The first paper contains a 12-page "Translation of Transcript of Tape-Recorded Radio Conversation Among Soviet Fighter Pilots Who Participated in Attack on C-130, September 2, 1958." The second and third documents are translations—with photostats of the original Russian articles included—of two articles in Soviet Aviation, the newspaper of the Soviet Air Force, on September 19 and 20, 1958.

The first article, entitled "Great Skill: Part 1: The Target Is Detected," glowingly portrayed the role of the anti-aircraft defense posts in detecting an aerial target. The following day, part 2, entitled "A Swift Attack," was published. This relates the guidance to the target of Soviet fighter planes. It is significant to note that in both these articles constant reference is made to Soviet interceptors Nos. 201 and 582 as they are guided to the so-called target, also referred to as the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I now call your attention to page 3 of the official translation of the tape-recorded radio conversation which took place between the Soviet fighter pilots who shot down our C-130 unarmed transport.

582, I see the target, to the right.
I see the target, a large one.
Its altitude is 100, as you said.
I am 201, I see the target, attack.
I am 201. I am attacking the target.
You are understood.
I am attacking the target.
Stand by.
The target is a large one.
Roger.
Attack, attack, 218 attack.
Stand by.
582.
Roger.

I only wish space allowed me to include the full transcript of this murderous attack which was uncalled for by every standard of civilized nations. On page 4 of the transcript, one pilot states, "The target is a transport, four-engined." Further attacks. Then "The target is burning, 582." More attacks, followed by "The tail assembly is falling off the target." On page 5, we note the Soviet pilots saying:

Look at him, he will not get away, he is already falling. Yes, he is falling. I will finish him off, boys, I will finish him off on the run. The target has lost control, it is going down.

It is deplorable to note that the articles in Soviet Aviation conclude with the description of a general welcoming home the pilots: "He shook their hands warmly and thanked them for their successful execution of the mission."

The butchers of Hungary again have done their evil deeds. The repeated disdain registered by the Soviet Foreign Of-

fice to our inquiries in this case and their refusal to let American Embassy personnel in Moscow visit the scene of the crash, shows not a feeling of remorse and regret, but a feeling of overbearing arrogance.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the release by the Department of State concerning this sordid affair. I am sure that it will be of great interest to all Members of the House and the public generally.

The release follows:

U.S. REPRESENTATIONS TO SOVIET GOVERNMENT REGARDING UNARMED U.S. AIR FORCE C-130 TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT SHOT DOWN BY SOVIET FIGHTER AIRCRAFT OVER SOVIET ARMENIA ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1958

On September 2, 1958, an unarmed U.S. Air Force C-130 transport aircraft disappeared while on a flight in Turkey. Seventeen men were aboard the plane.

As the result of an investigation conducted by the U.S. Air Force in Europe (USAFE), it was determined that the plane had been intercepted and attacked by Soviet fighter aircraft in the region of the Turkish-Soviet frontier near Kars, Turkey, following which it had crashed in flames in Soviet Armenia.

On September 24, 1958, the remains of six men were turned over to U.S. authorities.

The U.S. Government has repeatedly pressed the Soviet Government for the return of the missing 11 members of the crew of this plane or for information regarding their condition and whereabouts. In its latest written communication on this subject, a note of October 16, 1958, the Soviet Government repeated its earlier denials that any further information was available regarding members of the crew of the plane.

REPRESENTATION BY DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY MURPHY

On November 13, 1958, Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy made a lengthy oral representation to Soviet Ambassador Mikhail A. Menshikov, presenting him with evidence that Soviet fighter planes had intercepted the C-130 and shot it down without regard to the rules of civilized international practice. Mr. Murphy said that the United States wished a settlement of this case. He emphasized that some of our men had been killed, that there were certain rules of conduct in the civilized world, and that the United States Government hoped the desired information regarding the 11 missing men would be promptly forthcoming. The Soviet Ambassador said that he would convey the details of this representation to his Government. (A full account of Mr. Murphy's representation is attached.)

The Soviet Government did not reply to this representation.

REPRESENTATION BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

On January 7, 1959, the Vice President of the United States received the First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Anastas I. Mikoyan. During the course of their conversation, the Vice President raised the question of the eleven missing crew members of the C-130. Referring to the desirability of reducing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union, the Vice President said it would be useful to make progress on matters like this one. He said it would be helpful if the Soviet Government gave the United States Government an indication or a statement about what had happened to the men involved. The Vice President said that the C-130 case has great emotional impact in the United States. Great concern is felt about this case by the American people.

Mr. Mikoyan replied that the Soviet Government had given all the information it

had. He said that there was no sense in their trying to hide anything and wondered why the Americans were so suspicious about this.

REPRESENTATION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The Secretary took up with Mr. Mikoyan on January 16, 1959, the destruction by Soviet planes of the unarmed C-130, and asked for information regarding the eleven missing crew members. He pointed out that response by the Soviet Government to our representations would help to satisfy serious anxieties felt by the American people, who want the missing men returned, and that a meaningful response would be a helpful step from the standpoint of United States-Soviet relations.

Mr. Mikoyan said that the Soviet Government had done all that it could, that all the bodies had been returned, and that the Soviet Government did not know about any other personnel. Mr. Mikoyan protested that there would be no point in the Soviet Government holding any bodies or living crewmen, and he expressed the Soviet Government's lack of understanding and irritation over the U.S. Government's insistence concerning this case. He denied that the plane had been shot down, asserting that it had crashed.

In view of the refusal of the Soviet Government to respond satisfactorily to this Government's representations on this case, the U.S. Government reserves its rights with reference to the human and material losses incurred as a result of the Soviet action of September 2, 1958.

The remains of six members of the crew of the C-130 were returned to United States authorities on September 24, 1958. Four of the crew members were subsequently identified and were buried in accordance with the wishes of next of kin. The two unidentified remains will be buried with full military honors at Arlington National Cemetery at 11 a.m. on February 6, 1959.

ATTACHMENT No. 1

REPRESENTATION BY DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY MURPHY TO SOVIET AMBASSADOR MENSHIKOV, NOVEMBER 13, 1958

On November 13, 1958, Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy received Soviet Ambassador Mikhail A. Menshikov, who was accompanied by Maj. Gen. Mikhail N. Kostouk, Air Attaché of the Soviet Embassy at Washington.

Mr. Murphy recalled Ambassador Menshikov's past statements regarding his desire to promote improved U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations and better understanding between the two countries. He then referred to the loss of the U.S. Air Force C-130 in Soviet Armenia on September 2, 1958, as a cause of grave misunderstanding. He expressed the hope that the Ambassador would cooperate in removing this misunderstanding.

Mr. Murphy told the Ambassador that it was difficult for the U.S. Government to understand why the Soviet Government had supplied no information regarding the crash until 10 days after the incident had occurred, and then had furnished only a fragmentary report. Mr. Murphy reviewed the facts in the case and informed the Ambassador that it appeared to the U.S. Government that the American pilot, as a result of the signals transmitted by radiobeacons in Soviet Georgia and Armenia, had probably made a navigational error which resulted in his unintentionally crossing the Soviet border. The plane, having thus flown into Soviet territory, had been shot down by Soviet fighter aircraft without regard to the rules of civilized international practice, as though it were an enemy aircraft. The tail assembly had been shot off and the plane had fallen out of control.

There had been 17 men in the plane, but the remains of only 6 men had been returned

to the American authorities. Accordingly, the U.S. Government was making this démarche to the Soviet Government through Ambassador Menshikov for information in the possession of the Soviet Government regarding the men who were still missing. Mr. Murphy said that he could not emphasize enough the gravity with which the U.S. Government viewed this case. The U.S. Government wanted the facts. It wanted to know what had happened to the men.

Since the Ambassador had questioned Mr. Murphy's statement that the U.S. plane had been shot down by Soviet fighter aircraft, Mr. Murphy offered to have played for the Ambassador a recording of the radio conversation between the Soviet pilots who had shot down the C-130. The Ambassador declined to listen to this recording, saying that he was not competent to assess it from a technical point of view. Mr. Murphy explained that it was for that reason that the Soviet Air Attaché, General Kostouk, an aviation expert, had been invited to accompany the Ambassador on his call. Mr. Murphy explained that the Ambassador had been summoned in order that facts known to the U.S. Government might be communicated to him as Soviet Ambassador to the United States for conveyance to his Government. Mr. Murphy said that it was Ambassador Menshikov's responsibility, as Soviet Ambassador to the United States, to listen to the representations that were being made to him. The Soviet Ambassador nonetheless refused to listen to the tape recording. Mr. Murphy then gave the Ambassador a transcript in Russian of the recording.

Ambassador Menshikov stated that the Soviet Government had replied to the notes addressed to it by the U.S. Government on this matter and suggested that these replies represented all the information available to the Soviet Government. Mr. Murphy replied that evidence in the possession of the U.S. Government indicated that additional and very important information was available, and added that it was the intention of the U.S. Government to pursue this case further. Mr. Murphy said that the U.S. Government wished a settlement of this case. He emphasized that some of our men had been killed, that there were certain rules of conduct in the civilized world, and that the U.S. Government hoped the desired information regarding the missing men would be promptly forthcoming.

Mr. Murphy then briefly reviewed the case once more, pointing out that the operation of Soviet radio beacons in the area might easily have induced a navigational error on the part of the pilot. He said that the plane had entered Soviet airspace in error and not intentionally.

Mr. Murphy then read most of a translation of an article entitled "Great Skill: A Swift Attack," which had been published in Soviet Aviation, the newspaper of the Soviet Air Force, on September 20, 1958. When he had concluded, the Soviet Ambassador asked Mr. Murphy whether what had been read were fiction. Mr. Murphy then handed the Ambassador photostatic copies of the article and a preceding one on the same subject. Mr. Murphy once more told the Ambassador that the U.S. Government regarded this case with extreme gravity.

Ambassador Menshikov said that he would convey the details of this representation to his Government.

ATTACHMENT No. 2

CHRONOLOGY OF CASE OF USAF C-130 SHOT DOWN OVER SOVIET ARMENIA ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1958

September 2: An unarmed USAF C-130 transport aircraft, attached to the 7406th Support Squadron based at Rhine-Main Air Base, Frankfurt, Germany, disappears between Trabzon and Van, Turkey, while participating in a worldwide Air Force project to study the propagation of radio waves

transmitted by United States radio stations. The plane was on a flight from Adana to Trabzon to Van and back to Adana, all within Turkey. Aboard the aircraft were Capt. Paul E. Duncan, Washington, D.C.; 1st Lt. John E. Simpson, Richland, Wash.; Capt. Rudy J. Swiestra, Compton, Calif.; 1st Lt. Ricardo M. Villarreal, Laredo, Tex.; Capt. Edward J. Jeruss, New Haven, Conn.; Sgt. Leroy Price, Hodgeville, Ky.; T. Sgt. Arthur L. Mello, Erie, Pa.; M. Sgt. George P. Petrochilos, Levittown, Pa.; Alc. Robert J. Oshinskie, Shamokin, Pa.; A2c. James E. Ferguson, Jr., La Porte, Ind.; ASC Joe L. Fields, Cynthia, Ky.; ASC Gerald C. Maggiamo, Everett, Mass.; ASC Harold T. Camps, Coleman, Wis.; ASC Robert H. Moore, West Monroe, La.; ASC Archie T. Bourg, Baton Rouge, La.; ASC Clement O. Mankins, Fayette, Pa.; ASC Gerald H. Medeiros, New Bedford, Mass.

The Turkish Government and the Air Force begin an intensive search for the missing plane.

September 6: The American Embassy at Moscow delivers a note to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the American Embassy in Teheran orally approaches the Iranian Foreign Ministry, asking for any available information regarding the plane and its crew of 17 (see press release No. 518, dated Sept. 6, 1958).

September 8: The Soviet Foreign Ministry orally informs the American Embassy at Moscow that the Soviet authorities conducting the investigation requested in the Embassy's note of September 6 desire to know in what region the plane might have approached the Soviet border. In response to the Embassy's question, the Ministry states that the Soviet authorities have no information about the plane.

September 12: The Soviet Foreign Ministry delivers a note to the American Embassy at Moscow in which it is stated that a USAF aircraft has been found 55 kilometers northwest of Yerevan in Soviet Armenia (see press release No. 534, dated September 12, 1958). The note further states that remains of bodies were found "from which it is possible to assume that six members of the plane crew perished." The note charges a deliberate violation of the Soviet frontier. In answer to oral questions put by the U.S. Chargé d'Affaires, Richard H. Davis, the Soviet Foreign Ministry states it has no further information to add to that given in the note. The Chargé d'Affaires requests that a further search for the missing men be made, that an officer of the Embassy or another U.S. official be permitted to visit the crash site of the plane and that arrangements be made for the transfer to American authority of the remains of the six crew members mentioned in the Soviet note.

September 13: The American Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow delivers a note to the Soviet Foreign Ministry requesting information as to the whereabouts and condition of the 11 missing men and stating that the United States expects full cooperation from the Soviet Government in granting access to the crewmen and in returning them. The note also requests that representatives of the Embassy accompanied by technical experts as may be required to investigate the circumstances of the crash be permitted to visit the scene of the crash and that facilities be extended to them for effecting identification of the victims and arranging for the transfer of their remains to appropriate U.S. authorities. The note goes on to reject the Soviet charge that the plane intentionally violated the Soviet frontier and states that the U.S. Government is unable to understand the delay of the Soviet authorities in furnishing it with the limited information contained in the Soviet note of September 12 or the oral denial of any information made by a Foreign Ministry official. It states further that the U.S. Air Force has information to the effect

that the plane was intercepted by three Soviet fighter aircraft in the region of the Soviet-Turkish frontier, that following the interception the plane proceeded eastward under the control of the Soviet aircraft, and that shortly after this an explosion was heard and a large column of smoke was observed rising at a point within Soviet territory. Finally, the note demands complete information regarding the circumstances surrounding and following the interception. In answer to a question of the Chargé d'Affaires, the Ministry official to whom the note was delivered repeats that the Soviet authorities have no further information on the missing men.

September 15: The American Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, Richard H. Davis, asks Acting Soviet Foreign Minister Kuznetsov when a reply to the note of September 13 will be forthcoming and if he has any further information on the missing men, pointing out the anguish suffered by the men's relatives. The Acting Foreign Minister replies that he has no further information, that a reply will be expedited, and that these unpleasant affairs would be avoided if American planes would stop penetrating Soviet airspace.

September 17: Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Plyubin repeats the answers given two days earlier by the Acting Foreign Minister to the same questions put by the American Chargé d'Affaires.

September 19: The Soviet Foreign Ministry replies to the American Embassy's note of September 13. The reply states that the Soviet Government has no information on the 11 missing crewmen and indicates the willingness of the Soviet Government to transfer to the American authorities the remains of 6 members of the crew found at the site of the crash. The note denies that Soviet fighter planes intercepted the USAF C-130 in the area of the Turkish-Soviet frontier. The American Chargé d'Affaires again presses the Acting Soviet Foreign Minister for information on the 11 missing men but is told that the Soviet Government has no information about them. The Chargé d'Affaires also reiterates the request that American officials be permitted to examine the wreckage at the scene of the crash, but is informed that this would not be possible. In response to a question, the Acting Soviet Foreign Minister tells the American Chargé d'Affaires that he has nothing to add to what is in the note concerning the circumstances surrounding the crash.

September 21: The American Embassy at Moscow delivers a note to the Soviet Foreign Ministry again requesting information on the missing 11 crewmen. The note also requests the transfer without delay of the remains and all materials which will facilitate identification of the six airmen who are known to have perished.

September 24: The remains of the six airmen are delivered by the Soviet authorities at Leninakan on the Soviet-Turkish frontier to the Air Attaché of the American Embassy in Ankara (see Press Release No. 555 of September 23, 1958).

October 3: The American Ambassador at Moscow hands to the Acting Soviet Foreign Minister a note requesting further information on the plane (see Press Release No. 587 of October 7, 1958). The note repeats the description of the interception of the USAF C-130 by Soviet fighter aircraft in the area of the Turkish-Soviet frontier and states that it must be assumed that the Soviet fighter pilots involved have knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the crash of this unarmed plane. The note states that in view of this, the United States Government cannot understand why the Soviet Government appears unable to furnish information on the circumstances of the crash or on the whereabouts and condition of the missing 11 airmen. After again rejecting the Soviet charge that the C-130 intention-

ally violated the Soviet frontier, the note requests information on the crash and on the missing men, requests that United States technical experts be permitted to examine the wreckage at the crash site, and states that the United States reserves the right to full compensation for the loss of the aircraft and its equipment.

October 6: In the course of a conversation on another matter raised by the Ambassador, Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert D. Murphy requests Soviet Ambassador Menshikov for information on the missing 11 airmen and for access by U.S. authorities to the crash site of the C-130. The Ambassador states that the Soviet Government has no further information on the matter and that, since the crash site was probably in a restricted frontier area, the United States was asking to visit a closed area in the Soviet Union. Mr. Murphy asks Ambassador Menshikov to inform the Soviet Government of his comments, adding that the United States has evidence that the C-130 was shot down.

October 16: American Ambassador Thompson is handed a note by Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Kuznetsov in Moscow. The note reiterates the statements contained in earlier Soviet communications on this subject to the effect that no further information is available and that the United States bears the responsibility for the incident.

November 4: The Air Force announces the identification of four of the six-crew members who perished in the crash and whose remains were transferred to American officials on September 24. The Air Force announces that the two crew members whose remains were not identified will be buried at Arlington National Cemetery with full military honors. The crew members identified were:

1st Lt. John E. Simpson, Richland, Wash.; Capt. Rudy J. Swiestra, Compton, Calif.; 1st Lt. Ricardo M. Villarreal, Laredo, Tex.; Capt. Edward J. Jeruss, New Haven, Conn.

November 13: Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert D. Murphy receives Soviet Ambassador Menshikov, who is accompanied by Maj. Gen. Mikhail N. Kostikov, Air Attaché of the Soviet Embassy at Washington. Mr. Murphy presents the Soviet Ambassador with evidence that Soviet fighter planes intercepted the C-130 and shot it down.

January 7, 1959: Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, during a conversation with Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, asks that the Soviet Government give the United States Government an indication or a statement about what happened to the 11 missing crew members of the C-130. Mr. Mikoyan replies that the Soviet Government had given all the information it had.

January 16: The Secretary of State, during a conversation with Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan in the afternoon of January 16, asks about the fate of the crew of the C-130. Mr. Mikoyan says that the Soviet Government had done all that it could do. Mr. Mikoyan declares that the plane had not been shot down.

General Electric Receives Award for Its Work To Improve Understanding Among Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on January 30 of this year a distinguished firm with its headquarters in New York

State, General Electric Co., received a special award for its efforts to improve world relations. At a dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, the Institute of International Education celebrated its 40th birthday, as part of the third national conference on exchange of persons, which the institute sponsored.

A highlight of the dinner was the award by Vice President Nixon to General Electric, as one of five organizations, institutions, or individuals which has made unusual contributions to the improvement of understanding among nations.

In bestowing this award, the institute recognized the outstanding programs General Electric has carried out through the years by means of which many young people from abroad have been introduced to this country and have returned to their homelands to better conditions there, as well as to serve as ambassadors of good will for the United States.

We in New York State are extremely proud of this record, and are happy to join with the entire Nation in saluting General Electric for its manifold contributions to cementing world friendship and cooperation. The citation accompanying the award to General Electric outlines well the company's many international activities. It was accepted by Mr. J. S. Parker, vice president of General Electric Co., in the absence of Mr. W. R. Herod, president of International General Electric Co.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the citation be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR A U.S. CORPORATION

To the General Electric Co., an American corporation known throughout the world for its dynamic leadership and dedication to progress, the Institute of International Education presents its award for distinguished service.

The history of General Electric Co.'s 70 years of growth reflects its confidence and willingness to invest in a peaceful future. Matching the vision of its men of research, production and distribution has been General Electric's imaginative acceptance of its responsibility for public service, not only in the United States but in the more than one hundred other countries in which it operates around the globe.

Within a year after its incorporation, General Electric Co., in 1893, brought its first foreign student to the United States for training. Since that pioneer step, over 1,800 young men and women from 62 countries have trained in this country under the company's sponsorship and guidance. Returning to their homes with new knowledge and skills, and better understanding of the economic, social, and political structure of the United States, these young people have taken positions with local industry, government, and educational institutions. Their contribution to the economic and social development of their own nations and to the betterment of international understanding has been profound.

In addition to this major program of educational exchange, General Electric has brought thousands of its own employees and those of affiliated concerns to the United States for specialized training and observation of American industrial and community life. It conducts in the countries where it operates dozens of training schools, not only

for instruction in mechanical skills essential to industrial advancement but in the English language, public health, and other subjects of importance to local employees and communities. It has cooperated closely with the U.S. Government and other agencies in providing training and observation opportunities for great numbers of foreign specialists and advanced engineers. Its domestic plants each year receive more than 2,000 special observers from countries throughout the world.

Taking the best of its laboratories and plants to millions of people, the famed Science Show of General Electric has toured the world, revealing to men and women of other nations the wonders of the future and giving new hope for their own technical, economic, and social advancement. As a public service in the field of medicine, General Electric cooperated in introducing educational television to Latin America. Nearly a decade ago, in the infancy of closed-circuit broadcasting, the company's program "Video Medico" provided Latin-American doctors with training in advanced surgery techniques. This represented a revolutionary teaching concept both at home and abroad.

The Institute of International Education believes that the General Electric Co.'s record of service and leadership in meeting international responsibilities, and its faith in the future of foreign economic development, merit this award.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address by Paul M. Butler at Luncheon Honoring Gov. G. Mennen Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at a New Year's Day luncheon honoring G. Mennen Williams on his inauguration as Governor of Michigan for a sixth term the guest speaker was Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Butler's luncheon address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH OF PAUL M. BUTLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, AT INAUGURAL LUNCHEON FOR GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, LANSING, MICH., JANUARY 1, 1959

This is a most memorable occasion for all of us.

First of all, it is a great day for the people of the State of Michigan, for today marks the renewal of another 2-year period of progress and achievement for the citizens of this State, under one of the most notable administrations in the history of American State government—an administration noted not only for its longevity in office but for its breadth and caliber of accomplishment.

The transformation of the character and quality of the government of this State over the past decade has served to place Michigan in the front ranks of the best governed States in the Union. The people of Michigan know and appreciate this fact.

For this reason, they have adopted the pleasant habit of returning Governor Williams and the Democratic Party to the Executive Mansion in Lansing each 2 years—and, judging by the results, I would say that it is one of the most fortunate habits that the people of this State have ever acquired. It speaks well of their political judgment and of their desire to keep their State government attuned to the ever increasing needs of a constantly growing and rapidly changing society.

Thus, today should be a day of rejoicing for the citizens of Michigan, for the achievements of the past decade, under Governor Williams' leadership, have served to make Michigan a truly great State in which to live.

This is a great day particularly for Governor Williams and his family. I am sure that it is difficult for many of us to realize that today marks the beginning of Governor Williams' 11th year as Governor—a feat unprecedented in Michigan history—for Governor Williams is one of the younger men in American political life.

At an age that would be considered very early for many capable men to first achieve high public office, Governor Williams is already the senior Governor of the United States, and he has achieved what to my

knowledge no other man in modern American history has attained—election as Governor of one of our greatest States for six consecutive terms.

I know that it must be a source of great pride to Governor Williams to know that the people of his State have bestowed upon him these repeated reaffirmations of confidence and expressions of approval for a job well done. But we know that they are tributes which have been hard won and are well deserved, indeed. Governor Williams knows that the best politics is a strong record of positive achievement and that the people always respect a man of courage and conviction, even if they disagree with him on occasions. That is why your Governor is beginning his sixth term in office today.

Finally, this is a great day for the Democratic Party, and to appreciate this fact freely, one has only to look to the situation of our party in this State a decade ago.

Ten years ago, the Democrats had no U.S. Senate seat, only 3 out of 17 Congressmen, 4 out of 32 State senators, 5 out of 100 State representatives, no members of the State administrative board, no members of any higher education boards, and only 2 Democratic-nominated justices on the State supreme court.

Today, for the first time in history, Democrats hold all top State offices and both U.S. Senate seats. In addition, we have elected 7 out of 18 Congressmen, 12 State senators out of 34, 55 out of 110 members of the State house of representatives, all 8 members of the State Administrative Board, 4 out of 6 members of the board of agriculture, 4 out of 8 members of the University of Michigan Board of Regents, 1 out of 3 seats on the board of education, and 5 members out of 8 on the State supreme court.

Another interesting fact is that since 1954 there have been 40 statewide elective positions at stake in five elections. Democrats have won 37 out of the 40 positions, scoring "sweeps" in four out of the five elections.

The past few years have witnessed a remarkable expansion of support for our party throughout the Nation, especially in the West and Far West, and in those areas which had only recently been thought of as impregnable Republican strongholds—such as Maine, Vermont, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota. But nowhere has the record of growth of our party been more widespread and more sustained than here in Michigan—a fact which should be a source of great pride to every Democrat in this State.

Of course, this record just did not happen. There are a number of very substantial reasons for it.

First of all is the fact that not only is Governor Williams an outstanding Governor, he is a great party leader and he takes seriously his responsibility to provide political leadership.

Governor Williams knows that it is impossible for one man alone to achieve all the things which a good Governor should do for the State, and that that government which is most responsible and most responsive to the needs of the people is able, dedicated party government, functioning within the framework of the two-party system. He knows also that the principles and program of our great party transcend any one individual, and that it is necessary to develop a large number of capable and dedicated men and women who can assume positions of responsibility, carry on the work of our party,

assist with the implementation of the Governor's program and give effective expression to our party's aims and ideals at all levels.

The role of Governor can be decisive in the growth of his political party. Governor Williams has chosen to act vigorously as a party leader, to provide direction, to give of his time and effort to building the party. And the results show it.

Other very substantial reasons for this great record of party success are, of course, that grand gentleman, Neil Staebler, one of the finest men and one of the most able chairmen in our party; your outstanding and distinguished representatives on the national committee, Mrs. Margaret Price and Tom Quimby and, as an alternate, Mrs. Mildred Jeffrey; your wonderful vice chairman, Miss Adelaide Hart, and scores of other such dedicated men and women of this caliber who constitute the leadership of our party in this State.

Under this leadership, active political organizations have been developed throughout the State at the county level; the precincts have been organized; many people never before politically active have been persuaded to assume political responsibilities; effective representation and leadership have been provided from your State on the national level and the whole base of our party leadership has been broadened, as it should be, to give maximum expression to the largest possible number of party members.

To belong to the Democratic Party in Michigan, to participate in it and to work on its behalf has been made an enjoyable, meaningful, and most rewarding experience for the individual.

Consequently, you have developed one of the finest groups of precinct and county committee workers of any State in the Nation and they are the backbone of any party.

Another very important reason for the success of our party in this State has been the caliber of candidates you have chosen to carry our party's banner—men like Governor Williams; that able and fearless fighter for the people's interest, Senator Pat McNAMARA; your outstanding, intelligent, and most promising Senator-elect, PHIL HART; your fine newly elected Lieutenant Governor, John Swainson; your unusually competent congressional delegation; the members of the State administrative board, and other elected State officials.

Today, more than ever before, voters are taking a closer look at the candidates themselves, and unless the man or woman is, in and of himself or herself, worthy of the job to which he or she aspires, the chances are that the party label will not be sufficient to pull them through. One of the most outstanding features of our party here in Michigan has been your ability to keep coming up with candidates of unusual ability, integrity and attractiveness to the voter. That is the acid test of any good party organization.

As important as are the factors which I have just outlined, I do not believe that our party could ever have achieved the record it has here in Michigan, had it not been for the fact that the Democratic Party of Michigan is first and foremost an "issue-oriented" organization—one held together primarily by belief in and devotion to some commonly held, clearly enunciated principles that provide motivation for political action.

This, it seems to me, is the keystone upon which politics in the modern era must be founded.

The extent and nature of the modern means of mass communication, the increased educational level of the population, the increasing importance of nationalizing trends as regards both section and nationality, the expanding participation of citizens in the processes of political parties and the growing importance of governmental programs in the Nation's economy and the everyday life of the citizen are all increasing the emphasis on the power of issues, principles and ideas as the forces which are most responsible for the attraction and lasting attachment of new people to the banners of political parties.

Party leaders are fast discovering, some the hard way, that political organizations based solely on patronage, personal favors and the power and prestige of public office no longer enjoy the tremendous effectiveness they once possessed.

While these factors continue to be important forces to be reckoned with in building a party organization, other factors are growing in importance.

The caliber and personality of individual candidates are of increasing importance, but while temporary winning combinations may be put together on the basis of a candidate's personality alone, it is his performance in office and his identification with meaningful issues and principles that counts the most in the building of a vigorous and lasting party organization which can survive the passage of the personality from the scene.

Thus it is that the "new politics" places a premium on principles and demands greater attention be given to issues and the kind of image that the party projects to the average citizen.

A party organization which is held together by the bonds of common convictions and dedication to principles and ideas may be a more difficult and delicate structure to create but it is fashioned of hardy material, designed to endure and function as a truly responsible party should. Such a party is not only a tribute to its leadership, but a positive contribution to the society in which it operates.

And it is the most winning kind of organization. Proof of this can readily be seen in the results of recent elections, for wherever our party is creating an issue-oriented organization and is emphasizing a hard-hitting approach based on issues designed to clarify the differences between our party and the opposition, we are making steady and often phenomenal progress and achieving some remarkable victories in areas where victories by Democrats had never been seriously considered before.

It is not surprising that this should be so. For the greatest strength of our party down through the years has always been the things in which we believed. Because of our attention to issues and principles we have become known as the party of ideas. This has been our secret of success both in winning elections, achieving and maintaining a position as the majority party of the Nation, and in attracting to our ranks men and women of unexcelled excellence and intellectual integrity.

The principal problems which today face the people of the State of Michigan and of our Nation stem primarily from the shrinkage of our national economy, the declining rate of our national economic growth, and the consequent reduction of income and revenue at the local, State, and national levels. These problems are related to our failure on the national level to provide for the growing backlog of accumulated need, thus thrusting an impossible additional burden on the States at the same time that we are failing to meet the extremely serious economic, political, and military challenge posed by the growth of the Soviet Union and

the growing needs of the underdeveloped countries.

These problems can be met only at the national level and only by people who have both the will and the imagination to put America once again on the road to achievement of the sustained economic growth and military readiness of which we are capable.

The very same people who advocate a backward policy of retrenchment and shrinkage of governmental effort on the State level are generally the people who offer the head-in-the-sand policy of economic strangulation by reduced national effort on the Federal level.

These are the very same people who seek to avoid Federal action by protesting in the name of States' rights and then proceed to shirk State responsibilities by threatening the flight of industry and capital from the State should the State government act to meet the needs of the times.

Thus the buck is passed, responsibilities are avoided, duties are shirked. This philosophy, long pursued, can lead, in the treacherous world of today, to only one result—national suicide.

That is why the overwhelming victory achieved by our party on the congressional level this past November is so important to our Nation. For it is only to the extent that government accepts its full responsibilities at all levels that the full creative energies of our people may be released.

The voice of the people on November 4 said that America should move ahead, at all levels of government.

The voice of the people as expressed in the mandate of the ballot box said that America can, and must, afford the price of survival.

It is our task in the next biennium to give expression to this mandate for progressive action, and to justify once again the trust which has been reposed in us.

Address by George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate of the Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on January 3, 1959, the El Katif Temple, AAONMS, in Spokane, Wash., was honored with a visit by George E. Stringfellow, Imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America. At a banquet in his honor, Mr. Stringfellow offered a definition of a Mason and a Shriner that has lasting value as a reminder of the great principles on which this fraternal organization was founded and of the great work Shriners perform on behalf of crippled children. I ask unanimous consent that a digest of Noble Stringfellow's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my privilege to visit your city on a number of occasions in the capacity as president of the manufacturing division of the American Mining Congress, as vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries, Division of McGraw-Edison Co., as a Shriner, as an imperial officer, and now as imperial potentate, and I want you to know that I

feel that you have always made me feel at home, whenever I visit Spokane in any capacity.

I am particularly grateful, as is Mrs. Stringfellow to your illustrious chief rabban, Noble C. Grover Wilson, and his gracious lady Irene, for the special attention they have paid to us since our arrival here. I would also single out my good friend and one of mankind's benefactors, the Honorable A. Henry Pierce, 33d degree, past illustrious potentate of this temple, chairman of the board of governors of the Spokane unit of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children and a member of the board of trustees of that great philanthropic organization. He has added much to my life and he has been extremely helpful in making life more comfortable for crippled children. He is truly one of God's noblemen.

I am happy to recognize the presence of Illustrious Harold W. Walker, potentate of Algeria Temple, Helena, Mont., and members of his divan, Illustrious Sir Herman H. Dokken, potentate of Bagdad Temple, Butte, Mont., and members of his divan, Illustrious Sir Herbert L. Powell, potentate of Calam Temple from Lewiston, Idaho, and members of his divan, and finally my good friend of long standing, Barney Heffner, who for years was one of the moving spirits in Bunker Hill & Sullivan Mining & Concentration Co. and who now resides here in Spokane.

I also recognize the gracious and beautiful ladies who adorn this gathering with their presence. Some wise man once said, "Next to God we owe most to women for life itself and then for making life worth living." I am sure that applies to those in our audience.

Some months ago I was asked to give my definition of a Mason and a Shriner. Of course you Shriners know that all Shriners must first be Masons. Therefore, if you will bear with me for a few moments, I will give you that definition.

DEFINITION OF A MASON

A Mason is a man who believes in God and practices that belief. A Mason is a man who believes in brotherly love and practices his belief. A Mason is a man who uses the symbols of the bulider to set for himself and his brethren a code of life which refines his thoughts, purifies his sympathy, and broadens his outlook, it amplifies his friendship, exalts his morality, and tames his passions.

DEFINITION OF A SHRINER

A Shriner is a Mason employing all of the virtues and characteristics I have just mentioned and perhaps more. A Shriner is a Mason who realizes the work of the craft, exemplifying the high code of morality, requires refreshment. In obtaining that refreshment, Shriners adopted the code, 59 years ago, of pleasure without intemperance, hospitality without rudeness, and jollity without coarseness.

The general public identifies Shriners by their red fez, gorgeous costumes, and parades. However, behind our fun and behind our frolic is a burning desire to be of help to crippled children, regardless of race, regardless of creed, and regardless of color.

The love of little children has turned Shriners into ministers of healing and ministers of happiness. The red fez thus takes its place with the Red Cross as an emblem of mercy and as an emblem of loving kindness.

Shriners' desire to help crippled children is implemented through 17 hospitals organized 86 years ago. Those hospitals are often referred to as temples of mercy. In the words of one of our leading citizens crippled children's work "gave the Shrine its soul."

May I, in all reverence, quote the words of the Holy Writ: "Suffer little children to come unto me," and paraphrase those words

as follows, "Bring into our hospitals little children that suffer, so that we may lead them from the valley of despair to the hills of help, of hope, and of happiness."

Masons and Shriners walk especially close to God when they aid crippled children, which has been one of our prime objectives for many years.

The Shrine is often referred to, of course in jest, as an old man's organization. However, I submit that youth is not a time of life; it is a state of mind. Men grow old by deserting ideals. Years wrinkle the skin but compromising principles wrinkle the brain and sour the soul. We Shriners strive to emulate St. Paul who, while crying the days were evil, labored to improve them. We Shriners radiate good will which is more precious than a gold nugget and harder to find. Good will is a measure of a man's success and to a large extent determines his usefulness to society. Good will is a priceless possession. Shriners cherish no jealousies and entertain no hatred for their fellow man.

A great Chinese philosopher more than 2,000 years ago, uttering these words, "With righteousness in the heart, there will be beauty in the character; with beauty in the character, there will be harmony in the home; with harmony in the home, there will be order in the nation; with order in the nation, there will be peace in the world," set forth a philosophy to which every Shriner can and does subscribe.

Shriners seek peace but always with honor, for we realize that our forefathers bequeathed to us a way of life that we should preserve, and if we are worthy of our heritage we will lift our voices in defense of it, to the end that every American may enjoy a high living standard and degree of liberty heretofore undreamed of.

Civil Rights and Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles which were published on February 1 and 2 in the Newark Sunday and Evening News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. One, an editorial, is entitled "A Real Rights Bill." The other, a column by Marquis Childs, is entitled "Labor Reform Battle."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Sunday News, Feb. 1, 1959]

A REAL RIGHTS BILL

The same progressive Senators who tried unsuccessfully to knock out the anti-civil rights filibuster have returned to the fight with legislation to reinforce the Supreme Court's school integration decree. As in the Senate rules battle, New Jersey's Senator CASE, Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, and Senator JAVITS, Republican of New York, again lead the bipartisan coalition.

What the group seeks is a declaration of congressional policy that will support with the power of the purse and stronger laws the Supreme Court ruling which, after nearly 5 years, finds Virginia integrating 21 Negro children in the State's schools. It may be said that Governor Almond has finally aban-

doned Virginia's massive resistance and yielded to the Federal and State courts. But among his brother Governors, notably in Arkansas, Alabama, and Georgia, defiance goes on.

Concededly the outlook for the Case-Douglas legislation is little better than when it was bypassed last year, a senatorial abdication that had its sequel in closed schools and the bombing of places of worship. LYNDON JOHNSON, the Senate's Democratic leader, didn't want integration action then, he doesn't want it now. Otherwise he would not have barred any reference to school integration from his compromise program for which his brother Democrat Senator DOUGLAS, has another name. He calls it surrender.

That is why the new legislation contemplates the expenditure of \$200 million in Federal funds over a 5-year period to support schools deprived of State funds to thwart desegregation. What happens to it will provide the country with a far better guide to Democratic intentions than any kind words for civil rights out of the governors' conference in Detroit or the pious promises that may find their way into the national platform of 1960.

[From the Newark Evening News, Feb. 2, 1959]

LABOR REFORM BATTLE—CONGRESS WARNED PUBLIC TIES OF POWER ABUSES

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—In the many-sided dispute over labor legislation, one thing should be clear even to the leaders of the big unions. The appalling abuses of labor power exposed over recent months have created a widespread demand for reform.

Those who are jockeying for position and power in the struggle now beginning in Congress will ignore this at their peril.

The fight will be waged from three—perhaps four—vantage points. Here in general is the alignment:

PROBERS' BILL DUE

1. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY was first in the field with a bill to end abuses disclosed in the investigation of James Hoffa and his Teamsters Union. But the Kennedy bill, cosponsored by Senator SAM ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, with wide Democratic support, also contains as a kind of sweetener minor amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act that labor wants. Without these amendments, the AFL-CIO might oppose the measure and perhaps succeed in killing it.

2. The administration has put in its own measure which contains the reform proposals aimed at union corruption. It goes farther in Taft-Hartley amendments, taking in new ground on secondary boycotts and certain forms of picketing strongly opposed by labor.

3. Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, whose committee exposed the abuses, is expected to come up with his own proposals going beyond both KENNEDY and the administration. In this same camp is Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the foremost exponent of right-to-work and other union curbs. Because of his position on the Senate Labor Committee, GOLDWATER is sponsor of the administration bill, and that has produced considerable embarrassment to all concerned.

FEELING THEIR POWER

In between are those who hope that a reform bill shorn of the Taft-Hartley amendments can be quickly passed. Moderate Republicans, such as Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, are working toward this end. While he will not say so, it is possible that KENNEDY would accept this compromise to get a measure on the statute books effective against corrupt and racketeering unions and their corrupt leaders.

Labor leaders are feeling their power since the election of last November. But when it is used, as George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, is said to have used it, to dictate the new members of the Senate Labor Committee, then even those long friendly to the objectives of organized labor grow resentful.

A moderate reform bill will neither end all abuses nor stop the controversy. But it will be a step in the right direction.

Racial Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most thought-provoking letters ever written for the benefit of public consumption was Carlton Putnam's October 13 letter, to President Eisenhower, commenting on racial segregation. This letter has been published in newspapers throughout the Nation. In most instances, Mr. Putnam's letter was printed on the editorial pages presenting an intelligent viewpoint.

In order to have this viewpoint presented in newspapers which did not wish this viewpoint known, a special committee was organized for the purposes of collecting money to have the Putnam letter presented as a paid advertisement. To my knowledge, only one major newspaper in the United States has refused to give its readers the benefit of the Putnam viewpoint; that newspaper is the Post and Times Herald, here in Washington. It is indeed tragic that the people of this area are deprived by the Post and Times Herald of the opportunity to receive fair, impartial news coverage. But many of us have accepted this, and have read other newspapers, in order to receive both sides of major issues. For the Post and Times Herald, however, to refuse even paid advertising is incredible. This opinion not only is mine, but apparently is also that of many distinguished editors. I ask unanimous consent that the opinions of some of these editors be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Evening Post, Jan. 29, 1959]

WHERE'S THE LINE, MR. WIGGINS?

The now famous Carleton Putnam letter, in which a prominent northerner severely criticized the Supreme Court's school integration decision, has been widely published in the South. Northern newspapers, for the most part, have not seen fit to give space for the letter.

Some weeks ago, in response to criticism of the northern press for its position, the Christian Science Monitor, published in Boston, reproduced the letter in its columns.

The New York Times agreed to publish the letter as a paid advertisement, the cost being borne by southern contributors.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, largest newspaper in the Nation's Capital, with a daily circulation of about 400,000, re-

fused to publish the letter—period. It would open up neither its news nor its advertising columns to Mr. Putnam's anti-integration points of view. The newspaper has offered no explanation for its refusal.

The irony in the position taken by the Post and Times Herald is that its executive editor, J. Russell Wiggins, has probably made more speeches defending the people's right to know and advocating unrestricted freedom of information than any other newspaper editor alive.

Unless something very unusual happens this spring, Mr. Wiggins will be elected president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Perhaps when he accepts the gavel he will inform his fellow editors just where the line should be drawn in the people's right to know.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, Jan. 21, 1953]

CAPITAL NEWSPAPER REFUSES TO PUBLISH PUTNAM LETTER

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—The Putnam letter committee says the Washington Post and Times Herald has refused to publish the Putnam letter in a paid advertisement.

James E. Simpson, of Birmingham, chairman and treasurer of the committee that is circulating the letter, said the newspaper gave no reason for its refusal.

Philip Graham, publisher of the Post and Times Herald, declined comment at Washington.

The letter was written by Carleton Putnam, founder and president of Chicago & Southern Airlines, to President Eisenhower. Later it was published in the Birmingham Post Herald.

In the latter, Putnam, a native of New York and a graduate of Princeton, was critical of the U.S. Supreme Court's segregation decisions.

The Putnam letter committee was formed to circulate the letter. It already has published the letter in several newspapers with money collected through contributions.

Simpson said, "It is incredible that a newspaper published in our Nation's Capital should refuse to accept as a paid advertisement the fine statement of Mr. Putnam, which voices the views of the South on current problems facing our region."

Simpson made his remarks in a prepared statement.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 20, 1953]

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

The Washington Post and Times Herald, influential liberal morning newspaper in the Nation's Capital, recently refused to publish the Carleton Putnam letter either in its news columns or as a paid advertisement. The Post declined to say why it won't let its readers know about this powerful anti-integration statement by a distinguished northerner.

J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Post, is a member of the committee on freedom of information of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He has said repeatedly that freedom of the press means the citizen's right to know.

Will Mr. Wiggins report his paper's conduct to the ASNE?

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 22, 1953]

PAPER CURTAIN POST

Several weeks ago the Christian Science Monitor published the Putnam letter. This widely circulated statement by Carleton Putnam, a prominent northerner, presents the viewpoint of those Americans who oppose compulsory racial integration.

The Monitor said that newspapers in the North are being criticized for not presenting the anti-integration viewpoint. It said the

letter was being printed as part of a continuing effort to meet this news responsibility.

The New York Times refused to meet this responsibility in its news columns. The Times accepted the letter as a paid advertisement.

The Washington Post and Times Herald has refused to allow Mr. Putnam's comments to appear in any form, including a paid advertisement. The Post declined to explain its reasons.

Actually, no explanation is needed. The ultraliberal Post has no intention of meeting its news responsibility on the integration question. The Paper Curtain has been lowered. The editors of the Post have no intention of raising it.

The Splendid Record of REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these days of complex problems, we recognize that we have very serious challenges in the field of agriculture.

Unfortunately, according to USDA predictions, there may well be a drop in farm income in 1959. As possible, I believe this Congress should take constructive action to prevent the further decline of farm income. Our farmers and farm organizations, themselves, too, should be given every encouragement to improve our agricultural programs and bolster income. In addition, we must strengthen—not weaken—significant programs which have contributed to an improved agricultural economy and a better farm life. Important among these has been the REA program. Over the years, the REA has literally brought new light to rural America.

In Wisconsin, for example, over 30 electric co-ops are bringing light and power to more than 93,000 consumers—brightening the outlook for present and future rural Wisconsin. In 1935, only about 19 percent of our farmers were receiving electric service. By contrast, about 97 percent were being served in 1958.

We recognize, too, that REA co-ops serve marginal areas that are not economically attractive to private power companies.

From time to time, efforts have been considered, or made, to cripple this program.

In view of the economic hazards ahead for the farmer, however, I believe this is no time to take any action that would reduce benefits, or cut income, of the Nation's farmer.

To give a detailed picture of the scope of the REA program in Wisconsin and the Nation, I request unanimous consent that the current Wisconsin statistics, and a special report from REA Administrator David A. Hamil, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statistics and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT WISCONSIN STATISTICS

In the State of Wisconsin, at the time REA was created in 1935, only 39,206 farms, or 19.6 percent, were receiving central station electric service. REA estimated that 149,600 farms in the State, or 97.4 percent of all farms recorded in the 1954 census, were being served by June 30, 1958.

The first REA loan in this State was approved in May 1936, and the first REA-financed line placed in operation on May 8, 1937, by the Columbus Rural Electric Co., operative of Columbus, Wis.

Up to July 1, 1958, REA had approved \$134,345,289 in electric loans in the State to 31 borrowers, 30 of them cooperatives. One of these (Bangor Municipal Utility, Bangor), has discharged its financial obligation to REA. The loans were made to enable the borrowers to build 31,752 miles of line and other rural electric facilities to serve 93,385 rural consumers. Most of these facilities already are in operation.

By July 1, 1958, REA had advanced \$108,500,379 in electric loan funds in this State and the borrowers were operating about 30,389 miles of line serving 85,634 farms and other rural consumers.

The average monthly consumption on REA-financed lines in this State increased from 188 kilowatt-hours per farm in 1949 to 456 kilowatt-hours in 1957.

On July 1, 1958, the State's borrowers had paid \$12,740,151 in interest and repaid \$18,998,251 of principal on their Government loans. In addition, they had paid \$3,330,793 ahead of schedule.

No payment was more than 30 days overdue on loans for rural electrification in the State.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1959.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Attached is a copy of my report on the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration during fiscal year 1958, a year in which important progress was achieved in helping rural people get more and better electric and telephone service.

In both our electric and telephone programs loan needs were met fully.

During 1958, REA's electric borrowers connected more than 115,000 unserved rural establishments, raising the total number of consumers served to more than 4.5 million. They installed more than 200,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity. On and off the farm, rural consumers used more electricity, increasing purchases 8.7 percent over fiscal year 1957.

To enable rural electric systems to meet this growing demand, my office approved during 1958 a total of \$241,636,869 in electric loans, bringing total loans since inception of the program to more than \$3.77 billion.

REA electric borrowers continued to grow in financial strength and responsibility. During 1958, their principal and interest payments pushed total payments made since the start of the program to over \$1 billion. More than \$128 million of this sum represented payments made in advance of due dates. Four borrowers—an all-time low—were delinquent in payments more than 30 days as of June 30, 1958. And at the end of calendar 1957, the net worth of electric borrowers amounted to 14.9 percent of their total assets.

In REA's rural telephone program, borrowers chalked up new construction records and had connected 693,831 subscribers by June 30, 1958. Nearly one-third of these subscribers had telephone service for the first time, and almost two-thirds had their first dial service.

Rural telephone systems received 216 loans totaling more than \$89 million dur-

ing fiscal 1958—another record. Total loans from the start of the program came to more than \$478 million. When construction is completed, these loans will provide modern telephone service to 1,020,454 subscribers.

During the year, telephone borrowers made payments to REA totalling more than \$5.5 million. At yearend, 48 borrowers had a balance with REA of \$709,920 in advance payments. The number of borrowers delinquent more than 30 days in their payments was reduced to 15 at the end of the fiscal year.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. HAMIL,
Administrator.

Recognition of Outstanding School System in San Angelo, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, explorers, scientists, and authors come from education. I mean explorers which are America's satellites in space, and explorers into new horizons in the various fields which will make tomorrow finer for all mankind.

Our young people need the finest training available to help this Nation retain its present position of world leadership and to improve the world of the future. A vital part of providing this training is to challenge and inspire the student. This gives the training program its extra meaning and enables the pupils to get the most from their instruction.

As a former schoolteacher myself, I have always watched the progress in American education with great interest. Recently my attention was attracted by an article written by G. K. Hodenfield, an Associated Press education writer. The article described the "Three-Rail Program" of the San Angelo, Tex., schools. It seems to me this "Three-Rail Program" deserves three cheers from all of us.

I feel that congratulations are particularly in order for the farsighted members of the San Angelo school board; for Supt. George B. Wadzeck, a man who can translate dreams into action; for the administrators and teachers who work under him so tirelessly to help our young people; and for the students themselves who, in many cases, have not only responded to the regular teaching but have requested and willingly attended extra classes as well.

Mr. President, this article presents a thrilling departure from the traditional picture of a school and its students. As a mark of recognition for all those concerned, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Hodenfield's article entitled "Three-Rail Program Fills Needs of Pupils, Superior or Dull," which was published in the Dallas Morning News of Sunday, January 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE-RAIL PROGRAM FILLS NEEDS OF PUPILS, SUPERIOR OR DULL

(By G. K. Hodenfield)

SAN ANGELO, Tex.—This city of 60,000 on the west Texas plains thinks it has the best public school system in the United States.

That's a strong statement, even for Texas, and it begs for proof. San Angelo thinks it has proof aplenty.

For more than a year critics of education in this country have been demanding more academic achievement and less life adjustment. They want more of the solid and traditional subjects and fewer frills and vocational "escape courses," more challenges for the gifted student, more attention to the slow learners, better discipline, and more and better counseling.

In San Angelo they practice what the critics preach.

CHALLENGE TO ALL

The philosophy here is to challenge each student to do his best work in every subject, and then to provide the facilities and courses to meet and extend the challenge.

The payoff is in the curriculum—a three-rail program tailored to meet the needs and capabilities of all students, from the brightest to the dullest.

The San Angelo story is more than just the curriculum, however.

It's the story of a young, eager, and informed school board more concerned with learning than pennypinching, a citizenry willing to pay the taxes that built one of the outstanding high school plants in the country, a group of teachers and administrators willing to work 12 to 14 hours a day.

It's the story, too, of Supt. George B. Wadzeck, a man who cherished a dream for years and now has the tools and backing to make it a reality. When Wadzeck came to San Angelo 7 years ago the city had had an overdose of progressive, permissive, do-as-you-please education. It was ready for a change.

It took 2 years—until 1954—for Wadzeck to lay the groundwork and get his plans into action. And he's the first to admit there is still much to be done.

The San Angelo curriculum is based on the three-rail plan. Rail I is for superior students, able to move much faster than their schoolmates. Rail II is for average students, eligible for college after high school graduation. Rail III is for the poor student, the slow learner for whom high school is the terminal point of education.

The rail plan isn't new. Versions of it can be found across the country. In San Angelo, however, it starts in the first grade.

During a pupil's first year in school he is constantly tested and evaluated to see whether he is really ready for school, really ready for the learning process.

IMMATURITY FACTOR

"About 90 percent of a kid's trouble in grade school," says Wadzeck, "is that he is biologically immature when he starts. Some kids walk earlier than others, some talk earlier. It's the same with learning, some are ready before the others."

If a child isn't up to doing first class grade work, he is held in that grade for another year. At the end of the third grade there is a major check point.

Based on grades, intelligence tests, aptitude tests, and teachers' reports, the pupils are assigned to rails I, II, or III during the first grade. Depending on their aptitudes, some students might be in rail I English and social studies, and rail II or III arithmetic. Depending on their achievement, they can climb to a higher rail, or drop to a

lower one. All three rails are taught by the same teacher in the same classroom.

Some pupils spend 4 years getting past the third grade, some do it in two. But there usually is little grade-skipping. Brighter pupils stay in their own age groups, but do more advanced work.

MAJOR DEPARTURE

One major departure from normal grade school practice, even where the program is hailed, is that only the student in rail I can get an A. If he is in rail II, the best he can get is a B, in rail III a C.

Some educators will tell you this might frustrate the children, that they should be graded on the basis of whether they are doing the best work of which they are capable.

Wadzeck disagrees. "Life is competitive, and if the children don't learn it in the classroom, they'll certainly find it out for themselves on the playground," he says.

At the end of the sixth year there is another major check point. For many students, this may be a last chance to get on the academic ball.

From all of San Angelo's 17 elementary schools the pupils are brought to Washington School for the seventh grade. No other grades are taught in the building.

SIX SUBJECTS TAUGHT

Each student in rails I and II takes six academic subjects—English, reading, math, social science, natural science, and foreign language—plus one fine arts elective and physical education.

Rail III students do no seventh grade work. They spend the year catching up on work in which they have fallen behind.

And here is an exclusive San Angelo twist: If the rail III students get an A or B in his makeup work he isn't promoted. He is held back so that the following year he can take rail II or college preparatory courses. If, however, he gets a C or less he is promoted into the eighth grade in rail III.

"When a rail III student comes up with excellent grades in his remedial work," says Wadzeck, "we figure he deserves another chance. He may have had emotional problems stemming from troubles at home. Maybe he has been ill and out of school for long periods. Maybe he's just a 'late bloomer.'"

STILL NOT TOO LATE

"But if he comes up with poor grades in his remedial or makeup work, we just have to figure he isn't college material. So we push him ahead on a rail III program that will give him the best education he can absorb. If he spurts ahead later, of course, our testing and evaluating will catch him and there may still be time for him to advance to a higher rail."

Rail I students in the seventh grade take 2 years of a subject in 1 year and clear the way for honor courses and college level work during the 11th and 12th grades. Rail II students take the national curriculum or normal college preparatory courses. Rail III students take modified work adapted to their capabilities, but including arithmetic every year through the 11th grade and English every year through the 12th.

In this, the fifth year of the program, San Angelo's only high school, Central High, has rolled courses in math, foreign languages, science and English.

FEW ALL IN TOP RAIL

Wadzeck figures only about 1 percent of the students are able to handle the top rail in all four subjects. About 10 percent take two courses in rail I and two in rail II, and about 5 percent take only one rail I course.

In high school the students are graded according to the work they do in the rail to which they have been assigned. The transcripts, however, identify the course by the rail number. Thus colleges and universities,

as well as prospective employers, will know just what sort of work the student has done.

San Angelo's students are given every opportunity to enrich and broaden their education—and to pull themselves up to a higher rail while doing it.

For instance, the 710 seventh graders at Washington school have a 75-minute extra learning period at the end of the school day. If enough students ask for a particular course, Principal Dave Sands will try to find them a teacher.

EXTRA WORK, NO CREDIT

Thus, 20 students who take Spanish during regular school hours are studying Latin in the extra-learning period—for no academic credit. Similar no-credit courses are also offered in math, science, orchestra, drama, rapid reading, poetry, speech journalism—even football.

Almost half the 1,400 students at Central High paid tuition to take summer courses last summer. Most of them wanted only to brush up in their weak subjects or qualify for a higher rail. Wadzeck hopes that eventually all summer courses will be free.

"We encourage the students to go to summer school and pull themselves up," he says.

"That's the whole idea here—we want to challenge every student to extend himself to his limits, his full capacity. And when you get right down to it, that's all any school system can do."

Tough Tax Collector

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a New Jerseyman with an indirect connection with the U.S. Senate is probably the oldest tax collector in the United States. He is Walter C. Black, who at 92 is still tax collector of East Windsor Township. He has been on the job for 57 years. His grandson, Walter Black Stults, of Hightstown, N.J., has been on the job in the U.S. Senate for a shorter period. Mr. Stults serves as staff director of the Senate Small Business Committee. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Newark Sunday News, of February 1, 1959, on Mr. Black's service as a tax collector, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX COLLECTOR TOUGH—BLACK, 92, HOLDS ONTO EAST WINDSOR TOWNSHIP JOB

HIGHTSTOWN.—Every time Tax Collector Walter C. Black, of nearby East Windsor Township, neatly pens an entry in his ledger he sets a record.

Not a record for the amount of money collected since there are only about 700 people in East Windsor, but a record for efficiency and longevity in office.

Black, at 92, is the oldest tax collector in the United States, and has been working at what he calls his avocation for the last 57 years in his office in York Road. His vocation during all this time has been the operation of a plant nursery at the York Road address.

He sold this business to his grandson 2 years ago but stayed on to help with some

of the accounting work. Despite his advanced years, he still handles figures with an ease that would surprise some younger bookkeepers, and he has no thoughts of retiring.

SUCCESSFUL COLLECTING

During all the years he has handled the tax funds of the community, Black has compiled the record of never having collected less than 95 percent of the total tax levy in any year.

It was his ability to extract the needed money from reluctant residents that first won Black his job in 1902. Local officials wanted him because he was tough—not unfairly tough—but tough. When he took office, some residents owed as much as 4 years' back taxes. Within a short time all the money was in.

Black said he simply mimeographed a message to all the residents, telling them how displeased he was with the situation, and soon the accounts were up to date. He doesn't remember exactly what he wrote in the notice, but it was effective.

Last year the township built a new municipal building in Ward Road, and hung a shingle over one of the new offices which reads "Collector." The office is always empty.

Anyone looking for Black to pay a bill or chat must travel to the nursery about 2 miles away. A routine developed over more than a half century cannot easily be changed.

Black told the town fathers he wouldn't move when the building was being constructed, and they knew he meant it. The office is there in case he should change his mind.

Black graduated from Peddie School in 1886 and Rider Business College 6 months later. In 1907 he returned to Peddie as treasurer and a member of the school board, a post he held until 4 years ago.

JOBS SOUGHT HIM

Although he "never asked for an office in my life—they came to me," Black has had an active public career. In addition to his position at Peddie, he was a member of the township board of education for 54 years, including several years as president, and clerk of the board for 23 years.

He was also tax assessor for 2 years but gave it up when he found it interfered with the nursery business.

Last November the State senate took notice of his long career of public service and passed a resolution commending Black. He was also honored by the New Jersey Tax Collectors Association at the recent League of Municipalities convention in Atlantic City.

More Defense Contracts Should Go to Small Business Concerns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the rate of failures of small business climbed last year to the highest annual total since 1933. Nearly 15,000 business firms failed, and this was an increase of 8.9 percent over the previous year.

The liabilities of these failing firms in 1958 totaled \$728,258,000. Even greater than the dollar loss was the job loss to many men and women who need work, particularly in the depressed areas of our Nation.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business, under the chairmanship

of the very able and distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], has repeatedly pointed out to the administration that America's small businesses are frequently neglected on defense orders. But latest statistics show that the 100 largest defense prime contractors increased their share of all contracts over \$10,000 from 68.4 percent in 1957 to 74.2 percent in 1958. These statistics prove that the situation is becoming worse instead of improving, and it is a condition which demands correction.

Recently one of the better daily newspapers in my State, the Sherman Democrat, under the able editorial direction of the Honorable Frank Mayburn, published an editorial discussing this problem.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Friday, January 9, 1959, Sherman Democrat under the heading, "Defense and Business."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE AND BUSINESS

Stung by a charge of the Senate Small Business Committee that small concerns are neglected on defense orders, the Defense Department announces that small businesses averaged at least \$7 billion a year in defense contracts in the last 2 fiscal years.

In 1958 small business was awarded less than the previous fiscal year, and \$3,729,000,000 in prime contracts, slightly 243,000,000 in subcontracts, a drop of 2 percent. That is the basis of the committee's complaint. It compares with the total military procurement overage of \$20 billion a year for the last 2 fiscal years.

A 35 percent average of all procurement for small business in military material would not seem to be equitable. Even in ships, planes, and missiles, literally thousands of items go into each, produced by some of the biggest purchases, such as small concerns. The procurement can and should be used to help small business in economically depressed areas weather the economic storm. The committee does well to press for at least half of it for small business.

Procedure To Be Followed in Case of Disability of the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Congress has in past sessions and is currently concerned with the gap in our Constitution relative to the procedure to be followed if the President of the United States became unable to serve as President because of disability.

Prof. Noel T. Dowling, professor emeritus of constitutional law of Columbia University, and a summer resident of New Hampshire, has recently written an article on this problem based on the experience of several States whose Governors became disabled.

Professor Dowling's article has been printed in the January issue of the New Hampshire Bar Journal, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DISABILITY

(By Noel T. Dowling, Harlan Fiske Stone professor emeritus of constitutional law, Columbia University)

One day, now perhaps 20 years ago, a telephone call came to me at my office at Columbia University from a man who introduced himself as a member of the bar of a certain foreign country and said he wanted to consult me on a point of constitutional law. I asked him what it was about and why he had called me. He answered that he had been referred to me by a New York lawyer (well known to me), but that he would rather not try to tell me his problem over the phone.

When he came to see me shortly thereafter he told a rather lurid story of political unrest in his homeland. That unrest was largely attributable, he thought, to the presence of an ailing chief executive unable to discharge his responsibilities and yet unwilling to surrender them to the person next in succession. In the course of his story he remarked—in an offhand sort of way as if it were nothing out of the ordinary—that his countrymen had occasionally been known to resort to unorthodox or even violent means in the settlement of their political disputes. For his part, however, and others like-minded with himself, he wanted to explore the possibilities of peaceful, particularly of judicial, ways to remove a disabled executive. His specific question, on which he wanted whatever advice he could get, was whether any legal process was available under his constitution by which matter of disability could be submitted for determination by the courts. He seemed to take it for granted that we had had occasion to deal with disabled executives in this country, if not in respect to the President at least of a governor, and that our experience might provide guidance to them in the interpretation of their own constitution.

As to the President, I could tell him at once that the problem of disability under our Constitution had never been submitted to the courts. More than that, the Constitution being silent on the determination thereof, there was no assurance that the Federal courts would assume jurisdiction of such a cause. As to the Governors of States, I had no information. The upshot of our conversation was that I agreed to make a spot study of a few States and give him a memorandum of any relevant information I could find.

Almost at the outset of the study I came upon a New Hampshire case. It was *Attorney General v. Taggart* (66 N.H. 362, 29 Atl. 1027), decided in 1890. The action arose in the Supreme Court on an original petition for mandamus against the president of the Senate to require him to take over the powers and duties of Governor. It was begun on the written request by Governor Goodell to Attorney General Barnard to "take such steps as you think necessary to cause the president of the senate to exercise the powers of the Governor during the vacancy caused by my illness."

The pleadings were singularly short and clear. This is the petition: "Daniel Barnard, attorney general of the State of New Hampshire, in behalf of said State, complains against David A. Taggart, and says the chair of the Governor of said State has been and is vacant by reason of the sickness of His Ex-

cellency David H. Goodell, and his consequent inability to perform any of the duties of his office, and the said Taggart is president of the senate of said State; yet said Taggart does not exercise any of the powers and authorities which by the constitution and the laws the Governor is vested with, but refuses so to do. Wherefore the plaintiff prays for a writ of mandamus, or other appropriate and adequate process, directed to the said Taggart, requiring him to exercise the powers and authorities of the Governor during the vacancy, according to his duty in the premises."

And this the answer: "The defendant says he does not exercise any of the powers and authorities of the Governor's office, because his duty to do so is not settled by any adjudication or conclusive evidence of record. He is ready to do his duty when he has authoritative evidence as to what it is, and thereof submits to the judgment of the court."

The case was submitted upon evidence introduced by the plaintiff and heard by the whole court. The evidence established (a) that the Governor was disabled and (b) that there was "executive business demanding immediate attention." On this showing the court directed the clerk to enter "judgment for the plaintiff."

The opinion of the court, in which all concurred, was delivered by Chief Justice Charles Doe. He first quoted article 49 of the State constitution: "Whenever the chair of the Governor shall become vacant, by reason of his death, absence from the State, or otherwise, the president of the senate shall, during such vacancy, have and exercise all the power and authorities" of the Governor. He noted that the "mischief designed to be prevented was the suspension of executive government by the Governor's death, absence from the State, or disability," and that the "prescribed remedy is the duty of a substitute to act in cases of necessity." He then referred to the proof established by the evidence and concluded that in such a situation the constitution directs the defendant "to exercise executive powers until the Governor resumes them." That was enough to dispose of the case in hand.

But the chief justice went further. He observed that while a judicial determination of the question of vacancy "is not legally requisite to call the president of the senate to the executive chair" it may prove to be "a convenient mode of avoiding embarrassment that might sometimes arise from doubt and controversy in regard to his authority and the validity of his acts." No question of jurisdiction has been raised, but the chief justice seemed to have something of that in mind in saying that the "existence of an executive vacancy is a question of law and fact within the judicial jurisdiction." Looking ahead he remarked that if the defendant exercised executive power without a previous judgment on the question of his authority, "the legality of his acts could be contested and determined in subsequent litigation." The judicial character of the question, he continued, "does not depend upon the time when it is brought into court. With adequate legal process, the consideration and decision of such a question may be prospective as well as retrospective."

The remainder of the opinion was given over to a consideration of mandamus as an appropriate remedy. On that point and after examining an array of cases, the court concluded that when, as in this petition, "a plaintiff asserts a legal right and an infringement of it, and asks appropriate relief, his case is decided on the facts proved, without a waste of time in the consideration of a form of action." As already noted, the question of jurisdiction was not raised by the parties; nor was it explicitly discussed by the court. An objection on that score would probably have been futile anyway,

since the Court (aside from the fact that in some circumstances it could give advisory opinions) looked upon the case as presenting nothing other than an ordinary "question of law and fact." On its facts—however interesting the further reaches of Chief Justice Doe's opinion may be—the Taggart case was concerned only with the problem of a willing Governor and an uncontested jurisdiction.

A North Dakota case—to mention only one other decision discovered in the course of the study—tackled the tougher problem of an unwilling Governor and a challenge to the jurisdiction. This was *State ex rel. Olson v. Langer*, 65 N.D. 68, 256 N.W. 377, decided in 1934. It, too, was an original proceeding in the supreme court of the State, and it asked for a writ of quo warranto requiring the respondent to show by what right he continued to exercise the powers and duties of the office of Governor. The petition was based on the contention that respondent having been convicted of a felony, even though at liberty pending an appeal, was under a "disability," as specified in the State constitution, for exercising the powers of Governor. Jurisdiction was put in issue at once by a motion to quash. The basis of that motion was that these proceedings were inconsistent with the provision for impeachment as the exclusive method under the constitution for removal of the Governor.

The motion to quash availed nothing. "After a careful examination of all the authorities (said the court, with a reference to Taggart as an early case) we are of the opinion that this court has jurisdiction to pass upon the question as to whether, under the circumstances conceded to exist in this case, the powers of the office of Governor have devolved upon the Lieutenant Governor." On the merits, the court adjudged that the respondent had "suffered a disability within the meaning of that term" in the constitution and that the powers and duties of the office of Governor had "devolved upon the (Lieutenant Governor) for the residue of the term of office for which the respondent was elected or until such disability be removed."

Such were two high spots of the memorandum. I must say that my inquirer from abroad was less surprised than I at the number of times the question of disability had been before State courts. He seemed to find much satisfaction in the way the Supreme Court of North Dakota summarized the matter when it said that, though controversies had arisen in several States over the question of who should exercise the powers of Governor, "in each case the question had ultimately been solved by the courts." I was later informed that nothing ever came of the memorandum in the country on whose account it had been prepared. No judicial proceeding was attempted. On the contrary, the question of disability of the then incumbent executive was left for the settlement by the running of time and tenure.

The Taggart case seems to me to have a larger significance than merely revealing the Supreme Court of New Hampshire as the leading exponent of the judicial method for dealing with executive disability. An outstanding feature is its recognition of the practical aspects of State government in the situation with which the court was faced. The matter in issue, whether the president of the senate was entitled to exercise the powers of the Governor, was a question arising under the State constitution, and it had to be decided within the existing framework of government. As the chief justice pointed out, that very question, if not settled in advance, "could be contested and determined in subsequent litigation." So, if eventually, why not now—especially since the judicial machinery was amply geared for the task. The court thus became an

implement of government in the orderly and prompt transfer of executive power.

On a wider front the local experience of New Hampshire and other States may supply valuable suggestions on a present-day national problem. This is the matter of Presidential disability. On what happens in the event of the President's "inability to discharge the powers and duties" of the office the Constitution speaks in clear terms, namely, that those powers "devolve on the Vice President." But the Constitution is silent on the question who determines the existence of inability. There is a widespread belief that something needs to be done about it. Proposals in a variety of form and substance have been offered. Some call for congressional enactments; others for constitutional amendments; most would establish new governmental machinery. None has gained general approval.

It is just here that the experience of the States may prove helpful. For that experience has shown that the question of disability is by no means foreign to the judicial function and that, whenever invoked, the judicial method of dealing with the question has been adequate to the occasion. In the light of that experience, a possible proposal on the national scene would be that the matter of Presidential disability, both beginning and ending, be entrusted to the Supreme Court of the United States and placed within its original jurisdiction.

An amendment to the Constitution would be required. The basic content of such an amendment (it is no complicated affair) would be, first, extension of the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to cases arising under the inability clause, and, second, specification of the parties entitled to institute proceedings by petition to the Court—e.g., President, Vice President, Cabinet, possibly others. Perhaps the amendment should also include authorization to the Court to make rules governing the conduct of the proceedings.

Manifestly such a proposal would raise questions of large import and deep concern. I think I appreciate—and to some extent sympathize with—much that may be said against it. For myself, indeed, the most I would urge at the moment is that the underlying idea of the proposal is entitled to receive serious consideration. At the least and without detailed development here, several points can be made in its favor. It would utilize an ever-present and resourceful institution of government; it would put the matter to be decided on the highest possible plane of dignity and responsibility under the Constitution; it would—not wholly, to be sure, but I believe as far as possible in man-made institutions—free the problem of political considerations; it would settle in advance the legality of the Vice President's assumption of power and promptly stabilize his new position.

The United States Is a Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many excellent observations are made in letters to the editor of the Boston Christian Science Monitor. In a recent edition, Mary Elaine Adams, of San

Francisco, Calif., observes that the United States was set up as a republic and not a democracy.

I ask unanimous consent that her letter, entitled "Not a Democracy," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT A DEMOCRACY

TO THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

In your article of December 30, "Majority Rule Keys Filibuster Fight," the question is asked: "Should a majority vote run a democracy?" It would seem that the answer to this can only be an unqualified "Yes," for majority rule in the essence of democracy.

However, we should remember that our Nation is not a democracy. Our wise founders gave us a republic. From their study of history and their own experiences, nearly all of them had as much abhorrence for the tyranny of the majority as for that of a king.

History had taught them that democracy was the political system that led to the loss of human freedom, and they were convinced that only a republican form of government was adapted to protect the liberties of the individual. Thus our republican system with its filtering of legislation through representatives chosen by the people—rather than voting by the people directly—was intended to protect the individual's rights. The demand for a two-thirds majority among the people's representatives when considering certain vital issues was intended not only to put the brakes on government and prevent hasty, unwise decisions, but also to prevent obliteration by a bare majority of the rights of individual States to work out their local problems individually.

At the first Constitutional Convention there was much objection to the provision in the Virginia plan that only a bare or simple majority be necessary to settle any issue. While it is true that the Convention itself operated on the principle of a simple majority, it should be remembered that it was not a legislative body, but a purely advisory one, assembled for the sole purpose of making recommendations to the individual States. But in order to ratify the new Constitution, a two-thirds majority of all the States was necessary.

The idea of a two-thirds majority as a requirement in voting on certain important issues is thoroughly in harmony with the republican system. It is a wise check that should not be dispensed with for the sake of expediency—even if the end in view should be most desirable.

In sharpening our understanding of the terms "republic" and "democracy," contemporary lexicographers, unfortunately, are not of much help, since they make very little, if any, distinction between the two systems. Thus we must turn to the words of our founders in order to refocus our thinking on this vital question.

James Madison and Alexander Hamilton have given penetrating analyses of the nature—and consequences—of both a democracy and a republic, and the alert citizen today would do well to reacquaint himself with the political system the Founding Fathers had in mind and hewed out for us so laboriously.

Benjamin Franklin said, after the Convention, when asked what sort of government the delegates had agreed upon: "We have given you a republic, if you can keep it." Let us see to it that we do keep our priceless heritage. But in order to do so, we must thoroughly understand just what our system is and how it was meant to function.

MARY ELAINE ADAMS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Special Recognition of the Outstanding Abilities of Hon. J. T. Rutherford, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the term "public servant" is sometimes overworked, but I rise today to pay special recognition to a man who has—by his wisdom and hard work—earned the right to this title in its finest sense.

I call attention to the outstanding abilities of the Honorable J. T. RUTHERFORD, Representative of the 16th Congressional District of Texas, who has humbly, conscientiously, and unselfishly worked for the best interests of his district, his State, and his Nation during his entire career.

A moment ago, I mentioned his outstanding abilities. Mr. RUTHERFORD's talents are particularly evident in the field of public finance. His efforts in the public interest as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee have occasioned extremely high praise from his colleagues. He is an unusually able member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. RUTHERFORD was capably serving his State prior to his election to the 84th Congress on November 2, 1954. From 1948 to 1952 he was in the Texas House of Representatives and then served a term in the Texas Senate from 1952 to 1954 when the voters around his home gave further praise to his work by electing him to the national Congress. The people recognized a man who would work for them and stand by his principles at all times. I knew Congressman RUTHERFORD during his years in the Texas Legislature, and have been gladdened by his progress.

Mr. President, in recognition of Mr. RUTHERFORD's fine work in the national interest, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of his weekly "Report to the People" which I believe shows his interest in bettering the public financial picture.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

(By Congressman J. T. RUTHERFORD)

Birthday greetings are usually reserved for individuals, but this week I would like to say "happy birthday" to a Government agency: The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

There are many people who may not be aware of the existence of FDIC, nor familiar with its functions. I confess that my attention to the agency is brought about by my service on the House Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over it. Yet, if you have a bank account, chances are your money is insured by FDIC.

The greatest tribute that may be paid to the organization is that this month it reached its 25th birthday without fanfare. It may be that FDIC has moved so firmly

into history as one of the greatest financial reforms of the 20th century that no one feels the need to recall its basic beginnings. But 25 years ago, respected businessmen's and bankers' opposition to what they felt was Government banking was a bitter thing. Many well-meaning financiers and private citizens claimed the creation of FDIC would encourage recklessness among bankers, would discredit honesty and invite incredible abuses. Many of those former critics, still on the scene today, would probably like to forget their dire predictions but there are yellowed newspaper clippings around to remind them.

The purpose of the FDIC is simple: To insure us against bank disasters and to guarantee against the collapse of America's banking system as occurred in the early thirties.

The system has worked well. Although perhaps a half-dozen banks will fail over the Nation this year (the current annual average), countless innocent families will not suffer and there will be no wild-eyed panic, because the accounts will almost surely be insured by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

As of today, FDIC is insuring deposits of 13,333 of the Nation's 14,095 commercial and mutual savings banks. The insured banks hold 96 percent of all bank deposits in the Nation. (Of the 712 banks which aren't insured, about one-fifth fail to meet requirements, and the rest haven't joined because they resent the cost of the insurance or say they don't need it.)

The insurance maximum is \$10,000 for each depositor, which means that if you have several accounts in different banks each will be insured up to that amount. Since approximately 98 percent of all accounts involve balances of less than \$10,000 it is easy to see the vast majority of accounts are fully and completely insured.

In its 25 years, FDIC has built a nest egg of more than \$1.8 billion. It raises funds by assessing member banks at the rate of one-twelfth of 1 percent of the insured bank's deposits, but has done so well it has been returning about 60 percent of the assessments. During its lifetime, the agency has paid out more than \$343 million in insurance to about 1,500,000 depositors in 432 banks.

The spectacular success of FDIC has surpassed even the most enthusiastic predictions of its early supporters. And at the risk of using a poor pun, one might say its profits have made bad prophets of its detractors and former foes.

The Unlocked Back Door of the Federal Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the first budget-buster bill is on its way, and the boobytrap to catch those of us who are trying to hold the line on Federal taxes as well as spending has passed the House. I was 1 of the 89 to vote against this bill. I am referring to H.R. 2256, the bill which provided \$300 million for direct Government loans to veterans.

Let me make it clear, as was pointed out when the House was debating this bill, there is presently available \$192 million for these direct loans, but with the realistic interest rates in the new

bill I doubt if there will be a demand for funds. Private capital will meet the need and that is the way it should be.

Furthermore, as my colleagues are well aware, this \$300 million was not in the budget. That is why I, for one, did not deviate from my firm determination to support holding the line on spending.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on H.R. 2256 and this \$300 million unbudgeted item brought out some other facts which needed airing. In the discussions from both sides of the aisle, there was strong criticism of what has been going on and what is one of the major causes of Federal deficits. In other words, all of a sudden out in the open comes the admission of a means of back-door approach to the Treasury, which has been used to open wide the spending flood-gates and to bypass the constitutional requirement of congressional review and the prohibition that no money shall be withdrawn from the Treasury of the United States, except by appropriation pursuant to law.

It was pointed out that by authorization bills, which state the administrator of an agency in question may issue notes, it has been possible to get money direct from the Secretary of the Treasury who is required to cash these notes. Thus, the need as to the spending of such funds has not been studied or approved by the House or Senate.

Furthermore, the Constitution specifically provides that all revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, yet, as was brought out in the debate on veterans housing, 16 bills calling for \$9 billion of expenditures last year came to the floor of the House with that provision in them and 12 of these bills originated in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee has introduced a resolution which, as I understand, would require conformity with the Constitution covering appropriations. I hope it will come to the floor and if so I will support it. It is the only way to hold the line on spending.

Meanwhile, I want to emphasize that the \$300 million for direct loans to veterans, which I voted against, was an example of the back door Treasury type of legislation and in large measure is the way deficit spending has been flourishing.

I do not desire to inject politics today in this statement, but for myself I must ask to be counted in disagreement with those of the opposition leadership who seek to excuse this back door approach on the grounds that without it much progressive legislation, as it is called, would not be enacted. If legislation cannot stand up under constitutional legislative process and review within the framework of constitutional procedure and congressional approval, either the Constitution should be amended or the measures not enacted into law.

The salvation of our country to my way of thinking, as recognized by the Founding Fathers, lies in control by the representatives of the people of the right to appropriate money. If we abrogate the provision that no funds shall be withdrawn from the Treasury except by

lawful appropriation by the Congress, there will be little hope of checking inflation and maintaining fiscal responsibility.

Finally, let me say, as I have said so many times in the past, let us redouble our efforts to curb unneeded spending and remember that the money we handle belongs to the taxpayers and the debt we incur is their obligation and liability; not ours alone.

Creating an ever-expanding national debt to be loaded upon our children I cannot view with equanimity. Especially so in a time of comparative prosperity and highest earnings and wages in history. I cannot join the spenders and charge off deficits to "balanced human budgets"—except in times of economic crisis.

My conscience cries out that presently, as we spend more, we should tax more, and I am against both of these. They are not necessary. So I urge locking the back door of the Federal Treasury and restoring control to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to Thomas Jefferson, if a choice is necessary, I will support economy and liberty as against profusion and servitude, especially, as it may be in the latter case, it would be visiting our sins upon the third and fourth generation.

Dick Neuberger Is Fully Recovered and Will Soon Be Back in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to report that our respected colleague and friend in the other body, the junior Senator from Oregon, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, will return to Washington Thursday, February 12, 1959. He will be accompanied by his wife, Maurine.

It will be good to see them. His many friends have missed him. We were shocked and dismayed last fall when it was disclosed that he was the victim of a cancer the doctors identified as malignant. After a period of anxiety we were somewhat relieved to learn that this cancer was radioresponsive and that the outlook for recovery was excellent.

So it was DICK entered on a long period of cobalt treatments which only recently were completed. Now the official report is that he is wholly recovered. This is heartening news indeed for all his friends and admirers here and throughout the Nation.

Before he knew of his condition he had been in the forefront of the fight to obtain more funds for cancer and other medical research. He is resolved to continue this effort, and his very presence here should win him more allies equally determined.

The statement issued by Senator NEUBERGER's physicians on February 3, 1959, was as follows:

Senator NEUBERGER has completed an intensive course of radiation for the malignant tumor which was surgically removed last fall. He has tolerated the therapy well and has gained 14 pounds in weight. We are gratified with the manner in which he has responded to the treatment program, and we have every confidence in its success. He is returning to Washington next week prepared to resume a normal schedule of activity.

Congress Control of Debt, Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. W. W. McEachern, president of the South Carolina National Bank and president of the South Carolina Bankers Association, in the January 30, 1959, edition of the American Banker, urges Congress to do all in its power to control the national debt and inflation. One of the Nation's most able bankers and financiers, Mr. McEachern has made an excellent presentation of how the Federal budget affects even the smallest individual.

I ask unanimous consent that this presentation, entitled "Congress Control of Debt, Inflation, Called Major Task," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS CONTROL OF DEBT, INFLATION CALLED MAJOR TASK

(By W. W. McEachern, president, South Carolina National Bank, Greenville)

It is too bad that so many of us think of the budget as being something off in the distance when the real effect of what the Federal Government does is felt every day in nearly every transaction that takes place—in our grocery stores, in our department stores, on our farms, in our textile plants, in our banks, and in our homes. The sooner we come to realize that the only dollar the Government has to spend comes out of our pocket, the quicker we will try to protect against unnecessary or unwanted expenditures of the Government.

Too many Americans think of the Federal budget as some vast mystery beyond their understanding. That is just what the spenders in Washington want us to think. They want us to feel that budgetmaking is a task we don't understand and can't do anything about. That is bunk.

Perhaps the methods of accounting and the methods of arriving at a budget on the scale of the Federal budget are not easily understood, but the basic principles are the same as those we have to deal with in handling our personal income and expenditures.

When a family has a certain amount of income in a year, the most that family can spend is the total of its income, except under two conditions. If it has resources which have been saved from income in previous years, it can dip into them to supplement its income for the current year. Or it can borrow against anticipated future income.

Under certain circumstances, either of these ways of supplementing current income can be necessary and even wise. However, the one thing the family always has to face up to is that repayment must be made if it borrows. Or, if it dips into accumulated resources, the rebuilding of those resources is likely to require greater effort now and in the future than it did to build those resources in years past.

Therefore, the careful family first considers how badly it needs more funds than it is making. Then it considers the price it must pay to secure the funds. In cases of emergency, funds must be secured regardless of cost. But the prudent family is reluctant to obligate itself unless the need at a particular time outweighs the cost of the obligation it incurs to secure additional income. Or there may be other advantages to having access to additional funds immediately which outweigh the cost of borrowing.

The Federal Government is no different from the American family, except the Government can levy new or additional taxes while the family cannot call upon anybody for immediate income without having to repay.

A prudent Federal Government first tries to live within its income. When an emergency arises it borrows the needed funds and uses them wisely to end the crisis. And occasionally a situation arises that makes it desirable for the Government to borrow for a nonemergency purpose.

There is no justification for the Federal Government to spend beyond its income any more than for an average family to do so.

Deficit financing and the issuance of too many Government bonds can lead eventually to even greater Government bondage than at the present.

The Federal Government has spent more than its annual revenue 15 times out of the past 20 years. Since 1939, annual deficits have exceeded surpluses by a total of approximately \$235 billion.

Our total public debt is now expected to be \$285 billion at the end of 1960. This would be \$2 billion over the permanent legal debt limit.

Another point we should remember is that during these 20 years while the public debt was growing to nearly 7 times its 1939 size, the Federal budget was growing too. It is now almost 10 times its size then. So the constant borrowing that increased the public debt did not help to keep the budget down. It actually added to it heavily because the interest on our deficit financing is estimated at \$8.1 billion for 1960. In simpler terms, that means \$1.50 out of every \$10 spent by the Federal Government under appropriations for the current year.

The 2d session of the 85th Congress, which adjourned on August 24, 1958, appropriated \$67,773,583,153 for 1959. However, it also approved \$4,879,893,095 in supplemental appropriations for 1958, and permanent appropriations approved in prior years to be spent in 1959 are estimated at \$8,334 million. The prospects are that the new 86th Congress will exceed the spending efforts of its predecessors.

Another little known element in the Federal budget is the fact that carryover appropriations for commitments made in previous years to complete unfinished projects are being spent each year. These are over and above the funds laid out for the current fiscal year.

TRUST FUNDS

The President estimated in his new budget message to Congress that the new and old obligational authority which will be available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1960 will be \$128.3 billion including funds carried over into 1960 from fiscal 1959 and previous years.

In addition to the current and prior obligations included in appropriations and expenditures, the Federal Government also collects certain earmarked revenue which is set aside in so-called trust funds. These funds include such purposes as old-age and survivors insurance, Federal aid for highway construction, unemployment insurance, Federal employees' retirement, Federal disability insurance, railroad retirement, veterans' life insurance and other lesser funds among which is one of the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Sound business principles seem to have been dispensed with in handling these trust funds, just as in the overall budget making activities of the Federal Government. It is estimated that in four of the eight funds I mentioned the expenditures in 1960 will exceed the receipts.

Such policies would never be tolerated by any board of directors charged with the responsibility of regulating a trust fund, outside the Government. It is true that provisions have been made to increase the tax on employees and employers for social security, but experts on the subject still question the soundness of the program after the adoption of increasingly liberal amendments.

SOCIAL SECURITY COST

Some experts predict that the social security trust fund will be exhausted and it will be necessary for Congress to supplement it by direct appropriations. This, of course, could mean additional reductions in the taxpayers take home pay. If Congress continues its present trend toward liberalizing social security—along with all other expenditures—additional revenue will have to be found to make up the annual deficits which are sure to result.

The thing we have to remember about expanding old programs, or establishing new ones, is that, once put into effect, there is a continuing obligation which usually increases instead of diminishing with time.

One good illustration of this is the highway program which has been hit by inflation and for which the President now asks an additional 1½ cents per gallon gasoline tax.

Social security is another example of what I mean.

Along with the increases in benefits under the original program, there have been a number of additional benefits added in recent years. Many of these new benefits were provided without any sound basis for including them in an already costly program. The only sound way to operate a retirement or insurance plan is to establish it so as to take into account the amount expected to be paid in and the anticipated payments out of the funds and always to provide for a substantial reserve against unexpected emergencies which sometimes occur, even when careful business practices are applied.

In his budget message, the President pointed out that trust fund receipts in the fiscal year 1960 are estimated to be \$20.5 billion and trust fund expenditures \$20.3 billion.

Even if all the trust funds were lumped together—which they are not—the margin of less than 1 percent of receipts over expenditures would be too thin. This is a good illustration of the Federal Government's unbusinesslike handling of financial affairs.

OTHER FACTORS

One of the prime dangers in the system of legislating and appropriating by the Congress grows out of the fact that Congress quite often fails to take into account the possibilities of increased requirements for funds out of a program which is inaugurated without a complete determination as to how much it can grow under the limits established.

Under the price support programs of the Department of Agriculture an unexpected yield in wheat and feed grain crops means that an additional \$1.9 billion will be needed during fiscal year 1959, ending June 30. This is the largest nondefense item which helped to cause the 1959 deficit of \$12.9 billion estimated at this time.

Also, Congress has to take into account—or should do so—that pay increases for military and civilian personnel of the Federal Government mean increased Federal contributions into retirement funds. This calls for higher taxes, more borrowing or reducing the budget somewhere else.

Congress has been willing to borrow funds to appropriate, but unwilling to cut back expenditures or to meet essential needs by tax adjustments which might stimulate business activity and in turn increase Federal revenue.

POPULAR WILL?

Some observers have expressed the opinion that Congress has reflected the views of the people by approving increased domestic expenditures. They believe the people generally have taken the attitude that if the United States can afford to spend billions for military and economic aid to foreign countries, then they, as taxpayers, want to get as many benefits as possible under domestic programs.

Whether this was a correct estimate of the opinion held by a majority of the people or not, it is apparently the basis on which the second session of the 85th Congress permitted:

1. A deficit of \$12.9 billion;
2. The public debt limit to be raised from \$275 billion to \$288 billion temporarily and to \$283 billion permanently, and
3. Nondefense spending for fiscal 1959 to be increased by \$5.3 billion against an increase of only \$2 billion for defense purposes.

If the Members of Congress thought they were acting in accord with the wishes of the people, it is time for the people to let Congress know they were mistaken.

In most instances, the Members of the South Carolina delegation voted conservatively in comparison with a majority of the Congress. We should give our strong support and express our approval of an even more conservative financial course in the future sessions of Congress.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING RISE

The fact is that total national defense spending planned for fiscal 1959 will be \$4.3 billion under fiscal 1953's defense budget of \$52.6 billion. On the other hand, non-defense expenditures in 1959 are estimated at \$9.2 billion above the 1953 level of \$21.7 billion.

In the face of the growing public debt, such extravagance has no place in the budget of a prudent government any more than it would fit into the budget of a prudent family.

Let's bring the Federal budget down to everyday terms.

A family budget, operated in the same manner as the Federal budget, would mean that the family started out fiscal 1959 with a debt of more than four times its annual income. Following the Federal trend, that family would face its financial situation by obligating itself to spend more than \$1.08 for every \$1 of income received during the year. No sound financial institution would accept a note signed by a member of a family in such a condition.

As a matter of fact, you and I know that no family and no business or industry could ever get in such a dire financial situation with private financing. They would be considered broke long before reaching such a status.

Of course, the Federal Government need not go broke because it holds the power through Congress to levy sufficient taxes to defray the costs of government. However, only this power to dip into the pocket of the

taxpayer will prevent the Government from being declared insolvent.

One thing that has happened as a result of all this bad management is that Federal securities issued by the Treasury have been undergoing severe losses in value on the market. The people too have felt the effects of inflation in the decreased purchasing power of the dollar.

CONGRESSMAN CANNON'S VIEW

Congressman CANNON of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, advised his colleagues to tell the truth about the situation when they went home. This is what he said:

"When your people complain about the high cost of living tell them the facts. Tell them the national debt is higher because you voted to make it higher. Tell them the dollar has gone down and the cost of groceries has gone up because you voted to deprecate the dollar and voted to raise prices."

Congressman MILLS, of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, expressed fear that the 1959 budget "could let loose inflationary pressures that in turn will be emulated by business and labor. The result could be that during the course of the next several years we will see rises in prices such as we have not seen in peacetime."

It is my opinion that the contracts negotiated by the automobile workers union have shown that the continued inflationary trend in Government has indeed been followed by business and labor. We can look forward to other similar agreements all of which will pile additional costs on the American public for no additional service or value in a product.

DUTY OF CONGRESSMEN

On the other side of the picture, the President's veto last year of a \$280 million program for aid to so-called depressed areas was encouraging in an era of socialistic endeavors. And his courageous anti-inflation messages to the new 86th Congress point in the right direction. The trouble is there are too few substantial attempts being made to find ways and means of reducing Federal spending.

The executive departments and agencies cannot spend a single dollar that is not approved by Congress, so it is the duty of Congress to seek out and cut out its unnecessary appropriations. Congress also must make a start toward reduction of the national debt. If this is not done during a time of peace, reasonably high employment, and high average income, then there will never be a time to reduce the Government's obligations which really are the debts of the people themselves.

A balanced budget would mean the surplus could be applied against the debt. Then in turn the budget could be reduced too, or at least held in line, because a part of the budget now applied to interest payments would not be needed if the debt were to be reduced or paid off. One dollar and a half out of every ten collected in taxes by the Federal Government would no longer be needed for interest payments if we paid off our Federal debt.

Perhaps that is too much to expect, but certainly substantial reductions could be made through sound financial practices. That is not too much for the American taxpayer to expect and to demand of Congress.

Since Congress passed the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887, and the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890, we have seen a tremendous development of Federal regulation in many fields. When the United States entered World War I, Government controls had been enacted in the fields of banking, trade practices, farm and power credit, food processing, and labor.

During the boom of the 1920's the emergency controls were removed, but new acts

of regulation soon were approved as the economy declined in the postwar era. After the stock market crash, the real era of Federal regulation began.

NEW AGENCIES, NEW SPENDING

Actually, from the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act, in 1887, through 1939, approximately 100 new agencies were created in the Federal Government. These included such agencies as the Rural Electrification Administration, the Federal Land Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Social Security Board, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

By 1940, through the establishment of new agencies and the expansion of old ones, the Federal Government had firmly fixed its control or regulation over business and industry.

By 1944 the Federal Government was purchasing almost as great an output of goods as used by the entire Nation in 1929.

And consider this significant comparison: From 1900 through 1958 the Federal budget multiplied 140 times, while the population little more than doubled.

We have reached a point where the Federal Government is a vital and often controlling factor in the major economic decisions of agriculture, business, and industry—if not in labor. Many people in all situations have come to lean on Government and welcome Government support—if not Government control.

CHANGE IN POLICY NEEDED

We look to the Federal Government for security, for wage and hour regulation, for highways, for pork-barrel contributions to many projects. Perhaps some of the things we look to Washington for are desirable or necessary. However, many undesirable results have come about because of the Federal Government's expanded role in our daily lives.

We must be more consistent. We cannot write our Congressman to vote for a South Carolina appropriation and to vote against the same catchall bill because it contains similar funds for South Dakota. We cannot ask favors for our business which we would oppose for somebody else.

We must place principle above pocket-book.

There is no easy way to bring about a change in our situation. It will be difficult in the face of pressures and demands for new and continued Federal services and Federal aid for Congress to do an about face in spending.

However, the hard facts of dollars and cents should provide a powerful argument for a change in policy.

There are no tricks by which we can solve our financial problem. Just as the head of a family has to take drastic steps when things get out of hand with the family budget, so now must Congress take drastic steps to repair the damage done to our economy by the policy of spend and borrow beyond our capacity, and tax and tax beyond our means.

George Washington offered sound advice in his Farewell Address. These are his words:

"As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit."

He admonished the Nation to use credit "as sparingly as possible" and to avoid the accumulation of debt "not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear."

That is a simple formula. The following of it is what takes courage.

I hope the people and the Congress will find that courage. Otherwise, we will have to face a more destructive inflation than we have witnessed in the years since World War II. None can foresee what the ultimate results would be.

Views of Business and Industrial Leaders of New Jersey on the Economy Fore- cast for 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a symposium, prepared by several outstanding business and industrial leaders of New Jersey, on the economy forecast for 1959. The forecast was made through the cooperation of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America with the New Jersey Manufacturers Association and was published last month in the magazine, *New Jersey Business*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORECASTS FOR 1959: A SYMPOSIUM—SEVERAL MEMBERS OF THE NEW JERSEY MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION BOARDS, LEADERS IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, MAKE THOUGHTFUL COMMENTS ON THE PRUDENTIAL ECONOMIC FORECAST FOR 1959 AND WHAT THE YEAR WILL BRING FOR NEW JERSEY

Paul L. Troast, home, Clifton; president, Mahoney-Troast Construction Co., Clifton; director, New Jersey Bank & Trust Co., Passaic; president, S. H. Kress & Co., New York; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Co.:

"Being generally of an optimistic nature, it is not difficult for me to wholeheartedly agree with Prudential's economic forecast for 1959. It is heartening, too, to note that my optimism is shared by those in the Prudential who are so able and whose outstanding record over the past 7 years lends much stature to their forecast.

"I am disturbed, on the other hand, to note that Government spending is continuing along an upward curve and feel that we as businessmen should more carefully examine this ever-expanding expense item which is such a large proportion of our costs of doing business.

"New Jersey can hope to benefit fully from the prosperous years which lie ahead only if we reestablish the healthy tax climate which formerly prevailed and which meant so much to our expanding economy.

"Again like most businessmen, I believe that there is a place in this optimistic future for more compensating profits for our stockholders. Competition is an important and necessary part of our economy but the past year has shown too many companies operating with expanding sales and curtailed profits."

Ward J. Herbert, home, South Orange; partner of McCarter & English, counselors at law, Newark; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Co.:

"It is difficult for a lawyer, even though active in a practice devoted largely to legal aspects of business developments and busi-

ness affairs, to get the personal experience needed to form an opinion about local application of a national economic forecast. Much attention is naturally given to problems and litigation arising out of transactions which have already been closed in a business sense; and some attention goes to matters which are part of long-range planning and may or may not lead to immediate construction of new plants or the like. I can venture two comments, however.

"Some out-of-State capital, when considering new plants or branches in New Jersey, shows signs of being reluctant to face our new corporate income tax. The current uncertainty about an increase in the rate of the tax does not help matters.

"As to new housing, the recent decline in transportation for commuters, with the threat of worse to come, is obviously going to hurt the sale of new homes in a large part of the State in 1959 and will discourage building to some extent.

"These are unfavorable factors here which may limit to some degree the application in New Jersey of the Prudential's optimistic forecast for the Nation."

Steele L. Winterer, home, Short Hills; president, A. & M. Karagheusian, Inc., New York City; director, A. & M. Karagheusian, Inc.; Summit Trust Co.; Strauss-Rose Carpet Corp., Chicago; Wilbur Newman & Co., Inc., Chamblee, Ga.; Seaboard Floor Coverings, Inc., Philadelphia; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Co.:

"I think Prudential's appraisal of business conditions for the ensuing year will prove to be quite accurate. It is possible that in some industries again we may find ourselves unable to sell our productive capacity but, in general, the outlook certainly seems favorable.

"Overall, our Nation, with its population growth, will have vast numbers of new family formations and these are going to have a tremendous influence on business activity in the years ahead. However, it is evident that competition will be increased rather than lessened and those businesses that are able to improve their products and lower their costs will forge ahead, while those who fall in these two areas will lose out.

"Frankly, I am deeply concerned about New Jersey's future as a leading industrial State as New Jersey is facing a real challenge from many other States and if it is to retain its eminent position as an industrial State it must take a new look at its industrial climate. I don't think that business receives either encouragement or recognition for the part it plays in New Jersey and, in the long run, the States who are aggressively seeking new business are the ones that are going to go ahead and New Jersey's position will likely decline. Whether this decline begins to make its weight felt in 1959 remains to be seen, but it is one reservation on New Jersey business that I must add to the overall picture."

F. Raymond Peterson, home, Hackensack; chairman of the board and chief executive officer, First National Bank & Trust Co., of Paterson; director, First National Bank & Trust Co., of Paterson; director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Co.:

"I do not consider the Prudential Insurance Co.'s economic forecast for this year unduly optimistic. I expect a continuation of the recovery this year even if auto production shows only a moderate increase. A good gain could be a major factor in a spirited recovery in the economy, and if this influence continues strong it could be a major factor in a materially higher level of personal income, sales, and employment in the early sixties. With most of its labor problems solved, the auto industry appears to be in a position to meet whatever demand may develop.

"We expect steel production will expand between 20 and 35 percent this year, depend-

ing, in an important degree, upon demand from auto manufacturers.

"In my opinion, another major factor in this year's recovery, and for the years immediately beyond, will be the contribution of the construction industry with emphasis on residential building. A further hardening of money rates could result in some curtailment of homebuilding, but I expect a minimum of 1 million new starts and would not be surprised to see this figure exceeded by one or two hundred thousand.

"It is reported that the University of Michigan's annual conference on economic outlook attended by 70 economists working for corporations, financial institutions, and universities, thinks prices will rise no more than 1 percent this year and that unemployment will shrink to an average of 3.7 million. The resultant increase in expendable income, coupled with a relatively stable price level, should result in the movement of a considerably higher volume of goods.

"We are inclined to keep a constant check on three factors—construction awards, inventory buildup, and Government spending. Favorable developments in these three fields should result in our expectations being met.

"The outlook for New Jersey seems to be at least as good as for the Nation as a whole, based upon a check of our leading industries.

"Chemical output should expand approximately 10 percent and iron and steel upward of 20 percent. Military requirements should increase the output of electronic equipment, and production of electrical appliances should be materially higher. For other electrical equipment and for nonferrous metals, the outlook is not clear.

"Food processing and textile production are expected to be moderately higher and drug production should increase approximately 10 percent.

"The influence of Federal funds in our area is large and growing. This is particularly true in Federal aid for highways. Construction of routes 80 and 287, together costing over half a billion dollars, should aid our local economy for several years to come."

Sydney E. Longmaid, home, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; president and chairman of the board, the Esterbrook Pen Co., Camden; director, First-Camden National Bank & Trust Co., trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Co.:

"We heartily concur with the Prudential Insurance Co. of America in its economic forecast for 1959 that consumer purchases within the State of New Jersey will show a substantial gain.

"New Jersey is especially favored in the great diversification of its business. The people of the State have an unusual stability of income which such diversification permits.

"We further believe that on balance, New Jersey business has demonstrated the type of leadership necessary if we are to take advantage of every opportunity for sound business expansion in this highly complex and competitive age.

"A further constructive element is the continued expansion of employment within the State and we agree with the Prudential survey that this trend will continue in the coming year."

Donald V. Lowe, home, Tenafly; president, Lowe Paper Co., Ridgefield; chairman, the Port of New York Authority; director, New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; United States delegate to the Transport and Communications Commission of the United Nations; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association, and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Co.:

"Based upon general reading and opinions polled, it would appear that we can anticipate a continuing recovery in the overall economic picture, but at a somewhat tapered rate through the first half of 1959 with a flattening indicated in the latter half of the year.

"It would appear that Prudential's forecast is a little rosier than current newsletters such as the most recent one from RIA. Perhaps Prudential is banking a little too heavily on inventory buildup. As in our own experience, many industries undoubtedly are watching their inventories more carefully than ever as a result of their recent recession burn.

"Generally, I would anticipate that New Jersey's economic picture would be somewhat more stable than the national average for States, in view of the fact that it has such a well diversified industry pattern. Again, therefore, I would anticipate that not having been hit as hard as States in the Middle West its recovery might be closer to 5 percent than the approximate 7.2 percent indicated in the Prudential forecast."

Alfred E. Busch, home, Short Hills; vice president and treasurer, Keuffel & Esser Co., Hoboken; director, Summit Trust Co., Summit; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"I feel that the forecast as outlined in the Prudential 'Economic Forecast for 1959' goes pretty much along with our own thinking.

It might be of interest to you to know that we have in the past been approached by Government departments involved in forecasting future trends for information regarding our sales of certain nondurable materials, such as tracing papers and tracing cloths and reproduction materials. The figures were wanted as it was felt that the use of these items for future planning might be some indication of future production activity.

"These lines during 1958 were depressed only slightly, so we do feel that the planning which has made use of these is indicative of the improvement in production and construction that is going to take place in 1959.

"Our durable goods, such as surveying equipment and drafting equipment, were seriously down during the first half of 1958, but there are indications of noticeable recovery here, and although capital expenditures for items of this kind might not reach the high figures of 1957, we do anticipate a material increase in their sale.

"Our manufacturing activities in our New Jersey plants are scheduled to be increased by 15 percent starting the first of the year. Some of this increase, however, was brought about by a more rapid inventory depletion than forecasted.

"Altogether, our feeling is that there will be an improvement of from 7 to 10 percent in the manufacture of our nondurable items, and possibly an even higher percentage of increase in that of the durable items over the present year."

Charles B. Gilbert, home, Trenton; president, Gilbert & Mott Chevrolet Co.; director, the First Trenton National Bank; Standard Fire Insurance Co.; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association, and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"I have read the 'Economic Forecast for 1959' by the Prudential Insurance Co. Needless to say, it is good reading and I agree generally with their conclusions.

"The summary points out that much of the lift in business is expected from consumer purchases, and I agree that an upward trend in retail sales seems assured in the year 1959. Although durable consumer goods are expected to share in this trend, there is no clear indication that sales of such goods will rebound sharply. For instance, strikes in the automotive business have delayed production schedules so that the real tests of the public's attitude toward the 1959 models will not come until late in February or perhaps in early spring.

"The other items in the 'Forecast' such as public purchases of capital goods, housing expenditures, and Government spending, all take time to show their effect and to reach the consumer's pocket, so we should not be too hasty in looking for an overnight surge in buying. I have every reason to believe 1959 will be one of our better years if the labor element will use restraint in its demands and resolve its differences quickly."

George W. Furness, home, Millville; vice president, the Millville Manufacturing Co.; director, the Millville Manufacturing Co.; Millville National Bank; Wawa Dairy Farms; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"Due to the press of business, I do not feel that I can go into the minute detail that would be required to give a formal version of my views of the Prudential 'Economic Forecast for 1959.'"

"Suffice it to say, I feel the forecast to be over-optimistic and look forward to 1959 as in no way surpassing 1957. I rather expect business at best to run on a plateau rather than a new rise. The direction that will be taken after 1959 I feel is still indeterminate."

"In the textile industry a very bitter lesson was learned concerning inventory and I doubt if in the coming year it will be forgotten. There were little or no symptoms of it being forgotten in 1958. Sales and inventory have been kept in almost too close a relationship. I feel this might well apply to industry other than my own. From what I have heard from the automobile industry, while they are not disappointed in their sales, there is nothing startling in their improvement, which leads me to the above conclusion.

"I do agree that the man-hour output will improve in 1959 due to capital investment and modern machinery but I do not agree that the workweek will increase."

John S. Leslie, home, Ramsey; president, Leslie Co., Lyndhurst; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"Certainly, Prudential's economic forecast appears to be the most optimistic of any I had read and from the businessman's viewpoint, that is encouraging, particularly in view of the statement that Prudential's average annual error in their economic forecast has only been 1.6 percent for the past 7 years.

"Since our business is essentially in capital equipment, we concur in the improvement in this field during the last quarter of 1958 and are optimistic about 1959 which we believe in our company, should be back up to the 1957 level.

"The comment regarding consumer purchases and the relatively insignificant reduction in consumer buying from the peak of 1957 to a low point of 1958, is very interesting and encouraging and would appear to confirm the viewpoint of some economists that population growth is and will continue to be an important stabilizing factor in our economy. Perhaps many of us in top management in industry are too far from the consumer level to fully appreciate the importance of this attitude and are therefore insensitive to this index and the effect which it should have on our thinking and planning.

"Another encouraging factor in this report is the emphasis on the little bearing which increased Government spending has had on the recovery to date. This again indicates that recovery is not a result of pump priming, but of a more basic nature and therefore can probably be properly interpreted as more durable."

Governor Nelson's Appointment Restores Wisconsin's International Reputation in Utility Regulation Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Governor Nelson, of Wisconsin, has made an appointment to our State's public service commission which has significance far beyond the boundaries of Wisconsin, in his choice of Prof. Martin Glaeser, of the University of Wisconsin.

Professor Glaeser is internationally recognized for his pioneering and creative work in the field of utility regulation. His research, his textbooks, and his students constitute the basic foundations for this field of economic study. Moreover, he played an important role in designing the rate structure of the Tennessee Valley Authority—a rate structure which made an indispensable contribution to the outstanding success of TVA. Incidentally, there are some very worthwhile lessons in the theory underlying Professor Glaeser's work in establishing TVA's rate structure which deserve more attention from economists today in their studies of our present problems of high and rising prices in the face of severe restrictions on output. Glaeser is an exponent of promotional rates—rates established at low levels for the purpose of promoting maximum demand and consumption, so that the resulting market for the full potential output of the productive resources will yield adequate profits even at the low unit prices. Economists might very well give increased attention to this theory, and its remarkable success where it has been given practical application in the TVA and in rural electrification, in their studies of industries which have continued to raise their prices steeply even while operating at only half of capacity.

The appointment of Professor Glaeser to the public service commission recalls the days a generation ago when Wisconsin was leading the Nation in the development of ideas for advancing the general welfare. It was his work on the Wisconsin Public Service Commission that brought David Lilienthal to national attention and led to his appointment as director of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I warmly commend Governor Nelson for this most excellent choice for the State public service commission. It is an outstanding example of Governor Nelson's determination to raise the standards of public service in our State government to the highest possible level.

Mr. President, Governor Nelson's appointment of Professor Glaeser has been highly commended by the Capital Times,

which for 40 years has been nationally recognized as the living spokesman for the progressive ideas and idealism of the La Follette era. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GOVERNOR MAKES FINE CHOICE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION; PROF. MARTIN GLAESER

Commenting on Governor Nelson's appointment of Prof. Martin Glaeser to the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, David E. Lillenthal said Tuesday:

"I am confident that his appointment will help restore the national prestige of the commission and greatly strengthen protection of consumers and at the same time bring to the commission's work a judgment and understanding that will mean fair and intelligent regulation beneficial to management and investors as well as to users of public services."

From the standpoint of reestablishing the prestige of the commission, nationally or in the State, Governor Nelson could not have chosen more wisely.

He has selected a man with an international reputation as an authority on public utility regulation—a man who has made a tremendous and unique contribution to the field in which he is now called to serve his home State.

As a distinguished researcher, teacher, and author, he has helped to bring society a better understanding of the complex field of utility regulation.

His mastery of the subject has been placed repeatedly at the disposal of the public. He has helped to draft regulatory laws for Wisconsin and was an indispensable aid in establishing the first rate schedules for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The appointment should reassure the people of Wisconsin who have watched for 20 years a dismal succession of appointments to the public service commission based only on political considerations. This is the first time since the appointment of Lillenthal to the commission that such an authoritative figure has been chosen.

Wisconsin is lucky to have him available. Wisconsin should be proud that so distinguished an authority is a native son and a teacher at the university.

Governor Nelson has shown a profound appreciation of good public service by his appointment.

ord shows that this provision would have no practical application to Connecticut. In addition, I very strongly favor the provisions permitting an increase in interest rates because I feel that this increase will start bank funds growing out in the form of GI loans and that the direct loan provision will be rendered more or less academic. Finally, I know that in my section, existing lending institutions will adequately do the job of servicing these veterans applications and I see no need for governmental intervention in this field.

Inflationary Effect of Interest Increase in Veterans' Housing Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2256) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans, to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, citizens of Wisconsin have for many months been deeply concerned with the ever-increasing spiral in the cost of living. Inflation is becoming a major threat to the American economy. Inflation is brought about through ever-increasing prices of commodities and the resulting need for increased wages to permit working men and women to keep pace with the increased cost of living. This ceaseless price and wage increase has been a major cause of the high cost of living in America today.

We here in Congress have witnessed this year another cause of the inflationary spiral and in the months ahead it will become increasingly apparent to the people of the country that there are other factors contributing to the high cost of living besides higher wages and increased costs.

The Veterans' Administration was originally established as a means of enabling veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict to secure housing for themselves and their families at somewhat less than the full rate of interest. FHA financing was inaugurated to give all citizens assurance that they could provide housing for themselves and their families at a moderate cost. From the beginning, it has been understood that interest rates under FHA financing would be higher than interest rates under VA financing. We have, however, witnessed, especially in rural and urban areas, a virtual refusal of capital to enter into the VA program of financing. Banks, building and loan companies, and other financial institutions have and are refusing to make VA loans at the current interest rate of 4¾ percent. This rate is only one-half of 1 percent

lower than the FHA interest rate and this rate has already been raised several several times by previous Congresses.

Each time that the VA interest rate has been raised, the FHA has followed suit by increasing the interest rate on FHA loans. We have no reason to believe that the present VA interest rate increase will be met with any different response by officials of the Federal Housing Administration and I predict that the one-half of 1 percent increase in the VA interest rate will result in a similar increase in FHA loans. This will bring FHA interest rates to 5¾ percent. The criminal part of the situation, however, is that when the Federal agency interest rates are upped, this increase is accepted by private bankers as a license to increase private interest rates to private borrowers from our Nation's banks and I predict that the 5¾ percent interest on FHA loans will, during the summer and fall of 1959, result in private interest rates to private borrowers, across the board, of 6½ percent.

This interest rate is too high. It is inflationary. It is increasing the cost of living. The borrower has less money left when making the loan than he had before—just as the housewife has fewer groceries in her shopping basket for the money spent than she had before. There have been three increases in the past 3 years and undoubtedly 1960 will see further demands by the bankers to increase—first, the VA interest rate, then the FHA interest rate, then the private loan interest rate.

It is true the bankers made little or no appearance before Congress. They did not need to—for they had the American Legion and some other veterans' organizations, not including the VFW, and the National Association of Building Contractors to fight their battle for them.

I view this increase in the cost of using money with alarm. I view it as such because it has a direct effect upon inflation which besets our economy. I view it as such because the very people who are complaining loudest about the cost-wage inflationary spiral are the same people who championed for the fourth time the interest inflationary spiral.

I am for loans for the veterans at a moderate cost. I do not consider 5¼ percent interest a moderate cost to a veteran. This is especially true when the veteran is required to pay from 2 to 11 points for the privilege of getting the veteran's loan. We have failed in granting this increase to hold the line against inflation.

I, like many others who voted for this bill, did so because it represents the only way Congress provided of enabling veterans to get any loans at all, and because the bill carried a direct loan provision of \$300 million. This provision will enable veterans in rural and urban areas to secure loans. The money market in these areas has dried up and without this direct loan provision, the Veterans' Housing Act is of no value to veterans who do not live in the large centers of population.

Providing Additional Funds for Direct Loans to Veterans

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2256) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans, to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for H.R. 2256. I did favor and support the amendment which would have eliminated direct loans. The rec-

Airline Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, another accident in the vicinity of La Guardia Airport. How long must we wait to get corrective legislative action? This plane could just as well have fallen in the congested areas of Queens County, resulting in untold suffering and devastation, not only to those traveling in the plane but also to those on the ground.

Previous hearings indicate that about 90 percent of plane accidents are the result of bad-weather flying. The present regulations are too liberal—they need strengthening. It is our obligation to take this matter under advisement and to provide such action.

The crash of the American Airliner in the East River on February 3 is but one of many accidents which have occurred in the New York area in recent years during inclement weather. To cite a few, in April 1952 five persons were killed and four houses were destroyed when a plane crashed in Jamaica, Queens County, after it missed its landing at Idlewild Airport; in October 1953 two persons were killed and others injured when a plane crashed while taking off in fog at La Guardia Airport; on December 18, 1954, an Italian DC-6-B airliner roared low over homes and densely populated areas in the vicinity of Idlewild Airport, not once but three times, and finally, on a fourth approach ripped into a Jamaica Bay pier, burst into flames, and sank in the water, killing 26 persons.

To elaborate on this crash in December 1954, the airliner left Boston in bad weather for Idlewild where the weather was rapidly closing in; when the plane arrived at New York the ceiling was just about 200 feet—the minimum ceiling, under present regulations, for landing; the pilot had to drop below this minimum in order to establish visual contact with the ground—one point we must bear in mind is that before a pilot can effectively land upon any landing strip, whether guided by instruments or not, he must establish visual contact with the ground.

Now, this most recent crash in New York reveals that the ceiling was 400 feet at the time of the crash. In a report titled "Sensory Illusions of Pilots," published several years ago by the Flight Safety Foundation, Chief Pilot P. P. Cocquyt of Belgium's Sabena Airline, said that an overwater approach robs a pilot of landmarks by which to judge altitude visually. He often believes he is higher than he actually is and the illusion will cause him to descend toward the runway lights at a steeper angle than is warranted. I think it is safe to assume that the pilot of this plane, acknowledged by the company to be "one of the finest pilots American Airlines has ever had," lost his depth perception.

Mr. Speaker, I have cited these cases to point up the need for legislation to establish by law safety regulations to stop these bad weather accidents.

As my colleagues know, I have in the past two Congresses introduced legislation to raise, by law, the minimum visibility requirements for takeoffs and landings at the airports in the New York area. I have again introduced this legislation, which I feel would do much to avoid some of the catastrophes which have happened in the past and which I have outlined above. These bills are H.R. 4179 and H.R. 4180 which have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In addition, I have introduced House Resolution 162 to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the powers and functions of agencies over the operation of aircraft which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, time for talking has passed; it is time for action. I urge my colleagues to join me in urging these committees to act speedily on my bills. It is my firm conviction that they merit enactment.

Questionnaire by Farmers Grain Dealers
Association of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include an analysis of an opinion questionnaire which was sent out to the farmer-owner-directors and managers of 335 member cooperative elevator companies in the State of Iowa.

This questionnaire poll was conducted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa among its membership to obtain guidance in drafting resolutions for the association which would reflect the majority opinion of the members. More than 600 questionnaires, representing 32 percent of the member cooperative elevator companies throughout the State were completed and returned. Of important significance in the analysis of these returns is the following breakdown for the section of the questionnaire concerning the formulation of resolutions directed to the support of legislation to provide for a farm program:

1. The Farmers Grain Dealers Association should support a rigid farm program. Yes, 75 percent; no, 25 percent.
2. The Farmers Grain Dealers Association should support in-kind payments on idle acres. Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent.
3. The Farmers Grain Dealers Association should support emergency reserve. Yes, 97 percent; no, 3 percent.
4. The Farmers Grain Dealers Association should support a national agricultural board. Yes, 92 percent; no, 8 percent.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF
DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD
EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Youth Conservation Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Youth Conservation Act of 1959," prepared by myself, together with an editorial entitled "A New CCC?" published in the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of January 14, 1959.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH CONSERVATION ACT OF 1959

(Statement by Senator MORSE, of Oregon)

It was most gratifying to me to read another fine editorial appearing in the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune. On January 14 this truly great newspaper of the State of Oregon contained an item entitled "A New CCC?" In it the editor of the Mail Tribune struck a note which I think that the Senate will hear time and time again in the coming months as a newspaper after newspaper, the Nation over, joins the chorus of praise for the legislation to create a Youth Conservation Corps, introduced by the very able and humanitarian senior Senator from Minnesota. As a cosponsor of this proposed legislation, S. 812, I am proud to work with the Senator from Minnesota and with the other cosponsors, toward speedy enactment of the bill.

In the last analysis, as I have often reiterated upon the floor of the Senate, the basic wealth of the United States rests not alone upon the raw materials we have at our command, abundant though they be; nor is it to be found solely in the broad rivers which convey our goods to ocean ports, in our forests which mantle the slopes of our snow-capped mountains, in our wheat-golden farms, nor in our blossoming fruit orchards. These all have but a derivative value. No, the truth wealth of our country lies in our basic human resource, the boys and girls who will tomorrow be succeeding us in the trusteeship of our natural resources.

This being so, have we not a plain duty to arrange matters in such a fashion as will conserve this human resource, so that when our children assume the trust of land, water, and minerals in their time they will wisely preserve their inheritance and pass it on, not only undiminished but enhanced? How better can this be done than through a program which gives at first hand a knowledge of and love for our forests, streams, and wildlife?

The boy salvaged from the slums of our blighted metropolitan areas through the Youth Conservation Corps would gain insight into the truths expressed by the great poet when he caused his character to say:

"And this our life exempt from public haunt
Finds tongues in trees, books in the running
brooks,
Sermons in stones and good in everything.
I would not change it."

The Medford Mail Tribune editorial wisely points out that the cost is small in comparison with the benefits which would accrue to the boy, the community, and the Nation, through the enactment of this legislation.

The forest-access road program, so urgently needed, would benefit immeasurably from the enactment of the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1959. Forest-access roads pay for themselves over and over again. Our timber is a crop to be harvested. It is a tragic waste if it falls to decay. It is a hazard when it becomes tinder dry and ripe for fire. Far better that it be harvested at prime and used for homes. The Youth Conservation Corps, under skillful leadership of Forest Service and Park Service rangers and foremen, who would build the access roads, clear the underbrush, and improve our Federal forests, would profit by their growth in skills. Their health would be enhanced. They could contribute to the family income to feed their younger brothers and sisters; but, most of all, Mr. President, they would grow in understanding of the riches offered by our open spaces, crystal lakes, and fragrant forests. This is the experience which would instill a true love of country, to be passed on and treasured by the generations beyond.

It is my hope that this legislation will pass the Senate without dissenting vote when it is reported from committee. Passage by unanimous action would constitute a symbol of the determination of the Senate to develop our country through the aid we extend to the young men of America in the recreation of a Youth Conservation Corps.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, Jan. 14, 1959]

A New CCC?

A couple of years ago, after a jaunt into the woods with a group of foresters and outdoorsmen, we reported here on a discussion we'd heard about the possibility of forming something like the Civilian Conservation Corps of pre-World War II days.

Several of the men in the party had had experience with the boys who came west to take over the barracks camps, build roads and trails, construct forest recreation facilities, do reforestation work, build firebreaks and fight fires, and generally effect a double rehabilitation—that of the forests and that of themselves.

Frequently these lads were the products of the slums of the East, and often were "tough cookies" themselves—boys who today would be called juvenile delinquents.

A rather amazing percentage of them, if we are rightly informed, went on from the CCC into constructive, useful lives.

How much credit the corps can take for this record is, of course, subject to debate. But many men who watched the tough boys from the streets of New York or Chicago change gradually into men who knew something of the outdoors, something of life, something of their fellow men, and something of responsibility, will swear that it was the turning point in more lives than a few.

The possibility of reviving the CCC or something like it has been broached every so often since the war.

The latest to do so is Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, who advocates a Youth Conservation Corps, to provide employment for boys of 16 or over.

After reading HUMPHREY's proposal, Bud Forrester of the Pendleton East Oregonian

talked to one of that newspaper's employees who came to Oregon with the CCC in 1937, who stayed, and who became a responsible citizen. He told Bud:

"There are 12 or 14 of us in and near Pendleton now and all of the fellows have made good. They came out of New York and New Jersey and if they hadn't had the opportunity to leave there I'm afraid it would have been a different story."

"Most of those guys were tough. We had gang fights in the CCC camp here in the beginning. Every guy wanted to show how tough he was. But it wasn't very long before it all got straightened out. Everybody liked his job. We realized that there wasn't any point in trying to prove how tough we were—that it didn't make any difference in this new setup. It was just the right thing for some tough guys from the big city."

And he added that he thought Senator HUMPHREY should add one provision to his proposal, that the boys enlisted in a YCC should first of all come from the slum areas of big cities. He said:

"They are the fellows who need help. The situation that many of those boys face is almost hopeless. Get them into the YCC first. Broaden the program later."

The proposal, on a national scale, is similar if not virtually identical to suggestions for young men's work camps in Oregon, except that the latter would enlist youngsters who had gotten into trouble, or were headed that way.

Such an organization wouldn't end juvenile delinquency overnight, or in any length of time, for the causes are too deep-seated in our society. But it would solve a lot of problems, particularly in the area of the tough guys who really shouldn't be sent to prison, nor yet should be set loose again with a wrist slap.

The costs of such a program would not be negligible, but when compared to the Federal military budget, say, they would amount to probably a tiny fraction of that total.

And who could calculate the good that would come out of it?

It would include the construction of Federal forest access roads, which are so badly needed to get out overripe timber; it would speed up the rehabilitation and construction of forest service and national park recreational facilities now so badly behind the demand, and it would provide the resources for much other work which would benefit the Nation on its Federal lands—work now going begging for lack of budget and personnel.

But most of all it would provide a place for young men to get into a relatively wholesome atmosphere, to gain self-respect, to learn the merits of a hard day's work.

YCC has much to be said for it.

The Need for a Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star and News and the Phoenix Republic and Gazette, made before a meeting of the California-Nevada Associated Press on February 5, 1959.

Mr. Pulliam presents a very penetrating analysis of the need for a distinct two-party system of Government and spotlights some of our present-day trends. I was so impressed with the concise and straightforward approach presented by Mr. Pulliam that I am asking to have the text of his speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a means of calling it to the further attention of the American people.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA-NEVADA ASSOCIATED PRESS
MEETING

(Address by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher, Indianapolis Star and News, Phoenix Republic and Gazette)

Members of the Associated Press of California and Nevada, special guests, ladies, and gentlemen, frankly, I didn't come here to make a speech. I came to talk as one newspaperman with other newspapermen about the most important responsibility we have—the responsibility of preserving the Republic and saving individual freedom for America. Freedom is our business. It is our most important business.

I particularly want to call your attention to some things that have happened to this country during the last year, and give you at least my opinion as to why they happened.

Any sound political observer must admit that President Eisenhower was elected in 1952 by the protest votes of unhappy Democrats. There just weren't enough active Republicans in that year to elect a President. The unhappy ones hoped for a reversal of the New-Deal-Fair-Deal-Trumanism trend, and a return to conservative, economical, honest government. But within a couple of years or so they began to feel betrayed.

During the last 5 or 6 years this country has been drifting toward a one-party system run by Washington bureaucrats. Just recently I was talking to President Eisenhower about this matter, and he asked me about Congress. I ask him to define the Republican Party, and told him that if he would define the Republican Party I would prove he was talking about the Democratic Party, and if he would define the Democratic Party I would prove to him that he was talking about the Republican Party. There are the same elements in both parties. Neither party stands for anything definite and unequivocal, and this is one of the most serious aspects of our national life. Frankly, I believe it has happened because the newspapers haven't been articulate enough in warning the American people of the dangers of a one-party system run from Washington.

On its record for the past 6 years, the Republican Party has stood for deficit spending, bigger budgets, higher taxes, more foreign giveaways, more appeasements to the Soviets, Federal aid to and control of the schools—in short, everything against which it was fighting from the days of the two deals until the American people got sick of the two deals and threw Harry Truman out of the White House. No wonder the Republican Party got dumped in the ashcan last fall. It is no longer a national party with definite principles. It has abandoned the very people who gave it power and position in this country for the first time in 20 years. It has helped tremendously in establishing a one-party system in Washing-

ton and thus cut the ground out from under its supporters in State and local governments.

And yet the Republican Party does not need to die of suicide, as it seems just about to do. It can fight and win; as BARRY GOLDWATER—the most vigorous, the most unyielding, the most courageous Republican of them all—fought and won in Arizona.

Facing the combined assault of the rich and powerful AFL-CIO organization, COPE, facing the challenge of a popular and experienced former majority leader in the U.S. Senate, facing abandonment by his own party in Washington, and facing a population of voters registered overwhelmingly Democratic—as they always are in Arizona—GOLDWATER met every challenge. He did not retreat 1 inch from the principles in which he believed. He made not one particle of compromise with the liberal line. He fought for the very things his party once fought for in 1952, when he was elected, and he won a smashing victory, a victory so big that he carried a relatively unknown Republican Governor into office with him.

How did he do it? A month before the campaign BARRY GOLDWATER was beaten. Every poll taken in the State indicated this, but we kept hammering, hammering, hammering every day. We proved that the AFL-CIO organization called COPE was in the State with plenty of money, trying to take over both the State and local government and, above all, beat GOLDWATER. Not until we aroused the people of Arizona to the danger of having a labor-socialist government in the county and State did they begin to respond. By election time you know what the result was—the most disastrous defeat ever suffered by the Democratic Party in Arizona. And that was because they had allowed COPE to come in and manage their campaigns for them.

I tell you these things for one reason. The American people will do the right thing when they are told the truth, but you have to tell it to them day after day, day after day, day after day.

The tragedy of these last few years is that during this period of deterioration of the Republican Party, America has been drifting day by day toward a welfare state. There has been practically no organized or concerted opposition to the welfare state throughout the United States. Some newspapers oppose it consistently, others spasmodically, others not at all. Very few papers have paid attention to the great danger that faces this country when we degenerate into a one-party government. That's practically what we have now, because there is no difference between the Republican and Democratic Party as far as their governmental objectives are concerned. They are both dedicated to some type of welfare state.

I hold no brief whatever for the Republican Party. I have supported the Republican Party and I have fought the Republican Party, but as long as the Socialist leaders of labor are hell-bent on controlling the Democratic Party, the only effective opposition must come from the Republican Party. In other words, I think it is our job as newspapermen in our effort to save this Republic to constantly, day by day, reiterate the importance of a two-party system and to stimulate the Republican Party to adopt a set of principles which are completely antiwelfare and anti-Socialist, in order that the people of this country may have a choice between a labor-Socialist government and a traditional American government. As I have said before, the people of this country will always do the right thing when they know the facts and are aroused to their own responsibility. Frankly, they take government for granted. They have been disgusted with the trend toward welfarism, but they really don't take time to do anything about it. It is our job to stir them up and make them understand

that they must do something about it if they are to maintain individual freedom.

In the early 1900's, the New York bankers and the railroad presidents ran this country with an iron hand. The people finally rose up in rebellion and stamped out that dictatorship. Today our fight is with a group of highly intelligent but selfish bureaucrats in Washington and the Socialist-labor leaders of the country who are determined to turn our Government into a welfare state. As newspaper people we had to arouse the public to fight the railroad presidents and the bankers. Today it is our job to do the same thing—to arouse the people to the danger of a bureaucratic dictatorship in Washington, which leads to totalitarian government.

Another very grave danger has developed in this country, with some, but not too effective, opposition. And that is the definite objective of the Supreme Court to take over the legislative functions of the Government.

The Socialist-labor leaders are so exultant over their victory in the 1958 election that they are now determined to force a repeal of section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley law and thus nullify the right-to-work laws now in effect in 19 States.

This raises the question: Does the Congress have the power to prohibit such rights to the States?

When Senator Taft and Representative Hartley included section 14-B in their labor control law, they were simply acknowledging a State right which already existed. They granted no special sovereignty, because that sovereignty had already been established in the Federal Constitution. The Congress has no power to grant nor to prohibit the powers given to the States in the 10th amendment.

It is quite another matter, however, when we consider what politically inspired courts might have to say about the rights of the States. The American Bar Association and the Conference of Chief Justices of the States have been so alarmed that they felt impelled to rebuke the U.S. Supreme Court for decisions considered to be far more political than judicial. It is very obviously possible that the political courts, under the pressure of socialist-labor union bosses, might ignore the 10th amendment and render decisions which would emasculate the constitutional powers of the States.

The honorable Justices of the Supreme Court should remember that the laws and court decisions must stand the test of public approval and support. The 18th amendment, the prohibition amendment, was rendered ineffectual and finally repealed because it lacked the support of the American majority.

The people, after all, are the court of last resort and no judges, however they may be affected by delusions of power, can withstand the frowning disapproval of the people. It should be insisted then that the Congress has no power to nullify right-to-work laws in 19 States and that courts have no constitutional authority for upholding such an emasculator of States rights.

And this applies to all States rights—not only to the right to work. We have to maintain the integrity, the sovereignty, and the rights of the States if we are going to preserve the Republic.

So again I say to you that freedom is our business. It is our business to protest against this usurping power of the courts to make laws. The people must understand just what the Supreme Court is doing to the States and to the Constitution of the United States, and they won't understand it if we, as newspapermen, remain passively silent.

Thomas Jefferson, probably the wisest statesman America ever produced, recognized the great responsibility of newspapers and also what happens when people are not informed. He made this very dramatic statement, "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government,

I would not hesitate to prefer the latter—newspapers without a government," because he knew newspapers, properly operated and dedicated to the public good, would keep the public informed and the Republic would be preserved.

The American press is the real backbone of liberty in this country. It represents the very depths and aliveness of freedom in America. If we continue to maintain our fierce independence regardless of party affiliations, if we continue to resist the coddling and courting and flattery to which too many spineless eastern newspapers have capitulated, then freedom in America will be safe—in your hands. The preservation of a free America through a free press is more important than any other thing any of us can do. It is the finest, the ultimate service we can offer to our family, our State, our country, and our God.

Soviet communism certainly is a great threat to the American Republic. It is a great threat to the American people, but we can lick communism only if we keep America free and alert. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and that is something we've got to tell our people day after day after day after day.

Has it ever occurred to you that while the United States is drifting into some type of Socialist welfare state Russia is backing away from the actual practices of Socialist philosophy?

The progress which Russia has made in economic and industrial development is in almost exact ratio to her withdrawal from Socialist concepts of government.

Collective farming is being supplanted by incentive farming. Scientists and industrial workers and professional people are being given individual rewards for outstanding service. This is all contrary to socialism, but as Russia abandons socialism she is moving forward economically and industrially, while we are drifting downward into a socialized abyss.

How long will it take the American people to learn that 5,000 years of history prove that socialism has failed miserably in every country where it has been adopted? The Russians have discovered this, but so far our Washington bureaucrats and world planners are blind to the truth.

Low morals and excessive taxation have destroyed every civilization since man organized himself into collective society. Study all of them—almost without exception they were destroyed from within rather than from without. They are destroyed by taxation upon taxation, until people lose their incentive, their initiative, and the whole morale of the nation disappears. This is a lesson we must learn. This is a lesson we must tell our readers. Federal bureaucracy is a far greater danger to the life and future of this Republic than is that of Communist domination—even though that at the moment is still very, very serious.

Today America stands alone, the only free country left in all the world. Blessed to have such a beachhead, as newspapermen we should be proud to do battle for our God and for our faith in freedom. If America remains free, the things we hold dear and all our bright hopes for the future are secure. If we preserve and protect our freedom, then sometime, someday, somehow, America, being free, will show the rest of the world the road to freedom. This is the mission, this is the crusade which I urge on you now as newspapermen, with all your initiative and all your courage, to assume as your own. This is the divine mission of America—freedom for ourselves and eventually freedom for all the world in which the spirit of the Lord will abide.

So I salute you, American newspapermen, on your opportunities as American am-

bassadors for freedom. Wherever you go, whatever you write, and with whomever you come in contact, remember that America is great only because America is free.

New Parole System in Texas Saves Money and, More Important, Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a new professional parole supervision system has recently gone into effect in Texas, and I believe it to be a progressive step in the field of rehabilitation of convicts.

It is estimated the new plan will save the State \$1,250,000 in 2 years. However, I feel the new plan will save a commodity much more important—the lives of men.

Under the system set up by Texas' 55th Legislature, the requirements for the men who must administer the program were stiffly set. This will insure men of quality who will not only deal fairly with the parolees, but will conscientiously try to help them and their families. The good works which parole officers elsewhere have accomplished with patience and understanding are legion.

In addition, there is a supplementary system whereby local citizens volunteered to work with the parolees. As of the first of last year, there were 2,700 parolees out under the volunteer system. An additional 1,400 have been released under the professional system, for a total of 4,100. Of these, only 260 were returned to prison. This means more than 3,800 parolees have been returned to society. Certainly some will again run afoul of the law, but I feel these figures show most of them will abide by the law if given the chance. I am glad to say the Texas program is giving many convicts the chance to return to contributing lives outside.

Mr. President, I have a special interest in this program due to my 5 years experience as a district judge at Austin, Tex., and a member of the juvenile board of Travis County. Based on that experience, I led the way in advocating a State parole system in Texas staffed by professional officers and made more than 1,500 speeches in Texas between the years 1952 and 1957, advocating the system which has been set up.

And I feel special congratulations are due the State parole officers for their tireless, dedicated efforts to help their fellow men who have made mistakes, and to the legislature for establishing the program, and to the State board of pardon and paroles for its cooperation.

Mr. President, in recognition of the work being done by these men and women, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record

an article by Milton Turner which was published in the Beaumont Enterprise for February 2, 1959, telling the story of Henry Kirby Pitts, one of the dedicated State parole officers, under the heading "Professional Parole Officers Serve Offenders at Less Expense to the State."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PROFESSIONAL PAROLE OFFICERS SERVE OFFENDERS AT LESS EXPENSE TO STATE

(By Milton Turner)

Jefferson County and the rest of Texas now has a professional parole supervision program designed for greater public protection and economy. Since Texas' crime problem has grown more rapidly than the population this program has become a vital State project.

Tall Henry Kirby Pitts, 27, of Kountze, may look more like an all-American basketball player than a State probation officer, but he opened the first State probation office in this area on April 21, 1958.

SIX-COUNTY AREA

Operating from his headquarters in the basement of Jefferson County Courthouse he has charge of six counties, including Jefferson, Hardin, Tyler, Newton, Jasper, and Orange. He makes personal contact with an average of 150 to 200 parolees each month and keeps tab on others by telephone and mail.

In his role as State probation officer he must, at times, be judge, officer, friend, chaplain, psychologist, and adviser to parolees and their families. Not only does he keep close tab on the location, conduct, and condition of his charges but, upon request, check on parolees from other States.

STATE BOARD ACTS

Before the State board of pardons and paroles will release a convict on parole he must show that he has a place to live and a job waiting him on his release. It falls on the shoulders of Officer Pitts to get this information and return it to the board in report form.

It is well to remember that a parole is not forgiveness for an offense, nor is it a pardon given an inmate. It is simply a means for a deserving inmate to serve the remaining portion of his sentence outside prison walls.

If he fails to live up to the conduct expected of him, he is returned to prison. The results of a parole officer's investigation is the deciding factor in an inmate's release or reincarceration.

When the 55th State legislature appropriated funds to set up the present professional system consisting of a director, 4 supervisors, and 40 parole officers, it took into consideration that the Texas prison system was filled to capacity.

Parole is cheaper, and the legislators reasoned, by using professional probation officers citizens would be better protected and parolees would have a better chance of making a success of their freedom.

VOLUNTEERS SUPPLEMENTED

The former volunteer system where local citizens contributed their time and effort to work with parolees has not been discontinued but supplements the present system.

Under the volunteer system only 750 parolees could be released in 1957. As of January 1, 1958, there were 2,700 parolees out under the volunteer system. The same year the professional system made it possible to release an additional 1,400 parolees making a total of 4,100 parolees in the State.

Of that figure 260 were returned to prison due to new felonies and other parole violations. It is estimated that at the end of 2 years the State will realize a net saving of

\$1,250,000 after all parole costs have been deducted.

The division of parole supervision which operated under the State board of pardons and paroles is divided into three State areas including southeast, northeast, and southwest. There are 20 district offices.

Requirement for parole officers are necessarily stiff. For the job which pays a maximum salary of \$400 a month, officers must be between the ages of 26 to 55. They must have completed 4 years in an accredited college, have had 2 years experience in correctional work, education, personnel or social work.

District State parole officer Pitt surpasses even these standards. A 1947 graduate of Kountze High School, he matriculated at Lamar Tech and in 1956 received his bachelor of arts degree from the University of Texas. A former State highway patrolman he is now working part time on his master's degree in educational counseling.

Rural Electrification Administration Doing a Good Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration has filed a very enlightening and comprehensive report covering the activities of that agency for the fiscal year 1958. In connection with the submission of said report, I enclose the following letter received by me from Mr. David A. Hamil, Administrator of REA, giving a concise breakdown of the subject matter of the report:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOEVEN: Attached is a copy of my report on the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration during fiscal year 1958, a year in which important progress was achieved in helping rural people get more and better electric and telephone service.

In both our electric and telephone programs loan needs were met fully.

During 1958 REA's electric borrowers connected more than 115,000 unserved rural establishments, raising the total number of consumers served to more than 4.5 million. They installed more than 200,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity. On and off the farm, rural consumers used more electricity, increasing purchases 8.7 percent over fiscal year 1957.

To enable rural electric systems to meet this growing demand, my office approved during 1958 a total of \$241,636,869 in electric loans, bringing total loans since inception of the program to more than \$3.77 billion.

REA electric borrowers continued to grow in financial strength and responsibility. During 1958 their principal and interest payments pushed total payments made since the start of the program to over \$1 billion. More than \$128 million of this sum represented payments made in advance of due dates. Four borrowers—an alltime low—were delinquent in payments more than 30 days as of June 30, 1958. And at the end of calendar 1957, the net worth of electric borrowers

amounted to 14.9 percent of their total assets.

In REA's rural telephone program, borrowers chalked up new construction records and had connected 693,831 subscribers by June 30, 1958. Nearly one-third of these subscribers had telephone service for the first time, and almost two-thirds had their first dial service.

Rural telephone systems received 216 loans totaling more than \$89 million during fiscal 1958—another record. Total loans from the start of the program came to more than \$478 million. When construction is completed, these loans will provide modern telephone service to 1,020,454 subscribers.

During the year telephone borrowers made payments to REA totaling more than \$5.5 million. At yearend, 48 borrowers had a balance with REA of \$709,920 in advance payments. The number of borrowers delinquent more than 30 days in their payments was reduced to 15 at the end of the fiscal year.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. HAMIL,
Administrator.

Legislation Amending the Federal Airport Act So as To Extend the Time for Making Grants for Community Airports Should Be Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of legislation amending the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants and so forth.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 9, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO EXTEND THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. Chairman, as one who introduced a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants and so forth, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee in support of such legislation.

As many of you know, I represent the 20th District of Pennsylvania, comprising the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield, and in this area the communities of Altoona, DuBois, Philipsburg, and State College are interested in the legislation now under consideration.

For your information, Altoona is served by the Altoona-Blair County Airport located at Martinsburg, Pa.

At this moment the airport is undergoing expansion, and it is estimated that at least another \$315,000 of Federal assistance will be needed to complete the modernization program.

In the case of DuBois, Pa., the airport is under construction at this time with an estimated \$300,000 in Federal funds being needed to complete the airport and make it operational.

At Philipsburg, Pa., the Black Moshannon Airport will need at least \$100,000 in Federal funds to complete badly needed improve-

ments including a terminal building, and so forth.

At State College, Pa., the site of the Pennsylvania State University, according to communications I have received, the sum of \$100,000 in Federal funds will be needed to expand an existing and inadequate airport.

Mr. Chairman, in my three-county area the need of modern airports is acute.

The area is mountainous and what rail service we enjoyed the past many years is rapidly diminishing due to the curtailment of passenger service.

In the wintertime—and our winters are lengthy—travel by highway is precarious.

With the area being serviced by Allegheny Airlines, to obtain full enjoyment we need adequate airport facilities.

The communities which sponsor these airports through an airport authority organized for that purpose find it impossible even with State aid to finance the expansion and construction of airports.

Therefore, without Federal assistance the program of airport construction and expansion will come to a standstill.

It is for that reason I am appearing before this committee in support of legislation to extend the Federal Airport Act.

Engine of Overproduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Raymond F. Mikesell, a leading economist, is Miner professor of economics at the University of Oregon in my hometown, Eugene, Oreg. Professor Mikesell was quoted in the following editorial from the New York Times for January 6, 1959, and I include it here by unanimous consent, with respect to a problem which this Congress must squarely face as soon as possible:

ENGINE OF OVERPRODUCTION

In the period of 16 months between July 1, 1957, and October 31, 1958, the Commodity Credit Corporation disposed of surplus farm products whose cost to the Government had been \$4,207 million. Proceeds of their sale, however, were only \$2,956 million, a return of roughly 70 cents to the dollar. Stated another way, the loss to the Government in these transactions, which involve buying up farm commodities at the artificially supported domestic price and selling them for what they can bring in the world market, came to \$1,251 million.

Now, if the effect of that expenditure had been to reduce by \$4,207 million a Government-held surplus accumulated over a period of years, and if we could count upon similar progress in the years immediately ahead, then it might perhaps be economically and socially justified. But such was not the case. On the contrary, the figures just released by the U.S. Department of Agriculture reveal that over this same period of 16 months the CCC's price support inventory actually rose from \$5,372 million to \$5,576 million.

Prof. Raymond F. Mikesell, in a recent study, "Agricultural Surpluses and Export Policy," prepared for the American Enterprise Association, points out that rapid and unpredicted shifts in demand and supply conditions may create temporary surpluses

in which the Government may intervene to cushion their impact upon prices and ease the process of readjustment. So far as American agriculture is concerned the most important single element making for a shift of this kind is to be seen in the fact that between 1940 and 1955 output per man-hour alone increased by 88 percent. But when the Government's intervention results, as in this case, not in a temporary farm crop surplus but in the indefinite continuation of surpluses, notes Professor Mikesell, it can no longer be regarded as a readjustment program. "Thus," he observes, "the foreign disposal programs are a regular outlet for current overproduction. In fact, the disposal programs have become an engine for continuing overproduction."

headmaster of St. Martin's, Mrs. Ellsworth O. VanSlate, Mrs. Robert Bowers, and Mrs. Carleton Schupp.

Students: Pete Smith, Jim Hitchcock, Mack Kennington, Chip Pavrot, Bob Head, Stan Ligon, Randy Nockton, Bruce Cornay, Holland Collins, Larry Haas, Jimmy Williams, Jay Schupp, Eddie Ellzey, Ingersoll Jordan, Robert Bowers, Walter Drake, Phillip Tiller, Susan Dean, Dana Suggs, Susan Vreeland, Carolyn Wirth, Lynne Hall, Sara Hogue, Paddy Livaudais, Leigh Moise, Cathy Brawner, Sally Heyerdale, Merle Morrow, Ellen Ryan, Eleanor Faulk, Wing Sinnott, Dixie DeLong, Sue Fulks, Kathleen Ross, Sue Kerlin, Gwynne Bowman, Jeannette Boykin, Carolee Andrews, Barbara Mayo, and Taffy Yeagain.

Senate Act Usurps Power of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. George Rothwell Brown appeared in last Sunday's New York Journal-American, February 8, 1959.

The powers of the House of Representatives on all moneys to be appropriated are very clearly spelled out in the Constitution that we have all sworn to uphold 1 short month ago.

At this time in our history we can ill afford to have the powers of either body of the Congress curtailed or infringed on in any way:

SENATE ACT USURPS POWER OF THE HOUSE (By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON.—By an extraordinary usurpation of power, the Senate last week passed a Federal housing bill that increased President Eisenhower's estimates by \$1 billion, and knocked a \$135 million hole in the current budget.

The bill enacted by a reckless "liberal" Republican and Democratic coalition, was both an appropriation bill and in some features a tax bill.

Under the Constitution's provisions regarding all money bills, this highly inflationary raid on a balanced budget, if presented at all, should have originated in the House of Representatives.

Instead it unconstitutionally originated in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and was then for purely political reasons hurriedly rushed through the Senate before the House had begun even considering its own bill.

If this bill properly could have originated at the Senate it should have been considered first, and reported, by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Instead the Appropriations Committee was bypassed. But this was not all. The Senate also by the same dubious procedure bypassed the House Ways and Means Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, and the House itself.

When the bill was passed by the Senate Thursday, and was sent over to the House, the Appropriations Committee of that body was bypassed again, and the bill which would commit the taxpayers to a cost of \$2,675 million over a 6-year period, was referred for

consideration to the Banking and Currency Committee.

This is a free-loading, free-spending, welfare-state committee. Thus the Appropriations Committee, which is supposedly the watchdog of the House, was ignored.

The housing bill shifted the appropriations function of Congress to a sidetrack and laid down a secret pipeline directly into the U.S. Treasury through technical loans.

The clever scheme of sneaking into the Treasury vaults, as it were, through the coal hole, when nobody was looking, began about 20 years ago. The matter has now become a very great abuse, crying loudly for reform.

The Democratic Party in the Senate cut \$225 million from the original Sparkman housing bill, partly to evade the spendthrift tag that is being placed on it, and partly to escape a possible presidential veto.

It is now up to the Democratic leadership of the House, where there is a threat of an even greater raid through the Treasury's coal-hole pipeline, to keep the Housing Act of 1959 within the sane bounds laid down by the President, and avert the peril of runaway inflation to which it opens wide the door.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, Brings International Reputation as Patron of Scholars to Chairmanship of Foreign Relations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the United States is fortunate indeed that it has a man of the competence, training, vigor, and good judgment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to take over the vital responsibilities that go with chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee at this critical time in our history. In addition to his committee experience, the Senator from Arkansas has another outstanding asset to contribute to the Nation in his important role in our foreign relations. This is the symbolism associated with his name throughout the world through the Fulbright scholarships program. This association is indeed a most fortunate one for the Nation. The Fulbright scholarships have been a tremendously effective and constructive force in developing and cementing good understanding and friendly relations in many areas of the world. Indeed, this program has been one of the most successful ventures of the Government of this country in the eyes of the men and women in other countries who share the major responsibility for leadership and government.

The merits of the Fulbright scholarship program are set forth in an unusually well informed and thoughtful article which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on Friday, February 6. This article, by Mr. Gerald Kloss, gives full

Visit to Washington, D.C., by Students and Faculty Members of St. Martin's Episcopal High School, Metairie, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it was my pleasure several days ago to have as my guests in the Senate a group of students and faculty members from St. Martin's Episcopal High School in Metairie, La.; which is a suburb of the city of New Orleans.

St. Martin's Episcopal High School is fairly new to the New Orleans educational scene, having been founded in 1950. However, it is already the largest private school in metropolitan New Orleans. St. Martin's must be one of the few high schools in the United States to have all the members of the last three graduating classes enrolled in universities throughout the country. With this record, its standards are obviously of the highest order.

As part of its general educational program, the graduating class of 1959 made a trip to Washington between semesters for the primary purpose of giving the students an opportunity, before completing their secondary education, to visit some of the important centers of government activity in the country. During their visit to the Capitol, they were able to see the actual operation of our body

and to observe at firsthand the procedures which are followed by the Nation's lawmakers in handling the many problems which confront us today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the names of the students of St. Martin's Episcopal High School and their chaperones who visited Washington.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chaperones: Mr. Ellsworth O. VanSlate,

recognition to the fortunate contribution to our foreign relations which the chairman's association with the Fulbright scholarships makes at this time. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE'S MR. SCHOLARSHIP—J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, OF ARKANSAS, NEW FOREIGN RELATIONS HEAD, IS KNOWN INTERNATIONALLY THROUGH STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM

(By Gerald Kloss)

Senator J. (for JAMES) WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, enjoys one distinction that no other living American politician can match: His name has become part of the language.

The word "FULBRIGHT" is not yet spelled without a capital letter, but over most civilized parts of the globe it is practically a synonym for an American Government-sponsored college scholarship. Since 1946, when Senator FULBRIGHT pushed through a bill for a student-exchange program, about 16,000 American students, researchers, and teachers have gone abroad on "Fulbrights" and 15,000 foreign students from 31 countries have come to schools here. Not even the Marshall plan or Truman doctrine have achieved a closer identification with their authors.

A good many Fulbright scholars call on the Senator when they visit Washington, much as one would say thanks to a host upon leaving a party. FULBRIGHT regretfully has had to cut some of these visits short—"I haven't time for them all; I have to be a Senator, too."

He will have less time than ever from now on, for this week he started one of the most important and responsible jobs in the country, replacing the 91-year-old Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, as head of the Foreign Relations Committee. Under FULBRIGHT's leadership, the committee is expected to take an even larger role in shaping American foreign policy.

For several years FULBRIGHT has been one of the Senate's sharpest critics of the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy, scourging the administration particularly for its lack of initiative. He has urged greater flexibility in handling the Berlin crisis and has attacked Dulles for refusing "to get off dead center" in dealing with Red China and Russia.

He has been outspoken in other fields, too. While still a freshman Senator, he calmly suggested that President Truman resign and let a Republican take over the White House in order to prevent a politically split Government following the Republican sweep in the 1946 congressional elections. Truman frostily ignored the advice, as did President Eisenhower when FULBRIGHT made the same suggestion after the Democratic victory in the 1954 congressional elections.

HE OPPOSED SENATOR MCCARTHY

Even more spectacular was his stand against Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin in the heyday of the latter's era. Convinced that McCarthy was doing the Nation a vast disservice, FULBRIGHT voted against a further appropriation for the McCarthy subcommittee on investigations early in 1954—the only Senator to do so. He also lined up votes and directed policy in the censure resolution that tumbled McCarthy from power.

For all his candor, however, the 53-year-old Arkansan also has been tagged the Senate's most reluctant gladiator. According to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, FULBRIGHT is a child of the 18th century—a

throwback to that age of enlightenment, trust in reason, temperate argument and slightly aristocratic tendencies.

A handsome, blue-eyed man who keeps in trim by golf and frequent workouts in the Senate gymnasium, FULBRIGHT starred as an athlete and as a scholar in college.

At the University of Arkansas, which he entered at 16, he was captain of the tennis team, first president of the student government and a 60-minute halfback on the football team. In one game, against Southern Methodist in 1922, he gained 20 yards on a fake pass play, passed for a touchdown, ran 40 yards on a punt return and dropkicked a field goal, leading his team to a 9-0 victory.

Graduated from Arkansas at 19 with a straight A average and a Phi Beta Kappa key, FULBRIGHT then spent 3 years at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, studying modern history, playing tennis and rugby and touring Europe. He continued his studies on this side of the Atlantic, getting a law degree at George Washington University in 1934.

After serving briefly as a Government attorney in the Justice Department and teaching at George Washington, he returned to the University of Arkansas in 1936 as a law professor. When the university president was killed in an accident in 1939, FULBRIGHT was named the new president. At 34 he was the youngest State university head in the United States.

His academic career ended in spectacular fashion 2 years later—he was fired. The new Governor of the State, Homer Adkins, had been opposed by the Fulbright family newspaper, the Northwest Arkansas Times of Fayetteville. Governor Adkins fired the college president after FULBRIGHT emphatically refused to resign.

A year later he made his first try for public office, running for the House of Representatives from the Arkansas Third District. He won easily, piling up the biggest margin of votes in three decades.

Flouting the tradition that freshmen in Congress should be seen and not heard, FULBRIGHT leaped into national prominence in 1943 by introducing a 55-word resolution favoring U.S. participation in a world organization for peace. The House adopted the Fulbright resolution that fall, and the Senate followed suit 2 months later, assuring the world that America would not retreat into isolation after World War II, as it had after World War I.

Running for the Senate in 1944, FULBRIGHT topped a 4-man field by 32,000 votes—1 of his opponents, by the way, was Governor Adkins. He was reelected in 1950 and 1956 without opposition. He professes to have no eye for office beyond the Senate—"the end, the total of my political ambitions."

Senate observers have a hard time fitting FULBRIGHT into a niche, either as a politician or as a man.

A liberal in international affairs, he generally takes the conservative side on domestic matters. On the touchy problem of school integration—especially touchy for a Senator from a State the capital of which is Little Rock—FULBRIGHT has lined up with the southern bloc. He calls himself a "constitutional traditionalist" in civil-rights questions, and feels that the Supreme Court was wrong in trying to change a whole social pattern through a single Court decision.

He favored the controversial Dixon-Yates power contract and sponsored a bill exempting natural gas producers from Federal rate control. In labor matters he has frequently voted wrong, according to the AFL-CIO, but the unions do not consider him a labor baiter.

Similarly, FULBRIGHT has broken with his party on certain occasions, such as his celebrated suggestion that President Truman—of all people—resign in 1946. FULBRIGHT'S

investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1950-51, as chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee, gave the Republicans potent political ammunition, with the uncovering of the mink-coat and deep-freeze scandals in the Democratic administration.

SWINISH BLIGHT OF OUR TIME

Although FULBRIGHT disdains the back-slapping approach to politics—some of his Senate colleagues refer to him as "the professor"—he has shown a good sense of timing and a high degree of skill in political maneuvering. One such occasion was when his student-exchange bill came up for a vote in the Senate in 1946.

His bill provided that funds for the scholarship program come from the sale of military surplus abroad—the money, of course, was in foreign currency and had to be spent abroad. This provision removed the curse of financing the program directly out of Treasury funds. Even so, FULBRIGHT learned that Senator McKellar, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, was against the bill, and his opposition might well kill it.

So FULBRIGHT quietly got the backing of both party leaders in the Senate and did not bring up the bill for passage until McKellar happened to be off the floor. Then he called it up as a routine measure, announcing that it had the approval of both party leaders. The bill passed with no trouble.

Education has been one of FULBRIGHT'S primary concerns in his Senate career—he told an interviewer last year that the student-exchange program "is the thing that reconciles me to all the difficulties of political life. He has carried the lance time after time against what calls the swinish blight so common in our time, the blight of anti-intellectualism.

Some critics, of course, have pointed out that FULBRIGHT'S stand on school integration hardly squares with his fervent appeals for higher educational standards in the United States. That aside, the honorable Member from Arkansas is considered one of the most brilliant men in the Senate. Senator McCarthy once angrily dubbed him Senator "Halfbright" because of his opposition to the McCarthy investigations. Nobody has used the pun since then.

National Spending and National Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 31, written by E. F. Hutton whose column is entitled "Think It Through." It represents a brief review of the attitude of the American Farm Bureau Federation toward national spending and national income. I strongly endorse their position and commend to the attention of Members of Congress the farmers' feeling as focused by Mr. Hutton.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINK IT THROUGH

(By E. F. Hutton)

At Lexington in 1775 the embattled farmers stood and fired a shot heard around the world.

In 1958 at nearby Boston the embattled farmers fired another round. It was the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the largest farm organization, representing 1,800,000 farm families.

Those who think the old American spirit of Lexington and Concord has gone over the hill, would have been cheered by the speeches and resolutions of this notable convention of working farmers.

They were in rebellion against the whole trend of misgovernment for 10, these many years. They called for a balanced budget, reduced Federal spending, severe curbs on labor monopolies and the elimination of Federal controls on agricultural products at the earliest possible date.

The president of the federation, Charles Shuman, is convinced that without price fixing since the war ended, all agriculture would be better off.

A New Hampshire delegate said, "Every time you send \$10 to Washington, you get 50 cents back, after passing through 21 different offices, in each of which there are 33 bureaucrats, all of them not doing anything."

The president of a State bureau brought down the house with, "There is a surplus of jackasses in this country and nine of them are on the Supreme Court."

Rough talk—but easily understood.

Something is cooking in the farm kitchens.

And, as Patrick Henry said, "If this be treason—" you know what.

Now or Never

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Star of February 8, under the interesting caption "Now or Never."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Now or Never

Several days ago Budget Director Stans said that if the Federal budget is not balanced this year it will never be balanced. This, we believe, is a correct estimate of the Nation's fiscal outlook, and it is against this background that one should appraise the maneuvering in Congress over the bills to provide Federal funds for housing and airports.

There are those, of course, who don't believe in balanced Federal budgets. Others may be more interested in finding a political issue than in appropriate airport and housing aid. These are a minority, however. Most of the members of Congress, we assume, are genuinely interested in and concerned with drawing the line at the right point between necessary Federal aid and unnecessary Federal spending.

Thus, the Democratic housing bill was trimmed somewhat in the Senate and it has been cut back even harder by a House banking subcommittee. Even so, it calls for spending about \$100 million more than recommended by the President.

The airport bill, as passed by the Senate, also reflects a modest retreat on the part of

the leadership. But it still calls for substantially more spending than provided for in the budget, and it retains what we think are undesirable provisions for use of Federal money in building airport facilities which are not directly related to flying and flight safety.

This cannot be viewed as strictly a partisan matter, although the Democratic vote on final rollcall was 50 for and 5 against. For on this same vote 13 Republicans were recorded as for the bill and 17 against. In earlier votes on proposals to reduce the total outlay the Republicans were able to muster somewhat more strength.

The opposition arguments were summed up by Senator CORSON, Republican, of New Hampshire, when he said the total authorization "unbalances the budget, invites extravagance, and saps Federal money from the most vital of all programs—air safety."

The President, who vetoed a similar bill last year, will weigh the final versions of both the housing and the airport bills in the light of the uses which would be made of the money and their effect on the budget. In their present form these bills would produce a deficit in a budget which, at best, is precariously balanced. So Mr. Eisenhower will have to decide whether to approve these breakthroughs, and thereby pave the way for further and perhaps more serious breaches. If he approves, Mr. Stans' prophecy will be well on the way toward fulfillment.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, the Members of this body are all aware, I know, of the serious threat of inflation in our own United States.

The Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram of January 29, 1959, briefly outlines the course of inflation as it occurs in some countries other than our own. The warning is clear and obvious.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE OF INFLATION

With some of our South American friends, it seems, inflation is a way of life. Few of them really like it, we understand, and many of them are quite militant in their opposition to it and those who perpetrate it, as shown by the violence that often results in changes in heads of states. But apparently governments, new or old, know no other course to follow.

One observer on the scene down there sends us this candid report on how the inflationary cycle works in some South American countries:

1. Printing is the first step, he says. In order to encourage productivity in the factory and on the farm, governments need money. So most of it is simply printed.

2. Spending is the second phase of the cycle. Fresh from the printing presses, the crisp, new money goes out from state banks to develop public and private enterprises.

3. Price rise is the third phase. The larger

quantity of money in circulation serves to bid up the cost of goods and services. When labor finds prices rising, it strikes and riots, threatening political stability.

4. Wage rise comes next. In order to regain labor's support, politicians raise wages. Both prices and wages have then reached new levels.

5. Next comes devaluation of the currency. The rising cost of goods and labor serves to price exports out of foreign markets. Governments must then devalue their currencies in relation to the dollar in order to cheapen exports.

Then the cycle starts all over again at the printing presses.

Apparently the only ones who benefit from such a vicious circle as this are the politicians who manage to stay in office by hoodwinking the public, which has become demoralized and confused through successive inflationary cycles. Strange that they should be so foolish, and strange, too, that we up north who live in glass houses are still inclined to throw stones.

Spend and Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared under date of February 6, in the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, entitled "Spend and Tax."

SPEND AND TAX

The public is not unmindful of the soundness of the position President Eisenhower has taken in challenging Democratic spenders in Congress to provide new taxes to pay for their reckless spending programs. That would be the straightforward way, the President said, to whether the country really wants these programs.

The President hurled the challenge as both Houses of Congress were rushing to put through housing legislation which would sweep aside the administration's balanced budget. The Democrats are making it clear that they prefer inflation to a hold-the-line policy on spending.

President Eisenhower declared that neither he nor the American people want higher taxes, the way to avoid higher taxes he pointed out, is for the Government to live within its income and avoid unnecessary expenditures.

For their own protection, Americans by the millions should answer the President's plea for public support in his fight for economy in Government and preservation of his balanced budget. The spending zeal of the Democratic-controlled Congress should arouse the ire of the taxpayers. They are the ones who have to pay the bills.

President Eisenhower and the out-numbered Republican forces in Congress can win the fight for economy if the public stands with them. The force of public opinion can provide the reinforcements necessary to beat back the spenders.

The President's challenge to Congress applies not only to housing but to all other reckless spending programs that are churning in the legislative hopper. The President is leading the fight that must be made for fiscal responsibility and economic stability. It should be everyone's fight.

Beardless Grant Eyes Vicksburg Fete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most Members are aware that the Congress created a Civil War Centennial Commission 2 years ago. This Commission has been actively engaged in forming plans to commemorate the War Between the States.

Gen. U. S. Grant III, was wisely selected to be the head of this Commission.

As a member of this Commission I firmly believe we should commemorate many of the important events of this conflict.

I append hereto, an article written by a southern lady from Jackson, Miss., which contains much information in connection with the proposed commemorative activities of this Civil War Centennial Commission:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger-Daily News, Jan. 25, 1959]

BEARDESS GRANT EYES VICKSBURG FETE

(By Florence Sillers Ogden)

Well, you can't have everything. I did not get to attend the President's White House Press Conference. He did not have it and I could not stay any longer in Washington. He did have a conference, as you know, at the National Press Club luncheon. But that was a segregated affair. Men only. I wonder what the Supreme Court thinks of that?

But I did see Gen. U. S. Grant, 3d. I did visit the White House on the VIP tour. I did see the Hope diamond. I did attend the concert of the Philadelphia Orchestra with Sir Thomas Beecham conducting. I did hear the great pianist Artur Schnabel with the National Symphony Orchestra, Howard Mitchell, conducting. Both concerts were at the D.A.R. Constitution Hall.

My visit to General Grant was one of the highlights of my trip. The office of the Civil War Centennial Commission is on Jackson Place, diagonally across from the White House. My sister Mary and I called on the General and Mr. Karl S. Betts, executive director of the Commission.

And I tell you, friends, General Lee himself could not have been more courteously and hospitable than the grandson of the general who shelled my grandma's plantation nearly 100 years ago. They really rolled out the red carpet for us. It seems the whole staff had read my plantation-shelling letter to General Grant and they greeted us like old friends.

General Grant lives up to the description by George Kennedy in his column in the Washington Evening Star, entitled "The Rambler"—only more so. To quote Columnist Kennedy:

OLD SCHOOL GENTLEMAN

"General Grant . . . is a big, broad-shouldered, handsome, white-haired man with the military bearing one would expect of the West Point class of 1903."

I found him not only handsome, but very charming—a gentleman of the old school, with a sense of humor and a kindly twinkle in his eye. Indeed, he did not look old enough for the class of 1903. His face is smooth and unwrinkled, his hair still a white plume. I wanted to ask him where his beard was, for actually I felt as if I were in the presence of General Grant the first. Only he is far more handsome than his grandfather.

A large picture of his grandfather hung

on the wall to the right of General Grant's desk, and directly across the room, by Mr. Betts' desk, was a lovely picture of Gen. Robert E. Lee, and others of several Confederate generals, among them Stonewall Jackson, and Pemberton, who commanded the Confederate troops at Vicksburg.

This is evidence that there will be no swords drawn during the Centennial. Mr. Betts, the executive director, is a most alert, enthusiastic person with plans and historical facts at his fingertips. They both went over plans with me and are anxious to see a centennial program at Vicksburg. Each State or city, or area, has to plan and finance its own commemorative program. I, for one, would like to see a colossal pageant in the National Park at Vicksburg.

Mr. Betts said that if this was done, they could probably set aside 1 year as Vicksburg Year for the one big event. The logical time would be the summer of 1963. Cooperative assistance would be given by the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and so on.

TO REENACT BATTLES

Virginia plans to reenact the battle of Manassas, and Maryland, the battle of Antietam. But General Grant says it is not their plan to reenact Civil War battles except in certain areas. My idea for Mississippi would be a pageant depicting the history of the State and the river and culminating in the siege of Vicksburg. Of course, I am only one person, but I can have my dreams.

General Grant says there are two things he would like to see us concentrate on, the raising of the Federal Gunboat Cairo, which has been located in the Yazoo Pass, and locating and marking the graves of Civil War soldiers.

Governor Almond, of Virginia, has invited the Centennial Commission to hold its first general assembly in Richmond. This meeting will take place at the Hotel Jefferson, April 16-17. Outstanding national figures will be present and a banquet will be held. All members of the State and Advisory Centennial Commissions, the Civil War Round Table, and representatives of civic and patriotic organizations are invited to attend. It will be an exciting and stimulating gathering.

WILL READ HISTORY

In discussing historical events, I mentioned the burning of Prentiss and the Bolivar County Courthouse. General Grant, Mr. Betts, and two other gentlemen of the commission were very much interested, and all of them want a copy of the "History of Bolivar County."

Of course, I am sending one to General Grant, but told him I must reread it first to be sure we did not write too much that was bad about the Yankees. He was equal to the occasion and, with a twinkle in his eye, said:

"You send me the book. I will read it and tell you whether it is true or not."

I am indebted to Senator JOHN STENNIS for these pleasant experiences and associations, for it was he who gave my name to the commission, and I received my appointment from General Grant, as have a number of other Mississippians, most of whom I know.

Who Is the Workingman's Real Friend?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Chicago Daily Sun-Times, Feb. 6, 1959]

WHO IS THE WORKINGMAN'S REAL FRIEND?

President Eisenhower laid it on the line with congressional spenders Wednesday. Discussing a Democratic proposal for expenditures on housing that alone would unbalance the budget he has submitted to Congress, the President asked:

"If we are going to ask for these new expenditures—and everybody admitting that deficit spending is certainly not a good thing—why doesn't each one of these bills include a measure for increasing taxes?"

"That would be the straightforward, honest way to see whether the United States really wants this kind of thing."

Mr. Eisenhower was not seriously proposing that taxes be increased; he would like to see them cut. He was telling Congress and the people that if they want to spend more money than he has budgeted then they should be honest and schedule higher taxes to pay the bills. Otherwise, the Nation will go down deeper into debt and more inflation will rob all of us.

"I stand on this," the President went on. "You are going to hear me saying this often during the coming session and you will probably get weary of it . . ."

Readers of this page may get weary of our warnings about inflation, too. But, like the President, we are going to keep sounding them. Inflation is like a thief in the night who steals the savings of the industrious, pensions of the elderly, and insurance money of the widowed.

This week the Institute of Life Insurance warned that the United States can no longer temporize with inflationary forces in the economy. In the post-World War II period inflation has raised living costs 60 percent. Unless halted, inflation may undermine the people's desire to save, the institute pointed out. This would endanger the major source of thrift and investment funds upon which the country's future growth and progress are so vitally dependent, it explained.

We will put this another way, bluntly: Continued inflation could discourage family investment in insurance. Large funds invested by insurance companies would shrink. That would mean a shrinking of new construction and investment in business—and that would mean fewer jobs.

When the President speaks of inflation, therefore, he is not speaking of some theoretical and abstract economic theory. He is thinking about the effect of inflation on the average-American and his family. That is why he is so confident when he says the people will side with him if offered the alternatives of cheap money (inflation) or living within your income (a balanced budget).

Of course, the Congressmen who want to spend billions more than the President proposes, say that they are thinking of American families, too. They say that the expenditures that they propose are needed. They say that millions of dollars more than the President recommends are needed for urban renewal. They want millions for low-interest loans to house elderly people. They want more public housing.

Naturally every city dweller wants to get rid of slums and he wants to house low income and elderly people. But Americans should not confuse what they would like to have with what they can afford.

What would it profit elderly persons to have Government loans at the cost of further inflation that eats up their pensions and life insurance proceeds? Inflation hurts the slum dweller, too. If there had been no inflation—in recent years—no 60 percent increase in prices—the slum problem and the problem of the aged would not be as great as it is.

Putting the Government deeper into debt will create only greater inflation and bring still more problems of housing, slums, and the aged. A nation's needs should not be met at the cost of wrecking the nation's currency. Without sound money, no needs can

be adequately met—from military security to slum clearance.

Sound money requires that labor and business exercise restraint, too.

Many labor unions are preparing 1959 wage boost demands. They should ponder well that they, too, have a responsibility for inflation. They are powerful enough to exact wage increases that exceed the rise in productivity. What is the result? Here's a quote from the Guaranty Survey, a bank letter.

"The result is a wage-price spiral that impoverishes individuals and institutions with fixed incomes, while the increase in real wages is limited to the rise in productivity, precisely as it always has been."

In other words, most of the added real wages—purchasing power—workers have accrued over the years have come from the rise in productivity. That is why pay raises should be tied to productivity. The other dollars in the pay envelope are inflation dollars, worthless.

Congress will be putting more of these worthless paper dollars into pay envelopes if it votes to spend more than the Government takes in. This is hardly the role for the Democrats, who pride themselves on being the friend of the common man. It looks to us as though the common man's friend is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Needed: A More Active Interest in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article which William Scherwitz, chairman of the town of Oakland in Jefferson County, Wis., wrote recently for the Daily Jefferson County Union newspaper published in Fort Atkinson, Wis. Mr. Scherwitz' well-thought-out article should be read by all who are interested in good government:

NEEDED: A MORE ACTIVE INTEREST IN POLITICS
(By William Scherwitz)

The elections, for the time being, are over; budgets of the counties and local units of government are formulated; and the amount of money needed for the coming year has gone into the tax roll.

At this time, one who is actively engaged in politics begins to wonder about the worthwhileness of his efforts. From many sources come criticisms because taxes are high. Yet, those criticizing are often the same ones who wonder why services aren't better, why this road or that one isn't smoother, why the highways that pass their places aren't plowed or sanded at the minute it stops snowing, or why law enforcement officers aren't at the scene of the crime the moment it happens.

Naturally, our public officials are and should be eligible for constructive criticism. Such things as mink and vicuna coat scandals cannot be condoned, but more often than not this specific criticism becomes general criticism of all politicians and leads to open insult of capable and honest public officials—these officials being accused of being intellectual morons with no view in mind save the filling of their own pockets with ill-gotten gains from the Public Treasury.

Our young people go to grade school and high school to learn about the true greatness of America and its democratic form of government, and how that greatness could not have been attained without such men as Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Jackson, Lincoln, and many others. These men were statesmen—and also politicians. Yet, when the young people show any interest in politics, they are encouraged not to enter that dirty game.

The otherwise responsible citizen, when told he ought to run for public office, offers these excuses:

"It might hurt my business."

"I don't want to make enemies."

"I have troubles enough now."

"I wouldn't take that abuse for anything in the world."

"I can't afford to waste my time that way."

"I don't want to be classed as a politician."

Can anyone tell us, then, from where the responsible men are supposed to come?

Is it any wonder that there is increasing concern for the future of our country?

Doesn't it seem strangely inconsistent that we spend billions to send our young people to school and use a great part of this money to teach citizenship, political science, and history and then tell them how horrible all our officials are and urge them never to become a working part of that government they have been taught is so great?

Wouldn't it be better if we would occasionally search out those officials who earnestly try to do their duties—and there really are many of them—and commend them? We should do this whether or not we entirely agree with their views. Or maybe we should endeavor to put ourselves in their positions, and then ask what the dictates of our consciences would have been?

Would it not be wise to remember that all our statesmen have been politicians even though, unhappily, all our politicians have not been statesmen?

Surely, as mentioned before, politicians are not above criticism, but unless we begin to encourage those who are really trying to do right, and create more interest and respect for public office, our political structure will deteriorate to where we will be ripe for subversion.

Russian Propaganda in Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a sports article entitled, "Barnstorming With Barnea," printed in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader of February 4, 1959. In making this insertion, I desire to bring widespread attention to the fact that the United States is in direct competition with Russia in all aspects on all fronts. We all recall that in the last Olympic games the Soviet Union broke its agreement to keep separate the scores of the male and female teams. Although the U.S. male team had defeated the Russian male team, the Russians, by adding in the score of the Soviet female team could boast that they beat us in the aggregate. We can also recall what great propaganda use they made of this so-called victory.

Recently a touring hockey team of Russian professionals was passed off by the Soviet Union as amateurs, and great propaganda capital was made of the fact that they defeated some of our better college teams. Now comes the basketball fiasco in Chile, which the Soviet Union is using in the same propaganda way.

So important is the matter of prestige in the eyes of many impressionable people in the world, who are seeking to align themselves with what they expect to be the dominant power, that we should not overlook any facet of the prestige contest. We must be completely realistic about the fact that Russian athletes are not amateurs but professionals nurtured, coached, and supported by the all-powerful state. Let us get hardheaded about this situation and enter these competitions on a realistic basis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BARNSTORMING WITH BARNEA

(By Joe Barnea)

Can you imagine the fuss and furore that would result if the U.S. Government sent a group of college science students down to Cape Canaveral to take over the important job of beating the Russians in the race for space?

Every loyal American, of course, would be up in arms at the mere thought of sending a bunch of boys out on a man's mission.

But that, in a sense, is what happened in the recent world amateur basketball tournament in Chile, in which a United States amateur quintet was soundly trounced by both Russia and Brazil.

Representing this country in the world tourney was a team recruited from Air Force volunteers, presumably the only team available. But, at a time when the United States is fighting so desperately for prestige, why wasn't every effort made to send the best basketball talent in the country into the tournament?

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART of Indiana has strongly criticized the haphazard selection system which resulted in the disastrous defeat of the U.S. team at Santiago, Chile. The Republican lawmaker said that this country should make proper preparations in advance for such world events. The setback should be a lesson, he said.

He noted that the Yankee quintet not only was sadly trounced by the Russian representatives—who withdrew from the tourney after refusing to meet Nationalist China because they claimed it is not a country—but also was further humiliated when showered with debris from the stands in a game with Chile.

CAPEHART quoted a Santiago newspaper as stating, "When it comes to shooting at the moon or at a basket, the United States cannot keep up with Russia."

The Indiana solon said the team's showing was deplorable at a time "when our prestige could be much better in some parts of the continent to the south." He remarked, also, that basketball is an American sport introduced by the United States to other nations. "We should guard that heritage zealously, I might even say, jealously," he said.

Senator CAPEHART does not stand alone in his criticism of the selection method for such events. Alex Hannum, coach of the Wichita Vickers, a National Industrial Basketball League team, also blasted both the State Department and the National AAU for their selection of the United States team in the world tourney.

"Without consulting the National Industrial Basketball League, the strongest amateur basketball league in the world," Hannum declared, "they selected an Air Force all-star team that was soundly beaten by Russian and Brazil."

Continued Hannum: "I know for certain the Russians will make great propaganda use of the fact that they beat us in the sport which the United States invented."

And most certainly they will. The Russians will use any victory over the United States—whether in sports or in the field of missiles—in an attempt to mislead the rest of the world into believing that our system of government is decadent.

Whatever happened to that trusty, old axiom, about always putting your best foot forward? It would have been better to have stayed out of the world tournament rather than run the risk of playing into the hands of the Russians by fielding anything short of the best possible team.

What's going on in American sports today? On the one hand, we use a Peruvian tennis star to help us recapture the Davis cup; on the other, we make no attempt to field our strongest quintet in a world competition. It just doesn't make sense.

But, as usual, the Russian propagandists are having a field day.

The Spenders Can Be Stopped: Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, the Nation is looking to us, the national Congress, for the use of commonsense in the spending of its money.

The viewpoint of the average American is probably summed up in an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram of December 24, 1958, entitled "The Spenders Can Be Stopped." The frank warning in this editorial should give us food for thought.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPENDERS CAN BE STOPPED

President Eisenhower's promise to propose as close to a balanced budget as possible for fiscal 1960, stirs up a whisper of hope among a debt-burdened people that there is still a thread of sanity in Washington.

Additionally cheering was the observation by Representative AREND, of Illinois, that through the meeting at which the President made his statement there ran a dominant theme of fiscal responsibility. What a great thing it would be for the country for the future if Congress actually were to assume that obligation again—an obligation it has seemingly cast aside like an old cloak at the urging of the wild spenders.

We wish it were possible to be optimistic, as well as hopeful, over the talk of a balanced budget. Instead, we are fearful that this early talk is merely more whistling in the political rainbarrel, and that the beautiful theory will in time be assassinated by a gang of brutal facts resulting from the actions of a dollar-crazy Congress. The legis-

lative halls are due to be packed again by a preponderance of men who believe a nation can be made stronger by pouring out its resources—in hand and as much more as can be borrowed—all over the Nation and the world. The result will be more huge deficit spending, more inflation, a dollar that's worth less.

This will happen unless people do not want it to happen—and are willing to do something about stopping it. What can they do? A suggestion was made the other day by Thurman Sensing, outspoken advocate of a sensible fiscal policy for the Nation, to this effect:

"Unreason on spending undoubtedly will flourish in the liberal and labor dominated 86th Congress. President Eisenhower, who has recently struck out at the spenders, has a great opportunity. Conservatives will pray that he takes advantage of this opportunity. He is constitutionally barred from running again for the Presidency. The need for appeasing the spenders has vanished. He can save America by using his powers to stop the spenders in their tracks. The President's great power to prevent unreasonable legislation is the Presidential veto. As a President without an ax to grind, he can use the veto in a constructive fashion. He can save the American economy from raids by the pirates of the left wing.

"The American dollar—its value—is at stake in the political struggles of the next 2 years. If this wonderful symbol of American strength and financial integrity is not to be shattered, it will be necessary for President Eisenhower to act with firmness. All thinking citizens ought to write and urge him to use his freedom of action for this high purpose. A ruined dollar would symbolize the destruction of the free American economy.

"American taxpayers should also write their Congressmen urging them to vote against the welfare-state spending that produces an unbalanced budget. Not all of them are under the spell of the spending cult by any means. Even those who are, might be brought to see the error of their ways—if they heard from enough voters."

Mr. Summerfield Has Improved the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Summerfield Delivers," published in the Youngstown, Ohio, Vindicator of January 31, 1959. The editorial relates to the improvements made in the Post Office Department during the tenure of Postmaster General Summerfield.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. SUMMERFIELD DELIVERS

The Postmaster General who is a good businessman and executive is rare. On the average, he is a political figurehead who is given the office as a reward for successfully running a presidential campaign.

Only infrequently are taxpayers given the services of such a Postmaster General as Arthur Summerfield who, since taking office

6 years ago, has made notable progress in modernizing and streamlining the Department's operations.

The job hasn't been easy. The postal deficit in fiscal 1958 hit an all-time high largely because of congressional and other obstructions, yet Mr. Summerfield pushed through the first general increase in rates in years, thereby stemming the flow of red ink. He has increased Post Office efficiency and speeded up its service. He has enlisted the aid of private industry in finding better ways of processing an ever-mounting volume of mail.

Despite postal pay raises and huge increases to railroads carrying the mails, the long-range outlook for the Post Office is improving. Retroactive boosts in costs are out of the way; the higher rates voted last year will swell revenues through 1959, and some of the rate hikes are progressive. At the same time, the Department is working hard to cut costs while improving service. In the last year, for example, it has expanded rural deliveries, extended window hours, and stepped up mail collection.

More significant, perhaps, is the beginning of drastic changes in mail handling within the Post Office itself. Mr. Summerfield has sought the help of many private concerns in designing, producing, and testing equipment.

In short, the Post Office under Mr. Summerfield has displayed extraordinary vision, initiative, and energy in solving its problems and improving service. He has well earned public commendation.

The Arizona Watershed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, for a long time we in the arid Southwest have recognized that our number one problem is water. From the number of articles in the newspapers and national magazines on the subject, it is clear to me that the other sections of the country are waking up to the fact that they, too, are confronted with a water problem. This is indicated by the resolution introduced by the Senators from Montana, Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD—Senate Resolution 48 creating a committee to study our national water problems, which deserves prompt and favorable consideration.

There are a number of Federal and State agencies giving consideration to the full development of our water resources, as well as a sizable number of study groups, both public and private, involved in research programs dealing with water. In Arizona we are conducting a unique experiment. It is known as the Arizona watershed program and is a cooperative effort on the part of Federal, State, and private agencies.

The program is under the direction of the Arizona Water Resources Committee under the chairmanship of Lewis W. Douglas who is assisted by Mr. Kel M. Fox, the secretary-treasurer of the committee.

The specific purposes of the program is to determine, through study, research, and pilot operations, how best to manage the land areas of Arizona on a multiple-

use basis to assure the greatest possible water yield.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the December issue of the American Forests magazine by Mr. Kel M. Fox entitled "The Arizona Watershed Program."

To those members of the Senate, and others, who are concerned with adequate supplies of water I recommend this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARIZONA WATERSHED PROGRAM

(By Kel M. Fox, secretary-treasurer, Arizona Water Resources Committee)

Great ideas are sometimes hatched in the most unlikely places. Take the Arizona Watershed program for example. It was conceived under a pine tree, far from any conference room, let alone human dwelling place.

Two men attended this fateful meeting: Jake West, a hydrographer, and Dave Wingfield, a rancher with a penchant for practical conservation.

Both came well prepared. Born on a farm near Silver City, New Mex., West had spent 40 years climbing the ridges and exploring the canyons of the vast Salt and Verde River watersheds. His job, certainly one of the most unique in the world, is to see that this huge area delivers enough water to irrigate the thousands of farms, homes, and budding industries of the Salt River Valley. Lean and keen, West looks and acts like one of the fabled mountain men who once tramped these same canyons in search of beaver pelts, and he probably knows these watersheds better than any man alive.

Any man, that is, with the possible exception of Dave Wingfield. Now in his mid-seventies, Wingfield was born not many miles from where he and West were chatting. He had worked cattle in that very country before Theodore Roosevelt made his celebrated ride up San Juan Hill. He could remember the week-long drives to the railroad, the lonesome hours in the saddle scattering grass seed from a gunny sack tied to the horn, an occupation that has earned him the title of the "Johnny Grasseed" of Arizona. He could remember how this country looked 50 years ago, before there was a U.S. Forest Service.

The meeting between Wingfield and West began as an informal exchange of ideas on the same theme: Why were the lands of the Salt and Verde watersheds producing less water and less feed than they did 50 years before?

It ended with a conclusion, based on a century of combined experience: Something, probably the unregulated growth of brush and trees, was devouring the water and replacing the grass. If the brush could be controlled and the trees thinned, so they reasoned, springs that had vanished during their own lifetime could be made to run again, areas choked with trees and worthless brush could be restored to grass.

The theory found a responsive audience, and, before the year was out, the Salt River project, the Arizona Land Department, and the University of Arizona were embarked on a project to test its theoretical validity. Experts, a majority of whom were affiliated with the Forest Service, were called in to study the watersheds and express their opinions. These opinions were compiled by a staff headed by Dr. George W. Barr, at that time professor of agricultural economics at the university, and were printed in a report entitled "Recovering Rainfall," a report now almost universally known as the Barr report, after its chief author.

The Barr report took the raw theory of Wingfield and West and refined it into a broad program of recommendations for managing the various types of vegetation on the Salt and Verde watersheds. It predicted a considerable gain in runoff would result, along with such other benefits as fast growing, better-quality timber, more grass, and improvement in game and recreational sites.

Its release met with a mixed reception. It was hailed in some quarters, questioned in others—notably by spokesmen for wildlife groups fearful of possible changes in game habitat. The Arizona Legislature was sufficiently impressed, however, to create a new division of watershed management in the State's land department to promote the program, and elsewhere a group of citizens met and formed what is known as the Arizona Water Resources Committee.

This committee and the watershed management division, headed by Joseph F. Arnold, a former forester, have since become the principal champions of and spokesmen for the watershed program.

The committee is unusual in a number of respects, some of which are worth exploring. A private, nonprofit corporation, it operates on a very small budget, none of which comes from public funds. Aside from its president, Lewis W. Douglas, former ambassador to Great Britain, and its secretary (the author), each of its directors represents a group with an economic or other interest in the product of the watershed. Farmers are represented by Victor I. Corbell, president of the Salt River project; the logging industry by Pete Gaffney, a vice president of Southwest Lumber Mills, Inc.; ranchers by Ernest Chilson, former president of the Cattle Growers' Association; mining by Jack Pullen, of the Phelps Dodge Corp.; municipal users of water by Jack Williams, mayor of Phoenix; industrial users by George Christie; banks by C. C. Cooper, Jr.; game and recreation by Jay Price, former regional forester; publications by Richmond Johnson, former editor of the Arizona Farmer.

Each director has an advisory group of 4 to 12 representatives of his particular industry or activity.

The first task of the water resources committee was to make a fundamental decision: Would it promote the sweeping, sometimes controversial, recommendations of the Barr report, or would it choose a more cautious approach?

The answer was a combination of both. Six of the recommendations of the Barr report were adopted, in principal, with this important proviso: that each be evaluated in relatively small, field-test experiments before its adoption as a proven tool for management could be recommended.

Thus the Arizona watershed program, as it stands today, calls for experiments in the following:

1. Patch-cutting in the spruce-fir, mixed conifer type.
2. Thinning overstocked thickets of young ponderosa.
3. Conversion of noncommercial ponderosa to grass.
4. Removal of juniper and piñon where practical.
5. Chemical control of brush.
6. Thinning of stream channel vegetation in nonrecreational sites.

It is important to remember the proviso. The Water Resources Committee isn't recommending anything beyond the present research program until the experts, who should know, say it will work.

With this commonsense approach, the committee quickly established good working relationships with the Forest Service and Bureau of Indian Affairs, the two agencies managing some 90 percent of the Salt and Verde watersheds.

The Forest Service agreed to take the lead in conducting experiments to prove whether

patch cutting could improve runoff in the spruce-fir and mixed conifer-type forests. About 100 acres of the Apache National Forest have been cut in this manner. Results are being closely watched. On an adjacent area, three small watersheds are being measured for rainfall and runoff before one is cut by patch method, one by the selective method, the third left uncut as a check.

The Forest Service is also taking the lead in experimental work in ponderosa pine type, which embraces most of Arizona's not inconsiderable timber resources. Thinning of overstocked stands of saplings is taking place on several thousand acres of the Coconino National Forest. In the same general area, the Forest Service has removed all the noncommercial ponderosa pine from a 200-acre experimental watershed.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Forest Service are both engaged in fairly large-scale juniper-piñon removal projects.

With the enthusiastic support of the Indians themselves, who are supplying a portion of the necessary funds, the BIA is removing 33,000 acres of juniper on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation in a project being carefully measured for effects on water yield. Elsewhere on the same reservation, some 100,000 acres have been cleared of juniper and piñon, primarily to increase forage.

Forest Service juniper removal is approaching the 10,000-acre mark on the Wet Beaver pilot watershed project on the Coconino Forest.

The same agency is in charge of experiments to convert brush to grass on selected areas of the Tonto and Prescott National Forests. Various control methods are being tried, the chemical tests on this particular project being handled by the Agricultural Research Service.

The fourth agency playing a major role in the Arizona watershed program in the U.S. Geological Survey. Survey technicians have installed and are readying stream gaging stations for both Forest Service and Indian Service projects. In addition, the USGS is undertaking an important project in cooperation with the Land Department and Salt River Valley Water Users to measure the effects of removing cottonwoods growing along the banks of a stream located in Mohave County.

Research in watershed management and in the control and conversion of vegetation takes money, and the Water Resources Committee feels it has an important responsibility to see that agencies cooperating in the program get the necessary financial support. To this end, it has strongly backed agency requests for funds, and with good results.

Congress appropriated \$210,000 for watershed research projects in fiscal 1957, raised this to \$324,000 the following year, and made \$485,000 available this year. Some additional funds are appropriated by the State and by semigovernmental agencies such as the Salt River Valley Water Users Association. In addition, Indian tribes and ranchers are spending considerable sums each year in juniper removal work beyond the scope of these research projects.

Assuming positive results—and there will be a lot of long faces in Arizona if there are none—treatment of several million acres, at a cost of millions of dollars, will be the next step. How to raise the money, and the proportions to be borne by the several beneficiaries, are problems yet to be encountered.

The rapidly expanding Southwest desperately needs more water, and no one is more aware of it than the members of the Water Resources Committee. The committee feels it has taken a moderate, scientific approach to a problem that could easily become explosive in less cautious hands. It hopes the

ultraconservationist group on the one hand, and the more water at any price group on the other, will both be patient until the results are in.

Republican Support During Truman Administration for an Adequate Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter entitled "Symington's Failure," which was published in the Washington Evening Star of February 5, 1959, over the name of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein of Chicago, Ill.

I believe the letter goes a long way in setting forth the true facts regarding the positions of certain Republicans during the Truman administration with respect to support for an adequate Air Force.

Mr. President, the letter correctly asserts that my distinguished colleague, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, and I joined with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] in his plea for a strong air arm as a vital part of our Nation's defense program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYMINGTON'S FAILURE

Your January 19 editorial entitled "SYMINGTON'S FAILURE" just came to my attention.

I have the greatest respect for your editorial policy and your fairness, and I am sure you would like to have the facts from someone who knows something about this matter.

I yield to no one in my admiration with respect to Senator STUART SYMINGTON. As a matter of fact, if I ever have to vote Democratic I hope it will be for him. He is a truly great public servant and a fine, courageous patriot. Senator SYMINGTON and I were both assistants to the late Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson. I find no fault in the praise you have for Senator SYMINGTON, and endorse it. But I do object to your statement that Senator SYMINGTON had no Republican support or help when he fought for an adequate Air Force while Mr. Truman was President and when Mr. Truman was opposed to the policy of his own Secretary of Air. The responsibility rests with the Democratic leadership and the administration of the Congress that did not support Mr. SYMINGTON.

I do not agree with the attack of the Republican National Committee on Senator SYMINGTON, and you are right in bringing out the facts, but I do disagree with you when you say you cannot recall the name of even one Republican politician who stood up and fought with him.

I can name two great Republican Senators who were right in Mr. SYMINGTON's corner. One was my beloved and sainted friend, Robert A. Taft, and other one is Senator STYLES BRIDGES. And in my capacity as a Republican consultant Senator Taft directed me to rally all support for SYMINGTON. I personally arranged a meeting between Senator Taft and Senator SYMINGTON, and Senator Taft assured the then Secretary Symington of his solid 100 percent support for the

Symington Air Force program. Senator Taft felt that America must have the most powerful air force in the world as a deterrent to any aggressor. And no one will remember this better than my good friend, Senator SYMINGTON, if he is asked by you for the real facts.

I always felt that it is criminal to make the defense issue a partisan issue. Neither Senator Symington nor Senators Taft and Bridges ever did that. And when you speak of the Symington report in 1949, before Korea, you will find that Senator Taft was the staunchest supporter when many Democrats and the administration were opposed to it. No truer patriot ever lived than Senator Taft. He was a great statesman and a great politician, but also a partisan; but when it came to the security of America, Senator Taft championed the cause just as well as his and my Democratic friend Senator SYMINGTON. I owe it to the memory of Senator Taft not to let your editorial go unchallenged. If the Symington-Taft-Bridges program had been carried out the Korean war would have ended in complete victory or might never have taken place. Gen. Douglas MacArthur could have defeated the North Koreans and the Chinese Communists then and there—if he had not been hamstrung by the administration.

JULIUS KLEIN,

Major General (Retired), Chicago, Ill.

Out of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the February 1, 1959, issue of the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, entitled "Out of Politics."

OUT OF POLITICS

President Eisenhower's farm program recognizes the urgent need for getting the politicians off the backs of the farmers and allowing agriculture to produce freely for the market and not for Government warehouses. After spending many years and many billions of dollars in trying to solve the farm problem, the politicians and the Government haven't solved anything. They created the problem by burdening agriculture with programs dedicated to the impossible task of trying to make time stand still.

In his farm message, the President called upon Congress to move agriculture toward independence and stability by overhauling the Government's farm-price-support system, which is based on long-outdated standards. He cited the huge accumulations of surpluses and outlays of Federal funds as demonstrating the need for reduction of incentives for excess production. By the end of the current fiscal year on June 30, the Government will hold more than \$9 billion in farm surpluses. The supply of wheat, the President said, is enough to meet all domestic and export needs for an entire year, even if American farmers didn't harvest a single bushel of wheat this year. The Federal money goes to a relatively few producers of farm products and to warehousemen.

The President told Congress that the parity system which has been in effect since early in the New Deal should be scrapped in favor

of a plan which would gear price supports to a percentage of market prices in recent years. The proposed change is designed to permit a gradual removal of the floor under farm prices. The President's call for support reductions applies to the six basic crops now covered—wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. Production controls would be eased and eventually eliminated.

The course proposed by President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson is in line with the thinking of the farmers themselves. America's corn farmers last November voted nearly 3 to 1 in favor of Benson's plan to cut corn price supports sharply and eliminate acreage controls. Under the plan, which will go into effect with the 1959 corn crop, supports will be based on the average market price of the past 3 years. The American Farm Bureau Federation has urged a similar plan for wheat.

Adding weight to the President's arguments is the fact that producers of farm products, such as livestock, not covered by price supports, are doing well.

The politicians cannot continue indefinitely their stumbling efforts to try to guarantee the farmers a profit. Agriculture and the public will be better served when farmers are free to rely on their own ability rather than on Government paternalism.

Tribute to India League and J. J. Singh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following farewell message to the India League of America, which is suspending its activities on March 1, 1959:

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
17 East 54th Street,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRIENDS: I cannot tell you how much I regret not being able to be with you at this farewell meeting of the India League of America. I feel as if I were saying goodbye to old friends by proxy, and that I know is no way of revealing the depth of friendship and regard I have felt for the members of the India League. I wish I could be with you to tell you of the personal satisfaction I have gained from my association and participation in the work of the India League.

I want to single out from among the many friends in the India League the one with whom I have worked closest and who has given me so much of his time and thought when there was work I could do as a friend of India in the Halls of Congress. J. J. Singh has been a source of strength and inspiration to all of us; a man of dedication to his principles; a sturdy ambassador of good will for India. I remember the work we did together in accomplishing the passage of legislation that removed the obnoxious India Exclusion Act from our statute books and prepared the way for the naturalization of Indians resident in the United States.

Though he is leaving our midst, I know that our paths will cross again.

We who are the friends of India will not forget one moment that a crucial role in world history is now being played by the people of India. India must be given every opportunity to prove to the world that freedom and economic opportunity can exist

side by side and that it is not mandatory that freedom of a people must necessarily exclude its economic well-being, or that economic progress can only be made at the expense of freedom. This is the test mankind faces in these troubled times and one of the most significant of all testing foregrounds is the subcontinent. It is not a choice, it is a must that we, in the United States, give economic aid to India, help to increase her trade, and help to finance her new industries. That we have so far failed to recognize the importance of India to the development of a free society everywhere is borne out by the fact that of the \$20 billion of trade that the United States carries on, only \$5 million relates to India. Yet India gives us the mica, the jute, the manganese, the spices that we ourselves must have in the development of our own economic and scientific progress. To India we look for the attributes of charity and compassion, steeped as she is in spiritual strength. We in the United States cannot afford to take our eyes away from the Indian scene. I have witnessed for myself, in my visit to India, the heartbreaking problems that face her. I have seen, too, the tremendous work that is being done in the villages. The intelligence and sensitivity of her leadership, her men and women of dedication and sacrifice have left a deep impress on me. The world watches the struggles of a free people of India and the progress made under that freedom as against the brutal totalitarianism of Communist China. In a sense then I say—and I repeat—that herein lies the test tube of whence our civilization shall go.

I shall miss you all, but I must leave you with the assurance that my work and my friendship for India shall continue unabated.

Sincerely and hopefully,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Rising Retail Food Costs Are Not Caused by Farm Price-Support Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, payments to farmers for food products in 1957 were \$19.5 billion, almost the same as the \$19.2 billion paid in 1948, just 10 years earlier. This payment applies to food sold. It does not reflect the value of food produced on farms and used there by the farm family.

But the retail value of this same quantity of food in 1957 was \$50.4 billion. This is what the consumer paid. It was only \$39 billion in 1948. The increase in the marketing charge over the 10 years was \$11.4 billion. This is the rising food cost to consumers.

These payments to farmers and retail values apply only to foods produced on farms in the United States and purchased at retail by consumers. The quantity was larger in 1957 than in 1948 because of the increase in population. The retail values are calculated in such a way that food eaten at restaurants is valued in terms of retail store prices.

The table below shows how these values and payments have changed during the 10 years under consideration.

Payments to farmers and marketing charges for farm food purchased by civilian consumers in the United States, 1948-57

[In billion dollars]

Year	Market value	Payment to farmers	Marketing charges from farm through retail store
1948.....	39.0	19.2	19.8
1949.....	37.9	17.1	20.8
1950.....	38.9	17.7	21.2
1951.....	43.0	20.2	22.8
1952.....	44.5	20.1	24.4
1953.....	44.6	19.0	25.6
1954.....	44.9	18.3	26.6
1955.....	46.2	18.3	27.9
1956.....	48.3	18.7	29.6
1957.....	50.4	19.5	30.9

During the years from 1948 through 1957, the population residing in the United States increased from 146 million persons to 170 million. This averages out at about 2.4 million more persons per year. But the farmers' take from feeding the smaller population in 1948 was \$19.2 billion, whereas in 1957, 10 years later, it was \$19.5 billion. This is no idle achievement. It shows that the farmers have been very efficient in providing the food supply. Less farmers providing more food each year have delivered enough for everyone with some added for export and at a lower gross cost in a period of serious inflation.

What caused the increase in food costs to consumers? Labor, transportation costs, and taxes seem to have been very important in the increased cost of distribution. Additional marketing services, particularly in packaging, and the preparation of these foods for retailing were also significant sources of increased distribution costs.

The justification of these increases in food costs to consumers is not questioned. If consumers want to purchase their food in more costly prepared forms, that fact alone is sufficient justification. But it is important that consumers should understand the reason for increased food costs. All too often the farmer is assumed to have received a comparable increase in income.

All too often the increase is attributed to price-support programs with respect to farm products. The data above, however, include farmers' total income from food products. His income attributable to price supports is included. The farmers' contribution to the consumers' food bill has not increased in the 10 years reviewed. Even when the increased quantities of food used by the growing population are added, the farmers' take did not increase, but since 1951 has generally declined.

Incomes to persons who are not farmers have increased steadily since the war. The cost of goods and services which farmers must buy has also increased. But farmers' cash incomes for the postwar period have been relatively static. These are facts which should be considered by those who would reduce price supports. Consumers of food have been getting a bargain, insofar as farmers are concerned.

The farmers as a group have a proud record in the past 10 years. Hunger in

the United States has been greatly reduced. Important inroads have been made on hunger outside the United States. And all of this at prices which reflect the opposite of inflation in years when inflation has become our No. 1 national problem.

INFLATION HAS NOT AFFECTED BUTTER PRICES

Inflation, we are told, is one of the important problems of our time. Prices rise, and with them, the index of living costs also rises. In the case of butter, however, prices have declined. The average price of 92-score butter at wholesale in 1950 was 61.7 cents a pound. It rose to 72 cents in 1952, but since that time it declined until in 1958 the average price is 58.7 cents, 3 cents per pound less than in 1950. This shows that the farmers who produced milk for butter have not shared in any increase of income. Responsibility for inflation cannot be laid at the door of the dairy farmer. Consumers have been repaid for the tax cost of price support in their lower price for butter.

In 1950, the average retail price for butter was 72.9 cents a pound, and in 1958 it was 74.2 cents, an increase in cost of 1.3 cents per pound for this 8-year period. Retail prices also reached their peak in 1952, and since 1952 have declined, contrary to the general trend in prices. Whereas retail food prices increased by 30 percent between 1950 and 1957, butter prices increased less than 2 percent.

Butter: Retail and wholesale prices, 1950-58

Year	Wholesale price per pound 92 nd , Chicago	Retail price per pound United States
	Cents	Cents
1950.....	61.7	72.9
1951.....	69.2	81.9
1952.....	72.2	85.5
1953.....	65.9	79.0
1954.....	59.7	72.4
1955.....	57.4	70.9
1956.....	59.2	72.1
1957.....	59.6	74.3
1958.....	58.7	74.2

Hopes for Good Legislation on Capitol Hill Remain Slim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared February 6 in the Rockford, Ill., Register Republic, entitled "Hopes for Good Legislation on Capitol Hill Remain Slim":

HOPES FOR GOOD LEGISLATION ON CAPITOL HILL REMAIN SLIM

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—It's predictable that along around June, the Senate-House Democratic leaders will claim great accomplishments for the 86th Congress and will cite the large

numbers of legislative bills to prove the point. This is a regular annual occurrence, and it measures the amount of legislation rather than its quality. Nobody can tell by counting the sheaves of paper that have passed through printing presses whether a Congress has been good or bad. But here in February it is possible to make the calculated estimate that it will be among the least productive sessions that ever assembled and this is why:

Labor legislation, perhaps the most needed of all, gives every sign of being a dud—noise without force. There are three kinds of labor bills in competition. The AFL-CIO would like to have the Taft-Hartley Act repealed or, since that is impossible, emasculated. Andrew Blemler, the AFL-CIO legislative director, let this cat out of the bag in his first day of testimony. Responding to a deft query by Senator GOLDWATER, Blemler admitted that "at the present time we certainly would not support the Democratic (Kennedy-Ervin) bill without title 6," the latter being the Taft-Hartley revision section.

The Eisenhower administration has submitted a reasonably good bill, but the Democrats and liberal Republicans won't back it. This means it simply doesn't have the votes. Senator GOLDWATER may submit a very strong measure, probably including an antitrust provision. It could not possibly get the votes to pass. What will pass, in all likelihood, is a very feeble law against crime and misfeasance, completely dodging the labor issue in our times.

Military legislation, not quite as urgent as labor because it is less neglected, will not advance much beyond its present status. The administration, despite being under constant criticism, is very pleased with itself about our military posture. Senator SYMINGTON, the chief Democratic critic, says this is false complacency that is based upon minimized estimates of Russian strength. But, as one of his armed services colleagues has told this reporter off-record, the only way SYMINGTON can be proved right is for the Russians to attack.

Defense Secretary McElroy has developed a pretty unanswerable retort to the observation that he is spending less money on national defense, even though the dollar is losing purchasing power and the Russians are increasing their ability to assault us. McElroy says he has learned how to spend more effectively and does not need so many dollars. The country is in a mood to believe him rather than pay more taxes. There is little reason to think that this session will produce any improved military legislation.

Civil rights has been the main conversation piece in the early session. Everybody in Congress seems to have a bill or two. But the signs are that the heat is going out of the civil-rights issue. The collapse of massive resistance to school segregation in Virginia is a shattering blow to all defenders of State sovereignty and a tranquilizing victory for the other side. If the courts can do this, why should Congress act by passing unpopular force acts? We will probably get an extension of the present Civil Rights Commission and possibly a new bureau of community conciliation, but neither will alter the current situation. The new laws may be showy but will hardly be substantial.

Inflation will remain, as it is now, a problem which labor and business will have to solve, or become engulfed. Nobody expects the President's budget to yield \$77 billion in taxes so as to achieve a balance. But the President was right—and the rest of us wrong—last year at this time when he predicted a petering out by spring of the recession. He could be right again. Still, the two things that could be called dramatic—a tax cut, on the one hand, a return to

economic controls on the other—seem very remote.

Welfare and public works, including school and hospital construction, as well as more dams and airfields, are much in demand, especially by the many new congressional Members who came in by promising everything. But except for airfields, which the jet age demands, the spending may well be discouraged by Presidential vetoes and by serious-minded public opinion.

This leaves foreign affairs, a field in which Senator HUMPHREY is especially anxious to shine because of his 8-hour talkathon with Premier Khrushchev. HUMPHREY has been majoring in atomic disarmament, but he has no more chance than ever of finding a workable formula.

Sadly, it is world communism rather than the American Congress which can be expected to dominate events in 1959. In early February the signs are for a chatterbox session with humdrum results. All things considered, this could be the luckiest way to have it.

The Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Elementary Public Schools of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, HIRSH C. Long, superintendent of the public schools of Clay County, Fla., has recently made available to me the results of a survey of the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary public schools of Florida. This study was made in cooperation with Sidney L. Horne, director of instruction, and Mary Zeller, general supervisor. It speaks well for the initiative of these able school officials and of the effort of local school authorities to meet one of the important challenges of our time—understanding among people through improved communication. The report is as follows:

THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN THE ELEMENTARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF FLORIDA

BACKGROUND

One 10-teacher school in Clay County, the Middleburg Junior High School, this year became interested in offering instruction in a foreign language to some elementary school children. The fifth-grade teacher is well qualified in foreign language and was interested in teaching conversational Spanish to small children. The second grade was selected and, with the very active cooperation and support of the principal, arrangements were worked out under which, for one period per day, the second-grade teacher would exchange classes with the fifth-grade teacher. During this period, the fifth-grade teacher teaches Spanish to the second grade, while the regular second-grade teacher continues with routine instruction in the fifth grade.

The enthusiasm of the second graders in learning something of the use of the Spanish language is much greater than had been anticipated. Parents are interested and cooperate wherever needed. Other pupils have become so interested that the regular fifth-grade teacher is now finding it necessary to teach some Spanish in her regular class.

These children felt that their teacher was letting them down by going elsewhere to teach something which they also wished to learn. Other teachers and other schools in the county are watching this experiment with interest.

Feeling that the county could profit by experiences of other counties in this field of effort, and also prompted by the possible implications of the Federal Defense Education Act on language teaching, Clay County instituted a study to determine to what extent Florida Public Schools have gone into the field of elementary foreign language teaching. In addition, some information was requested which would, to some extent, indicate the types of programs in operation in the State.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

Letters were sent to each of the 67 counties of Florida requesting that the following information be furnished:

1. Is foreign language taught in the schools of your county below the ninth grade?
2. What languages?
3. Is teaching traditional or conversational?
4. Number of schools in the county teaching foreign language(s) below the ninth grade?
5. Grades in which taught?
6. Is there an in-service teacher training program for this type teaching in your county? Please describe.
7. Helpful comments.

FINDINGS

The excellent response to the inquiry is perhaps indicative of the statewide interest in this subject. Sixty-four counties have replied to the request, and the other three may perhaps reply later. Of the responding counties, 24 are teaching foreign language in some classes below the ninth grade. Twenty-two are teaching Spanish; four are teaching French; and one is teaching German. Where this item was checked, the counties indicate that the language is taught as conversational rather than traditional, with the exception of the seventh and eighth grades in French and Spanish in Okaloosa County.

Dade, Hillsborough, and Pinellas Counties are conducting foreign language instruction by radio, and Palm Beach County plans to institute such instruction in January of 1959. Dade County also conducts a program of television instruction in foreign language. Gulf County indicates that phonograph records are used for foreign-language instruction.

There appears to be little or no consistency throughout the State as to programing and general practices. It is interesting to note that Brevard County reports that "we use parents in the community and are not concerned about the language." Orange County indicates that it has a policy of supplementing the salaries of some teachers who conduct instruction for classes of 20 pupils after regular school hours. Some counties consider the language instruction to be a part of the social studies program, others consider it to be a separate area of instruction.

The 24 counties reporting affirmatively on the teaching of foreign languages show such instruction being practiced in 177 schools, plus an indefinite number covered by such general terms as "optional with the schools," "several," "some," etc.

Only five counties report an in-service teacher training program for teachers of elementary foreign languages.

There seems to be little consistency with regard to the grades in which foreign language instruction is being conducted though the tendency seems to favor the upper elementary grades (grades 5 and 6). Three

counties teach foreign language in the first grade, 5 in the second, 8 in the third, 9 in the fourth, 11 in the fifth, 14 in the sixth, 4 in the seventh, and 3 in the eighth.

RELATED STUDY

Under the leadership of Mr. R. W. Sims, coordinator of research, State department of education, a study is being conducted designed to make an analysis of offerings and enrollments in foreign languages in all public high schools in Florida. A preliminary report has been published on this study,

based on 1957-58 enrollments, and covers the following 20 counties: Alachua, Baker, Bay, Bradford, Brevard, Broward, Calhoun, Charlotte, Citrus, Clay, Collier, Columbia, Dade, DeSoto, Dixie, Duval, Escambia, Flagler, Franklin, and Gadsden. In this group it was found that 17 of the 20 counties were teaching some foreign language in at least one high school in the county, and 1,723 seventh and eighth graders were enrolled in language courses as follows: 1,615 in Spanish and 108 in French.

REPORTING OF FINDINGS

Copies of this study are being distributed to each county in the State and to other interested persons. Clay County appreciates the assistance of each of you in making information available.

A compilation of all data furnished is contained in the following:

1. A tabulation of the replies of the 64 counties from which replies were received.

2. Summary of comments offered by the reporting counties.

The teaching of foreign language(s) in the elementary public schools of Florida

County	Taught?		French	Spanish	German	Other	Conversational?	Traditional?	In how many schools?	Grades								In-service teacher tng?		No reply
	Yes	No								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Yes	No	
1. Alachua																				X
2. Baker	X			X			X		1				X	X	X	X	X			X
3. Bay	X			X			X		2											X
4. Bradford	X	X		X	X													X		X
5. Brevard	X		X	X	X															X
6. Broward		X																		X
7. Calhoun		X																		X
8. Charlotte		X																		X
9. Citrus		X																		X
10. Clay	X			X			X		1		X			X						X
11. Collier		X																		X
12. Columbia		X																		X
13. Dade	X			X			X		126	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X
14. DeSoto		X																		X
15. Dixie	X			X			X		1		X									X
16. Duval	X		X	X			X		3					X	X					X
17. Escambia	X		X	X			X		Several				X	X	X					X
18. Flagler	X			X			X		1				X	X	X					X
19. Franklin		X																		X
20. Gadsden		X	X						1							X	X			X
21. Gilchrist	X						X						X	X	X					X
22. Glades	X			X			X		1				X	X	X					X
23. Gulf	X			X			X		1					X	X					X
24. Hamilton		X																		X
25. Hardee		X																		X
26. Hendry		X																		X
27. Hernando		X																		X
28. Highlands		X																		X
29. Hillsborough	X			X			X		Optional				X	X	X	X		X		X
30. Holmes		X																		X
31. Indian River		X																		X
32. Jackson		X																		X
33. Jefferson		X																		X
34. Lafayette		X																		X
35. Lake		X																		X
36. Lee	X			X			X		6			X	X	X	X					X
37. Leon		X																		X
38. Levy		X																		X
39. Liberty		X																		X
40. Madison		X																		X
41. Manatee	X			X			X		1						X					X
42. Marion		X																		X
43. Martin		X																		X
44. Monroe		X																		X
45. Nassau		X																		X
46. Okaloosa	X		X	X			X					X	X	X	X	X	X			X
47. Okeechobee		X																		X
48. Orange		X																		X
49. Osceola		X																		X
50. Palm Beach	X			X			X		30			X						X		X
51. Pasco	X			X			X		1			X								X
52. Pinellas	X			X			X													X
53. Polk	X			X			X		1	X	X	X	X	X	X					X
54. Putnam		X																		X
55. St. Johns	X																			X
56. St. Lucie	X			X					Some			X								X
57. Santa Rosa																				X
58. Sarasota																				X
59. Seminole	X			X			X		1						X					X
60. Sumter		X																		X
61. Suwannee		X																		X
62. Taylor		X																		X
63. Union		X																		X
64. Volusia	X			X					1	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X
65. Wakulla		X																		X
66. Walton		X																		X
67. Washington		X																		X
Total	24	40	4	22	1	0	20	0	177	3	5	8	9	11	14	4	3	5	59	3

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS OFFERED BY THE REPORTING COUNTIES

Baker: The foreign language program in junior high is exploratory type.

Bay: This is a beginning program so we have not gone far enough to be helpful.

Brevard: We use parents in the community and are not concerned about the language.

Broward: We are giving some consideration to the teaching of Spanish in the eighth grade.

Collier: We plan to initiate a conversational Spanish program in the intermediate grades (fourth, fifth, sixth) in one of our schools in the county in the school year 1959-60.

We have been in contact with the foreign language departments of both Florida State University and the University of Florida concerning such a program, and have received much helpful material as suggestions. Our elementary supervisor plans to take a course

offered by the University of Florida during the summer of 1959 which is designed particularly for teachers of Spanish on the elementary level.

Dade: Weekly TV programs by superintendent of Spanish, evening. Also daily program by radio to every class in every school.

Dixie: We have a second grade teacher who is a good Spanish teacher and offers Spanish to the second grade of her own accord. We do offer Spanish in high school.

Duval: An exceptional child program teacher for gifted children has been teaching French in two schools to selected pupils. One school is experimenting on letting classroom teachers learn Spanish along with the children.

Escambia: Several elementary schools teach Spanish as an extra activity in sixth grade but no formal teaching is done in our schools below ninth grade.

Gadsden: This French is taught in a small school (grades 1 to 8). The principal of this four-teacher school teaches both seventh and eighth grades (12 children). This French class is enrichment.

Glades: The above program (Spanish fourth, fifth, sixth grades) is designed as an enrichment or challenge for the apparently superior and gifted students. It is not available to the total student body in those grades.

Gulf (Spanish, sixth grade): We use records (phonograph) and the guidebooks developed by Dade County.

Hillsborough, (Spanish): In the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh it is taught by radio and teachers are given a guide for the lessons. Teachers do not have to be able to speak the language itself. Radio teacher is available to help classroom teachers. A course in conversational Spanish is offered adults through our adult program.

Hamilton: How effective is the foreign language in the elementary and what is the true purpose for teaching it? We, too, are interested in this idea.

Lee: This was part of our enrichment program for gifted students.

Leon: There are a few teachers in the county who teach a little Spanish on their own. This is not a planned program, however.

Levy: We are a small rural county and do not have teachers qualified at the present time. We have had a 30-minute class in conversational Spanish 1 year in the elementary grades which was very well received by both pupils and teachers. We had to discontinue this when we lost this person.

Marion: We had a Spanish class in one of our third grades 2 years ago but due to the faculty we were not able to follow the program in the fourth grade. At this time, we are simply giving thought to the possibilities in the future.

Nassau: Our junior high day is overflowing now. I would like to see the daily schedule of a junior high class which has a foreign language.

Okeechobee: We plan to teach Spanish beginning with the second semester, in an advanced section of the fifth grade.

Orange: We are trying out an experiment of teaching four classes in foreign languages in four different elementary schools, after school hours. The teachers will get \$300 a year and the hours will be from 3:30 to 4:30 p.m. Each class will be limited to 20 students. This is all the foreign-language teaching we have in the elementary schools at the present time, and this experiment has just been started.

Palm Beach: Through the adult education program, classes for teachers will be organized in conversational Spanish. Consultant from Miami will work with teachers who will be engaged in the program. We plan to initiate a program of Spanish radio lessons beginning at the third-grade level on January 27, 1959.

Pasco: (Spanish third grade). We have just started this and as yet would not be in a position to make an evaluation. It does seem thus far that the pupils enjoy it and tend to make a game of it. If it is successful we will probably expand it at a later date. We would be happy to have the results of your experiment.

Pinellas: We have a course in conversational Spanish taught by radio and on a voluntary basis.

Putnam: We are planning to begin a program (on a very small scale) in one of our elementary schools here in Palatka. We are at present attempting to secure suitable materials. At present we are looking over materials from Harr Wagner Publishing Co., San Francisco.

St. Lucie: In some third grades a limited amount of conversational Spanish is taught.

Seminole: Two sixth grade teachers in one school teach some Spanish in connection with social studies.

Volusia: (Spanish—grades 1 through 6) A junior college Spanish teacher is conducting a weekly class in Spanish with the entire faculty of 35 teachers in the one school where this is being done. This is the first year of the experiment and so far there is little which can be reported but the interest seems to be high. Every teacher participates in the program. In one other school a French war bride is conducting a small class in conversational French on a voluntary basis in the upper elementary classes.

Radical Surgery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Arthur Daley, entitled "Radical Surgery," and dealing with professional sports legislation, which appeared in the New York Times on February 6, 1959:

RADICAL SURGERY

(By Arthur Daley)

ESTES KEFAUVER, the resident surgeon at the legislative cure-all hospital in Washington, is operating on his sports patients with all the finesse of a physician who uses a meat ax instead of a scalpel. Even though the operations are successful, the patients surely will die. The surgery is far too radical and has been prescribed without any true understanding of the backgrounds of those about to be carved.

Senator KEFAUVER has just dropped into the hopper a sweeping sports antitrust bill that almost seems antisports as well. He proposes such an amputation job on the reserve clause that baseball hardly will be able to stand. He would cripple the draft, a move that baseball might survive but that would kill pro football.

The phenomenal rise of pro football is predicated almost entirely on the fact that evenly matched teams make competition so keen that these are the sharpest sports blades ever honed. It's the draft that supplies the razor's edge.

NEIGHBORLY LOOK

The Senator doesn't have to look far to find exhibit A. Just up the pike a bit from the Capital is Baltimore. Not many years ago the Colts were hopeless. But the draft kept giving them first whack at star players and the Colts now are the champions. The Detroit Lions won a title one season, dropped to last the next campaign and picked up just enough star performers to zoom back near the top again. The draft is the greatest equalizer ever invented.

If it should be eliminated, the rich clubs with the biggest seating capacities will dominate the National Football League. That would mean the Los Angeles Rams, the Cleveland Browns, and the New York Giants. They would corner the talent in an open market. That's what the Browns did in the All-American Conference and the lack of an adequate challenger to Coach Paul Brown's invincibles led to the league's dissolution.

The baseball draft is not quite so important as a feeder. Yet it has its place. When there was no draft some 30 years ago, the shrewd Jack Dunn of the old Baltimore Orioles of the International League built up one of the strongest of all minor league teams. While he was at it, Dunn delayed the big league debuts of a slew of stars.

DELAYED PROMOTION

The Oriole owner was the chap who sold a brilliant left-handed pitcher to the Boston Red Sox in 1914 for \$2,900—a fellow named Babe Ruth. Eleven years later Dunn was an infinitely better salesman. He sold another brilliant southpaw, Lefty Grove, to the Philadelphia Athletics for \$100,000. The reason for that odd price was because of the fact that Ruth's resale to the Yankees was for \$100,000, then a record. Dunn merely wanted to top it with Grove.

But Lefty was then 25 years old, a late start for a fireballer of his superlative skills. Max Bishop was 25 when he was sold by Dunn to the A's for \$50,000. Jack Bentley was 28 when he went to the New York Giants for \$65,000. Other high-priced Orioles were George Earnshaw, aged 28, and Joe Boley, aged 29. If there had been a draft then, they'd have gone years earlier.

Dunn made a profitable operation out of minor league ball. But the minors never did recover from the blight of the depression. The number shrank to 14 leagues in 1933 and the alarmed majors began to subsidize their little brothers. In the lush postwar years the leagues zoomed to nearly 60, an obviously inflated number. Now they are down to 26, which is much too deflated.

But the majors are to blame for the most part because of their reckless flooding of minor league territories with television broadcasts. Commissioner Ford Frick would dearly love to control TV but is powerless to do so. If Senator KEFAUVER really wanted to help baseball, he would take the shackles off Frick and permit the Commissioner to order restraints.

SMART SYSTEM

Bert Bell, the football commissioner, operates a tighter league and he took the gamble of ordering blackouts of home games. When he won in court, his circuit's prosperity was assured because the play-for-pay gridiron performers were not required to give away what they were trying to sell.

However, Frick's sprawling baseball empire is so constituted that lawsuits with triple damages involved could lead to bankruptcy. If he could remove the risk of charges of conspiracy, the Senator from Tennessee would be doing a real favor. Instead of that, he seems inclined to fuzzle up the situation even more by consigning baseball's television problems to the Federal Communications Commission.

The Kefauver bill, as reported in the press, appears unnecessarily harsh and unrealistic. It wouldn't cure the minors of their ills but would kill them because they would die of malnutrition as soon as the majors withdrew their subsidies. And there would be little spending for talent by the majors when they lacked assurance that they might some day profit on investments.

Maybe Senator KEFAUVER just got confused from listening to Casey Stengel's testimony in Washington last summer. The Yankees' manager can confuse anyone.

Jimmy Waits, but Page Job Hope Is Fading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Mr. William McGaffin, of the Chicago Daily News, in my judgment, is one of the most factual reports on the troubles little Jimmy Johnson, Jr., has experienced.

I thought it would be of interest:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 6, 1959]
JIMMY WAITS, BUT PAGE JOB HOPE IS FADING—INTEREST IN CHICAGOAN'S CASE SLACKENING OFF IN CONGRESS

(By William McGaffin)

WASHINGTON.—Jimmy Johnson, Jr., flew in from Chicago on January 28, a 14-year-old Negro boy bursting with happiness.

Representative O'HARA, Democrat, of Chicago, had arranged for him to be a page in the House of Representatives.

This meant that Jimmy could attend the Capitol's page school and, perhaps, get a scholarship to go on from there to medical school.

After a week and a half of waiting, however, Jimmy still does not have the job. His nerves are so shot, his mother, Mrs. Avis Johnson, has had to take him to the doctor.

While Jimmy sits in the apartment of his aunt, Ethel Payne, nursing headache and disillusion, the interest his case aroused at first seems to be dying down.

Who was to blame for the fact that the job was not open when Jimmy arrived?

O'HARA asserted that he had received a go-ahead from the Democratic patronage committee to send for the boy.

The committee later told him, O'HARA said, that it had made a mistake and confused his recommendation with one made by Representative O'BRIEN, another Chicago Democrat and leader of the Illinois Democratic delegation.

Representative WALTERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the patronage committee, contends that O'HARA's version is incorrect.

After the initial shock wore off, however, it was not a question of who was to blame. Rather, could a job be made available for a boy who, through no fault of his own, was without one after being promised it?

O'HARA said he would fight for the boy. He would offer a resolution in the House to increase the number of pages from 50 to 51 so that Jimmy could be appointed to the vacancy.

WALTERS countered that this would do no good as there were 14 Congressmen ahead of O'HARA with greater seniority waiting to appoint pages.

O'HARA might still have gone ahead with his promised fight except that the Democratic leadership in the House gave him the cold shoulder treatment. And the white-haired veteran of many a political battle was unable to rally enough support among his personal friends to fight "city hall."

Is there an unwritten rule or a gentleman's agreement, inspired by the powerful southern Democrats who control the House, that a Negro shall not serve as a page in Congress?

Some northern Members of Congress are beginning to suspect this.

They say perhaps that is why there has never been a Negro page in either House, although there are two now in the Supreme Court.

The patronage committee denies that race had anything to do with this. But the committee is not lifting a finger to cooperate with two Congressmen who are attempting to provide a solution to Jimmy's problem.

Representative ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, and Representative AYRES, Republican, of Ohio, have offered to share Jimmy as a clerk and messenger boy in their offices until a page job opens up for him, providing Jimmy is allowed to go to the page school.

"This has left a terrible impression around the country," said AYRES. "A little kid who was promised something and then Congress reneged."

AYRES said that although Jimmy now had a job offer, he still would have to get the approval of the Democratic patronage committee before he could enter the page school.

An official of the school confirmed this. Chairman WALTER, however, challenged both the school official and the Congressman. He said the committee's approval was not necessary.

Budget Out the Window

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Feb. 6, 1959]

BUDGET OUT THE WINDOW

It hasn't taken the Democratic majority in Congress long to dash all hopes that the United States will operate on a balanced budget, as proposed by President Eisenhower, in the next fiscal year.

With the House of Representatives authorizing a new \$300 million fund for veterans housing, the Senate pushing through a \$2.9 billion omnibus housing bill and Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON fronting for an airport improvement bill, it is obvious that the Democrats have launched on a spending spree that is likely to run up a deficit similar to the \$12 billion one that we'll have during the present fiscal year ending in June.

The Democrats have shown definitely that they have no interest whatsoever in ending deficit spending or in making possible a reduction in Federal taxes any time in the foreseeable future. More than ever they are embarked on a high spend—high tax program with no thought whatever as to the consequences.

President Eisenhower in his press conference this week put the finger squarely upon their fiscal irresponsibility when he called upon those who vote for more spending also to vote to levy the taxes to pay for the expanded programs which they are espousing.

In their votes on housing and in the airport promotion program the Democrats have given no indication that they plan to provide additional taxes to pay for those programs. Apparently they have given no thought whatever as to how the money is to be provided.

Reckless spending of this sort can lead only to increased inflation and a further devaluation of the dollar.

There is only one thing good about the situation as it has developed. The respon-

sibility for the wild spending spree is definitely placed at the door of the Democratic Party. There can be no doubt about that.

Life Magazine Prize Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in last week's Life magazine sets out facts regarding international problems. All Members should read the timely warning which reminds us of the downfall of nations in world history when the people followed the easy way of profits and pleasure.

THE COST OF EASY OPTIONS—WE MUST RECOVER OUR PUBLIC CONSCIENCE TO DEAL WITH RUSSIA'S IRON PURPOSE

Beneath the particular controversies over the missile lag, foreign policy, and the budget, a deeper and more fearful concern has been stirring some of the most responsible U.S. leaders. Their worry: are Americans—undereducated, overentertained, tossing easily but restlessly in what Reinhold Niebuhr calls a state of sophisticated vulgarity, still capable of discharging their moral duty as citizens to their country and to the world they live in? When, they ask, will we realize that the very power and success of U.S. society demand more, not less, individual dedication from its citizenship.

The concern has lately been voiced by many men of widely separate outlooks—Vice President Nixon, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, Adm. Arthur Radford, Walter Lippmann, and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, among others. And increasingly it is stated not in terms of security but of survival. In the long run, they agree, nothing but an intense national effort can halt the hugely purposeful Soviet assault on free civilization.

The best recent statement of this informed worry comes from Adlai Stevenson, in a speech about the condition of survival. It makes sharp and disturbing reading—especially against the background of the current proceedings at the Communist Party Congress in Moscow where Khrushchev's re-Stalinized leadership loudly boasts of the speed with which communism can overtake and defeat the United States.

Stevenson first cites his own recent observations of the Soviet Union: "An overwhelming impression of thrust and purpose in most aspects of Soviet life * * * no effort, no dedication, no sacrifice is too great that may help realize the Communist Party's goals in Soviet society * * * no corner of humanity can be a matter of indifference to the Communists, because the whole human race is destined to become one in Communist brotherhood."

This Soviet purpose he sets against the dilatoriness of the United States, which like the self-distracting hare seems content to watch Khrushchev's curious armored tortoise plod steadily toward the race's finish line. ("Why should they be so busy?" he asks. "Why do we never meet an isolationist Communist?") The reason for the discrepancy: " * * * the Soviet Russians believe in their truth, as the men of the Western World once believed in theirs. * * * The fact that their faith is in many ways an evil perversion of the great propositions that once made the blood course in our Western veins

does not alter the fact that their tempo is dynamic and ours sluggish—even, I think, to ourselves.

"All our talk—in diplomacy, in strategy, in aid and trade . . . has been to a depressing degree purely defensive. We have offered aid not to help others but to shield ourselves. We watch the skies for other people's sputniks and listen to the telegraph wires for other people's moves. Yet we are the freemen of this universe, the children of liberty, the beneficiaries of unequalled abundance, and heirs of the highest, proudest political tradition ever known to man."

This U.S. defensiveness comes from a paralysis of will, which has nothing to do with any deficiency of technology or resources. It is a matter of people forgetting that political freedom can be sustained only by continuing individual commitment. As Stevenson continues: "The great German poet Goethe, who also lived through a crisis of freedom, said to his generation, 'What you have inherited from your fathers, earn over again for yourselves or it will not be yours.' We inherited freedom. We seem unaware that it has to be remade and reearned in each generation of man."

"Do not let us make any mistake about this. The natural government of man is servitude. Tyranny is the normal pattern of government. . . . For freedom demands infinitely more care and devotion than any other political system. It puts consent and personal initiative in the place of command and obedience by relying on the devotion and initiative of ordinary citizens."

"If freedom means ease alone, if it means shirking the hard disciplines of learning, if it means evading the rigors and rewards of creative activity, if it means more expenditure on advertising than education, if it means bachelor cooking and life adjustment courses in the schools, and the steady cult of the trivial and the mediocre, if it means—worst of all—indifference or contempt for all but athletic excellence, we may keep for a time the forms of free society, but its spirit will be dead."

"I believe we have had enough of adjustment, conformity, easy options and the least common denominator in our system. . . . The dreary failure in history of all classes committed to pleasure and profit alone, the vacuity and misery accompanying the sole pursuit of ease—the collapse of the French aristocracy, the corruption of Imperial Rome . . . all these facts of history do not lose their point because the pleasures of today are mass pleasures and no longer enjoyments of an elite. If we become a nation of Bourbons, numbers won't save us. We shall go their way. Vacuity and indifference are not redeemed by the fact that everyone can share in them."

"We do not slip into happiness. It is strenuously sought and earned. A nation glued to the television screen is not simply at a loss before the iron pioneers of the new collective society. It isn't even having a good time. No society has even spent as much as we do on drink and tranquilizers. Can we argue that this is evidence of universal fun?"

"How are we to defend freedom if, for the tyranny of external control, we substitute the clattering, clattering tyranny of internal aimlessness and fuss?"

"I doubt if any society in history has faced so great a moral challenge as ours, or needed more desperately to draw on the deepest source of courage and responsibility. Ours is the first human community in which resources are so abundant that almost no policies lie beyond our capacity for purely physical reasons. What we decide to do, we can do . . ."

The ease of modern living makes our responsibility for wise decision greater, not less. "In a century in which so many of the mentors of the public mind—from the psy-

chiatrists to the admen—speak to us in terms of what we owe to ourselves, may there not indeed have been a slackening of devotion compared with those days not so long distant, when what man owes to God and his neighbor was a common theme of public discourse?"

The implications of Stevenson's concern run too broad and deep to be confined to any set of rules or helpful nostrums. Some areas of U.S. life are more obviously targets of his criticism than others—in another speech last week Stevenson himself singled out the damage done to our schools by life adjustment educationists. But the prevailing climate of moral isolationism is found in every corner of our society, and almost everywhere it contrasts sadly with the immortal but energetic expansionism of the Soviet Union.

The United States grew into a great and free society precisely because the Nation could always count on a widespread instinct among its citizens for translating private moral conscience into public virtue, a virtue made operational by the citizens' action in the Nation's life. At the moment this instinct is dangerously weak. The resultant gulf between private conscience and public virtue cannot be bridged by easeful living, spectatoritis or a let-George-do-it indifference. The wider this gulf becomes, the narrower grows our margin of national survival.

Military Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address "Military Research and Development," delivered by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, at a luncheon of the American Management Association, held in Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, on January 14, 1959.

General Trudeau, a dedicated American is one of the best qualified men to discuss this subject matter of his address. His address should be as widely read as possible.

In making the remarks he did about Deputy Prime Minister Mikoyan of the Soviet Union, he is to be admired not only for his remarks, but for his courage in making them; remarks that at least 99 percent of our people agree with and approve. This is particularly so now in view of the release by the State Department of authenticated evidence of the inhuman and cold-blood killing of American airmen.

The Department of the Army is to be congratulated in having Lieutenant General Trudeau as one of its officers.

As the Department of the Army is a service branch of the Department of Defense, my observations above applies to this Department.

The address follows:

MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Marvin, distinguished guests, members of the American Management Association, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a pleasure

for me to visit this great center of financial and industrial management and especially so when I can address such a notable group of Americans devoted to the ideals of better management.

Management—its concepts and practice—is the directing force of our national economy. It determines the effectiveness of our Government, our foreign relations, world trade, and our entire way of life. There is a growing recognition of the fact that it is one of the most vital factors in the tremendous challenge that lies in the future, particularly now, when we have a late but a growing awareness of the economic struggle ahead.

Today, I would like to discuss this challenge in the light of military research and development and how this program is related to industry and, to put it bluntly, to our national survival.

One hundred eighty-one years ago—just about this same time of year—Gen. George Washington was trying to rebuild his shattered army at Valley Forge to meet an enemy seemingly invincible at that time. The British were waiting for spring to close in on him and the American people were dismayed, at least those courageous Americans who believed in freedom. It appeared likely that the infant American Republic would not survive its birth struggle. There were many people in our country at that time who, I am sure, said either openly or covertly, "If that fool Washington would go home and leave things alone, we'd be much better off and business could go on as usual."

This group of people, who never have stood by the colors very well, I am sure said the same thing at Bunker Hill. They thought our fellow Americans were fools to stand and face the British and possible death by waiting until they saw the whites of their eyes, despite the fact that these patriots were fighting for principle and for honor and for freedom.

Unfortunately, there is still an element that feels that way today and advocates peaceful coexistence with the Soviet bloc without any appreciation of what the end result of such a policy would be.

Some of you have probably seen Bunker Hill. It is not a very impressive hill. In fact, it is not a very big hill at all. But the men who were there were very tall men because they stood for principle. When our country takes a firm position today with respect to Quemoy and Berlin as frontiers of the free world, it is taking the same attitude that those courageous men took at Bunker Hill and Valley Forge long years ago, even though the purpose be somewhat different. This has been done in spite of those weaklings who haven't the courage and of some who haven't the desire to support our national position in these difficult, delicate times; in fact, they constantly seek to dilute and destroy our national will to resist the ravages and inroads of world communism.

Now it was during this heartbreaking winter at Valley Forge that an American soldier sat down one night to write, and by the flickering light of his campfire, on a drumhead, he wrote as follows: "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country."

This soldier was, as some of you may have guessed, Tom Paine. And the paper was the first of his many pamphlets titled "The American Crisis." While there are many points in the philosophy that Tom Paine expounded to which I do not agree, and I am sure some of you disagree also, we would have a hard time finding any fault with this particular thought.

A little later he said again: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom,

must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it."

I stand shoulder to shoulder with you members of the American Management Association and with real Americans everywhere who are willing to stand by their responsibilities for the privileges of reaping the blessings that have been bestowed on our country and retaining them for our children. We must do it with our whole strength and our whole mind and our whole spirit. I hope, and I know, that there are among us here no summer soldiers who are going to shrink in any crisis, and it is reassuring to me today to stand before such a group dedicated to the ways and means of keeping our Nation strong and uppermost in the struggle for freedom.

Our blessings of freedom today are being seriously challenged by an enemy who is powerful, fanatic, shrewd, ruthless, and completely unscrupulous. The Communists regard the struggle between themselves and ourselves as a matter of life and death. And it is truly that. Anyone who studied the tenets of Marx, Engels, Stalin, and Lenin cannot help but appreciate what these people, the proponents of this philosophy of life—as between ours which represents the dignity and freedom of man, and theirs which represents the slave world—are intending to do as far as we are concerned.

Khrushchev, the latest exponent of the Communist philosophy, states it in his own words. He made it very short, and only used four words, five syllables: "We will bury you." And he continues to repeat that day after day. The policies he follows indicate clearly his intentions, and we would be completely stupid to disregard them.

The Communist intention is very clearly stated in their own words—to destroy us. Yet there is that segment of our population who would try to tell you otherwise, through ignorance or intent, who would try to lull you to sleep, who would try to make you lie down as the lamb with the wolf and expect to wake up in the morning.

We must either be prepared to defend ourselves adequately or be willing to accept the consequences. That is the national challenge today, and the question is up to us—the American people—and our leaders to recognize these problems.

To meet the challenge of the Communist economic, political, and military threat that they have fashioned, our National Government and the military services must carry out an expanded research and development program that will result in better ways and better means to meet that threat. I am sure the great Soviet success with their lunar probe will give added impetus to our own programs.

At this moment in another part of this great city the No. 2 man in the Soviet Union is trying to convince some of our business leaders that the bosses of the Kremlin are really great and well-meaning fellows and that we ought to give them large credits to equip their industry so that it can outstrip ours more quickly. Since by their own definition they are our enemy this would clearly be giving aid and comfort to them in my opinion. Only last year Khrushchev said, and I quote:

"Of course we must recognize that we cannot coexist externally. One of us must go to the grave. We do not want to go to the grave. They (the West) don't want to go to their graves, either. So what must be done? We must push them to their graves."

But now our visitor's personal charm, ready wit, and pleasant smile are given the wishful interpretation of representing a new and really friendly Kremlin. It is easy to effect a grin that is a photographer's delight (this seems to be modern proof that one is a success and a great fellow) but we need a cold appraisal of the verbal vodka that flows from

the Kremlin. It is alarming that this is so readily imbibed by many gullible people who accept the smiling face of Mr. Mikoyan as the proof and trademark of newborn sincerity, friendship, and integrity on the part of the Soviet despite the absence of any single action on their part to recede from or alter policies and programs that revulse the free world and foreshadow world chaos.

Our guest should be accorded courteous treatment by all means, whether he is here to borrow, bargain, bluff, or bludgeon—but if we have money to lend or invest and credit to give, let us turn our eyes to our friends in Latin America and elsewhere around the world who are trying to fend off the insidious and subversive pressures of communism by improving their stability and internal economy.

I would now like to turn to the military research and development programs, cover some of the more important aspects and point out where we need some bold steps forward. Following that, I would like to briefly examine research and development in industry and the combination of Government, military, and industrial research and development efforts as they affect our security for the future.

First, our Government research and development program.

As scientific and technological progress has accelerated in the past decade, so has the emphasis on research and development. I think it is a recognized fact that our ability to meet the military requirements in the next decade has largely been determined by research and development efforts which started several years ago. This is due to the present long leadtime cycle required under our system to produce operational weapons and equipment. We like to say that leadtime is the period from wanting to getting, or from "womb to boom." More specifically, it is the time from the initiation of a project until the finished hardware is delivered to the using troops.

At the present time, it takes an average of 8 to 10 years to complete this cycle. This is much too long. This time covers research, development, testing, engineering, and production. When compared to the Soviet leadtime of about 5 years, we can see that we have a serious problem between Government and industry to shorten this leadtime. And shorten it we must, if we are to match the wide and shifting range of Soviet capabilities. We can't compete in quantity with the manpower of the Soviet bloc, so it is necessary to be superior in weapons and material along with strategy and tactics if we are to assume a strong and adequate national posture and maintain it in the face of the Soviet threat. This means superior management, a dynamic research program and better utilization of our manpower.

I am not going to discuss the details and mechanics of the development cycle nor the corrective measures we are seeking to oil the gears of production. I do want to impress upon you the importance of shortening leadtime if we ever hope to establish a sustained advantage over the U.S.S.R. As an example, if a technological breakthrough were achieved today it would not be until 1966, or later, that a new family of developments could be operational. In contrast, the U.S.S.R. could acquire such new information 2 years later—or steal it from us meanwhile—and still beat us to the punch by 1 year with a similar weapon or a counterweapon. This is the real meaning of leadtime to us and the reason we are so conscious of the need for a drastic revision in our funding and management techniques to achieve a much shorter cycle of 4 years. This is a positive step to keep obsolescence from undermining our new developments.

You have undoubtedly noticed a definite tendency for centralized control of the national research and development effort. The

President has a scientific adviser, Dr. Killian, a new Federal Council for Science and Technology, and other organizations such as the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The important point is here that research and development is becoming such a big business with the Government that centralized direction of such effort is necessary. However, there is always a danger of becoming overcontrolled. Of course, this is a problem that is common not only to Government and the military services but also to industry as well. In these days of superior communications and rapid transportation we often neglect the proper decentralization of authority to commanders and operators on the ground. Instead of letting a responsible manager make a decision, he can more easily be told to make a phone call or asked to come to his superior's office by plane to discuss the problem. This shifts the decision away from the place where it can best be made on many occasions and is costly in time, money, and effort.

It's an area that we all have to watch very carefully in the future. We all know the basic rule of good management that warns against overstaffing as it so often dissipates authority among those who share no real part of the responsibility for the results of their actions.

In general, the national research and development program has achieved widespread recognition in recent years as a basic requirement for the continuing scientific and technological progress of our Nation and the free world. Our Government has expanded the national budget to reflect this emphasis and has organized more facilities to pursue the fields of research. The services in turn have devoted more funds to research and development as requirements for more expensive and complex weapon systems increase with the growing Communist bloc threat.

Now for the military research and development program.

Because of the present environment of military uncertainty, all of the services face a difficult task in creating and maintaining effective weapon systems to carry out their missions. As you know, the Army has the mission of winning the land battle as well as providing elements for air defense. It is our objective in research and development to provide the most effective weapons and materiel for our future Army. The scope of this research and development mission covers an extremely wide spectrum of developments and we feel our responsibility very keenly whether we are predicting future needs in mobility, communications, firepower or logistical support.

I know that you representatives of management deal with organizations and objectives a great deal, but I would like to say a few words about the Army's research and development organization as an example of the military effort. We monitor over 2,000 tasks in the 2 general areas of basic research and applied research and development. By and large, these projects are actually executed by the Army's seven technical services and civilian contracting agencies.

We conduct a substantial amount of basic research through industry and some 123 colleges and universities. Ten major fields and 74 subfields are covered from mathematics and materials research to human factors and nuclear effects. We must continue to emphasize this type of work. Without it there would be little future development. As a matter of fact, our technological progress today determines the state of the weapon art in any future period. We can never afford to neglect basic research which contributes the seed from which applied research and development not only extracts the crop of weapons but also redounds in so

many ways to the betterment of our civilian economy and the welfare of our people.

Inseparably related to management, proper funding is one of the most critical factors in our program. An effective research and development program capable of producing weapons and equipment superior to that of any potential enemy in a timely manner requires hundreds of millions of dollars in any given fiscal year. There has to be appropriate adjustments to this amount annually to accommodate rising state-of-the-art and cost trends. Some of the factors inherent in the increased funding required are interesting to investigate because of their impact on our national economy and their general application to industry and Government, as well as to the military.

First, the acceleration of technological advances leads to earlier obsolescence of materiel, requiring more frequent replacement. This is part of the reason for the Army's \$15 billion modernization program. As a result of rapid obsolescence, constant product improvement is required and it is seldom adequate. Bold steps forward are required in this area and these steps are often costly. While the horse and lance remained important weapons of warfare for more than 2,000 years, the manned airplane may last less than 100 years. Only man remains irreplaceable and we can hope that ultimately he will gain the wisdom to forgo the horrors of warfare.

Next, the decreasing value of the dollar serves to provide less and less return from each dollar expended. Based on comparative statistics, the Army can expect its current dollar to buy only 80 percent as much goods and services as dollars did 5 years ago. Projected to 1960 and translated in terms of the research and development program, this means that the money provided in our budget will procure 20 percent less than the dollar in the 1955 appropriation.

Third, the increasing cost of the more sophisticated weapon systems required in the modern Army further limits the return per dollar. The guided missile systems that became operational in 1953 such as the Nike and the Corporal are being replaced with newer systems today that cost several times more. Such is the cost of survival today in the face of the growing threat that confronts us but it is better to spend dollars than blood to preserve it.

The last factor is the increasing likelihood of hostilities without a thermonuclear exchange and with a possible restriction on the use of nuclear weapons. This requirement for dual approaches to satisfy conventional as well as atomic military needs—like the artillery piece that must be capable of firing either an atomic shell or an ordinary high explosive charge—further increases costs.

To secure the maximum advantage from available dollars, we must continue to eliminate projects that offer only marginal improvement. We don't have the funds to develop one-third of the projects that are favorably recommended to us. Consequently, we have to constantly review the developments already initiated or proposed and cut off those which appear to be only of marginal value.

Although I have not mentioned the role of management specifically, it is certainly up to military and Government management to terminate unprofitable projects of the type that I have just mentioned. This requires a definite degree of boldness, for you run head on into enthusiasts, backers, and manufacturers of these items who do not give in quietly. To keep our programs moving we must continually review and reject or cut off those at the bottom of the pile, while being aggressive but more selective in seeking newer developments for the future.

Another important action of management is to require a constant and studied boldness and alertness by scientists and tech-

nologists to seize upon new techniques and breakthroughs that continually change the research pattern. Such information must be quickly assimilated, disseminated, and exploited.

To take advantage of this rapid technological pace, concurrent research, development, production design and engineering is necessary in many cases. This is the "systems engineering concept" where production engineers enter the picture early. These two areas of research and development are certainly fundamental in any analysis of the relationship of the technological goals of the military to the profit goals of industry. I have covered some of these technological goals in a rather general manner so far, so now I would like to be more specific in this respect.

The military services seek weapons and materiel that can be produced in the shortest possible time. This equipment must be as foolproof as possible, yet rugged enough to withstand the rigors of a dusty, grimy, dirty, muddy battlefield under all types of environmental conditions. The equipment must be lightweight to provide the utmost mobility. Above all, it must reliably perform its particular function, whether it is a complex guided missile system or whether it is merely a new item of clothing designed to keep a soldier warm in the most extreme arctic conditions. Integrated into this must be the human factors concept of engineering this equipment, so that maintenance, and particularly, training can be performed by a man with only limited military experience. Some of our recent electronic developments like module packaging and rapid "go, no-go" checks are examples of this type of design and engineering which give full consideration to man-machine compatibility problems.

In addition to those characteristics of new materiel which reflect the latest state-of-the-art, the military also seeks a broad base of research and development experience that covers the various sciences and delves into the area of new materials, energy sources, radiation effects, and high frequency transmission systems. With a sufficient investigation of these areas, the requirements for future weapons and equipment can be more readily and better met.

Enough for the military side of research and development. Let's look at the industrial picture with which you are so familiar. I can only attempt a brief discussion in this area, but I would like to point out a few factors that I think are important.

As you well know, in our civilian economy, each corporation engages in research and development activities to increase its sales, either with new or improved products. The cost of such research and development must be borne completely by the corporation and will be reflected in the price of the product. Normally research and development by a corporation is done by laboratories and personnel within that organization or by contract. Generally speaking, the urgency of civilian research and development is dictated by economic factors and the rate of progress of such research activities is that which will give the most economical end result.

Research and development in industry is always a high risk business. The investment in research and development of products for the civilian market has to be considerable these days but industry must be able to please the customer with its newest products if its sources of profit are to continue. When a company is particularly successful in doing so, because of product innovations or improvements, the earnings are high enough to pay off many unsuccessful attempts. Therefore the same factors that govern military research and development—funding and management—achieve the same importance

with industry albeit the motivations are different.

Now when civilian research and development is combined with the military programs we find that industry faces monumental new requirements. And all of these considerations have to meet the added requirement for mass production in minimum production time.

There is quite an impressive list of requirements that must be achieved if the technological goals of the military are to be met. When you also consider the time-consuming contractual and budget procedures, you can see why there is a need for bold innovation at every level of the research and development process to include its management, funding, and administration.

On the national level again, it is mandatory that we increase our ability to better manage our resources, both material and human, if we are to cope with the Communist threat. If we feel that we can control our material resources by better research, engineering, development, and production methods, then perhaps we should look more closely at how we manage our human resources. I mean this: I believe we have failed seriously to advance our social sciences and their application at the same pace as we have advanced our physical sciences. This includes failures in the field of education and failure to indoctrinate our young people and our fellow workers with the ideals, morals, pride of accomplishment, initiative and acceptance of responsibility that made America great. Our philosophy of life needs a searching review.

Theodore Roosevelt expressed it this way: "The things that will destroy America are prosperity-at-any-price, peace-at-any-price, safety first instead of duty first, the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

Those are certainly words to think about and they rather indicate some of our present national attitudes toward life.

We cannot maintain the status quo of our economy and our way of life if we continue to look at ourselves and the world with the same old complacency that dictates holding the line and only advocates a higher standard of living for us with no willingness to make greater sacrifices or accept greater responsibilities on behalf of the free world. We need to regain the dynamism that energized us during the past century.

I believe that this directly bears on our national ability to project a more energetic research and development program in the military, industry or in government. Today, I have emphasized the military part of the research and development program and tried to indicate some of its objectives and technological goals as well as how it functions, at least within the Army. There are many ways to improve and broaden this vital program and I have stressed that the problem today is not so much one of shortages of material and human resources as it is the problem of better management and funding. Aggressive action in these two areas will result in better equipment and materiel for our future civilian as well as military needs and production by industry in a shorter lead time than we have now.

I opened my remarks with a bit of our rich American heritage which culminated in the establishment of our Nation years after that bitter winter at Valley Forge. Those men, those patriots, never ceased to take their eyes, their hearts, or their souls from the vision of independence. They came through the test by courageous action and not complacency for it was a most difficult task to even survive that environment in those times.

Liberty is a precious thing. It was bought with the blood of our fathers, and preserved by you and me and many of our sons within our lifetime. The signers who

pledgers their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor on July the Fourth, 1776, and the hundreds of thousands who gave their lives for America on this century's battlefields would look down on us with shame if they thought we would fail them now.

We must have a bold confident spirit in the fact of the Communist threat that endangers the free world today and a faith in our destiny as well as in our heritage. This is the kind of spirit that a fellow Vermonter of much earlier vintage had. His name was Ethan Allen.

After he had captured Ticonderoga and turned in the booty that he had captured, the Congress in its timidity considered turning the captured cannon back to the British, whereupon Ethan Allen wrote a letter to Congress and this is what he said among other things:

"I wish to God that America would, at this critical juncture, exert herself. She might rise on eagle's wings and mount up to glory, freedom and immortal honor if she but knew her strength."

Thank you very much. It has been a pleasure to be with you.

New Chairman of American Council on Education, Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, Distressed at Status of Education in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the new chairman of the American Council on Education is Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Oregon which is located in my hometown of Eugene. Dr. Wilson is the youngest chairman ever chosen for the council and is the first selected from west of the Mississippi. His honor is an honor for our State and the university. Dr. Wilson is concerned about the status of education in our country today. He urges wise investment in education to bring each of our children to his brightest potential. His remarks at a recent dinner in his honor are thought provoking. Portions of his address appeared in the January 30, 1959, edition of the Eugene Register-Guard. The story by Dan Sellard follows, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON'S WILSON WARNS COUNTING PENNIES HARMS EDUCATION
(By Dan Sellard)

SALEM.—America must not relax its attitude toward education, for tomorrow is looking in on us to see whether we are writing a prolog to tragedy or pages in an epic drama in which tomorrow can be a happy episode in a triumphant cavalcade. O. Meredith Wilson, University of Oregon president, said here Thursday evening.

Wilson spoke at a dinner gathering which honored him for his recent election as chairman of the American Council on Education. He is the youngest chairman ever chosen for the council and is the first west of the Mississippi.

About 150 guests were present at the dinner. Charles A. Sprague, Salem publisher and a former Governor of Oregon, was host.

Wilson expressed distress at America's status since the 19th century which has bred in us complacency, fed our national ego, quieted our pulse and stultified our efforts.

"There is merit in viewing the past as a prologue . . . but it is a fateful conceit for us or any nation to believe that we are the goal and that ours is the golden age."

To believe that "ours is the golden age," he said, "would mean that for western civilization this is the finale, and all since sputnik is but curtain call."

"Our history, read as prolog," he said, "should be searched for cause, in the hope that we may write a better script for what our children in their time may consider to be the final act."

The Nation has always invested generally in the minds of men, Wilson said, "but today we are faced with new difficulties, and if out of national conceit we spend our time in self-congratulation, we will be prologue to catastrophe."

THE HUMAN RESOURCES

"A sudden upsurge in the birthrate after World War II has presented us with the greatest crop of human resource in the history of our civilization," he continued "but at the moment when we should be congratulating ourselves and gladly making the appropriate investment to bring each of these children to his brightest potential, half the country is cautiously counting the educational pennies as though the perfection of our children were an extravagance rather than a prudent investment."

"Without support, education will fail and we will be prelude to tragedy," he said. "At the very moment that Russia, learning from our history, seems about to triumph through education, we threaten to make our education less general in its influence and more particular in its consequence."

QUOTED DE TOCQUEVILLE

Wilson quoted the French historian De Tocqueville, who in 1835 said that "There are two great nations in the world . . . the Russians and the Americans . . . the Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and commonsense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. . . . The principle instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. . . . Their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

Wilson said that "what DeTocqueville expressed so clearly 125 years ago we were unwilling to recognize until sputnik rang the alarms and brought us bolt upright from the couch on which we have been taking our cultural siesta."

After tracing the history of American culture and education, Wilson launched into a case for spending more public money for better and more teachers.

DANGER TO EDUCATION

Obsolescence must be plowed under . . . without new adaptations or inventions, the quality of education must decline, for our supply of qualified teachers in college is soon to be in shorter supply than it has been in secondary education.

"In order to provide instruction for this increase (100 percent of college students by 1970) 440,000 new teachers will have to be appointed . . . but during the period, only 220,000 doctor of philosophy degrees may be awarded if we are able to double for the next decade the output of the last. . . . But of the 220,000 doctors to be prepared, only 50 percent may be expected to enter teaching. . . .

"In other words, at a time when we are most concerned about the quality of the education we require for national security and economic prosperity, it appears certain that

only one in four of our men teachers will be prepared as well as we would like to hope."

A possible innovation to alleviate the teaching load, Wilson said, is television, but he urged that this innovation be viewed with "a word of warning."

DO "WITH" NOT "TO" STUDENT

"The act of teaching should not suggest doing something 'to' but rather 'with' a student . . . it is, therefore, regrettable to contemplate an American society that is conditioned only to receiving—to being told. . . . If discussion falls victim to mechanical invention both education and democracy must suffer."

In conclusion, Wilson made an eloquent plea for more money to change higher education in Oregon from an average system to one of distinction.

It is always distressing, Wilson said, "that when the biennial (budget) decisions must be made, to be caught up in a campaign to keep Oregon's education average."

"As a State we are eager to grow. We have launched a great centennial celebration to attract attention. But we overlook the obvious, most simple step."

"The difference between the costs of average and distinguished higher education is primarily expressed in faculty salaries and library resources."

OTHER COSTS FIXED

"The other costs remain fairly fixed. For a small percentage addition to our asking budget we could catch attention where it really counts."

"Distinguished faculty draws distinguished students and funds for research often many times the State's investment. If there is any thing I can do for Oregon, this would be most useful: To persuade my people that investment in distinction would be prudent."

"Of course, it would have been prudent," he continued, "to have invested today's missile money in the last decade's education, for the success or failure of each countdown is but a symptom of our state of knowledge."

But we must remember that we are prologue, too, and that we must invest again, now. . . .

The wisdom and courage of today's investors in education will be measured in Oregon's growth and security tomorrow," he concluded.

Interview With Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island—An Elder Statesman at 91 Looks at the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, by the U.S. News & World Report, published in the issue of that magazine for February 13, 1959.

In my opinion, this interview with the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island is noteworthy, because it was participated in by a man who has seen much of the changing history of our country and the world. He has observed with wisdom and concern what has occurred and has, I believe, a good

deal of good advice for the rest of us.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR GREEN—AN ELDER STATESMAN AT 91 LOOKS AT THE WORLD TODAY

Question. Senator GREEN, what do you think is the most exciting period you've lived through?

Answer. Oh, I think this is.

Question. Why would you pick this period?

Answer. Well, I think possibly because more things are happening, faster and over a larger area. We are spreading out into other worlds now. And, partly because I am more susceptible to these changes, I find them more exciting.

Question. You are in the middle of them—Answer. Yes, yes; I have a part in it and it is wonderful, I think—a wonderful time to be alive for any of us, but particularly those of us who possibly have something to do about it.

Sometimes it works the other way, of course, and it is depressing to think something ought to be done and it isn't, and you can't get it done, but I think it's better to try, even if you fail, than not to try.

Question. What is your general feeling, Senator, about the kind of world we are living in today, compared with earlier years?

Answer. Well, we are living so much faster today in every way—physically and every other way.

Question. Have you found that you can live more slowly than the general mass of the people?

Answer. No, I don't live any more slowly. Question. Do you think things are moving in the right direction in Europe?

Answer. Well, we are moving so fast—

Question. Are they moving toward us, toward our ideas of what should be done?

Answer. Oh, I think so. I think the rest of the world is developing. They are going through some of the things we went through. The world has gotten so small now—we have to deal with the whole world. Even when I was a boy, our world was very much more limited than it is now.

Question. Are there many big men in the Senate today—and were there many big men years ago?

Answer. I don't think the big men in the Senate seemed as big at the time as they do now, when we look at it historically. Don't you think it makes a difference?

Question. Do you think the system of election by the legislatures gave us better men—more qualified men—than we get now through the primaries?

Answer. I don't think you had as great a variety. No, I think it's a better system—the elected system.

Question. In your quarter century on Capitol Hill, what changes in the service that Congress renders to the people have impressed you most? Hasn't it become more international minded?

Answer. Oh, yes, it has; but that isn't owing to Congress—that's owing to the world outside. I think the Congress has changed as the world has changed.

Question. We read in the papers all about the nuclear age. Are you fearful of our future? Do you think we're going to be destroyed?

Answer. What difference does it make?

Question. Does it make no difference?

Answer. No.

Question. Why? Are you a fatalist?

Answer. I'm going to do my duty as I see it as long as I'm here, and if I'm destroyed and everybody else is at the same time, what difference does it make—for me, for them, for any of us? Here where we are talking about all these worlds—suppose this earth is

blown up by sputniks or some new inventions or discoveries.

Question. You don't have any fear about the future, then?

Answer. What is there to fear?

Question. Being blown up—

Answer. I fear a lot worse things might happen to us than being blown up.

Question. Should we stop worrying about it and get down to business?

Answer. That's right. It's our job to do the best we can with things as we find them—try to improve them—we can't make them perfect; we realize that.

Question. You don't think it's wise to look into the future too much?

Answer. Yes; I do. Look to the future. But I wouldn't worry about it. You can't change it probably very much—perhaps you can.

Question. Are you a fatalist? Do you believe what's going to happen is going to happen, anyway?

Answer. No. I think that men can do a great deal to affect their own careers and to affect the career of their country.

Question. Do you think there is much difference between the Republican and the Democratic Parties today?

Answer. I think it's much less than it has been.

Question. Have the Republicans come over toward the Democrats?

Answer. More of that than the other, yes. I think they have become more "liberal."

Question. Do you think the Democrats have become less "radical," and they have gone over to the middle of the road in both parties?

Answer. I haven't seen many signs of that.

Question. Do you think they are still as "radical" as they were in the thirties?

Answer. I think it sways back and forth a little bit. It's more the mood for the moment than it is the plan of the centuries. We're not planning for the good of the generation. Perhaps we ought to, but I don't think we do. How can you these days? A new invention comes along, and everything is changed in a week or a month or a year.

Question. Senator, you're a great traveler. Would you like to take a trip to the moon?

Answer. Yes, I would.

Question. You would volunteer to go on the first planet ship?

Answer. I never ask for invitations.

Question. You've been asked this a lot of times, but how do you account for the fact that you are looking so well at the age of 91?

Answer. Because I had a lot of warnings when I was young. I was an invalid. I had everything—all the usual children's diseases and a lot of extras—everything—pleurisy, pneumonia, typhoid fever—everything.

I was sick most of the time, so I couldn't go to school—not well enough when I was a little boy. I had tutors. Then I got better and better and, when I was old enough, my father sent me to a private school about a mile and a quarter north of where we lived. I remember the winter and I thought I would freeze to death. I withstood it and I got toughened up and I had all the other things I could have so I was pretty well after that and got better and better. I became interested in athletics.

Question. Do you still walk back and forth to the Capitol every day?

Answer. I frequently walk up in the morning—that's 2½ miles.

Question. Do you do any other exercising?

Answer. It all depends on whether I can find the time. Now it gets worse and worse. The longer I am here the worse it is—the less time there is.

Question. You played tennis until recently—

Answer. Yes, I played until about 2 years ago. It was a question of time more than

anything. I like to play singles better than doubles.

Question. Do you exercise in the gym now, Senator?

Answer. I don't get time. I wish I did.

Question. You did that regularly for many years—

Answer. Yes, yes. I've had less and less time for myself.

DIET: "I EAT ANYTHING"

Question. Do you follow any particular diet?

Answer. No, no—luckily. I go out to so many dinner parties that I eat anything that is put before me.

Question. And you live through it?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You've spent a good deal of time abroad in recent years, haven't you?

Answer. Well, yes, I went abroad first in 1889. My grandfather thought that a young man—had the old idea about "finishing"—he ought to be "finished" by a trip abroad. I thought it was a very good idea, so he sent my two cousins who were just a little bit older and myself on a grand tour of Europe.

Question. And you have been going pretty regularly ever since?

Answer. Off and on.

Question. But in the last few years you've made official trips abroad, haven't you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. There has been a lot of criticism of our educational methods—

Answer. Oh, I don't think that boys and girls study here as hard as they do abroad.

Question. Should they study harder?

Answer. They should. But I don't think they do.

Question. You went to college both in Europe and here. How would you compare the two?

Answer. Well, it depends. They prepare you for a different life, perhaps. You usually decide there much earlier than you do here what you are going to do in life. In some ways one is ahead, and in some ways the other.

But I do think that, for instance, a German boy had to study a little harder than any American boy that I knew here. I know one of my friends, I remember in those days, could recite a whole book of poetry—I mean the whole thing right straight through—and things like that. They memorize a great deal.

Question. Does that train the mind very much?

Answer. That's one kind of training and the other is to develop your powers of thinking and reasoning. There are different parts of your human brain that you want to develop more.

Question. Do they narrow down the people they are going to educate?

Answer. The universities there had a different standard right along. They didn't care whether you studied or not. It was up to you. I don't think there was any more responsibility developed there than here. I regret to find the tendency seems to be the other way here.

They build these dormitories, for instance, at colleges, and they used to be standing free. Now they like to build them with moats around them, so the boys can't get in and out easily. They have to go through the gates—like they do it in English colleges. They keep tabs on them—when they go out, when they go in.

In Germany they go to the other extreme. They don't pay much attention to the boys. If they want to get a degree, they've got to pass an examination. In order to pass the examination, they've got to study hard to do it.

Question. They put the responsibility on the youth rather than on the teacher?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Do you think an individual's life is fuller now than it was when you were a small boy?

Answer. I think so. I think the average individual life is too crowded. That's the reason they do most things half well.

Question. Is that true on Capitol Hill?

Answer. Yes, certainly.

Question. Who was the first President of the United States you remember, Senator?

Answer. I've known every President—I've met personally every President—beginning with Hayes. Except Garfield—I never met Garfield.

Question. Of the Presidents you have known, which one has impressed you most?

Answer. I haven't known many of them intimately. I've known both Roosevelts—Theodore and Franklin—very well, indeed. I admired Woodrow Wilson very much indeed. He was a scholar, made great sacrifices—he'd go the limit. He practically died for his country. And he had a clean mind, clear. He was more scholarly than those I've known. He worked a great many reforms. He had a deep knowledge of government; he impressed me that way.

Question. Who do you think was the best politician of the Presidents?

Answer. I think Franklin Roosevelt.

Question. How about Teddy Roosevelt? He was pretty successful—

Answer. Not as good. He came to Providence, when he was first running, and he made a rather antiprotection speech. As the subject of tariffs was foremost in the minds of most conservative Rhode Islanders, that was the wrong speech to make there. I am told he never mentioned that subject again during his New England campaign.

I was very fond of him. I knew him very well, indeed. I stayed at his house. I had a standing invitation—a room at my disposal whenever I wanted to go and stay there.

Question. Even though you were a Democrat?

Answer. Yes; I knew all his family well.

I shocked him sometimes. I remember one Sunday morning he came downstairs in his togs—"Rough Rider" stuff—and I didn't have any. And he said, "Here, take an ax. Come out and help me chop down some trees."

And I said, "Well, I won't come down and help you chop down some of your trees because I've got on my 'Sunday-go-to-meeting' clothes, but I'll come around and boss the job." And I realize this was something terrible, and a sort of gasp went around the room because I had the nerve to say that to the President.

He asked me to be his campaign manager when he ran on the Bull Moose ticket. I had just come back from my first experience of a Democratic National Convention in Baltimore. When I got home, I found this request from Roosevelt to be his campaign manager for New England. Of course, I wasn't going to do it, couldn't do it, and had to write him to that effect.

But I ran for Governor that year and I never mentioned the fact—and there was a Bull Moose ticket in Rhode Island, too, but I didn't think it was decent to take advantage of a friendship and hurt him. And so I didn't and I got licked, but that wasn't the only cause.

Well, anyway, I never told anybody about it, except a few intimate friends who wouldn't tell. And I was staying, a couple years afterward—they were having a dinner party at Sagamore Hill, and somebody said, "Well, Mr. President, I guess nobody ever turned you down when you asked for anything."

"Oh, yes," he said, "they did, and he is right at this table now." Then he told the story.

Question. Senator, does government better serve the interest of the people today

than when you were trying to bring about governmental reforms in Rhode Island back in the thirties?

Answer. Oh, I don't know. I can't compare those parts of the government. I think that Rhode Island and Pennsylvania were supposed to be the worst-governed States in the Union then. And by the time I got through with my State—I was elected Governor and I changed over the whole government—everything, including the whole supreme court and everything else.

Question. Senator, when you changed over the whole government, do you mean that you changed the people in it, or did you change the system—reorganize the government itself?

Answer. I reorganized it. I had the same constitution and the same laws. I changed those gradually, too.

Question. What changes did you bring? How were you able to get hold of the situation?

Answer. In the 1934 election I got a majority in both the senate and the house.

On January 2, 1935, the date of my second inauguration as Governor, the general assembly met at noon and I was sworn in for my second term about 11 p.m. that night.

Previous to my being sworn in, the house and senate met and several measures which had been carefully prepared as a result of several very secret meetings held at my home in Providence were introduced and passed immediately. I remember one bill vacated the five supreme court places held by the Republicans. The grand committee of the general assembly then elected five new judges—three Democrats and two Republicans.

At that time we had in Providence a Republican State board of public safety which really controlled the Democratic city of Providence.

The general assembly passed a bill repealing the State Board of Public Safety Act, and I named Ed Kelly superintendent of State police and temporary safety director for the city of Providence.

This bill passed the general assembly about 10:30 p.m. on the night of January 2, and I recall very well that I had my secretary, Eddie Higgins, take my car and chauffeur and deliver personally, at that time of night, letters from me to the board of public safety letting them know that they had been fired. The next morning I saw many broad smiles on the faces of the policemen and firemen in the city of Providence.

The assembly, at my suggestion, abolished the office of finance commissioner and created the office of budget director and comptroller—the appointee to be named by the Governor. We also had a bill passed declaring vacant the office of high sheriff of Providence County and reduced the term from 5 to 3 years.

We also passed bills that day restoring home rule to a number of cities and towns. The control of cities and towns had been taken away from these municipalities and placed in the hands of this Republican-controlled machine.

We passed a bill that day providing for the consolidation of about 80 overlapping bureaus and commissions. We set up this reorganization to take effect in 60 days and created under it 11 new departments in the State government.

I recall that at that time Colonel McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, became very upset about what we did in Rhode Island, and the story is to the effect that he cut out one of the stars from the American flag which hung in the Chicago Tribune Building. From what I am told, someone tipped the colonel off that he was desecrating the flag, and he had it removed from the lobby. I did not know for years why the colonel was interested in Rhode Island politics, but I later found out that one of the stockholders

of the Tribune lived in Rhode Island and was very active in Republican circles.

One incident I recall regarding the so-called bloodless revolution on the night of January 2, 1935, is regarding the Republican judges who were still in office. As I recall it, the judges were in a committee room waiting to be escorted to my second inauguration. Of course, there was considerable delay because the general assembly was busy passing these bills and I was busy signing them.

The judges sent some of their sheriffs out to find out what was going on and they soon learned that they might be out of office shortly. In order to save them some embarrassment, I went down to the committee room and saw the chief justice and the presiding justice of the superior court. I told them what was going to happen.

As a matter of fact, the legislature was at that moment passing the bills vacating their offices. I suggested that they might be somewhat disconcerted if they were to stay around, and I understand that they called their sheriffs and all went back to the courthouse.

The next day they were all out of office at 12 noon and the new supreme court, which had been elected in grand committee and sworn in by me, had taken over in the supreme court chambers.

LAWYER AND BUSINESSMAN

Question. Senator GREEN, it isn't often that someone serves in business and public life as many years as you have. Did you start as a lawyer?

Answer. Yes. I went to college—Brown, and Harvard Law School then to the universities of Bonn and Berlin. Then I came back and I practiced law—went in with my father.

The eldest son in every generation is a lawyer. My great-grandfather, the eldest son, was a lawyer. His eldest son, my grandfather, was a lawyer. My father, the eldest, was a lawyer. I was the eldest son, so I am a lawyer. I am not married. My eldest nephew of the name is a lawyer, and I take for granted his son is going to be a lawyer.

Question. How long did you practice law?

Answer. I still am, I suppose—theoretically, anyway. I have a law office in Providence.

Question. Then you went into business after that?

Answer. I never ceased being a lawyer—I am still a lawyer.

Question. You were head of a bank in Providence. Did you give full time to that?

Answer. I couldn't give full time to all these different things, although I did them all contemporaneously. I was chairman of the Providence Plantations Bank; I started it, and I am still chairman of the board, and I know they don't resent that I hang on because, on my 90th birthday, they gave me a large silver punchbowl and ladle.

And I was president of the J. P. Coates Co., the thread company.

Question. You were also a director of the National Exchange Bank in Providence?

Answer. Yes, for many years.

Question. You were officer and director of various railroad companies?

Answer. All of them in Rhode Island.

Question. You've also had an active participation in some of the public institutions there, too. You are a member of the board of fellows and a trustee in Brown University.

Answer. Oh, that's just like being loyal to the family. Ever since Brown University started—except for half a dozen years some member of my family has been on the board of trustees.

My great-great-grandfather's brother was the first—and for 2 months he was the only—student in the college. They had a president and only one student. So nobody can date further back than that, you see, or as far back. So I am a trustee, I am a

member of the board of fellows, I am the senior fellow. When the president is absent, then the senior member of the board of fellows takes his place. So I've been president of that, too.

Question. Before you were elected Governor of Rhode Island in 1932, you had already lived a pretty full life. When you became Governor you were 64—an age when most people are retiring. Was the governorship your first elective office?

Answer. No; 25 years before I was elected to the general assembly. That's the first taste I had of politics, the first active part I had in public office.

I was on some good government drive—they had a terribly rotten machine in Rhode Island—and I saw the rotten government we had. Rhode Island and Pennsylvania were the worst governed State in the Union. "Corrupted, contented," was the combination of adjectives there—it applied to both—and I said, "Well, I am going to change this if I can."

So I started out then and I ran for public office and got licked most times. For 25 years off and on I ran for something—the general assembly or Congress or something or other. I was elected Governor in 1912 but firmly believed as do many others, that I was counted out by the then Republican-controlled State board of elections. The Republican machine controlled everything, including the courts.

Question. How did you overcome that?

Answer. Well, I kept on running and I guess they got tired of voting against me.

NO PLANS TO RETIRE

Question. Do you plan to stay in the Senate?

Answer. In the last campaign they said I was too old to run. At first I thought the proper thing was to ignore it. Then I said it was going too far, I guess I would have to tackle it—so I did. And I said I intended to stay in the Senate until I was 100.

Question. How old was your last opponent?

Answer. Middle aged.

Question. Did you have much difficulty with that campaign?

Answer. No; I had more votes than I ever had before. Every time I have run I have gotten more than I have the time before.

Question. You have gotten practice each time. What's the secret of that success?

Answer. Honesty is the best policy. You'll find it so as you grow up.

Minnesota Provides a Model Report for State Studies of Radiation Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in this atomic age the problem of radiation control is at once one of the most serious problems and one of the most neglected problems. The State of Minnesota has faced up to the problem. Under a unanimous consent previously granted, I am including here a copy of the review prepared for the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, famed atomic publicist, of the Minnesota report.

BASIC DATA REGARDING ATOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS IN MINNESOTA

(Review by R. E. Lapp)

The State of Minnesota has issued a report on atomic energy which other States might

well use as a model for their own studies. A Governor's committee consisting of more than a score of scientists (mostly from the University of Minnesota) and specialists compiled a very useful sourcebook on atomic energy which should be of value beyond the State's boundaries.

The report presents basic data on the science and technology of the atom, atomic power and radiation applications. No attempt to treat the military applications is made since this is obviously beyond the control of the State. There are some 20 pages devoted to summarizing measurements of radioactivity in Mississippi River samples and in air. These data amplify the summary reports published for the Nation by the Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). The availability of fallout data at a State level will be valuable in resolving local arguments about fallout.

A survey of radiation exposure was made within the State of Minnesota and it was found that X-ray shoe fitting machines ranged in dose from 0.4 to 23 roentgens per exposure (there was an estimated 100,000 exposures per year). It was found that there are 55 radioisotope licensees in Minnesota. Detailed data on the radiation dosage from diagnostic X-rays are presented.

It remains to be seen whether or not the States can handle the complex problems of radiation control; it is clear, however, that some States are fully aware of the problems and are looking for solutions.

Foreign Economic Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to an article that recently appeared in the Boeing News of Seattle, Wash.

I have been one of those who has constantly tried to point out that these foreign aid programs—which this country has been engaged—is nothing more nor less than buying foreign competition for the American worker and farmer.

The president of Boeing Aircraft, Mr. Allen, recently pointed out some most significant facts. Why anyone cannot see that by promoting these economic foreign aid theories all over the world for other countries—that eventually these countries would be bringing back to our country products which have been made with their cheap labor—which causes workmen in our country to lose employment.

It seems to me that this article points out very dramatically that we are now reaping what we have sown.

How anyone believes that we can compete in the world markets with our labor price of \$1.87—with other countries' cheap labor of 25 cents an hour—is beyond my comprehension.

I commend this article most highly:

America is entering a new era of worldwide economic competition which will have a tremendous impact on business, labor, and our standard of living. So declared Boeing President William M. Allen, in an address this week to the West Coast General Management Conference. Because his discussion of the road ahead deals with matters of tre-

mendous importance to all Americans, Boeing News carries here some of Allen's comments:

COMPETITION FROM ABROAD

"In the years since the Second World War . . . there was a domestic market hungry for goods. . . . We could offset lower wages in other countries through our mastery of mass production techniques. That era . . . has come to an end.

"The list of U.S. companies now having products made overseas for sale in U.S. markets is growing every week. In addition, foreign manufacturers of various important products are rapidly increasing their participation in our domestic market.

IMPACT NOT YET APPRECIATED BY AMERICAN PEOPLE

"Just as we ended our political isolation when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, so today we are ending our economic isolation. The results of internationalization in military and political terms are all around us. . . . Changes of the same magnitude are now in the making as a result of the internationalization of markets. Such a change will have an impact on business, on labor, and on our standard of living to a degree not yet appreciated by the American people.

OTHER COUNTRIES USING MASS PRODUCTION, TOO

"We are now entering upon a competitive world economy. Ten years ago—even 5 years ago—most American producers could take solace in the confidence that they could produce better goods at a price competitive with foreign makers—by reason of the American's mastery of mass production techniques. In the meantime, other countries of the world are in the process of developing an industrial base which utilizes mass production and marketing techniques.

WE BEGIN WITH TWO HANDICAPS

"In endeavoring to compete with foreign producers, we begin with two basic handicaps. One is a wage scale that is dollars above those paid in competing nations. The other is lack of drive, in comparison with the will to work and the will to face up to economic reality which exists in certain other countries of the world.

PRICING OURSELVES OUT OF WORLD MARKETS

"Here at home, we have been and are in an inflationary spiral . . . So long as increases in wages do not reflect true increases in productivity, prices will increase—or profits (the use of which is one way of increasing productivity) will be squeezed further—or both. Thus, we face the prospect of pricing ourselves further out of world markets—and out of our own as well. We face also the possibility that capital, needed for greater mechanization of industry, will not be attracted to industry in this country. The rate of return on invested capital has declined steadily since 1918.

NOTHING SHORT OF A NATIONWIDE EFFORT

"It seems clear that the American people must exert their very best efforts to increase the productivity of labor and of invested capital in the years ahead, if we are not to be left well behind in the coming competition for world markets. Nothing short of a nationwide effort is likely to bring about percentage increases in the productivity of labor greater than the increases in the cost of labor which appear to lie ahead.

CAN WE MEET THIS CHALLENGE?

"Can we successfully meet this economic challenge? The answer, of course, rests in the attitude of the American people. There must be a general recognition that we have no God-given right to live at a higher standard of living than the rest of the world. We are entering an era in which we cannot maintain our economic position if we are unwilling to put the same amount of effort into a given product as do our competitors for an equivalent reward.

CRITICAL ROLE OF LABOR LEADERS AND
BUSINESSMEN

"The President's economic report emphatically states that the future well-being of our country is dependent upon our ability to control the inflationary spiral with a resultant stability of prices. You have no doubt read that his statement regarding the responsibility of labor leaders in this effort have met with little enthusiasm in certain quarters. The President said 'Leaders of labor unions have a particularly critical role to play, in view of the great power lodged in their hands.'

"However, the President did not ignore the vital role of the businessman. He said: 'Businessmen must redouble their efforts. They must wage a ceaseless war against costs. Production must be on the most economic basis possible.'

SOMETHING WITHOUT WORKING FOR IT

"There is a need to get back to basic principles. We cannot expect to get something without working for it. We must stop the inflationary practice of paying more for less. The American people must understand that their welfare and their country's welfare are dependent upon a return to these basic principles."

Communist Penetration in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the challenge of communism today is primarily its threat to the peace of the world and the many, many directions in which its subversive tentacles reach throughout the world. Like every American, I am very concerned with the problem and, over the years, I have acted to expose communism and its dangers.

There was recently brought to my attention an address given by a friend of mine who is well known throughout the United States and all of Latin America. It carefully develops the penetration of the Red threat to this hemisphere. This gentleman, who devotes much of his time to this effort, is Mr. Pedro de Mesones, of Peru, who delivered an address to students of Latin America at Fordham University, December 9, 1958.

Mr. Mesones comes from a distinguished pioneer family of Peru who have contributed much to the development of that nation both in its economy and through many philanthropies. His travels and study in many countries qualify him for his post as permanent delegate in the United States for the Inter-American Federation for the Defense of the Continent, an organization of citizens of all Latin American nations, the United States and Canada, who carry on the fight against communism. It is their aim, through extension of friendship between these nations, to solve the mutual problems brought about by Communist assaults upon our shores. I commend the efforts of Mr. Mesones.

I believe this address would be beneficial to all the people and under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include it in the Record at this time:

COMMUNIST PENETRATION IN LATIN AMERICA
(By Pedro de Mesones)

The great French political writer Charles Maurras once said that "contempt is not a political attitude." I should like to borrow that phrase and apply it to communism. To be contemptuous of communism would indeed be a grave mistake, for it is the most intelligent and systematic challenge our western Christian society has ever had to face.

Taking a leaf out of the book of another great Frenchman, Marshal Foch, let us apply the same system he used in the First World War whenever he was confronted with difficult situations created by the German Army. "De quoi s'agit il?" What is it all about? If we consistently tackled our problems from this angle, we should greatly facilitate their solution. What, then, is communism all about? First, we must understand what it is. Secondly, the nature of the mechanism whereby it expands. Thirdly, how we can block its advance.

Communism may have been, in its beginnings, and above all in the minds of its first theorists, the social ideology of the working class. According to Marx, the progressive concentration of capital would inevitably produce a type of society in which all the means of production would be controlled by a tiny minority, which would hold the rest of the population in subjection. This polarization of forces would result in the seizure of power by that immense majority of the dispossessed, either through universal suffrage (social-democracy) or by means of revolution (communism).

According to this thesis, the countries best fitted for socialism or communism would be those which had achieved the highest degree of industrial concentration: Germany, Britain, Belgium, the United States, and so forth. Countries with an agrarian social structure, on the other hand, would be practically impervious to socialist ideas.

Events, however, have not borne out these Marxist predictions. Those four highly industrialized countries I have mentioned are ruled by Social-Christian parties, in Germany and Belgium, and by traditional conservatism in England and the United States. Yet, agrarian Russia, backward China, and Korea and Vietnam, which have hardly emerged from the Middle Ages, are dominated by the Communist Party. What has happened? What is it all about, as Foch would say? Simply this: Marxism has triumphed, thanks to a factor disdained by the Marxists—the decisive action of a human minority. It was the Bolshevik Party, a small group representative of the Russian working class—itsself hardly 2 percent of the population—which seized power in Russia by means of two completely anti-Marxist platforms: Peace and the agrarian revolution, characterized by the bourgeois slogan of redistribution of the land. Lenin, a strategical genius, liquidated Kerensky and all the political and social philosophies in harmony with Russia's historical development in 1917 and seized power. From this position of power, with the aid of the slogan "Soviets plus electrification", with the iron discipline of the Communist Party, he diverted Russia's historical course and built on that immense, leaderless, agricultural country, without industrial tradition, technology, or capital, what is now the world's second industrial nation. We must not, therefore, underrate communism. Charles Maurras was right.

From the standpoint of Marxist theory, the countries best adapted to Communist penetration are still those of Western Europe and the United States, but, with the sole exceptions of Italy and France, where the local Communist parties have attained great numerical strength, communism is practically nonexistent in the rest of the indus-

trial zone. On the other hand, it has triumphed throughout central and eastern Europe and has made serious inroads in the agricultural and backward continents of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

The way in which communism took power in central Europe is common knowledge. The Red army, which occupied the whole area, insisted upon the formation of popular-front governments. There sprang up in 1945 in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, a group of popular governments composed of representatives of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, and parties representing the poor peasants. Communist participation, at the beginning, varied between 20 and 25 percent of the members of the assemblies and cabinets. In the second phase, the Red army, using reasons of security as a pretext, asked—in reality, demanded—that the Ministers of Interior, War, and Propaganda should be members of the Communist Party. With these key government posts in their hands, they launched the third phase: the discovery of plots against the new regime, always organized by Socialists or peasants. Step by step, and always in defense of the state, the Communists gradually increased their participation in the government until they achieved a complete and absolute monopoly.

The tactics adopted in China were different. There, the Communists of Mao joined forces with Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists in a struggle against a common enemy—Japanese imperialism. But while Chiang devoted all his efforts to this single purpose, the Communists were penetrating his organizations and gaining control of key positions in the country. Suddenly, once the common purpose of the struggle had disappeared with the collapse of Japan, Mao turned on Chiang Kai-shek and, in an amazingly rapid campaign, expelled him from the mainland, uniting the ancient land of China with the Communist world.

This brings us face to face with a paradox whose consequences may prove fatal for the course of civilization. While the highly industrialized areas of the world—western and northern Europe, Britain, the United States, Canada, and Australia—remain impervious to communism, the agricultural areas of central and eastern Europe, Russia, China, and parts of Korea and Vietnam are completely under the control of communism. It is from this vantage point that the Communists begin the struggle for the conquest of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. On the result of that struggle depends the future of our western, Christian culture.

In Asia, the struggle has favored communism from the outset. Outer Mongolia, Sinkian, and Tibet, occupying peripheral political and geographical positions, have been completely absorbed by the Communists. There is danger of absorption in Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, and Ceylon. There is already one state in the vast subcontinent of India—Kerala—with a Communist government, and several others in which the Communist Party, with a parliamentary representation only slightly inferior to that of the Congress Party, hopes to come to power with the next change of government. There is Communist penetration in Nepal and in a number of border states between India and China.

In the Near East, Russia has used the emergent nationalism of the Arab world and its opposition to the State of Israel to mask profound penetration. The Syrian and Egyptian armies are being supplied with Communist arms; yesterday's newspapers announced the shipment of Soviet arms to Iraq and everybody knows about the \$100 million loan granted to Nasser for the construction of the Aswan Dam, on the Nile. The Communist Party is lying low in Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco, but it is

numerically powerful and only awaits a propitious occasion to assert itself. There is a strong Communist influence in the new African Negro state of Ghana and the political leader Sekou Toure, of Guinea, which recently won its independence from the French Empire, is a declared Marxist.

What is the situation as regards communism in Latin America? First of all, a brief outline of social and economic conditions will help us to judge to what extent our continent is suitable soil for Communist expansion.

In a recent statement addressed to the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Correa, the Ecuadorian Ambassador to the United Nations, declared that, if the Latin American population maintains its present rate of increase, which is 2.5 percent a year, by the end of the century it will reach the figure of 493 million inhabitants. During the same period the combined populations of the United States and Canada will only reach 380 million. A recent study published by the economist Woytinsky gives the annual per capita incomes of a number of Latin American countries. With few exceptions, the present standard of living in the great majority of the countries of Latin America is slightly superior to that of Africa and Asia, and the per capita income is hardly more than \$100 a year. The social structure is also very similar, the rural population accounting for the vast majority of the inhabitants. In Haiti, Honduras, Guatemala, and Nicaragua, more than 70 percent of the population is made up of country people. That is to say, there exist simultaneously in Latin America three factors—population increase, poverty of the masses and the absolute predominance of agriculture—which, as we have seen and contrary to Marxist theory, are the elements most favorable to Communist penetration.

In 1945 the French Communists had the largest parliamentary representation and three of four Ministers in the Cabinet. The Minister of National Defense was a Communist. In Italy the situation was identical. It was at that time that the famous writer Kestler said that the Communist Party could have seized power in France over the telephone. Why did it not do so and how was it possible for its failure to do so to be transformed later into the recent rout of the French Communists in the latest elections? It was simply because it was not convenient to Moscow for the Communists to seize power in a western and industrial country like Italy or France in 1945. It was not expedient for international reasons, inasmuch as it might very well have provoked an armed attack by the United States at a time when Russia was still not prepared militarily; and it was not desirable from an internal point of view, either. Russia does not want any power to dispute her hegemony within the Communist world. The defiance of Yugoslavia—an only slightly industrialized country—has already caused her considerable difficulties. The rebellion in Hungary practically threatened her empire and she eyes with misgiving the industrial progress of China. The inclusion of an industrial western European country in the Communist sphere could conceivably cause a shift of its center of gravity from Moscow toward Paris, Berlin, or London, and undermine the whole historical plan, based on nationalism, of the Russian Communists. The Kremlin's plan is to expand into the agricultural and economically primitive regions of the world: First, Asia; then, the Near East; later, Africa; and finally, Latin America. The fact that our continent is last in the program of Communist expansion is due to two main reasons: Its geographical and spiritual isolation from Moscow and the presence of the United States. But everything seems to indicate that the time has now come for penetration to begin. For the time being and

in order to avoid arousing the opposition of the United States, which has made the Monroe Doctrine the keystone of its international position, Communist activities in Latin America are limited strictly to the economic field.

We have three examples of this policy: Argentina, Brazil, and Bolivia. One of the causes of the chronic crisis in Argentina is its lack of petroleum. Imports of that fuel cost an estimated \$300 million a year. The elimination of this deficit would stabilize the balance of payments, reinforce the national currency, and lay the foundations for the development of the country's economy. Blind nationalism and Communist opportunism have violently opposed any deal with foreign oil companies capable of helping the country exploit its oil. But recently the Frondizi government, with a display of rare courage, signed two contracts of different types. One was with Russia and the other with the United States and European powers, and both were aimed at the development of a domestic oil industry. What was the reaction to this move? The Communists, and the Peronists, following in their wake, declared a protest strike in the oil zones of Mendoza, against the national "abdication" implied by the contracts signed with the United States, but said not a single word against the signature of similar contracts with Russia. It is to overcome this strike in Mendoza that the Frondizi government has had to proclaim martial law, running the risk of civil war.

In Brazil there is a very similar situation. There also the Communists and the extreme nationalists of ex-President Vargas oppose any collaboration with the big American companies which might tend to increase the tiny domestic oil production. The imports of that precious fuel, also estimated at some \$300 million a year, are a contributing factor in the grave economic crisis through which the country is passing. The Communists—who are partly to blame for it—take advantage of this situation to extend their political influence. Brazil is also faced with the prospect of a new civil war, and there is already very serious talk of the liquidation of Kubitschek and the formation of a military government.

In Bolivia, with the victory of the national revolutionary movement, a political revolution has triumphed which is most cordially hated by the Communist, since it is composed of a truly popular mass, socially progressive and politically anti-Communist. Russia wishes to discredit the Bolivian Government, in the same way as it has tried to discredit that of Yugoslavia, and to that end it has made use of a very dangerous economic weapon. Soviet agents in London recently launched on the market huge quantities of Chinese tin, to precipitate a vertical decline in the prices of that metal on the exportation of which Bolivia lives almost exclusively. The Bolivian Communists were thus enabled to make political capital out of the situation by asserting that the collapse of tin prices was due to the maneuvers of Patino, protected by Wall Street and the big American economic interests.

In other parts of Latin America Communist activities are carried out on a purely political plane. We refer principally to Guatemala, Venezuela, and Mexico. We have already seen the Communists at work in Guatemala; their penetration in that country was achieved by means of the popular front platform so successfully employed in Spain and France before the Second World War. Colonel Arbenz denied his Communist sympathies, but once ousted from power by Castillo Armas, he installed his family in a country behind the Iron Curtain. The Community minority in Venezuela is very important. There the Communist Party, whose cynical opportunism is proverbial, supported the candidature of Admiral Larrazabal

against that of Romulo Betancourt, with whom it has broken and whom it considers, like Paz Estenssoro, Haya de la Torre and Tito of Yugoslavia, as its friendly enemy for the moment.

In Mexico, the Communist Party, weak and disorganized, is not a menace, either on the political or the economic plane. But, for a number of geographic reasons, the Mexican nation has long been used by the Communists as a springboard for activities throughout America. That excellent newspaperman, Roscoe Drummond, at present in Mexico, has just denounced this fact in one of his columns. "The families of more than 100 American Communists live in Mexico," he says, "since the persecution of the Communist Party began in the United States; moreover, during the period of dictatorship in Venezuela, Mexico was the meeting place for the leaders of Venezuelan communism. Between 100 and 150 of them lived in Mexico for 5 years, working under the orders of the officials of the Soviet Embassy. It was the same with the Guatemalan Communists. The secretary general of the Guatemalan Communist Party, Jose Manuel Fortuny, finally obtained a false Mexican passport to go to Moscow, but was discovered in time by the Mexican authorities. He was able, nonetheless, to make the trip to Russia, and on his return, via Rio de Janeiro, he was arrested by the Brazilian authorities for using a false passport." Drummond explains that, during the trial of the Soviet agent, Sobie, in the United States, the American authorities asked Mexico to permit the extradition of one of his accomplices, Martha Dodd Stern, and her husband. It was not possible to arrange it, and a few weeks later the two turned up in Prague. The Soviet Embassy in Mexico is one of the largest in the world, being composed of 125 adults and 48 children. Since the restoration of diplomatic relations between Mexico and Russia, the Soviet Embassy in that country has been considered the most important center of espionage against the United States and Communist expansion in Latin America. The mysterious murder of Ambassador Oussinsky, in Mexico, confirms this theory.

Russia, then, has penetrated by means of its economic maneuvers in Argentina, Bolivia, and Brazil. It exercises a powerful political influence in Chile and has considerable minorities at its beck and call in Venezuela and Guatemala. Mexico is the geographical center of its activities in Latin America.

We repeat that, for reasons of political opportunism, Moscow has not yet given orders to its agents in Latin America to mount a general offensive, but the historical perspectives for its development are so favorable that that order for mobilization may be given at any moment, opening up a new chapter of grave import in the history of the continent.

The countries of Western Europe have had at their disposal a defensive instrument whose effectiveness has surprised all the political observers: Christian Socialism. Without it, the traditional Democratic and Socialist Parties would have been unable to stem the Communist tide. At this moment, Christian socialism controls the governments of the following European countries: Italy, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, and Sweden; very similar organizations direct the destinies of Luxembourg and Norway. De Gaulle is a militant Catholic and the same may be said of Salazar and Franco. What would have happened if the defense of Europe had been left in the hands, for example, of that French radical-socialism that has just been overwhelmed in the recent elections in France? Pacciardi's Liberal Party has only 3 or 4 deputies in Italy. There is no Liberal representation in the Belgian Parliament, nor in Adenauer's Germany; it hardly exists in Sweden, Norway, Holland,

and Denmark. The Liberal Party, formed historically in England, has hardly half a dozen Members in the House of Commons.

The tragedy of Latin America is that, in the absence of powerful Christian-Social groups, it is these "liberal" parties that aspire to canalize the revolution. We have already seen how, in Europe, they merely become the Trojan horses for Communist penetration.

This historical lack in results, in Latin America, in the triumph of the so-called strong men or the establishment of military dictatorships. The army really stands behind Frondizi in Buenos Aires. The same is the case in Brazil. Strong men govern the destinies of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Paraguay. The Venezuelan elections have most likely been won by an admiral, and the liberal experiment in Colombia is succumbing before the threat of a military government.

There have only been two timid manifestations of Christian-socialism in this continent: in Brazil, where it was symbolized by the figure of the Christian general, Juarez Tavora, and in Venezuela, through the presidential candidature of Mr. Caldera. Everything would seem to indicate, however, that, despite the catholicism of the Latin-American masses, Christian-socialism does not find fertile soil in those countries as a political ideology, and that the political panorama in those republics, in the face of the traditional incapacity of parliamentary liberalism tends to oscillate between the latent danger of communism and military dictatorship.

It is our duty, in the face of these tragic prospects, both as Catholics and as Americans, to encourage the development in our continent of these Christian-social ideologies, which, based as they are on the fundamental principles of humanity, have become in Europe an unbreakable barrier against which the atheistic despotism of international communism has hurled itself in vain.

A Great President Vindicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago the newspapers were filled with caustic and slanderous remarks on the administration of a great President. We have now learned that one of those who was the object of this malignant offensive has been vindicated, and I deem it only fitting and proper that the article which appeared recently should be made part of the permanent RECORD of this House, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 6, 1959:

GENERAL VAUGHAN WINS \$10,000 LIBEL SUIT

Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan (U.S. Army, retired), President Truman's military aide, was awarded \$10,000 libel damages by a jury yesterday against the Curtis Publishing Co.

The verdict was based on a November 3, 1956, picture caption saying "charges" by Columnist Drew Pearson against General Vaughan had been "confirmed by testimony before a Senate committee."

General Vaughan told a District Court jury he had been "criticized" during 1959 Senate "5 percenter" hearings, but that there

were no formal "charges" as, he said, the caption implied, and nothing was "confirmed."

TESTIMONY ONLY

General Vaughan was accused by witnesses of using his influence to help business friends deal with the Government. He denied giving any help that was improper.

There were Republican demands he be fired. But President Truman kept him on until the President left the White House. He now lives in Belle Haven, Fairfax County.

The trial sounded like the 1949 hearings repeated in miniature. General Vaughan was asked about John Maragon and others. He told the jury:

"I was instructed by the President to give aid to anyone who came in with a legitimate request for cutting redtape."

His lawyers were Byron N. Scott and Hyman Smollar.

"It was the principle," General Vaughan told a reporter afterward. "A verdict of \$1 would have been enough."

It's Good To Be Free Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the following in an exact copy of a letter written in English to Rhoda Jenkins, 4 Garden Drive, Rye, N.Y., from her friend Elena Centurion in Havana, Cuba. Paragraphs concerning her family are omitted. It gives a first-hand account by a highly successful architect who studied at the University of Pennsylvania and is now practicing in Havana. Miss Centurion is a teacher at the University of Havana and has a conservative background, her family coming from the professional and land-owning class of Cuba. Mrs. Jenkins sent me the letter in the hope that it would help Members of Congress better understand the feelings of Cuba concerning Castro:

JANUARY 23, 1959.

Our emotions have been great since January 1 at 4:30 in the morning when someone called us and told us Batista was gone. What a wonderful beginning for 1959. How much father would have enjoyed knowing it. Fidel really did it. We all sympathized with his movement. Genaro's (her husband's) ex-partner was in exile over a year and a lot of people we knew personally or by reference. Every night for the last year we kept hearing at 11 p.m. the broadcast from Caracas, Venezuela, that retransmitted Fidel's speeches, ideas, and advances. We had complete censorship in our newspapers and in speech. They were paying \$83.33 to people who gave away any information and it seemed there were quite a few. Many of those are the ones killed on that first days in the streets. Fidel's movement called the "26" didn't want those things to happen, but they were inevitable. One of father's property was burnt partially (brick and concrete didn't suffer) because one of the worst men of Batista, Masferrer, leader of a bunch of killers, had taken the house with his paper in the lower floor and two upper stories—he owed 2 year' (rent) but there was nothing we could do—it was full of machineguns and at night he even closed the street. That goes for democracy. I wish the Congress in

your country could realize what countries like ours get from American democracy when they give their moral support to a man who takes the government by force like Batista did 2 months ahead of elections. It's too bad that so many had to die and suffer penalties, for I think I would rather die once than suffer what some people underwent. Now they've found the different implements of torture, for people had been found dead without nails, eyes out, burns and all kinds of things done to their different parts in their body. One can't imagine those things going on until it comes from people we know.

From your editorials it seems in the States they don't like us having people shot. I can tell that I wouldn't kill a mouse, but after going through all these years of terror I can well understand how people claim for it. It doesn't seem possible that you send someone to the electric chair for killing one person and yet have someone who has killed and tortured several, teaching others that one can do that and yet go on living as if nothing had happened. It was too bad that Batista and the worst men of his regime got away. I wonder if he was afraid of them for he let down practically all those who had given him moral and economic support. Tell your mother that Agullera (was an architectural client of her's) was one of them. He didn't get notice on time like most of his political collaborators and they are all in the embassy's or hiding. I don't know where he is at all. He hasn't been caught as others who are in prison. It seems the revolutionary movement expects to make people give money back to the state and all they've done so far is freeze their bank accounts, taken their homes and business, and looked for documents and guns in their homes and offices. We don't know yet what or how they are going to do it and if good relations and influence will help or not.

As to the university, we don't know yet when it will open. I guess soon. A group of revolutionary (not the "26") was up against Fidel and took the university with tanks and guns but Fidel has crushed them apparently anyhow, by talking on the television. Never in your life you could imagine how people went out for him when he arrived to Havana. We saw him from a roof eight floors up. Today the university hasn't been handed back to the professors. Give Nora this letter and believe it, it's good to be free again.

ELENA.

Should Stop Selling Savings Bonds Until Inflation Halted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial from the Kansas Stockman, which has a new approach to the inflation problem.

Too few people realize just what inflation does to people on a fixed income. Too few people seem to be aware as to just what happens with bonds purchased 20 years ago with 100 percent dollars and cashed today on a 47-percent-dollar basis.

The article appended hereto would tie bond interest rates to the cost of living. Many wage contracts between unions and management have this provision. It

would seem that elderly citizens who have invested in Government bonds should be entitled to some protection from the evils of inflation.

The editorial follows:

**SHOULD STOP SELLING SAVINGS BONDS UNTIL
INFLATION HALTED**

The thrifty and patriotic citizens who own the vast bulk of the \$42 billion of U.S. savings bonds outstanding are entitled to protection of the value of the principal and interest of their investment in Government bonds.

So far the Government has failed to give them that protection, and those who have held these bonds since the early offering years have lost over 50 percent of their savings in terms of buying power. This record stands as a shocking indictment of the fiscal integrity of our Government.

If this confiscation of savings by inflation continues, these bond owners, who qualify as the most patriotic of our citizens and also as the segment of our citizenry who can least afford to lose will be financially wiped out to the degree they have trusted their Government.

Accordingly we propose that the Government face up to this problem now, and that it take immediate steps to give these frugal and trusting creditors a square deal.

To this end we propose either of the following alternatives:

1. That the sale of savings bonds be halted until the President has achieved at least a 2-year period of stability in the cost of living, or

2. That savings bonds issued from February 1 on carry an escalator clause on both principal and interest, giving the owner a guaranteed increase of both interest and principal proportionate to further increases in the cost of living.

As citizens deeply interested in the economic and political independence of the people of America, we contend that further temporizing with this grave injustice cannot be tolerated.

We urge that President Eisenhower, in his current stand against reckless and inflationary spending, recognize the significance of this evil, and that he make its correction a project for immediate action. We suggest that such prompt action on his part would do much to halt the flight from the dollar that is so apparent in the stock exchanges and trading markets of the Nation.

**Statement of General Pate Before the
Senate Armed Services Committee**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to insert in the RECORD the recent statement of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Pate, before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

It is a precise factual document. It lists in factual language the repeated instances during the past year when our ready Marine forces have had to move rapidly in response to emergency. Our need for this professional amphibious force in readiness in these tense times

is starkly apparent from this mere recital of the record.

There follows an equally dispassionate account of the effect of the deep cuts in the Marine Corps which have been directed by the Pentagon. Without editorial comment, the effect of a cut of 25,000 Marines below the 200,000 the Congress considered minimum, and appropriated for, is factually set forth in terms of deactivated combat battalions and aircraft squadrons, and continued maintenance of remaining units at reduced strengths.

General Pate's statement is a simple, dignified statement of facts.

I consider it of such importance that I most urgently ask that all Members find time to study it with care.

For in it we see the actual results of the continued failure of the Pentagon to heed the most carefully considered and clearly expressed judgment of the Congress on a matter of vital importance to the Nation's military policy.

We have determined and provided by law that the Marine Corps shall be organized into three combat divisions and three air wings. We have determined that a strength of 200,000 is the minimum necessary to enable the Marine Corps to comply with the law. We have appropriated the funds necessary to maintain a Marine Corps of 200,000. We have stated our intent regarding this small, professional force in readiness in the most clear, simple and unmistakable words. The Senate Armed Services Committee, for example, used these words:

This decision to appropriate the funds necessary for a 200,000-man Marine Corps was made with full consideration of the fiscal and military implications. The committee desires that it be clearly understood by appropriate agencies in the executive branch of the Government that it is the clear-cut intent of the committee, and of the proposed appropriating legislation, that the Marine Corps be maintained at the strength of 200,000.

It is against this background that we must assess the Pentagon's order to cut the Marine Corps by 25,000 below what the Congress considered an absolute minimum. We are seeing a deliberate stripping from the Congress of constitutionally imposed responsibility.

This is the true impact of General Pate's plain statement of the facts.

Never has the need been greater for our Nation to possess this combat-ready Marine striking force to respond to any of the potential crises that confront us. Only with such a force as we possess in our fleet marine forces can we apply the proper amount of military pressure to protect American interests, carry out our national policies, and at the same time prevent a localized fire from spreading into a worldwide holocaust.

It just does not make sense to extend the draft and force into Army service unwilling—at least unenthusiastic—recruits while at the same time we arbitrarily direct the reduction of 25,000 hard, lean, highly professional, completely volunteer Marines. It does not make sense to say that we can maintain our strength for limited war by reducing each of our divisions by two battalions

landing teams—for a total of six battalion landing teams out of the 27 we now have in our Marine Corps.

I am convinced that this arbitrary reduction of the Marine Corps to 175,000 is the deliberate, chosen method of the Pentagon for undermining and vitiating the provisions of Public Law 416 of the 82d Congress, very appropriately known as the Vinson bill after our distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who was largely responsible for conceiving, sponsoring, and the ultimate passage of the law that requires three combat divisions and three air wings in the Marine Corps.

The continuing series of crises which have characterized the East-West conflict in the past few years have completely vindicated the position taken by the Honorable CARL VINSON in insisting that this bill be passed and thus provide the Nation with such a striking force of marines. In spite of this congressional foresight the Pentagon, unfortunately, has seen fit to disregard the provisions of the statute and the intent and desire of Congress when we appropriated the money to give meaningful effect to the provisions of the Vinson bill.

The argument that the Marine Corps is stronger by reducing its forces and disbanding a large portion of its combat units in the divisions cannot be understood except as a smoke screen behind which there is a deliberate effort on the part of the Pentagon—which stubbornly opposed the original passage of the Vinson bill—to erode and destroy its provisions. No other conclusion can be drawn from the action that is now taking place in refusing to apply the funds to provide the forces for which they were appropriated.

This is not only a matter of straight military policy. Even more strikingly it poses in crystal clear form the deep issue between the legislative and executive branches in the field of defense policy.

I am not one of those who feels that Congress should go into details of the direction of the Armed Forces. The use of the Armed Forces is the clear-cut prerogative of the President in his role of Commander in Chief. However, the Constitution places squarely upon Congress the inescapable responsibility of providing and maintaining those forces. This responsibility is not one that Congress can pass on to the executive, nor is it one which in good conscience Congress can let go by default.

The Attorney General of the United States speaking of the power of Congress to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a Navy has stated:

This power to raise and support armies and provide and maintain a Navy is plenary and without limitation or restriction, and Congress is the sole judge of how the Army or Navy shall be raised and of what it shall be composed (27 Op. Att'y. Gen. 259).

I know of nothing which has changed the correctness of that opinion. Indeed I am convinced that legally only a constitutional amendment could strip the Congress of the powers so precisely delineated by the Attorney General. I may also note that supine acquiescence

by a legislative branch which abdicates its responsibilities to a faceless, general staff type of executive omniscience will just as certainly accomplish the same perversion of the wise separation of power established by Founding Fathers.

We live in perilous times.

The Congress, after exhaustive, careful hearings rejected the proposal of an administration which insists on a Marine Corps of 175,000 as adequate to our needs.

Even as the Congress determined a ready force of 200,000 marines is vital to the Nation's security in these troubled times, the twin crises of Lebanon and Taiwan force an admission of Pentagon error when a Marine Corps of 190,000 is kept in hand to deal with these relatively mild examples of the Communist policy of constant pressure against the free world.

Then as the order is issued to execute the cut to 175,000 the Secretary of Defense tells the Nation that our military policy must be shaped with the lessons of Lebanon and Taiwan in mind.

Do these lessons justify a 12½-percent cut below appropriated strength in what is already the smallest of our active services?

How do they justify this cut—400 percent greater in relation to appropriated strength than that imposed on any other service—in the very forces which were able to respond most rapidly, most precisely, when Lebanon demanded action in a matter of hours?

No one has answered these questions. No once can. For the true answer is that we are witnessing a return to the disastrous reasoning of the Louis Johnson school—the Alice in Wonderland theory that we gain strength through weakness.

Only strong, decisive, and immediate action by the Congress can reverse our course.

Never has the foresight of our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] the sponsor of the Marine Corps bill, been more thoroughly vindicated than in the past year as well as the continuing crises which characterize the probings and incursions of Communist aggression.

Never has the Nation's need for a small professional force in readiness such as the Marine Corps been greater than it is today.

General Pate's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEN. R. MCC. PATE, U.S. MARINE CORPS, COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS, BEFORE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, U.S. SENATE, JANUARY 26, 1959

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Marine Corps deeply appreciates the interest you have always shown in our affairs. We welcome opportunities such as this to appear before you, and to report on our status. In general, I feel this committee is quite familiar with the Marine Corps. We are guided by the missions which Congress has assigned us. For the purposes of this meeting I will not make a lengthy statement, but will confine my remarks to two main points: (1) A summary of our activities during the past year; and (2) our plans, programs, and capabilities for the coming year.

During 1958, the basic deployment of our Fleet Marine Forces, which we have maintained for the past several years, was found

responsive to the realities of global military pressures. One division and one aircraft wing were maintained on the east coast of the United States with the Atlantic Fleet. At least one battalion landing team of that force was normally on rotational deployment with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. Two divisions and two aircraft wings were assigned to the Pacific Fleet, one division and one aircraft wing operating on the west coast, and one division and one aircraft wing in the western Pacific. The latter division/wing team was under operational control of the 7th Fleet. This distribution of our forces provided for an amphibious capability in each of the great ocean areas.

To render these deployments meaningful, our Fleet Marine Forces were constantly prepared for combat action. The state of their readiness was several times demonstrated, when world events called for limited military action by the United States.

In May 1958, incident to the Vice President's visit to Caracas, Venezuela, elements of the east coast team deployed. Two rifle companies of a battalion landing team were airlifted to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and embarked aboard the cruiser *Boston*; a third rifle company was lifted from the parade-ground at Camp Lejeune by helicopters which then accompanied them on board the carrier *Tarawa* to join U.S.S. *Boston*.

In the summer, world attention was focused on Lebanon, where the orderly processes of constitutional government were endangered. As tension mounted, the normal amphibious troop strength of the 6th Fleet was increased. An additional battalion landing team was provided in May; in late June a third departed its east coast base. On July 14, the Lebanese President sent an urgent request to our Government for assistance. As the Nation's initial response to that request, the 6th Fleet quickly landed the three battalions of Marines—the first one hit the beach on the 15th of July at the precise hour directed by President Eisenhower. The prompt arrival of those units had a stabilizing effect on a very explosive situation, and ultimately the Lebanese were given an opportunity to work out a Lebanese solution to a Lebanese problem.

In late August, there was need to reinforce the air defense of Taiwan. Marine Air Group 11, stationed in Japan, was alerted for the purpose. The fighter squadrons flew off at once; but it is a mark of the mobility of the entire unit that within 12 days after its new base field was designated, the entire group—aircraft and ground support units alike—had moved their personnel and equipment 1,300 miles by sea and were effectively contributing operational support to units already at Taiwan.

Each of the incidents I have mentioned constituted a real emergency. In each one, the amphibious forces demonstrated professional competence in responding to the requirements of their role in our national defense. As a result of careful prior preparation they reacted immediately, using normal task groupings and communications, and without last minute, frantic planning. They moved at once to the trouble area, and they remained in the area until their presence was no longer required. The real mobility of naval forces was thus made apparent, and the true nature of the fleet's readiness demonstrated. No international political arrangements were necessary to permit the movement of these units. They were free to anticipate international events. They needed no rights of transit; and their own strength and self-sufficiency gave them ability to stay as long as their presence was needed.

So much for 1958. Now let me turn to our plans, programs and capabilities for this year.

The Reorganization Act of 1958 will necessitate no change in Marine Corps opera-

tions. Under its provisions we will continue to do what we have done in the past; that is, equip our troops, train them in the specialized techniques of amphibious warfare, then assign them to appropriate field commands. However, we do so in a somewhat different way than do the other Services. The bulk of our Marine fighting forces are assigned directly to the principal fleets of the Navy. They become an organic part of the fleets to give them balance and complete the flexibility of their striking power. The fleets, in turn, are assigned directly to the several unified commands. Their commanders thus possess a ready amphibious arm which they may deploy in any locality bordering on the seven seas.

We started this year with a strength of approximately 187,500 officers and men. Right now, today, we have about 185,000. We will continue to decline as we implement the directive to reduce to a strength of 175,000 by June 30 of this year. Our supporting base, and the security forces which we must provide to other Government agencies, have already been reduced. Their strengths have reached the minimum consistent with efficient operation for the forces and missions presently assigned. For this reason, reductions have to be made in our combat units—the Fleet Marine Force. To effect this, we have two alternatives. We can either provide fewer and fewer men to the units than their tables of organization call for, or we can deactivate units.

In fiscal year 1958, with a ceiling of 188,000 personnel, we had a personnel availability in our Fleet Marine Forces equivalent to 8 battalion landing teams per division or a total of 24 within the Fleet Marine Forces. However, I chose to retain the full structure of 27 battalion landing teams in the 3 divisions and levy reductions across the board.

However, during the past year our experience in Lebanon and the Far East clearly demonstrated to us the fallacy of maintaining units at levels seriously below combat strength. I have therefore abandoned this philosophy, and returned to one of maintaining our battalion landing teams at full combat strength. This, linked with the further reduction to 175,000, has required me to deactivate 2 of the battalion landing teams in each of our 3 divisions. Thus our 3 Marine divisions will be reduced from a total of 27 to a total of 21 battalions. All remaining divisional units can then be maintained at not less than 90 percent of their table of organization strength. Also, by June 30, 6 aircraft squadrons and 100 additional aircraft will be deleted from our 3 aircraft wings. Some other reductions in our combat strength will be entailed, but I have mentioned the principal ones.

Elsewhere in the personnel field, in order to get every possible benefit from our Marines, we are making strenuous efforts to improve quality, to keep commitments for housekeeping and support functions to a minimum, and to reduce individual training requirements wherever possible.

These programs are meeting with considerable success. For example, the reenlistment rate for first enlistees has increased from approximately 17 percent in fiscal year 1957 to 25.4 percent in the first 5 months of fiscal year 1959. Added to this, the trend among first enlistees is to sign for 4 rather than 3 years. Last year only 21 percent chose the 4-year term. This has increased to a high last month of 89 percent of 4-year enlistees. The trend should continue. The combined effect of these programs will lead to a significant reduction in our training load, higher quality marines and increased readiness.

Throughout the past year, the Fleet Marine Forces carried out a number of exercises, battalion size and larger, aimed at the improvement of old and the perfection of new techniques of amphibious warfare. Each

exercise was in every sense a rehearsal for combat. Each exercise, regardless of size, involved the interplay of Marine air and ground units operating as a team with Navy amphibious forces. This mode of operations is a hallmark of our composition and doctrine, exemplifying, with the Navy, the essential qualities of modern war on the land, on the sea, and in the air. We have another full schedule of exercises planned for this year. Through them we will maintain our readiness for any eventuality.

In all of our exercises and in all of our training, we are stressing modern techniques of amphibious operations—the vertical envelopment concept. The helicopter assault landing capability, which we developed, is a reality now, and it is growing in potential from year to year.

The assault elements of our divisions are organized to take them transportable by helicopter. The structure of each Marine aircraft wing on the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, and in the western Pacific provides for a balanced helicopter group in each locality.

In order that helicopter capabilities can be employed in amphibious operations, carrier decks are required. In the Pacific, the Navy has one aircraft carrier specially converted for use as a helicopter platform. This is U.S.S. *Thetis Bay*, a former escort carrier which in 1955 underwent minor conversion and overhaul to give it a troop-carrying capability, and to facilitate the handling of helicopters. Marines have used it extensively. It has provided the naval amphibious forces with much valuable experience, both in perfecting modern amphibious techniques and for ideas of design to be incorporated in new construction vessels. However, *Thetis Bay* provides vertical assault capability for less than one battalion and only in one ocean. More is needed.

The Navy's approved shipbuilding program will provide two carriers specially designed for the purpose in 1962, but the problem cannot be put off until then. We feel there is urgent requirement that greatly increased helicopter lift capabilities be available to the fleets right now.

The chief of naval operations and I have, after much study, arrived at an interim solution. By providing additional marines to augment the Marine detachment to help fill out their crew, two—and possibly three—CVS-type carriers can be kept in service and devoted to helicopter operations. We have determined that a Marine detachment of 10 officers and 323 enlisted men will be required for each carrier designated, and I have agreed to furnish those marines. The Marine detachments, organized into two companies, will perform assigned air, guard, supply, communication and other support duties appropriate for marines. I might point out that this solution to our problem is only possible because of the close and intimate association of the Navy and Marine Corps over the years.

In the Atlantic area the amphibious forces inaugurated the use of the carrier *Bozer* early this month. In addition to U.S.S. *Princeton*, to be assigned to the amphibious forces in March, one more carrier is under consideration for assignment at a later date. These vessels are not ideal for efficient helicopter operations, nor for amphibious troops habitability, but they do provide a significant increase in our combat potential. They enable us to apply modern doctrine in our amphibious operations.

Any comment on our combat readiness would be most incompetent without mention of the Marine Corps Reserve. We place great reliance upon it. In the event of mobilization, our reserve will provide us immediately backup strength.

Our ready reserve comprises 208,000 men. Of these, some 43,000 are organized into drill-pay units. Drill-pay unit training programs

maintain these units in a state of readiness that makes them immediately available for mobilization.

The balance of our reserves would be called to duty and placed in combat units as quickly as refresher training could bring them up to fleet marine force standards. Right now I am proud to say our reserve is in the highest state of readiness we have ever achieved short of full mobilization.

Gentlemen, I have summarized briefly our accomplishments during the past year, and indicated our posture for the year ahead. As it always has been, it is now—a posture of preparedness. Everything we have available to us today is in the highest state of readiness we know how to achieve. You have my assurance it will be kept that way.

Kentucky's Future—Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, for the second consecutive year a young man from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky was won first place in the soil conservation essay contest. This year's recipient of the award is Glenn C. Dockery, a 17-year-old Ohio county high school senior. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Owen Dockery and resides on rural Route 1, Beaver Dam, Ky. Glenn's essay entitled "Kentucky's Future—Soil and Water Conservation," was judged best from a record number of 31,426 written by grade and high school students in 118 Kentucky soil conservation districts. This honor which has been bestowed upon Glenn C. Dockery is to be coveted and is one of which he has every right to be proud. Not only in this particular instance, but by other means he has set an example which can well be emulated by young people throughout Kentucky. He has served as vice president of the Beaver Dam Chapter of the National Honor Society and as treasurer of his high school junior class. This year he is president of the honor society and vice president of the science club. Also he is a member of the student council and the junior conservation club.

Over the years the young men and women of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky have manifested a deep interest and concern in agricultural pursuits, and, by virtue thereof, have received recognition for their accomplishments. In addition to Glenn C. Dockery, winners in this year's soil conservation essay contest from our district are:

Jean Goodman, Scottsville, Allen County; Johnnie Hines, Hardinsburg, Breckinridge County; G. McCoy, Morgantown, Butler County; Mary Alice Wethington, Utica, Daviess County; Jackey Pearl, Big Clifty, Grayson County; Jacqueline Stephens, Pellville, Hancock County; Brenda Briscoe, Hebbardsville, Henderson County; Lena Villines, Nebo, Hopkins County; Sarah Miller, Sacramento, McLean County; Joyce De-

Bruler, Fordsville, Ohio County; Lynn Caudill, Franklin, Simpson County; Shelby Woodring, Morganfield, Union County; Joe R. Cowles, Bowling Green, Warren County.

Mr. Speaker, soil and water conservation means a great deal to the State of Kentucky. Not only are the people of Kentucky, generally, aware of the necessity for a soil and water conservation program, but our young people have been well instructed along such lines, as evidenced by Glenn C. Dockery. The awards received by him and the other boys and girls are indicative of the outstanding work being done by our Soil Conservation Service under able and conscientious leaders. The young people who reside in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent belong to the different farm organizations such as the Future Farmers of America, Future Homemakers of America, and 4-H Clubs. I am justifiably proud of our future farmers and homemakers. I am thankful for the enormous potential that resides in the youth of our land. I feel that such potential for good is being fully realized. As our youth see, they understand, and as they hear, they are comprehending the truth so that they and all the citizens of our land may live more abundantly.

More Art Needed in Federal Architecture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1959, the Toledo Blade took occasion to applaud the recent admonition of the Fine Arts Commission against the stark functionalism of our Federal buildings throughout the Nation generally and in the Nation's Capital particularly. In an editorial entitled "One Percent for Art" the editor makes an eloquent plea for filling this aesthetic void through the judicious use of ornamentation to reflect something of the spirit and aspirations of the American people.

Surely the reservation of one percent of the funds appropriated for construction is little enough to devote to alleviating the barren utilitarian and uninspiring severity that has so characterized our public buildings.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of the editorial, and I commend its sentiment to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

ONE PERCENT FOR ART

In many American cities and towns Federal buildings are among the most prominent architectural features. In Washington, of course, they dominate and convey both to foreign visitors and to our own citizens something of the spirit of the American people and their Government.

For this reason Congress ought to take note of the complaint of the Fine Arts Com-

mission against the plainness and severity in design which has made Government buildings constructed in the postwar period examples of barren monotony. Too often, the commission says, paintings, sculpture and other enlivening ornamental features have been struck from the plans of Federal and District of Columbia buildings.

The Government can afford to be a better patron of arts and American artists in this respect. Particularly do we believe that the humblest of Americans from the most remote crossroads would want the public buildings in the Nation's Capital to be of inspiring beauty and dignity. Elsewhere, too, the example of the Government in departing from barren monotony would have a leavening effect on other public, as well as private, buildings.

What the Commission would like is for Congress to set aside a special fund, equal to one percent of the appropriations for Federal and District of Columbia construction, that could be devoted to the judicious use of art for buildings and their adjacent surroundings. The size of the sum which should be made available may be debatable but not we think, the need for the Government to move away from any sterile, purely utilitarian concept of building.

Thanks for the Sputniks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to hear my dear friend Dr. John S. Allen, president of the University of South Florida, when he recently made an excellent address before the Phi Delta Phi law fraternity breakfast at the University of Florida. I am happy to include here the challenging but, at the same time, encouraging thoughts which he presented on that occasion.

The address follows:

THANKS FOR THE SPUTNIKS

A century ago the colleges of this country taught liberal arts, theology, and a little science. Law was not in the college curriculum, it was read in a lawyer's office. The science that was taught was very simple and elementary compared to what is known and taught today. I have on my bookshelf an astronomy book that was used as a textbook by some of our colleges about a century and a quarter ago. It has in it the following definition: "Electricity is an all pervading fluid emanating from the sun." Today our information is more accurate and more elaborate.

A century ago colleges were small. President James Garfield described the ideal classroom as "a log hut with only a simple bench, Mark Hopkins on one end and I on the other, and you may have all the buildings, apparatus and libraries without him." Today we have so many attending college that it is physically impossible to provide President Garfield's ideal classroom, and in fact we seem to be going in the opposite direction when we point a television camera at a professor and carry his message by coaxial cable to literally thousands of students. If we will admit that some people can do good teaching by the lecture-demonstration method, then television is simply a device to carry the work of one excellent teacher to

thousands rather than having most of the students subjected to less than excellent teaching. Many will feel that this is losing the personal touch, and education in the crowded classrooms of today is just not as good as it was in "our day."

On October 4, 1957, Sputnik I went into orbit and sent radio beeps to earth with coded messages. We Americans were embarrassed and annoyed by this, because we like to be first. A lot of people who had never been very much concerned about schools went into orbit and started beeping. They now want better schools. For this, I say, "Thanks for the sputniks."

I want better schools too. We all want better schools. Thanks to the sputniks, maybe we can get them. But I am not sure the general public knows what kind of schools they really want. I have known people: Who objected to their children having homework to do; who really desired social success more than academic success for their children; who thought time off from school for basketball practice was proper; who would provide car transportation for athletes after practice; or who would contribute personal labor to help build a football field. But would they do this for a library or for an honor student?

The practicing lawyers at this breakfast find themselves in the role of leading citizens of their respective communities. You who are still in law school will soon find yourselves in this role. People just expect a professional person, such as a lawyer, to be informed. They will expect you to know about the schools and how they may be improved.

Many of the practicing lawyers here are in my generation. We, of course, look on our days in school as a rigorous program of such high quality, that it made real men of all of us. Unfortunately, nostalgic memories are not very accurate. I propose to present some facts that will give us all a better understanding of where we are.

We should not be misled by nostalgic stories of the past when it is reported that men busied themselves with glorious fighting for church and country, or they amused themselves by dancing around the maypole. Actually, in the past most people were poor, sick, illiterate, short-lived, and worked from dawn to dusk to keep body and soul together. They were slaves to their jobs. They had no real freedom of choice or freedom of opportunity if they wanted to eat regularly. A boy learned his father's trade. A girl taught school or was a housewife, and that was about the only choice they had.

Freedom has come with our material abundance. A boy or girl can work at what they want to do. They can make a living by encouraging and exploiting any talent they enjoy. They can work in business, in industry, in science, journalism, music, art, or any other field.

In 1900 only 8 percent of our high-school-age population graduated from high school. The high-school program was strictly college preparatory in nature. Yet only about 4 percent of the high-school graduates went to college in 1900. This was a situation the American public would not tolerate. They insisted then, as we insist today, on the democratic principle that every child have the opportunity for as much education as his ability permits him to absorb.

This caused a diversification of offerings in the high school. Instead of attempting to prepare all comers for college, even though those who go to college are a small percentage of that age group, the secondary schools have developed offerings in secretarial studies, vocational agriculture, shop and industrial arts. The schools recognized that for many pupils this would be society's only chance to educate them, not only for a job, but for good citizenship and for their personal living responsibilities.

By 1950 two-thirds of the children of high-school age were enrolled in school. This gain was not made entirely in the nonacademic or skill courses. In 1900 only 7 percent of the boys and girls of high-school age were taking courses in mathematics and science. In 1950, 35 percent of them were doing so.

In other words, there are more boys and girls enrolled in mathematics and science today than there were in 1900, a greater percentage of children of high-school age enrolled in these subjects, and both enrollments and percentages are increasing rather than decreasing.

We must remember that we are created equal, before the law. We have equal privileges, responsibilities and opportunities. But let us not confuse equal with identical. Courses in science have always been offered in the better equipped modern schools, but they are not designed for all pupils. School counselors advise those who are not interested in academic things or ideas, but who are interested in doing things with their hands, to take skill subjects that will prepare them for trades and immediate employment. We must remember that we need the skilled artisan and that good workmanship at any level has dignity.

Unfortunately, some who have the ability for dealing with ideas rather than things have not been challenged or been shown the need for putting forth the effort necessary to succeed in academic subjects. School counseling is not able to accomplish this alone. School administrators have found that by working consistently and continually through the PTA, they can get parents to understand why certain pupils should be encouraged to take science courses. The pupils then get guidance at home around the dinner table, as well as in the classroom, and from the counselor. One school principal reported that whereas he had had only enough pupils for one half section of high school physics, the next year he had four sections. And where he had had only 3 sections of chemistry, the next year they had 13 sections of chemistry. Obviously pupils will take these courses if challenged and if properly guided by both the school and the home.

Further studies indicate that the schools are today doing a somewhat better job at teaching than they have in the past, as measured by student performance on standardized achievement tests. Let me give you an example from the elementary school. A midwestern university gave a reading test to the elementary pupils in the city of Indianapolis, and repeated the same test 30 years later. They found on the average that third-grade pupils read better today than did fifth-grade pupils at the earlier date. In the past the retarded reader dropped from school. Today we know how to help him. Scores made by third-grade pupils today should have been held down by the fact that the pupil who would have been retarded in the past and maybe dropped from school is in school today because of compulsory attendance laws if for no other reason.

I had a colleague who told me that he graduated from elementary school in west Florida nearly 50 years ago. The school term was 5 months a year. On graduation from the eighth grade he passed an examination given by the county which enabled him to start teaching immediately in the school from which he graduated. From his teaching he earned the money necessary to pay his way through high school which was on a 4 months' term. Since then he has not only completed college, but has gone on to earn a doctor of philosophy degree and is still devoting his energies to improving our schools. But I ask how many of you today would be willing to have your children attend elementary school only 5 months of the year, and be taught by a person with no other

preparation than graduation from the eighth grade? How many of you would be willing to have your children attend high school only 4 months of the year?

Similar statistics can be cited to show similar gains made at the collegiate level. Between 1900 and 1950, for example, the college age population of the United States about doubled, but the undergraduate enrollment in our colleges and universities jumped almost 1,000 percent and the graduate enrollment increased almost 4,000 percent.

At the same time the curriculum has been pushed downward through the colleges and schools. My father and I attended the same college, but 40 years apart. He majored in mathematics and got to calculus in his senior year. I majored in mathematics and got to calculus in my sophomore year. Not because I was smarter. More and better mathematics was taught to me in high school, and the college curriculum had been pushed downward by 2 years. Today many college freshmen take calculus.

Some people have been so impressed by the sputniks that they want us to install the Russian school system. Enough Americans have visited Russian schools and universities for us to know rather well what they are doing. For example, the programs in mathematics and in the physical sciences are very good. These were encouraged by the Czarist regimes and they are encouraged by the Communist regime today. Other programs are not given so much encouragement. To be admitted to a university the candidate must come from the family of a common man. The candidate must be politically reliable. A high quality program may be followed in science, but along with it each student is required to study Marxist-Leninist philosophy. And they are required to study a history that is so distorted it is hardly recognizable by our western historians.

Others say one of the western European school systems that has produced great scientists would serve our purposes better. Let me describe parts of the French system, since it is reasonably typical. To go beyond elementary and vocational schooling the child must come from the right family and must decide between ages 10 and 14 to take the school program that will lead to the university. Should he decide not to take that program and later with growth and maturity he discovers he would like to go on to the university and study academic subjects, he finds the way is blocked. There are no transfer points between the two routes.

Dr. Byron Hollingshead has reported on his 5½ years' of work assisting universities in western Europe that there are as many students elected to the three top American honor societies of Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, and Phi Kappa Phi as there are students in the total enrollment of all of the colleges and universities of western Europe.

In America about 10 to 15 percent of our college-age population graduate from college, and about 1 percent complete college with superior records that cause them to be elected to the top honor societies. This means that in France, for example, only about 1 percent of the college-age population is enrolled in college or university. This is a high quality program in France. And the program completed by members of Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, and Phi Kappa Phi in American colleges is equally high in quality. But we in America have a dual program. One in which educational opportunity is open to all who can profit by it, and a program within the first that is for superior students. In a democracy such as ours is, we have no alternative but to make some educational system, such as this, work and work well.

It is reported that in France there are not enough people educated to high enough

levels to fill the positions in business, industry, and government that require college education. It is reported that a minister of finance in the French Government did not know even the rudiments of money, banking, finance, or even tax collection. If France has had a serious Communist Party, I believe it can be attributed in part to its educational system and its limited opportunities. If we in this country have not had a "serious" Communist Party, I believe this can be attributed in part to our educational system.

Remember that our educational crisis did not begin with Sputnik I, nor will it end when and if we are the first to send a rocket to the moon. Our educational crisis arises because to maintain our economic and political system, we in America must educate more people to higher levels than any society ever attempted before in all of history. Unfortunately during our growth in numbers we have not always had a similar development in intellectual standards. To this problem we must give immediate attention.

However, we do not do this by copying the Russians. They have built a system to serve the needs of their state. I do not believe the French educational system has served that state well. We in America have built a system to free the minds of 175 million people. And a democratic society with free and well-trained minds need not fear any challenge. We must be sure that our educational system really aids and stimulates its students to use their minds to full capacity.

To many of our people have gone under the illusion that you could get a good educational system for practically nothing. We thought that paying a few dollars school tax on our property and sending a \$10 check to our college alumni fund every year was all we had to do. We seemed to think that the Government or some philanthropist would somehow do the rest. It is not so easy. Our less than adequate support of our schools to date causes me to question whether or not we really want better schools. It is typical to place a limit on the tax millage that can be assessed by local government for schools when there is no millage limit for other Government services. Have you been willing to authorize bond issues for new school buildings needed to avoid double sessions?

We are the ones who must pay the bill. And we can do it quite readily by increasing our total support of education, through taxes and gifts, from 2 percent to 3 percent of personal income. We are finding that local and State taxes have not been enough, and now it is proposed that the Federal Government use its taxing power to help out. But if you will hurry home to vote quickly for higher school taxes, and send twice as much to your alma mater, you can keep Uncle Sam from getting deeper into the educational business. If we do not, then the Government will do it for us, for Uncle Sam cannot afford for America not to have a first-class educational system.

Finally, our schools and colleges must demand the best from their students. We must never make the degrading assumption that young people unfitted for the highest levels of intellectual endeavor are incapable of meeting some sort of standards. Too many have assumed that those who are incapable of high level intellectual activity are incapable of any standards and can be exposed to shoddy and trashy educational fare. We recognize individual differences in aptitude or ability and at the same time we must expect every level of education to stretch the individual to the utmost of his particular potentialities.

"And," as John Gardner of the Carnegie Corp. has said, "we must expect that each student is striving for excellence in terms of the kind of excellence that is within his

reach. Here again we must recognize that there may be excellence or shoddiness in every line of human endeavor. We must honor excellence in every socially accepted human activity, however humble the activity. There may be excellent plumbers and incompetent plumbers, excellent philosophers and incompetent philosophers. An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellent in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity, and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

The Enemy We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article should be widely read, but especially it should be read by every Member of Congress.

We have got to recognize the fact that we face an enemy who is implacable and bent on our destruction. The time is growing short, and we are going to be destroyed not only by the men in the Kremlin but in our own lack of knowledge and our desire not to face up to anything unpleasant.

Mr. Wolfe is right when he says:

Our policy of containment has not contained; and our policy of liberation has not liberated; as our acceptance of the poison semantics of peaceful coexistence and the propaganda circus of summit conferences has given us neither genuine conferences for agreement on anything, nor peace, nor coexistence.

We must wake up, shatter our rosy, silly dreams and face reality.

[From the New Leader, Jan. 26, 1959]

THE ENEMY WE FACE

(By Bertram D. Wolfe)

The Soviet system of power, which is the enemy we face, can only be understood properly with the help of certain theoretical criteria of a sociohistorical nature. Very briefly, we may say that the Soviet system is a closed, single-centered, modern totalitarian society, as distinguished from an open, multicentered society. A closed society is one with built-in staying powers which enable it to endure for a very long period of time; it is a self-conserving society, in that any changes that occur are within-system changes that leave the basic structure of power untouched. A single-centered society is one in which there is only one focus of power, the state, which does not tolerate the diffusion of power among any other relatively independent social institutions or groups. Finally, a modern totalitarian society, as distinguished even from an old-fashioned despotism, is one in which the state seeks to be coextensive with the whole of society and the whole of life, a society that is perpetually at war with its own people and with the rest of the world, and which uses modern technology and widespread literacy as weapons in that war.

Now, the Soviet Union is truly a great power—great in population, great in resources, great in technology, and great in

military strength. Secondly, it has a great state machine which is in a condition of permanent semimobilization, and which attempts to keep its people mobilized. Finally, it is an enemy which is resourceful enough, wealthy enough, and determined enough to do what we have not had the determination to do (although we have had the resources in the West in much greater abundance): namely, to keep simultaneously an atomic striking power and a massive conventional striking power in being. It has a definite advantage over us at this moment because it is geared to both types of warfare. It believes that both types are necessary and that they must be integrated into a single plan.

At the beginning of the 19th century, one European in seven was a Russian, or under Moscow rule. At the beginning of the 20th century, one European in four was under Moscow rule. At the middle of the 20th century, approximately one European in two is under Russian rule. This in itself is enough to give us pause—especially if we remember that there are 125 divisions in being in Russia, while we have approximately 15 and are engaged in cutting our forces further.

It is a deadly enemy. It is a deadly enemy because never for a moment does it abandon its two basic aims: to remake man, and to conquer the world. It is particularly our enemy—not because we so choose, but because it has chosen. It regards the strength and the way of life of the United States as the chief obstacle to its plan to remake its own people and to remake the world in the image of its blueprint. We have been picked as enemy No. 1.

No matter what Eisenhower says or does, no matter whether Dulles conducts himself with tact or tactlessness, no matter how well the tourist behaves when he goes to the Soviet Union for his 3 weeks—we will still be enemy No. 1. Whether our working class is prosperous, or hungry and jobless, or jobless and not hungry, we will still be enemy No. 1. Whether we treat American Negroes decently, or indecently—or somewhere in between, as we are doing at present—we will still be enemy No. 1. Whether we pull out of Berlin or Quemoy or do not pull out of Berlin or Quemoy, we cannot disengage ourselves from this enemy.

Let us not listen to the siren song of those who tell us that we can get a release of tensions and a little peace in our time if we only disengage ourselves. If we disengage ourselves, we leave another strip to be occupied, a new place from which battle will begin.

They know, to be sure, that they cannot conquer us. They know something about our strength. They do not covet for a moment the risks of all-out war with us. There are two things that they are determined with all of their might to avoid: one is all-out war, the other is all-out peace. They will keep us in between as long as they have the power to do so. They do not wish all-out war because they believe that time and history are on their side. When they consider how their system has been expanding, I must say it seems to them that they have some empirical confirmation for their belief that time is on their side.

Of course, they do not want all-out peace, for their two fundamental aims do not permit them to be at peace either with their own people or with the rest of the world. If our statesmen and experts wish to make a test of any fresh proposal of theirs to see whether it really intends peace, there is a simple test. When they are ready to make peace with their own people, then we will know—and only then—that they are ready for real peace with their neighbors and with us. Otherwise, when they use the word "peace" it is just one of the gimmicks in their waging of war. It is well to remember that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev is said to have two sets of teeth, one to smile with and one to bite with. And the more dangerous

of the two is the set with which he smiles.

My next point is that "by the enemy we face," I do not mean the Russian people. The Russian people are not and have never been our enemies. They have not chosen and they do not choose their Government. They do not control its policies—except by their mute and silent pressure. And those who tell us that when the Russian people mature they will be able to control their Government and its policies, are deceiving themselves and us. No mere maturing of the Russian people will change their system, nor does their system allow them the organizational scope and independent activity, the genuine information and the right to judge which alone permit of maturing.

The Russian people are not unfriendly to us, only ill-informed, deeply curious, well-disposed toward us, and a little envious. If the gates were opened, they would vote with their feet by the millions in favor of our system. In fact, wherever they have had a chance to cross the line, they have crossed by the millions. Two-thirds of all the Chinese volunteers whom we took as prisoners during the Korean war refused to return to their native scenes, families, and lands, preferring the half-world of barbed-wire camps to returning to a country where their Government makes unending war upon them.

The real reason for the Kremlin's endless hostility toward the United States, regardless of what we do, is that they regard us, and rightly, as the main obstacle to their underlying plan. This will not be changed if Khrushchev should come to New York and see our skyscrapers, or if he should then go to Detroit and see how many automobiles our workmen have. The Russian leaders are ruthlessly friendly. They talk of easing of tensions. In our society, tension is a bad word. We can thank the Freudians for that, I suppose, for they talk of the age of anxiety and the age of tension. To anybody who comes with a panacea for easing tensions, we open our arms and our hearts. However, if every time they speak of easing of tensions you would substitute for the word "tension" the word "concern" (which is a more neutrally or differently colored word), you would see that what they are asking us to do is to stop concerning ourselves with the freedom of the world and with our own freedom. Then you would realize that we must hug our tensions to our breasts as long as the dangers exist which have caused the concern.

When I say that nothing we can do will change this, I do not mean to say that it makes no difference whether our workmen are prosperous and employed or not, or that it makes no difference how we treat our colored population, for it does make a difference. But the difference is in the winning of allies, not alienating them; in winning the secret support of the Russian people; in strengthening our prestige with neutrals. However, we will not disarm or change the philosophy or the goals of a mortal enemy. Nor do I believe with those who think that if we but disarmed everything would be easy (of course that sentence is not complete: it would be easy for the men in the Kremlin). I have never believed that the best way to get thieves to reform is to remove the locks from our doors.

The world is in serious and even mortal danger now, as it was in Hitler's day. Every country in the East is in mortal danger from China, with its huge population. Every country in Western Europe, the cradle of modern thought and liberty, is in mortal danger. Every country on the Mediterranean, which was the cradle of Western civilization and culture, is in mortal danger. The Near East, which was the cradle of our faiths, is in mortal danger at the present moment.

We have tried the gesture of "Let's be friends and see if that won't work"—we have tried it more often than our historical mem-

ories permit us to recall. I remember when Franklin Roosevelt said to Frances Perkins: "I really believe that I can get Uncle Joe to go along with me." Well, we tried it. So, at the end of the war, it turned out that there were three kinds of occupation zones. There were countries which Russia occupied ("liberated") exclusively—they lost their freedom and were sucked behind the Iron Curtain. There were the countries which were jointly occupied—all of those except one have been partitioned, and the Soviet-occupied half of each is behind the Iron Curtain (North Korea, East Germany, and so on). One country was occupied exclusively by us, Japan, and there the occupied country is free to criticize and disagree with its occupiers and liberators. If the experience of those three types of occupation does not teach us not to play this costly game of seeing if we cannot hypnotize the men in the Kremlin into abandoning their blueprint or into just being nice, then nothing will ever teach us. In the end we will perish, and deserve to perish, for being fools incapable of learning.

They are now proposing (and have been proposing for some time) a unification of Germany. Unification consists, as they have made abundantly clear, in having the two Germans linked together and then in seeing how Communist Germany can gradually take possession of West Germany as well. We tried that before, too. We tried it with the two Chinas during World War II, and we see how it turned out. We tried it with the two Koreas, and we also see how that worked out. Some poor fellows tried earnestly to co-operate with them in Eastern Europe. But the Communists took the key posts in the cabinets and popular-front governments; they took the Ministry of War, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Propaganda (Education); and, in the end, they took the country, by what former Hungarian Communist boss Mathias Rakosi called "salami tactics," in which you slice off one slice, then another slice, and then another slice, until you have the whole salami sliced up.

If we are still tempted by poisoned semantics (one of their deadliest weapons) to believe that the word "peaceful" means peace; and that coexistence means mutual tolerance and live and let live, I don't know at this late date what I can say, except perhaps that I might offer a homely metaphor: The farmer is perfectly willing for the turkey to coexist with him until Thanksgiving Day. If we keep that in mind, we will have a general notion of what they mean by peaceful coexistence.

The mistakes which our public figures have made, our statesmen, experts, journalists, diplomats—and our military men as well when we were in a joint military effort with Russia—have all sprung from the same thing: the virtual incapacity of a people brought up in an open society to understand the nature of the system we have been examining, and the aims and plans of its rulers. I could illustrate that with errors made throughout the last 41 years, since 1917. But let us start with World War II and the grand alliance. Not understanding that our ally of the moment had been, was then, and at the war's end would be also our enemy, we did not plan the peace during the war. We did not make it a self-enforcing peace, which we could only have done by planning our military conduct of the war to insure a decent peace by the position of our armies at the war's end. Therefore there has been no peace.

We have failed to understand that agreements with such an unrelenting and continuing foe are carried out only if there are deliberate provisions to make them self-enforcing. Such provisions involve the proper disposition of our military forces to insure enforcement.

Thus, when we say free elections for Germany, and they say free elections, it behooves us to remember that the elections they have in the Soviet Union are what they call free elections. We must spell out any agreement on free elections so as to include multiple parties, a press owned by individuals, associations and parties not controlled by the government, empty prisons and closed concentration camps, and the like, and joint occupying troops in quantity in all sectors, to enforce the rights and liberties we mean by the thus-defined free elections.

When they say peaceful unification arranged between the East and West German Governments, we must remember that that is what they said of Korea, of Vietnam, of wartime China. Agreements that are not spelled out and self-enforcing are merely semantic poison to prepare and justify conquest.

Above all, we are not giving our own people a clear vision of this opponent, and the nature of our struggle. How often have I sat down in taxicab or train and been asked: "What is your racket?" I answer, "Russia." Invariably the taxi driver or traveling companion follows up with: "Tell me, is Russia really as bad as our newspapers say it is?" Always I must answer, "Much worse, man. Our newspapers are not doing a good job." That depressing and forever recurring question shows how our leaders have failed to make our people understand—because they do not really understand themselves—the nature of our self-appointed opponent. Since both our political parties must appeal and do appeal recklessly and demagogically to a people to whom they have not given decent leadership and proper political education, each party poses as the party of peace while the enemy chooses to continue to make war on us. This is the most dangerous feature in our political life.

At the war's end, we demobilized our troops too soon, because we had not prepared our own minds or our people to remain mobilized until a decent peace was assured. We failed to make effective use of our then-monopoly of atomic weapons in ways which would have furthered a decent peace and effective and controlled disarmament, not because this could not have been done—it probably could—but because we were not sufficiently aware of the need to do so, and too frightened by our awful preponderance of power to make wise and restrained use of it for bringing about genuine peace and genuine liberation of the liberated countries.

We left Korea without adequate defenses because we were afraid that the Koreans might use our arms to unify their country, and we did not have the understanding to realize that the puppet government of North Korea would surely use Russian and Chinese Communist arms and forces for the peaceful unification of Korea, and the liberation of Korea from its independence. We even withdrew our troops and made the fatuous and inviting statement that Korea was not part of our essential defense perimeter. What could be expected from such a foe under such circumstances? When we finally had to fight to save Korea, we did an inspiring job. But under such self-imposed limitations that it was easy for Communist China to reconquer the northern half of the country, and restore the same impossible conditions that had brought us into war.

Our policy of containment has not contained; and our policy of liberation has not liberated; as our acceptance of the poison semantics of peaceful coexistence and the propaganda circus of summit conferences has given us neither genuine conferences for agreement on anything, nor peace, nor coexistence.

All these errors—and, alas, I could enumerate many more like them—come from a failure to understand the difficulties and

intricacies of the problems, because of a failure to understand the nature of our enemy, his system, his power, his ruthlessness, and unscrupulousness in negotiation and action, his aims, his determination, and the role of his ideology in his efforts to conquer the world and remake man. This failure of vision or understanding is at the root of our failures in action and omission and negotiation.

I have used the word enemy and I should like to explain my choice of this word. I recognize that it is not a nice or a pleasant word. But we ought not be afraid of it. We did not pick the men in the Kremlin as enemies; they picked us. We have not tried to believe their statement of their aims. They said "world revolution," but we preferred not to believe they meant it. We have tried many times to show our good will and friendship. We offered to help them with arms in 1918 to reestablish a front against the invading Germans, but all that came of it were the misunderstandings of intervention. During the so-called intervention, we helped them to get back Siberia after they had lost it, and we forced the Japanese by our pressure to give up their occupation of Siberia. When war and civil war and the follies of their socialization of every grain of wheat and every inkpot brought on universal famine, we helped to save millions of Russians from starvation by our generous famine relief. In the period of their forced industrialization, we sent them technicians and engineers, whole factories and machinery, and helped them to build dams and powerhouses.

In World War II, after they had made their pact with Hitler to divide Europe, and Hitler turned on them, our help was generous and unstinting. Instantly, not after Pearl Harbor, but as early as June 1941, Harry Hopkins flew to Stalin to offer planes and tanks and trucks and guns, and wool and meat and fuel and bread. When Stalin asked Harry Hopkins quite naturally: "What do you want in return for all this?" Again came the failure of vision and understanding. Harry Hopkins boasted: "I told him we were not interested in conditions. All we were interested in was getting them the planes, the guns, the tanks, and the other things they needed."

They have picked us as the enemy of the things they are trying to do to their people and to their neighbors. If we forget that for a moment, in any one of their maneuvers, we fail in leadership. Yet always, with each maneuver, we are prone to forget afresh. We have failed to learn from a monotonous multitude of repetitions. We have failed in understanding. We have failed in leadership and enlightenment of our own people and other peoples. We have failed in political courage. Above all, we have failed in vision—and here, truly, where there is no vision, the people perish.

I would not have you understand that we have done nothing right in these 40 years, or recently. We have done many fine things. I do not count generosity among our errors, only the generosity which defeats and undoes itself.

A power which wishes to preserve peace and prevent an upsetting of the status quo by force is always at a disadvantage when dealing with a revolutionary power. I recognize that. Moreover, our life in this recent period has had its great moments: The first stage of the Korean war; the Berlin airlift; the Marshall plan—in which we even offered to include Russia if she would use it for genuine healing of the wounds of war. These have been noble moments, and there have been others like them.

But our vision is faltering, our understanding blurred; we are too easily deceived and too ready to deceive ourselves, to the world's detriment. My purpose in this analysis has been only a single one: To give such aware-

ness of the nature of the Soviet system that the hand can be steadier, the vision clearer and more unflinching, so that each new maneuver of a tactical nature which the Soviet Government undertakes can be appraised in the light of a deeper, overall understanding of the nature of the system that torments its own people and is vowed to our destruction.

Moral Re-Armament in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter to me from my esteemed friend, Mr. Oliver W. Saul, together with two most interesting statements.

The Moral Re-Armament group is composed of citizens from over 40 nations, who have dedicated their lives—and without pay—to the task of bringing Christianity to the world in the most interesting and effective ways.

Moral Re-Armament is a great force for world peace. Their only purpose—prayers and every act—is to bring God and peace and good will to the people everywhere.

The letter and articles follow:

JOHANNESBURG, AFRICA,
January 19, 1959.

HON. BEN F. JENSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND: The enclosed report is by a leading British lawyer. It was in Washington that I first met him when he joined the statesman's mission.

At the assembly here the decision was made to start, at once, an all out offensive to do in Africa just what Sir Roy makes clear we must do.

In Lagos Nigeria performances of the play "He Was Not There" begin on February 6. A cast for the play "The Next Phase" assembling from all parts of Africa will be trained there, and will soon be in action. You may have seen both plays in Washington. The film "Freedom" will be shown throughout Africa. Commercial showings will begin here February 2. We are securing 16 mm. copies of this film in order to reach the masses in the heart of the African reserves.

Businessmen of South Africa are out to raise the funds that will be needed for the complete task. However, I am sure we will need considerable help from Europe and America.

Yesterday, over 200 gathered here to welcome the Colwell brothers who have arrived to join the 5 young men from America who have been with Moral Re-Armament in Africa for the past 2½ years. You will know if there is any way whereby Washington can give financial backing to these effective young ambassadors.

My son, Don, will be traveling right with the Colwells to introduce them. The other Americans will be scattered from here, through central and east, to west Africa. I can always be reached at the above address.

With very best wishes and kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER W. SAUL.

[From MRA Information Service]

BRITISH M.P. ON MIKOYAN'S VISIT TO U.S.A.

"Deputy Premier Mikoyan of Soviet Russia has been sent to America to pull the wool over our eyes and to trick the free world with the greatest phoney peace offense that has even been seen," a leading member of the British Parliament said today in a speech which was reported in the Los Angeles Herald Express.

John McGovern, member of the British House of Commons for 28 years, told the Moral Re-Armament Assembly for America and the Pacific Nations that Mikoyan's job is to sell America on trading with the Communists so that their revolution can be financed by the free world.

To make his point Mr. McGovern quoted the greatest authority on world communism, Mikhailovich Lenin, and Dimitri Manilski, president of the United Nations Security Council in 1949.

Mr. McGovern said that Lenin told the Communist International in 1920: "On the day that capitalist countries purchase our products, they begin their own change to communism. And they provide us with the financial means to wage the internal struggle for world communism."

He quoted Manilski who said, "To win, we will need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures, and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries will leap at another chance to be friends. But as soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with clenched fists."

Mr. McGovern continued, "That is the job of Mikoyan at this moment. It is part of the old idea of coexistence—you feel nice, cozy, and comfortable, but the real purpose is for mental and physical disarmament."

"I have been shattered at the American attitude to a man who 2 years ago proposed an agreement with the Hungarian revolutionaries and then broke it to allow Russian tanks and armies to sweep in and start that nightmare of a blood bath. That is the real Mikoyan. But now he comes to America and all that is forgotten. People wine and dine with him and say, 'He's not such a bad fellow as he's made out to be.'"

"I am not surprised to see certain people in the film industry meeting Mikoyan, because we hear Russia has great difficulty in getting her films accepted in Poland and other Iron Curtain countries. Therefore they want something from America, but also to find a market for their own spurious films by unloading them in the West."

"My earlier Marxist training taught me that the extreme left and right would both sell their country to communism—one in the pursuit of world control and the other in the pursuit of profit."

Mr. McGovern is one of the most colorful figures in British politics. He has led hunger marches from Edinburgh to London. "Once I was a Marxist," he said, "but now I am fighting all out for the revolution of moral rearmament not solely because it is answering communism on a world scale but because it is the only answer I have seen."

"The Communists see in MRA the one force that can meet them on more than level terms. It is God-guided and deals with men and women on a moral and spiritual basis. Every day more and more people in authority are beginning to turn to MRA as an answer to the world's problems. They are going on steadily in every single field, in trade unions, labor organizations, among Conservatives and Socialists, and even bringing doubt to and winning numbers of Communists. They find in MRA an alternative to the brutal lies and system of deceit that this Communist philosophy has developed."

Mr. McGovern said the man in America who is "the clearest brain in the interna-

tional field is John Foster Dulles. In spite of attacks that have been made on him right and left, he is still the one man that knows the Marxist aim. He knows how to take a stand to prevent its expansion. He could be the greatest figure in the entire world today if he could understand that moral rearmament is the positive answer to communism."

Mr. McGovern said, "Before I met MRA I was violently anti-Communist, but now I am in agreement with Chancellor Adenauer's adviser on East European affairs and communism, Dr. Hans Koch, who stated, 'We should go to the countries, the people behind the Iron Curtain and say to them, 'We are not coming to you as anti-Communists, we are coming to you with moral rearmament, a superior idea to create a new world. We seek your liberty and ours, your freedom and ours.''"

WHICH WAY AFRICA?

(By Sir Roy Pinsent, Bart.)

Will Africa be another China? In recent weeks there have been held three conferences—in Ghana, Nigeria and South Africa—which raise the issues involved. The Pan-African Peoples' Conference was held at Accra in December last. A close friend of mine attended as a press representative. As is well known, the conference was chaired by Mr. Tom Mboya, the ardent African nationalist from Kenya. The moving spirit behind the conference was Mr. George Padmore, who is Dr. Nkrumah's adviser on African affairs. One of the two joint secretaries was a Nigerian of great ability, Mr. Fred McEwen from Lagos, whom I have known well since 1956. The conference was attended by responsible leaders from all parts of Africa, and several governments made substantial contributions to the cost.

The theme of the conference was "Africa for the Africans," but as to the means by which this objective was to be reached, a compromise resolution was passed, laying emphasis on the use of nonviolence in territories where democratic means are available and giving its blessing to the use of violence only in retaliation. In a leading article in the Times of January 14, Dr. Nkrumah's visits to Delhi and Cairo are described as symbolical epilogues to this conference, and taken together amounting to a formal declaration of war in the all-out thrust against colonialism and white domination in Africa. Dr. Nkrumah, in Delhi, stated that in Ghana, while they were inspired by Gandhi's policy of nonviolence, they also believed in positive action.

It was noticeable at the Accra conference that large delegations came from Russia, China and the United Arab Republic, but little interest was shown by the West. Messages of support from Khrushchev and Chou-en-lai were announced at the opening and received prolonged applause. The delegations from Russia, China and the United Arab Republic went out of their way after the conference to assure the secretaries of their wholehearted support and help. The only message from the West was a brief message of good will which Mr. Nixon sent toward the end. The conference made it clear that the floodgates of African nationalism have been opened and cannot be closed. Its spirit was expressed in the chairman's closing remark: "The whistle has blown and we are on the march."

The second conference, in the preparations for which I was clearly concerned while I was in Lagos, was held over the New Year at Onitsha, Dr. Azikiwe's home town, on the banks of the Niger in the eastern region. There leaders from all sections of Nigeria and other West African countries met to prepare "a bold heave forward" in the moral rearmament of their nations.

Mr. McEwen, who is General Secretary of the National Council of Nigeria and the

Cameroons, called for "men of destiny" to lead Nigeria into independence. "Such men of destiny," he said, "will be men who sacrifice everything for an idea big enough to heal the hurts, relieve the fears, answer the hates and meet the needs in human nature."

Describing the upsurge of nationalism and the need to rid Africa of imperialism, he said that nationalism "needs to be purged of bitterness, hate, jealousy, ambition and corruption. The reason why democracy has not worked in certain countries of Asia and Africa is because nationalism was not purged of these things," he said.

Mr. McEwen appealed to the leaders of the Western democracies to study and understand the force of African nationalism. "This force," he said, "may be sentimental or emotional, but men are ruled not by cold reason and logic, but by those very emotions and sentiments which the Western democracies tend to despise and which the Communist countries exploit."

Describing Nigeria's role in the development of Africa as a whole, Mr. McEwen referred to its population and resources, which will make it the largest independent country on the continent, and also to the links Nigeria has with the Arab countries to the north. "Nigeria can be the key to the whole of Africa," he said. In building unity out of the diverse peoples of the country, Mr. McEwen said, "The patience, tolerance and understanding developing in Nigeria stem out of our conviction for Moral Re-Armament, and we are beginning to find the way to unity."

Mr. McEwen called for a bold heave forward where people will be prepared to risk everything to get Moral Re-Armament into the hearts and minds of the masses, so that each man can take on the struggle with his own human nature and then affect his family and create change throughout the nation. "For me," he said, "the demand is total. It means the willingness to surrender pleasure, sex, ambition, alcohol and purposeless living, and let God rule my life."

"I am optimistic about the future," Mr. McEwen concluded, "because Frank Buchman, the initiator of Moral Re-Armament, has given us this message that produces the answer. It is for us to be bold to apply this answer to every situation as it arises, and we will turn the tide."

Professor Ita, who is an action group member of the eastern parliament, as chairman of the gathering, issued a new year call to Nigeria to become "a listening nation, to realize God's purpose for Nigeria in 1959." In this way, he said, Nigeria would achieve "complete liberty and the fullest development of the best in us and of our nation's resources."

"Above the shouts of battle in politics, above the sordid squabbles at home, wranglings in the market and industry," Professor Ita said, "we must hear the voice of God. His wavelength is absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness, and absolute love. We must listen and obey."

His Highness Okosi II, Oba (King) of Onitsha, received the entire conference at his palace. After hearing from representatives of the different regions, the Oba spoke of his part in the making of the film "Freedom" here in 1956. "I and my red-capped chiefs have studied Frank Buchman's work and message," he said. "We are happy to follow the same steps."

A South African farmer, Mr. Roland Kingwill, speaking with his wife and daughter, said, "I am glad to be here to apologize and to find the way to restore for the way people like myself have lived in South Africa. People often come to South Africa and attack our political problems," he continued. "Dr. Buchman came and saw that our problems had to be tackled deeper down—they were the moral problems of men like me, bitterness, resentment, greed, and fear. The

issue is not between black and white but between those who decide to obey God's will and those who live for their own self-will."

The Nigerian leaders who convened and carried the Onitsha conference are men of action, and immediate plans on a national scale are in hand to give practical effect to their convictions.

The third conference, at most of which I was present, was held at the Moral Rearmament center between Pretoria and Johannesburg from January 1st to 8th to plan South Africa's part in making Africa the answer continent." Over 300 people from all parts of South Africa, including leading people from law and education, businessmen, sheep farmers, revolutionary African political leaders, and students, were there. Also present were two chiefs from Basutoland, one of whom had just returned from the recent constitutional talks in London.

Dr. William Nkomo from Pretoria, first president of the revolutionary African National Congress Youth League, opening the conference said, "This conference will formulate a strategy for our continent. All of us are thinking on a Pan-African basis. There are people who are thinking on an ideological basis to change Africa and make it another China. People want to know—will Africa be another China? It depends on whether you and I by our living allow it.

"African nationalism moving side by side with white supremacy and domination will lead to clash and unprecedented bloodshed. Either there will be catastrophe tomorrow and our children will not know the new Africa that we want, or we hand our lives over to God and live as God directs. It rests on you and me being prepared to live by absolute moral standards. It isn't what the white man or the black man wants, or what both want, but only what God directs. In the words of Dr. Frank Buchman, Africa can be the answer continent."

Responding on behalf of the white South Africans, Mr. Roland Kingwell, who had just returned from 5 months with the Moral Rearmament force in Europe and West Africa, said, "If we don't think in terms of the whole of Africa we are living in an unreal world and we need to wake up and rise to our destiny." He continued: "I love this country. For many years I talked about loving it and just took out of it, and it was only after I had seen what I had been doing and where we were drifting that I began to understand what patriotism really meant. We are being called to the deepest patriotism today. God can give an answer to the people who listen. I am committed to bring that answer to Africa, because I believe that Africa can bring the answer to Russia and China. We haven't much time to grasp that opportunity, but if we do we have the greatest destiny as a nation."

Speaking in Afrikaans and standing with other Afrikaner leaders, Advocate John Tregrove of Pretoria said, "We represent the first white settlement of the southern tip of Africa. We feel that we have come here with a special destiny, and we have discovered afresh through Moral Rearmament what that destiny is. We are grateful for the contribution which our forebears have made toward the development of South Africa, and where we have caused hurt to other races in this country, or where we have been indifferent to the real interests of other groups in South Africa, we want to accept responsibility for that and ask forgiveness from the other races."

"We believe that a new South Africa and a new Africa cannot be built on the superiority of any one group," continued Advocate Tregrove, "whether that be in South Africa or Ghana or Egypt or anywhere else. As Christians we are called to serve our fellow human beings in South Africa and Africa. That is why we stand here today and commit our lives to this struggle, to fight with repre-

sentatives of all races of Africa for what is right in our country and throughout the continent of Africa according to the plan of God. To that we wish to commit our lives and submit our wills to the will of God."

Two weeks after Basutoland had received its new constitution, two senior chiefs motored several hundred miles to this assembly because, said Chief Mopedi Jonathan Molapo, "We are in a state of transition and Basutoland needs this answer most." Chief Molapo, who had recently returned from the constitutional talks in London, continued: "The people I have seen here have shown us the way which God would like us to follow. I want to be a changed man in order that I should play my part with this big force that is going out to the world."

Mr. Benjamin Angoma, revolutionary African leader from Johannesburg, said, "We Africans, particularly in South Africa, live at the crossroads with offers of different ideologies. Being desperate, we will accept anything that will mean freedom for us in our own country. Now we as a black race are being offered communism. Society cannot live without an ideology. You refuse an offer because you have something better. Can we really repel that offer of communism because we have not seen it at work? We, accepted the Western way of life but in it saw hatred, selfishness, and impurity at work."

"We can only refuse communism if a change of heart takes place. From both black and white in this country we need a change of heart through moral rearmament. So under the guidance of God I have decided to throw in my lot with this new ideology with its absolute moral standards."

I am convinced that Africa need not become another China and will not do so if the tide of nationalism can be guided into positive and creative channels, along lines which the new leadership so much in evidence at these New Year conferences is determined to pursue.

I am convinced that we in Britain can do much to help this new leadership to achieve its goal, if we approach the situation realistically but humbly with open heart and mind and a real caring for the African people.

I am convinced that what happens on this continent in the next few years will profoundly affect the course of history.

Tight Money Millstone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the current issue of the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

TIGHT MONEY MILLSTONE

Now that the reactionary press is aiding and abetting President Eisenhower's campaign against important social legislation by attacking spenders who advocate such measures, we'd like to call attention to one of the biggest budget items which proves who the real spenders are.

Syndicated Columnist Sylvia Porter points out that at the end of the Korean war our national debt was close to \$280 billion. The interest we taxpayers kicked out to carry this debt was about \$4.7 billion.

The President's latest budget, with the national debt standing at \$282.7 billion—or

just about the same as at the close of the Korean conflict—provides for interest payments of \$8.1 billion, or nearly twice as much as during Truman's days.

Why are we paying so much more—almost \$4 billion more—in interest on the national debt? Sylvia Porter says, "It has been the result of deliberate policies adopted at the highest policymaking levels in Washington."

This is the real spending waste in our national life, because this interest goes into powerful investment trusts. It is paid to the banks, the big businesses, the insurance companies that already control most of this country's wealth. Very little reaches ordinary consumers who spend what they get and keep the wheels of the economy moving.

This is the tight money policy we have been writing about ever since the Eisenhower administration arbitrarily began to encourage higher interest rates to discourage expansion.

Isn't it about time—especially in view of rising unemployment which has sent unemployment compensation claims beyond the 10,000 mark right here in Berks County—that this story of tight money and anti-expansion policies of the Republican regime in Washington is told forcefully to the people?

A stabilized dollar at high interest rates doesn't mean a hoot to people who can't even get a job.

Did Mr. Mikoyan Get the Message?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the recent holiday by Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan evoked interesting reactions in this country. Though I do not approve of egg throwing or other forms of hooliganism, such actions did, nevertheless, serve to show Mr. Mikoyan that we are not fooled by phony overtures of friendliness by the Soviet Union.

I must admit I was not impressed with the actions of some of our business leaders who seemed to think Mr. Mikoyan was a happy dispenser of good cheer and small jokes. Politeness is one thing, but when it can be misinterpreted for weakness and a desperate desire to conciliate, then perhaps etiquette must be modified. One of my constituents, in a letter to the editor of the Binghamton (N.Y.) Sun, set out what I think should be our correct attitude toward Mr. Mikoyan.

If Mikoyan took back any impression that this Nation is going to lie down and let the Soviets fool us and milk us of technical know-how and strategic goods in the next few years, I hope he will now realize that the attitude expressed in the following letter is indicative of general public opinion throughout the United States.

Under unanimous consent I include the letter, as follows:

HE ASKED FOR IT

EDITOR, THE BINGHAMTON STAR:

I sincerely wish that reality were such that I could conscientiously commend your January 12 editorial, "Bad Behavior." Reality forbids it.

The only reason any United States citizen or refugee from Communist atrocities should feel humiliation in connection with the Mikoyan visit would be because our high Government officials allowed themselves to be sold this Communist propaganda visit to build up their prestige and because so many big businessmen and bankers, following the Eric Johnston line fall all over themselves to show they will do anything to make more dollars. Yes anything, even to sit down and break bread with this moral leper at dinner parties, "in his honor," not realizing that you cannot honor an object which has no honor. I say object, because other than his physical shape, on his record no one can consider him to be a human being.

Naming the Communists with political parties and religious faiths is grossly misleading to many people because communism is neither a political party nor a religious faith, but an atheistic conspiracy—the most vicious the world has ever known.

Comparing the Mikoyan visit to the United States with Vice President and Mrs. Nixon's visit to South America is absurd. The Nixon visit was definitely a good-will tour to countries where the United States has given millions of dollars in aid, both cash and credits, and has never mistreated a single citizen. On the other hand, Russia imprisons our citizens on the slightest trumped up pretext and still holds thousands of our civilians and servicemen in their slave labor camps. They collaborated with Red China in holding 944 of our servicemen illegally after the ill-advised Panmunjom armistice, besides the hundreds transferred to their Siberian salt mines during the war in Korea and some probably as far west as their slave labor camps in Solovetski islands in the White Sea, not far from Leningrad, which they started as far back as 1920. It was Russia's Communists and their dupes who did the atrocious things to the Nixons on their South American trip and most assuredly on the orders from this same Mikoyan, who also gave the orders for the slaughter in Hungary. Now, to a small degree, it's backfiring and he and his dupes don't like it.

His mission here was not a "holiday," but a trip planned to spread more propaganda, to build up Communist prestige, to buy strategic machinery and other strategic materials that Russia needs, and that on credit which we United States taxpayers will pay for, as it is certain Russia never will.

How long do you think Teddy Roosevelt or Grover Cleveland would have put up with such asinine nonsense, from any country, especially while they were holding thousands of our citizens in their slave labor camps?

Please, fellow Americans, wake up, it's later than you realize.

FORD M. SPERRY.

The National Debt: Cheaper To Pay Than To Owe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, our national debt stands today at \$283 billion.

In the new fiscal year we shall be paying \$8.1 billion in interest.

The trend toward higher interest indicates clearly that the Government soon will be paying 3.5 percent on all its obligations,

or a total annual interest of \$9.8 billion, assuming the total debt remains unchanged.

This means that, of every dollar paid in Federal taxes, approximately 11 cents must go for carrying charges on the debt.

It means also that, if things go along exactly as they have been going, without any change in the total debt and with the Government having to pay 3.5 percent interest on its borrowings, in 28 years we will have paid the total amount of the debt, but we will still owe all of it.

This is a tremendous amount to pay in interest, for which our Government and our Nation get nothing in return. It is the price we are paying simply for the privilege of owing this huge debt.

Of course, so long as we have the debt, the carrying charges must be paid. There is no alternative, unless we were to mimic the Soviet Government and repudiate our obligation to those of our citizens who have loaned money to their Government. This would be so utterly unthinkable that it shames us even to mention it.

HOW MUCH IS \$9.8 BILLION?

But the interest charges on our public debt have grown so large that they constitute today an immense burden upon the taxpayers of our Nation. They amount to almost \$10 billion annually in dead weight.

As we struggle this year to strike a precarious budget balance in face of national needs, inflationary pressures and high taxes, anyone can think of a thousand beneficial uses for this \$9.8 billion annually.

It could build some 15,000 miles of superhighways of the most modern design each year, and thus complete the entire 41,000-mile Interstate Highway program in less than 3 years.

Or, applied to development of the Nation's water resources, it could complete in 1 year three times as many flood control and navigational projects as have been authorized for the next 10 years.

Applied to soil conservation for the saving of our Nation's most indispensable wealth, it could perform more useful works in 1 year than we have devoted to this awesomely important task in the past 25 years inclusively or perhaps in the entire history of our Nation.

It could purchase some 700 B-58's, more than we would ever need of the world's best, most sophisticated and most costly weapons system; whereas we are struggling along today purchasing between 30 and 40 a year and wondering nervously if these are enough to serve their minimum purpose of deterring aggression.

Or, considered another way, this \$9.8 billion if returned to the taxpayers on an equal prorata basis would mean that the average taxpaying family head could pay some \$275 less in taxes every year.

LET'S MAKE A PLAN TO PAY IT OFF

In the interest of our own generation and of generations yet to come, I believe we should make a positive resolution and develop a definite plan of systematic debt retirement. I firmly believe the American public expects such leadership

from the national Congress and will be disappointed if we fail to provide it.

I have today introduced a concurrent resolution which would set forth such a plan. It would express the sense of Congress that in each succeeding year we should pay on the principal an amount equal to not less than 1 percent of the present indebtedness.

In other words, the present Congress would be pledging ourselves—and insofar as it is within the power of this Congress we would be calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury and future Congresses—to pay an amount not less than \$2.8 billion annually to the reduction and eventual retirement of this burdensome national obligation.

Such payments, of course, would be in addition to the interest payments which we are obliged to pay and over which we seem to have no control. But as the principal decreased, the interest would decrease. In 100 years, the debt would be completely paid and the slate wiped clean.

Under this plan, as I shall point out, we would actually pay many billions of dollars less over the next 100 years, in both principal and interest, than we shall be compelled to pay in interest alone if no such course is embarked upon.

In the beginning, to be sure, it would be an additional burden of expense. But it would be an honest burden, honestly assumed. It shall have to be undertaken someday, and the sooner we face up to it, the less costly it will be to our progeny.

CHEAPER TO PAY THAN TO OWE

If we can demonstrate the self-discipline, Mr. Speaker, to chart such a path and stick to it, we can reach a point in 29 years at which we shall have reduced the debt to a level where we will be paying no more in both principal and interest than we now are being called upon to pay in interest alone.

For the basic figures upon which I found this approach, I am indebted to a man named R. S. Shade who lives in Tulsa, Okla. He has worked out a table of payments based upon a \$2.8 billion application to principal and allocation of interest at 3.5 percent on the unpaid balance.

In profound but simple terms, these figures reveal the amazing and yet inescapable fact that it is more than \$485 billion cheaper to pay off the debt in 100 years than it would be simply to continue paying the interest for that period of time.

In 100 years we could completely retire the debt by paying \$495 billion in interest and \$283 billion of principal, or a total of \$778 billion. But if we pay nothing on the debt itself, the interest alone for 100 years will be \$980 billion, and we will still owe the debt of \$283 billion, or a total of \$1,263 trillion.

During the past 4 years we have three times extended the temporary debt ceiling and once increased the permanent ceiling. Since the end of World War II, there has only been one brief period—during the Truman administration—when our Government has made any reduction whatever in the national debt.

Yet these years have been years of comparative national prosperity. If it has not been possible for Congress during these years to reduce the indebtedness, we must wonder seriously if ever in the future we shall find it either expedient or even possible to do so without a definite commitment to some systematic plan.

We have had emergencies during this period, to be sure. But can anyone honestly contend that there exists any realistic prospect for the lessening of these tensions and critical demands in the foreseeable future?

Our Nation is engaged with Russia in a titanic competition which may not be resolved for a generation or more. And we fully intend and expect to be in business at a nation after this period of recurrent crises and ideological conflicts shall have ended.

CHALLENGE TO STATESMANSHIP

Why then, does it not make sense to gear ourselves to the long pull and begin facing in earnest the challenge of true fiscal responsibility which seems so clearly to demand such a course?

It would be a demonstration of our faith that this Nation expects to continue in operation for at least 100 years and are conducting our business with no other end in view.

It should provide a good example of resolution and sound economy to the families of our Nation who must of necessity make plans for the eventual retirement of their private debts. And 100 years in the life of a nation is not so long as it may seem.

Such a plan should have a salutary effect upon the inflationary spiral of cheap money and increasing indebtedness. It should revive confidence both in our own land and throughout the world in the stability of our dollar.

Perhaps more basic than any of this, however, it would constitute a simple act of good faith with those generations of Americans yet to come.

This is a challenge to our vision and to our statesmanship. It will require discipline and self-restraint of both the Congress and the American public. But I believe the American Nation is equal to it. Let it not be said that the Congress lacks the courage or the faith to put it to the test.

North Dakota Representatives Urge Removal of Excise Taxes on Telephone Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. DON. L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the excise taxes upon local and long-distance telephone service were imposed during World War II and the original justification for these taxes no longer exists.

In this connection the House of Representatives of North Dakota has passed a resolution which I commend to my colleagues. The resolution follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 4

Resolution memorializing the Congress to remove the wartime excise taxes upon local and long-distance telephone service

Whereas a Federal excise tax of 10 percent upon the charges for local and long-distance telephone service was passed in 1941 as an emergency wartime measure to provide needed funds to support the war effort and to discourage the use of telephone service during the war period; and

Whereas telephone service is an essential part of our way of life and cannot under any circumstances be considered a luxury item to be taxed in the same manner as furs, jewelry, liquor and other luxury commodities; and

Whereas other household and business necessities, including electricity, water and gas are not taxed in such a manner; and

Whereas the placement of high excise taxes upon such a necessity of life as telephone service results in the taxation of those citizens who can least afford to pay in the same manner as those of unlimited financial means; and

Whereas the wartime emergency requiring the special additional revenue and restriction of the use of telephone service has long since passed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota; That the Congress is urgently requested to remove the unfair and inequitable tax upon telephone service during the current session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded without delay by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

HJALMAR NYGAARD,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.

National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, some of the excellent mail that I receive from my constituents is worthy of far greater notice than the confines of my office. With the permission of the writer, I am inserting in the Record an excellent letter written by Dr. Serge A. Korff, professor of physics at New York University. Dr. Korff points out the importance of support of the National Science Foundation and the pure science aspects of our various science programs.

The letter follows:

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS,
New York, N.Y., January 5, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Congressman from New York,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. LINDSAY: There will presently come before the House various measures sponsored by the administration for the

financial support of science in general and the National Science Foundation in particular. Such bills will presumably have Bureau of the Budget support and will, in my opinion, represent a minimum that should be done for science.

Further, it is often argued that other agencies, including the NASA, the AEC, and the research branches of the armed services, as well as other organizations, support research in basic science. It is, of course, true that they do, yet their budgets must principally cover applied science and development work. In this area the principal problem is one of semantics, for there are many pure scientists who would call much of the work those agencies support applied science, technology, or, indeed, development of military hardware. Now certainly applied science and technology and the development of military hardware are necessary, and should also be supported. It is not my view that these should be reduced. Actually, after pure science has uncovered new facts, it often takes a long and costly period of passing first through applied science and then through development before the new fact or idea is useable in a practical way. Therefore, the second and third steps must be supported also; but the main purpose of my argument is that sometimes the use of words is such that the considerable outlays for applied science and development are considered as being spent for pure science and that, therefore, science gets shortchanged.

In this complex technological world, the role of the pure scientist, and indeed often the lone investigator remains the principal spring from which flow the ideas which later make up our technology. The new ideas and facts of nature, which it is the job of the pure scientist to unearth, represent the capital upon which the system functions. These are the ideas which the applied scientist applies, and which later the technologists develop for industry. It is vital to the functioning of industry that this orderly progression in the flow of ideas continue uninterrupted. Among the newest of the ideas there must necessarily often be many that don't work, or that turn out to be impractical, or indeed wrong. And yet if we do not continue to stimulate the flow of ideas, our subsequent technology dries up.

It is often impossible for a pure scientist to say, where a given study may lead, or indeed if it will lead anywhere. He may, of course, guess, but one should not be surprised if the actual direction of subsequent events is quite different. For example, if someone were seeking to find a better way to help surgeons set bones, who would think of studying the passage of electrical discharges through a rather bad vacuum? Yet this way X-rays were discovered. The great advances in technology spring often from quite unexpected facts found by pure science. No man has ever been wise enough to foresee all the ramifications. Science is, as Dr. V. Bush has so ably put it, our "endless frontier." This is so because science is knowledge, especially knowledge of nature, and many more facts remain to be discovered. Once discovered, how to apply them is sometimes obvious. But none can say what they will be before they are discovered.

The reason I am laboring the point is that the difference between pure and applied science is often not understood in this country. Our great genius here is in taking the second and third steps. We can take fission, discovered in Germany, and build the large plants needed for the next step in harnessing the process for useful ends. We can consider penicillin, discovered in England, and build the plants to produce it in quantity. But it seems poor public policy always to await the discovery of new facts by Europeans. In the long run we must learn to take the first step here also. This, in turn, means build-

ing up a vigorous and healthy basic science, and a climate in which this science can grow. To do this we must continue to build and back an increasing effort in pure science. Frankly, I do not think that this country has as yet done this on a scale required by our world leadership.

While I dislike to use the Russian argument to favor increasing our support of science, for I think that it should need no such prop and that it can be shown to deserve support in its own right; nevertheless the argument is cogent today. We are facing an increasing challenge, and whether we like it or not are in a race for the control of our environment. Science will give us the facts needed to control nature and to build an advancing technology. But if we cut down on science, then the flow of new ideas dwindles, and soon our applied scientists will be out of new ideas to apply. With new ideas shut off the technology too will cease to advance. The process is a slow one due to the time taken in the intermediate steps, but it is inevitable. It seems today hardly necessary to point out that the fruits of niggardly support of pure science in the past have been the striking relative advance of Russian technology.

I am well aware of the economic problems which are relevant and of the difficult task of the Bureau of the Budget. Nevertheless, we must not starve the goose that lays the golden egg, lest the supply dwindle below the levels we already know to be dangerous. For these reasons I urge support of the money bills for the National Science Foundation and for the pure research portions of the budgets of the other agencies.

Very sincerely yours,

SERGE A. KORFF,
Professor of Physics.

Mr. Hoover on Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Register of January 19, 1959:

MR. HOOVER ON DELINQUENCY

Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, has appropriately called attention in Congress to a lengthy article written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and published in This Week magazine.

This article by Mr. Hoover was entitled "Counterattack on Juvenile Delinquency."

In this article, which appeared in three parts, the Director of the FBI recommended that the counterattack against juvenile delinquency should include these points:

- "1. Accenting the responsibilities of parents.
- "2. Improving our juvenile courts and juvenile-aid facilities.
- "3. Stopping the coddling of young criminals.
- "4. Stopping the protection of juvenile hoodlums by secrecy.
- "5. Cracking down on the corrupters of youth.
- "6. Attacking delinquency at the local level."

Mr. Hoover pointed out that "fighting existing delinquency, however, is only half the problem. At the same time, we must also

begin today to reestablish a firm moral structure to prevent future delinquency. We must stop sowing the seeds for more frightening delinquency in the years to come."

In emphasizing that the problem is not limited to dealing with current cases of juvenile delinquency but also involves a need for more effective action to prevent future delinquency among the young, Mr. Hoover is, of course, correct.

In commenting on the punishment of juvenile offenders, Mr. Hoover pleaded against undue leniency.

"In dealing with juveniles, it is essential that the punishment fit both the offense and the offender," he wrote.

"* * * Six boys in Virginia were convicted of savagely beating and mistreating a mule * * *. The judge who heard the case ordered that the boys be given what many may regard as an appropriate punishment, a good, sound, old-fashioned whipping by their parents.

"In addition, each of the six was released to the custody of his parents on strict injunction of good behavior until he attains the age of 18.

"In another case, a 17-year-old boy who had committed extensive acts of vandalism in a high school was placed on probation under the provision that he find a part-time job after school and make restitution at the rate of \$20 per month for the damage he had done.

"If, as a result of their sentences, the six Virginia youths learn to respect the feelings of animals and the teen-age vandal learns to value the property of others, the courts will have helped them to become better citizens."

Mr. Hoover has made extensive and intensive study of the juvenile delinquency problem in this country. What he says on the subject is worthy of thought.

Extending Universal Military Training Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

The House on Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as we are called upon to vote upon H.R. 2260, which will extend the draft for 4 more years, I find myself in the position of being dissatisfied with the operation of the draft in some respects and at the same time reluctantly concluding that voting against the bill is not the way to correct the matters to which I object. I have read the testimony before the committee word for word and all of the reports. I have very seriously considered voting against this bill and for that reason spent about 14 hours carefully reading every piece of material and chart available. The statistical matter confirms conversations and communications which I have had from persons in the district I represent, to the effect that the

military has been reducing the number of Ready Reserves and in some instances refusing to take men into the Ready Reserves when at the same time they are drafting new men into service who do not want to leave their civilian pursuits. It seems inexcusable to me that someone who wants to serve and be a minuteman, is refused the opportunity to do so; at the same time someone else is refused the opportunity to stay out of the service. Another thing that I dislike is not having a program for selectees where they can take about 3 months of intensive training and return under a Reserve obligation to become a part of the Ready Reserve. Many of these boys have an extreme hardship when taken away for a 2-year period, but almost all of them could be away for a 3-month period and then come home and remain in the Ready Reserve without nearly so much sacrifice. The other reason I feel so strongly about this is that many of these young men that were drafted for a 2-year period have told me that only the first 3 months of their tour of duty was spent learning how to be a soldier. Too many of these who are inducted spend most of their 2-year period either doing nothing, or cooking, chauffeuring, or doing something unrelated to the defense of our country. I object to inducting young men for these kinds of jobs. There are civilians who would like to have a job cooking in Army camps and my experience has been that no matter how much experience young men have at cooking with military recipes, the food still is no better.

I am very much impressed, however, with the figure shown in the report which indicates that of the men who reach 26 years of age and therefore have graduated from the 8-year period during which they were liable under the Selective Service Act for military obligation, over 70 percent received military training of some kind and that 286,000 were inductees, 467,000 were volunteers, and 17,000 had entered the Reserves or National Guard. It is very clear to me from these figures that even if the military would keep everyone who wants to stay in the Ready Reserves and even if it did not waste men, it still would be unable to maintain the forces that the experts conclude we need. I was also informed upon questioning the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], a long-time member of the Armed Services Committee and regarded as an expert on personnel matters on the committee, that I am not alone in feeling that the Military Establishment has not done the best job that it could in all of these matters, however, it has been brought to my attention that when the appropriations for the military are brought before the Congress there is some opportunity to review these matters and Congress can make some qualifications in expenditures in the fields which may help in the situation. It is a very bad situation when we try to administer as well as legislate, but it is also recognized as a fact by many of us that too many of the military are not as imbued with the necessity of avoiding waste in the military as most of us are and if the administration is unwilling to do

anything about it then there is no choice but for the Congress to do everything it can. I am voting for the 4-year extension of the draft but I am also going to go to work to do what I can to help reduce the number of selectees that are inducted to take the place of other young men who are refused the opportunity to be a member of the Ready Reserves. We must do this even if it requires placing qualifications on the appropriations for the military.

It seems to me that we must vote for an extension of the Military Training and Service Act today and then continue to do all that we can to alleviate the necessities for using it to the extent that it has been used in the past.

"Spain's Struggle for Freedom"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we know too little of modern Spain. A book that deserves close attention from Members of Congress and others who wish to know more is "Spain's Struggle for Freedom," by Lawrence Fernsworth. His experience qualifies him to write a book on this struggle which is still in progress and to which our contribution has been entirely too negative.

By unanimous consent I am inserting two reviews of his book, one from the *Christian Century*, September 10, 1958, and one from the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, September 16, 1958:

[From the *Christian Century*, Sept. 10, 1958]

FULL SWEEP: "SPAIN'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM," BY LAWRENCE FERNSWORTH

(Review by W. Stanley Rycroft)

The time has come when the complete story of Spain, and especially its glorious but tragic struggle for freedom, must be told. This book does just that in a moving and convincing way. Lawrence Fernsworth gives us the full sweep of the drama of a people struggling to be free; it is a drama of heroism, disillusionment and tragedy. The author has been a student of Spain for almost 30 years. As a reporter for the *Times of London* and a special reporter for the *New York Times*, he has been an eyewitness of many tragic events, for he has lived for long periods in Spain, particularly during the civil war.

It should be pointed out that the struggle for freedom in Spain did not begin with the birth of the Second Republic in the thirties; it is "the oldest thing of its kind in Europe." Prof. Trend of Cambridge University is quoted as saying, "It is seldom remembered that democratic government began, not in England, but in Spain," the principle being established in that country, before Magna Carta, that the king could not take action against the person or property of any of his subjects, "except by process of law."

The author's thesis is that Spaniards live in two Spanish worlds: one the world of individual freedom and human equality, an urge deeply implanted in the hearts of the masses; the other an absolutist, privileged world, the kind of world that imposed the

deadly Inquisition and brought on political and religious wars. The upholders of this absolutist world consider individual liberty and equality very un-Spanish. The watchword of the former world is "toward happiness from below" and of the latter "revolution from the top."

During the past hundred years the forces that have withstood the demands for human freedom are the throne, the altar, and the army, or in other words, the monarchy, the political church, and the political generals. Sometimes there was a partnership between two of these, sometimes between all three.

Out of the turmoil and confusion of the Napoleonic wars, the political generals emerged; at times some stood with the throne and others with the people, but largely they have been motivated by personal power. "The word 'General' became synonymous with ambition, opportunism and treachery." One of the main purposes of the partnership of the Spanish throne and the Roman Catholic Church was the isolation of Spain from modern liberal culture. The dual nature of the Roman Catholic Church, that is, the spiritual church and the political church, is seen in Spain as in no other country, although often it has been impossible to draw a sharp distinction between the two.

At the end of a period of repression under the throne-and-altar partnership lasting over 200 years, came the Peninsular War against Napoleon which seemed to awaken the Spanish people and give rise to popular resistance movements. A new constitution approved in 1812 played an important role because it symbolized the democratic yearnings of the people. In 1873 the First Republic came into being as a result of 30 years of efforts by the Republican Party, but it lasted only 11 months.

A considerable part of this book is devoted to the rise and fall of the Second Republic, which the author considers the greatest moment in Spanish history. The Second Republic, which came into being in April 1931, is termed "the fifth phase in [Spain's] struggle for freedom. It was a gallant adventure." In this Republic the 1812 Constitution of Cadiz provided a basis for the new constitutional government. There were, however, two important changes: the king was no longer recognized and separation of church and state was proclaimed. Two criticisms that have been leveled against the Republic—that it was anticatholic and that it brought communism into Spain—are dealt with in detail. The author brings out the fact that Alcalá Zamora, the first president, was a staunch Roman Catholic and that the government never intended to be anticatholic. Rather it sought to hold the political church within reasonable bounds.

The story of how the Republic was destroyed within a few years from both within and without, is told graphically and forthrightly. Hand in hand the church and the political generals plotted and maneuvered. During a period of conspiracy some of the reactionary and treacherous generals were exiled. Says the author, "This was the Republic's worst and most fatal mistake." Francisco Franco was one of these. He and other exiled generals made contact with the agents of Hitler and Mussolini through General Sanjurjo who had been sentenced to death for treason but had later been pardoned and allowed to cross over to Portugal. The Republic was deserted in its hour of need by those who should have been its staunchest friends—Great Britain, France, and the United States.

The charge that the Republic was pro-Communist cannot be substantiated. As the author points out, until the rebellion broke out the Republic refused to establish diplomatic relations with Russia and it was not until 2 months after the outbreak of civil war that Russia decided to send badly needed arms. If Communists fought in the

ranks of the International brigades, it is also true that Mussolini sent many thousands of Fascist soldiers to Spain. Fernsworth learned by questioning prisoners after 30,000 Italians were routed at Guadalajara that many of them had been duped into thinking they were going to Abyssinia to settle. The defeat of the Republic was brought about by the sheer weight of arms and men from Germany and Italy and massive bombing raids on defenseless towns. History will show that the civil war in Spain was the prelude to World War II.

However, the civil war is not the end of the story told in this book. The United States tripartite military pact, usually known as the bases agreement, is examined carefully. The author states that of all the European countries, Spain is the least communistic, but points out that the United States seems to have done about all it could to disillusion the liberal democratic people of Spain and "drive them toward communism, however they hated it."

By placing an embargo on arms to Spain in the thirties, the United States contributed to the downfall of the most democratic government Spain ever had. The bases agreement seemed to say to the rest of the world as well as to Spain that we put expediency before ideals and principles by giving aid to a regime which was once the close ally of Hitler and Mussolini. Says Lawrence Fernsworth: "All the evidence points to the conclusion that the move [the bases agreement] has earned for the United States suspicion and ill will in many places; that it has lessened its moral authority."

Fernsworth ends on an optimistic note. "The dictatorship will collapse," he says. "Every Spaniard knows that." There is hope in the fact that there are still liberal Spanish Catholics such as the Jesuit priest, Laburu, who told the Mexican newspaper *Excelsior*: "I prefer the authentic catholicism of the Republic to the formless, catholicism of this present time. . . . The young priests do not hesitate to express their disconformity with the formula that 'state equals church.'"

[From the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Dec. 16, 1958]

TERRORISM IN FRANCE'S SPAIN

Soviet Russia, unfortunately, is not the only country in the world where a Boris Pasternak is unwelcome. It is not the only land which does not allow its people to read such a book as "Doctor Zhivago," that is a book that is critical of the ruling power. Spain today is such a country.

The cartoon on this page shows Spain's dictator, Francisco Franco, twirling the keys to a cell door that locks away Spanish citizens who have committed the offense of thinking and speaking for themselves. They are representatives of the 80 or more young scientists, doctors, lawyers, factory leaders, and students who have been put behind bars for daring to criticize Franco's totalitarian regime.

Iberica, the monthly magazine published in New York by friends of Spanish freedom as a means of spreading facts about Franco's terrorist rule, shows that the new prisoners range all the way from sympathizers with the idea of an eventual democracy in Spain, to some who seek the return of the old monarchy of which the late Alfonso XIII was the last king. To a Franco it makes little difference what the dissent is or where it originates; there is only one allowable view, and that is the view of the controlling authority. Developments in the post-war world led the United States to work out defense arrangements with respect to an elaborate and costly system of air bases in Spain. This does not require anyone to admire or support Franco's iron-handed rule. Countless Americans who have agreed to sending defense funds that have propped up the Franco economy, hate his every terrorist act.

Meanwhile the United States has gained little in good will in Franco's Spain. As Lawrence Fernsworth, long a New York Times correspondent in Madrid, reminds us in his excellent book, "Spain's Struggle for Freedom," the dictator's regime has caused its tightly controlled press to denounce the United States for not pouring in still more money. When a Spanish newspaper speaks it is Franco speaking, for in Mr. Fernsworth's words, "the press gets its orders every day concerning what it must say and must not say." It is no wonder that many new political prisoners are in jail.

Playing With Economic Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following article by David Lawrence, "Playing With Economic Disaster," which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., February 6, 1959:

PLAYING WITH ECONOMIC DISASTER—VOTE TO INCREASE HOUSING FUNDS FEARED AS FIRST STEP TOWARD INFLATION DEBACLE

(By David Lawrence)

An economic debacle is in the making. Can it be avoided? Both Houses of Congress took on Wednesday a step that may hasten its coming. The American people may learn sooner than anybody has believed possible that a blunder was made in the election last November by giving the Democratic Party control of Congress.

For the threat now is that if the budget is unbalanced higher taxes for everybody will have to be enacted. And if the revenues to balance the higher spending begun by the Democrats are not to be collected by the Government, then the American people are in for an era of inflation that could send the cost of living upward and eventually bring the dollar down to a 10-cent purchasing power. This would mean international danger. For the weakness in the American dollar would have a far-reaching effect on the currencies of Western nations.

The vote in the House and Senate this week on the Federal housing program is significant. It was a bold defiance of budget balancing and an invitation to higher and higher taxes. President Eisenhower has said frankly that if the budget is unbalanced he will demand the passage of higher taxes.

The Democrats lined up almost solidly for budget busting and disregarded the inflationary dangers. Of the 282 Democrats in the House, 257 voted to authorize \$300 million to provide direct loans to veterans for housing whenever they cannot borrow from private institutions. Only two Democrats voted with 121 Republicans against the measure. Just why any group of American citizens should be given such an advantage—especially in these days when there are outcries about second-class citizenship and discrimination—is not clear to anybody except the politicians. They think the relatively small number of veterans in the country who can't borrow from private loan institutions is a big enough vote to go after in disregard of the interests of all other voters. But that's selfish and misguided politics.

Democrats cast 51 of the 58 votes in the Senate against the administration's housing program, and in favor of more money than the budget provided. Only 7 Democrats

voted with 25 Republicans to support the President's budget. This shows plainly that in both Houses of Congress, the Democratic Party has become the party of the spenders and looks with scorn on the savers.

There are several bills coming up for consideration in Congress involving the expenditure of more billions than the budget provides. If the Democrats think the country is back of them, they'll make a shambles of the President's budget. There is a feeling on Capitol Hill that the country doesn't care and that the sky is the limit on public spending if a "welfare" label can be pinned on it. Indeed, there are many so-called economists who say that the more spent, the more the country will prosper. No private individual has ever been able to get by on a doctrine that favors spending more than one earns or borrowing more than one can pay back.

The only reason the Government can borrow large sums of money while its tax receipts are down is because people have confidence in the ultimate capacity of the Treasury to pay back what it borrows. Once this confidence is shaken and Government bonds depreciate in value, the Government has to pay higher and higher interest rates. The price of everything else goes up correspondingly.

The biggest worry in America today is how long public confidence will stand up against the spending orgy that has now begun in Congress. Doubtless, the labor unions will begin a new series of demands for higher wages if prices of the articles the workers buy start going up. It's an inflationary cycle often called the wage-price spiral. Before it runs its course, nations generally do not realize the perils ahead. Only when the shock comes and it is almost too late to apply the brakes is there a popular revulsion.

Many countries in the world have had what is termed a "runaway inflation." Before it reaches that stage, the argument is made that a collapse can't happen. Today there are many economists who are arguing that inflation has been stopped. But what happened on Wednesday of this week is proof that, despite all the debate about how inflation is being held in check, an overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress—particularly the Democratic Party—now votes to ignore the President's plea for a balanced budget and to plunge the country into more and more deficit spending.

Nothing would please the Kremlin so much as to see the economy of the United States weakened from within by unsound fiscal policies. For an inflationary trend would make necessary even bigger spending to pay higher prices for the same armament planned many months ago.

This week was a critical one in American history, and the die seems to have been cast by the Democratic Party in favor of inflation, which means a further devaluation of the purchasing power of the dollar.

One Hundred and Fortieth Anniversary Commemoration of Abraham Lincoln's Birth—One of History's Greatest Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to again present a few remarks, further and again,

affirming the great inspiration the life and the sacrificial death of the great commoner has always been to me.

The last occasion, a couple of years ago, when Mrs. Doyle and I again stopped at the dirt-floored, one-windowed cabin at Hodgenville, Ky., where he was born, which is being so nicely and appropriately preserved, it was borne upon me again that his life had not only been one of extreme hardship and trial, but had in fact been one in which there had been a fair share of romance.

Then we continued to travel during the following few weeks the full length of the Lincoln Trail through Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois. I respectfully suggest it would not be amiss for many American parents to take the young folks of their family and spend some of their vacation time in taking this same trail. Increasingly I appraise as accurate and correct the statement of Secretary Stanton at the bedside of Lincoln about 94 years ago when he said, "Now he belongs to the ages."

So, Mr. Speaker, so much will be written and said of him by others more talented and gifted than I during these next few days that I will close these remarks by repeating the significant and historical, true and correct statement, which has been frequently stated before, which is to the effect that more books, both foreign and domestic, have already been written about Abraham Lincoln than any other civil ruler of government in all the world's history.

When I was a lad in the fifth grade of elementary school I used to draw the outlines of the birthplace cabin of Abraham Lincoln on my school slate when I should have been applying myself to my studies to be recited upon yet that day. I now realize I was doing in those very early years of my young life, in a very meager way, what the brilliant, informed brains of men and women of many lands have done in a truly magnificent manner in these subsequent years to the days when I drew the cabin on the slate and then tried to wash it out with the sponge before the teacher caught me violating her edict to study instead of wasting my time.

Resolution by State of Texas Opposing Increase in Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under clause 4 of rule XXII of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the attached resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas, expressing opposition to further Federal invasion of the gasoline tax:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

Whereas the President has recommended that Congress increase the Federal tax on gasoline by 1½ cents per gallon; and

Whereas the Federal Government is annually diverting more than \$1½ billion of Federal highway user taxes into nonhighway channels; and

Whereas it has been estimated that the addition of the 1½ cents to the present 3-cent Federal tax on gasoline would result in Texans sending \$137 million more in highway user taxes per year to Washington than would be returned to the State for highway purposes under the present aid formula: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress be respectfully requested to oppose further Federal invasion of this gasoline tax which should be reserved for the use of the States, and that the use of such present highway user taxes be restricted to highway purposes only; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each member of the Texas delegation in Congress.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
WAGGONER CARR,
Speaker of the House.

Lincoln Penny Changes Garb First Time Since 1909

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I make these brief remarks about the brandnew Abraham Lincoln penny which penny makes its bow to the public commemorating the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

You will recall that President Dwight D. Eisenhower of the United States of America approved the new design of this historic penny on December 20, 1958, and that same cannot be changed except by law; if it is changed at all; and then only by congressional authority after 25 years. This, of course, will make it very, very difficult for so many counterfeiters to profit off of the theme and extensive daily use of the penny. My reading indicates that the Abraham Lincoln penny as we have known it, until the birth of this new penny in commemoration of the 150th birthday, was designed and created by Frank Gasparro, an employee of the Philadelphia, Pa., Mint.

This new penny is quite different, because it will have on its reverse side for the first time a very legible, discernible view of the magnificent Abraham Lincoln Memorial, situated right here in our Nation's Capital. On the several occasions, I have already spoken in commemoration of Abraham Lincoln, I have on each occasion, and I do now, urge every Member of this great legislative body to visit the Lincoln Memorial both in the daytime and during the nighttime as well. It is closed, by the way, at 9 o'clock sharp at night. The motto "E Pluribus Unum" also appears on the new penny below the designation of the penny as "One Cent." However, the

original front of the penny with which we are all familiar, and which was designed by Mr. V. D. Brenner, remains as it has been.

In connection with the issuance of this historic penny, the National Geographic Society gives us some interesting facts about the history of the penny as we have known it. Here are those facts:

At least 25 billion cents have been produced since 1909, according to Geographic. Each day, mints produce about 15 tons of cents worth \$43,500, but costing only about \$10,396. Each coin contains 45.6 grains of copper, mixed with 2.4 grains of zinc and tin. Precise minting lightens the chore for those handling pennies by the thousands. They weigh them instead of counting, since there are exactly 145 cents to the pound.

Truth Must Prevail for Krebiozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have had hundreds of requests for copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Appendix, page A7780, presented on August 25, 1958, on the subject "Truth Must Prevail for Krebiozen." There have also been hundreds of requests for the material inserted, by me, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the dates hereinafter listed in the aforesaid article.

In view of the great importance of the public interest in this issue and the fact that nothing has been done, to date, although conferences are presently being perfected between the U.S. Public Health Service and Dr. J. R. Heller, Director of the National Cancer Institute, and the Krebiozen Research Foundation, and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, the Research Adviser of the Foundation, on the proposal of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois, giving Krebiozen a fair test, as set out on the floor of the U.S. Senate in August 1958, I hereby acquiesce to this request of hundreds of Americans who are acquainted with the same, by republishing the remarks made on August 25, 1958, touching upon this important subject.

TRUTH MUST PREVAIL FOR KREBIOZEN

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ROLAND V. LIBONATI, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Saturday, August 23, 1958)

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the story of Krebiozen is a sad one, and by their unfounded opposition, several past officials of the American Medical Association have been guilty of heinous actions against a great scientist in the medical profession, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, who presently holds the high position of distinguished professor of physiology and head of the Department of Clinical Science of the University of Illinois College of Medicine. Because of the actions of these men, Dr. Ivy lost his position as vice president of the University of Illinois, as well as his membership in the Chicago Medical Society.

A true scientist is a man who seeks the truth, and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy exemplifies that type of man. In his experimentations

with 250 other physicians, all members of the AMA, he has proved that there is biological activity in the use of this drug.

Dr. Stevan Durovic and his brother, Marko Durovic, have spent large sums of their own and their friends' money in Argentina in the development of the discovery of Krebiozen as well as thousands of dollars to the Krebiozen Foundation, to place the drug at the disposal of cancer victims, terminal cases, who were doomed to die.

Personally, I am well acquainted with the whole story in view of the fact that I acted as vice chairman of the committee and the commission, duly appointed by the Illinois Legislature, to conduct an inquiry to determine whether or not there was a conspiracy to prevent freedom of research at the University of Illinois, a tax-supported institution. A great deal of testimony given by many expert witnesses at those hearings proved beyond a doubt that false reports were released to the public by medical stooges of the AMA to destroy public confidence in the scientific findings conducted by Dr. Ivy and his fellow medics. This subject was in controversy for a period of 5 years, and still continues today in spite of the reports that have been released showing favorable results in certain phases of cancer study listed in the reports made by those individual doctors on their own cases.

Material has been inserted by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 29, 1958, page A-4957; June 12, 1958, page A-5370; July 25, 1958, page A-6712; and August 5, 1958, page A-6986. The subject matter and testimony, together with conclusions thereon, were masterfully presented in the two books written by Mr. Herbert Bailey, K-Krebiozen, Key to Cancer? published in 1955, and A Matter of Life or Death recently published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, a concern that is very selective on printing any books, and especially those touching on scientific subjects, as to their value and veracity.

I am very pleased to note that the very distinguished Senator, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, being a person of substantial reliability in dealing with matters of public import, has advanced proposals for controlled tests for Krebiozen. He has every reason to be concerned in view of the fact that he has studied this question thoroughly. It is to his credit that he deals with the subject with a highly constructive sense of justice. He avers that mistakes were made by both the AMA and the scientists interested in the Krebiozen study, and yet he does not lose the mental grasp that there is a high sense of public obligation to be considered and, therefore feels that in view of the favorable reports of the doctors working with Krebiozen, the merits of the drug should be inquired into officially on a purely scientific basis, to determine its medicinal value for public approval.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS is a man of important stature in America. His background is one of high intellectual training as a professor in our colleges and universities. He shows no disposition to dillydally with words, but gets at the meat of the problem and presents a complete picture of the controversy and its shortcomings.

His stand should be considered by the AMA as a warning that if they persist in their present attitude to belittle and devalue the results and published findings in the experiments presently being conducted, that there is no question that the public health services and the National Institutes of Health will be drawn into the picture through congressional enactment in the nature of a thorough investigation of this subject.

I stand firmly behind Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS in his position in this matter and, unless something is done to remedy the present unfortunate standoff situation preventing an authentic test of Krebiozen, I will proceed in the 86th Congress, God granting

my presence, to introduce a resolution to investigate those elements that are preventing the carrying out of such a test, on the grounds that the public interest demand such action. It is fundamental that a conspiracy to prevent scientific research is in itself within the congressional prerogative to protect the welfare of the people of the United States.

No organization can defy or deny the right of justice to be meted out to honest men and their works, especially in this case, directly affecting thousands of unfortunates, who die every year with great suffering and at great cost to their families, or the charitable institutions which are established throughout the land for this cause.

I am warning the American Medical Association at this time, as I did before in the Illinois State Assembly, to pay heed to Dr. Ivy's appeal for fair play and give Dr. Andrew C. Ivy a fair chance to prove what he contends is of benefit to mankind.

The Chicago Daily Tribune article touching on the Krebiozen proposal, by Senator Douglas, appearing in that paper's issue of August 23, 1958, follows:

"SENATOR DOUGLAS PROPOSES TEST FOR KREBIOZEN"

WASHINGTON, August 22.—A secret scientific test of the merits of Krebiozen as a cure for cancer was proposed in the Senate Friday by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

"DOUGLAS said in a Senate speech that the public is bewildered by the conflicting statements regarding the preparation. Dr. Andrew C. Ivy has reported Krebiozen to be helpful, DOUGLAS said, while the American Medical Association has denounced it and the National Research Council has found on the basis of the AMA report that there is no evidence of curative or palliative effects from use of the drug.

"DOUGLAS called for tests to be conducted by the United States Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health. Under DOUGLAS' plan the Institutes would conduct a sample test upon 200 more or less terminal cancer cases of patients who had applied to the Institutes for help.

"ONE HUNDRED WOULD GET KREBIOZEN"

"Of these, 100 cases would be treated with Krebiozen while the other 100 would be given mineral oil instead.

"The Institutes and Ivy would choose an outstanding biostatistician who would help design the tests and would be the only person knowing which patients had received Krebiozen treatment.

"The lists of those who had and had not received the treatment would be placed in a sealed envelope in a safe, to be opened later by the biostatistician and two advisers, Dr. Ivy and a representative of the medical profession chosen by the Public Health Service. The advisers would not know the identity of the patients.

"WOULD REVIEW HISTORIES"

"At the conclusion of the test-treatment period, the case histories of all 200 in the test would be submitted to Ivy, and he would be asked to identify the 100 cases in which Krebiozen had been administered. DOUGLAS said Ivy would naturally select those showing the most improvement or pain alleviation.

"The sealed envelope would then be taken from the safe and the lists would be compared with Ivy's list. A comparative study would be made of the cases of the patients who did and did not receive Krebiozen.

"The degree of agreement or disagreement between Ivy's list and the other lists would then be announced.

"WOULD PUBLISH FINDINGS"

"Finally, if Ivy requested it, the Public Health Service would examine records com-

plied by Ivy of other cases treated with Krebiozen, appraise the results, and publish the findings.

"DOUGLAS said the organized medical profession disparaged the discoveries of Pasteur, Lister, and others, and sought to defame the discoverers."

Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, one of the achievements of the 84th Congress was the enactment of the Rural Library Services Act of 1956. Members of the Congress have supported appropriations for the library services program beyond the timid and inadequate figures recommended each year by the administration. Each year, the appropriated funds have been put to good use by the participating States.

This year the President's budget looks generous, at first blush. It appears, before one gets to the fine print of which the Budget Bureau is so fond, that \$6 million are programmed. This is still 20 percent below the authorized amount, but it exceeds past requests, and seems a step in the right direction.

However, when one does get to the fine print, Mr. Speaker, one finds a different picture. The \$6 million programmed includes \$350,000 of funds left over from last year. If this year's request is not increased, it will mean that in 4 years only 60 percent of the total amount of funds authorized will have been appropriated.

The library services program is a good one. It is one of which the Congress can be proud. It is my hope that the distinguished Appropriations Committee will recommend, and that the House will approve, an appropriation of sufficient magnitude to enable the librarians throughout the Nation to do the job which this act was designed to make possible.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the following editorial from the New York Times of February 7 be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Ten years of effort for Federal aid to libraries culminated June 19, 1956, in the Library Services Act. The benefits derived are available only to libraries in rural areas of 10,000 population or less. This legislation was backed by the American Library Association, public librarians and library trustees throughout the United States. When President Eisenhower signed the bill he said, "It shows promise of leading to a significant enrichment of the lives of millions of Americans."

The act calls for annual grants of \$7,500,000 for 5 years. The moneys appropriated have yet to equal the amount authorized. This year's budget recommendation is \$6 million and, like last year's appropriation, still falls short of the allowable fund necessary to provide minimum service.

Address by Commissioner Armand D'Angelo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by Commissioner Armand D'Angelo of the department of water supply, gas, and electricity of the city of New York at the installation dinner of the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut at the Astor Hotel in New York City on January 28.

Commissioner D'Angelo is recognized as an outstanding labor leader. His address relates to his recent visit to Israel as a guest of the Republic of Israel through the invitation extended to Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York.

ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER ARMAND D'ANGELO AT THE INSTALLATION DINNER OF THE AMERICAN TRADE UNION COUNCIL FOR HISTADRUT AT THE ASTOR HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 28, 1959

I am very happy to be here this evening and to have this opportunity to share with the members of the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut on this very wonderful occasion.

For although my name is D'Angelo—and although my own family background reflects a heritage which stems from an area of the Mediterranean many hundreds of miles from the shores of Israel—I, too, rejoice, as you do in the birth, the early struggles, and the growing maturity of the great, young, vibrant land which has benefited so greatly from your dedication.

Indeed, it would be very strange if any American—regardless of religious creed, national background, or any of the social and cultural differences which distinguish one man from another—could remain unmoved by the saga of Israel by the breadth of the human concept which is Israel, by the courage of its people, or by the devotion of its friends in other lands.

It would be stranger still if I—as a lifelong trade unionist—could fail to take great inspiration from the magnificent work which my fellow trade unionists throughout our country have contributed to the development of a strong and vigorous labor movement in Israel.

For me, it is a very great privilege to participate in the activities of an organization such as the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut, and to contribute in some small personal measure to the material and moral support which are so vital to the democratic tradition which the people of Israel today are building for the spiritual nourishment of future generations.

As some of you may know, I had the opportunity last year, through our mayor, Robert F. Wagner, to visit Israel and to see at firsthand many of the astonishing economic, industrial, and agricultural develop-

ments which her people have fostered during the past decade.

I wish that everyone could be as fortunate as I; for the experience of witnessing at firsthand all of the modern miracles that the sons and daughters of Israel have wrought in their homeland, is something that will remain in my memory for the rest of my life, as proof of man's faith in his fellow man and of the reality of courage and vision in our troubled times.

A decade ago, the vision of Israel shone as a beacon of freedom which promised light and hope for Jews throughout the world—comparable only to the lantern uplifted toward heaven by our own Statue of Liberty to guide oppressed people of all nations to America's shores.

The vision of Israel today has been transformed into the achievements of courageous pioneers, of men and women—yes, and of children, too—who have labored, with love, with devotion, and with sublime faith, to recreate a nation that first rose to greatness thousands of years ago.

The story of Israel today is an inspiring account of the establishment of a democratic nation where men and women and children live without fear—secure in the knowledge that they may worship God, each according to his own conscience and heritage—and pledged to protect and to advance the welfare and well-being of his neighbors.

Many of the brightest chapters in that story have been penned by the men and women of the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Israel, by the Histadrut.

This community—for it is just that—of more than half a million workers in every phase of labor, in every part of Israel, so thoroughly permeates the life of the nation that it is literally impossible to think of Israel without immediately recalling the incredible achievements of Histadrut.

Throughout the land, the living, functioning monuments to the concept of Israel which have been lovingly created by Histadrut, bear witness to the strength and vitality of the organization. Modern hospitals, medical clinics, trade schools, cultural centers, youth centers, housing projects, consumers' societies, agricultural developments—all strength—and owe their very existence to the dynamism of Histadrut.

And in a very large measure, to a very great extent, the dynamic success of Histadrut stems from the financial, moral, and political support lavished upon it by the American labor movement through the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut.

The great fraternal relationship between labor in Israel and labor in America has been permanently recorded in the roll of institutions erected and maintained by Histadrut.

The William Green Cultural Center in Haifa, the Philip Murray Cultural Center in Eilat, the ILG Hospital in Beersheba, these are just a few of the monumental Histadrut edifices which bear the names of revered American labor leaders and prominent American labor organizations, in testimonial to the warm spirit of friendship which exists between the working people of these two great nations.

And it is you, my good friends—the officers and members of the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut—who have helped to build these monuments, who have breathed life into them, and who have helped to transform a great dream into a still greater reality.

Your unselfish, your openhearted—your immensely generous—gifts of time and effort and money to the cause of labor and social justice in Israel certainly have made possible the greatest national success story in modern history.

Tonight, as we accept the new and renewed pledges of faith in this great humanitarian enterprise of the new and reelected officers of the American Trade Union Council for

Histadrut, let us pause, too, with gratitude and happiness in our hearts, with prayers on our lips, and with fervent hope that Almighty God will continue to bestow His benediction upon us, upon our brethren in Israel, and upon all workingmen and women, upon all of our fellow human beings who share our faith in His power and His love.

It is now my privilege to introduce the following newly elected officers: honorary chairman, Claude Jodoin; honorary vice chairman, George M. Harrison, Donald MacDonald, and David J. McDonald; and co-chairmen, Bernard Shane and Harold Hanover.

The following newly elected members of the national executive committee: Shelley Appleton, William Collins, Steve Federoff, Samuel H. Friedman, Samuel Herbst, Samuel Kraisman, Joel Menist, Jack Paley, Frederick H. Siems, and David Weisman.

And the following officers, all of whom have been reelected to their present posts: Chairman, Moe Falikman; cochairmen, Joseph Gold, David Siegal, and Norman Zukowsky; national executive committee chairman, David Gingold; administrative committee chairman, I. H. Goldberg; treasurer, Philip Lubliner; associate treasurer, Nathaniel M. Minkoff; financial secretary, Frank Brown; associate financial secretary, Murray M. Kolker; and recording secretary, Max Goodman.

My friends, it has been both a pleasure and a very great honor to join you here this evening and to pay tribute to the wonderful work that you are doing.

Thank you and God bless you all.

Community Development and Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely article by Prof. Paul S. Taylor, chairman of the University of California Institute of International Studies and a distinguished economist. Notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer has advised the cost of including the article will be \$486, I ask unanimous consent that this item be inserted in the RECORD:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(By Paul S. Taylor, Community Development Consultant, ICA Office of Technical Cooperation, Community Development Division, and Chairman, Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.)

In the 13 years since World War II a succession of Asian nations have established their independence, one after another. Having thrown off the yoke of colonialism, following an American precedent dating from 1776, the governments of these young nations now carry the responsibilities of power that formerly rested on other shoulders. They have said to the world that they are capable of self-government, and are now engaged in demonstrating it. They have told their own people that independence is superior to colonialism, who now expect visible evidence of the validity of that claim. Korea is one among these new nations. Although handicapped by a cruel severance, by the ravages of a recent war, and by the uncertainties of

an uneasy cease-fire, its political independence still stands after 10 years.

Most of the people of the Asian nations are farmers, living in villages. They live according to the customs of their ancestors handed down from time immemorial. However familiar and even cherished the customs themselves, the conditions of their daily lives are beginning to change. For the idea is reaching even the countryside that poverty, disease, and misery are not inevitable. Through advertising, movies, the sights in the cities, the vehicles that pass on the roads, political propaganda, and every other form of communications, they are subjected to a bombardment saying in myriad ways that old burdens can be lightened, that there are practical alternatives to acceptance and resignation.

These voices that penetrate into the villages are long familiar to the Western World. They represent the forces that create and are created by the city, the influences of a money economy that binds ever more remote areas of the world together, the spread of a technology that reduces distances and lightens labors and if experienced, even in the form of a modern war machine, leads young men at the end of their soldiering to seek escape from the drudgery of their ancestral farming occupation. Korea now hears these voices, and feels these forces and influences.

Community development in the villages is among the most conspicuous and important of the domestic programs adopted by new Asian nations. It is founded on recognition of this urge toward a higher level of living, of the forces that portend the flight of farm youth to unprepared cities, of the subtle penetration of money economy into an economy based for ages upon ownership of land, of the impending urbanization of rural life itself through the spread of modern technology and widening of markets. Community development seeks to meet these forces in conscious ways guided by aspiration for the future and by reason, rather than in ways prescribed by tradition and the precepts of the past. Community development assumes a willingness to accept guided change as a political responsibility. It chooses democratic methods of stimulating change in preference to totalitarian methods.

India began a program of community development in 1952. There it carries the blessing of the followers of Mahatma Gandhi, the prestige given by gestures of presidential approval and the power accorded by the Prime Minister's personal assumption of chairmanship of the commission in charge of community development.

The Philippines followed in 1955 under the vigorous leadership of their President, who placed the program in the hands of a presidential assistant. The political leaders of both India and the Philippines felt a challenge to their leadership in the villages, coming from supporters of totalitarian programs of development. They found community development an effective answer. People generally choose progress by democratic methods with the aid of their own government.

When democracy was new in the modern world, it was regarded by monarchies as an untried experiment. In the 1830's a Frenchman, Alexis de Toqueville, went to the United States to examine the nature of the new phenomenon called "democracy." There he went from city to city, farm to farm, seacoast to wilderness frontier. His report, entitled "Democracy in America," has become classic. At one point he said:

"These Americans are the most peculiar people in the world. You'll not believe it when I tell you how they behave. In a local community in their country a citizen may conceive of some need which is not being met. What does he do? He goes across the street and discusses it with his neighbor. Then what happens? A committee comes into existence and then the committee

begins functioning on behalf of that need, and you won't believe this but it's true. All of this is done without reference to any bureaucrat. All of this is done by the private citizens on their own initiative."

Popular vigor, initiative, and participation are not only the strength of democracy; they are the antidote for authoritarianism whether in India, the Philippines, the United States or anywhere else, whether in the 1830's or in the 1950's. They are also instruments of progress.

II

Now the Government of the Republic of Korea, following India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Indonesia among others, has decided to inaugurate its own program of community development. This program is to begin soon in rural areas selected for pilot demonstrations; it includes a training project and carries a prospect of expansion as availability of qualified personnel and other resources in the future may permit.

This decision rests not only on high policy, but also upon solid, earthy grounds. About 70 percent of the population, living on farms and in 20,000 villages, produces only about 40 percent of the gross national product. This maladjustment between human and material resources bears familiar symptoms of underemployment, unemployment, inefficiency, a low level of living, and a flooding of people from the villages into the cities faster than these can absorb them. An early 1958 document from the file on community development contains this passage:

"Korea has two acute rural problems. The first is a considerable degree of overpopulation in relation to the available land base, with the probability that increase will be more rapid than can be absorbed by industrial employment. The second is the potentially dangerous timelag in bringing to rural communities the technical knowledge and training needed for improved use of present resources and development of new sources of wealth. Population pressure makes the speedy and fullest utilization of present resources and the introduction of new ones a vital necessity. The alternative is a declining rural living standards, accelerated flight to the cities, and the aggravation of urban unemployment and overcrowding with its threat to internal order and security."

This is not to say that until now the Government has wholly ignored the existence of these problems. On the contrary, as Dr. Kyun Hi Tchah, economic planning officer in the Ministry of Reconstruction, told the Philippines-Korean Community Development Conference on May 26:

"The development of our industries, creation of an agricultural extension system, establishment of a special bank of agriculture, encouragement of farmers' cooperatives, a cottage industry program, reforestation program, and public works program are designated to solve these problems in these lines."

The Korean Government has been doing even more—by promoting improved agricultural practices, expanding irrigation, encouraging fisheries and better housing, assisting resettlement, and extending education and health, sanitation and other services of government into rural as well as urban areas. But the pace of these programs needs to be accelerated. Time presses, the resources of manpower technically trained in the specialties still are insufficient to meet the need, while unused resources are at hand in the villages themselves, and experience with community development elsewhere holds promise of its usefulness as a means of accelerating and amplifying the effectiveness of the substantive programs in rural areas.

The document of early 1958, quoted earlier, states this clearly:

"Community development does not provide the solutions to these problems but is a method, successfully tested in other coun-

tries with similar problems, whereby the timelag in providing means for the development of rural communities can be materially shortened, and the underemployed manpower of the villages can mobilize itself to improve the utilization of present resources and to discover new ones."

In preparation for this decision on program, and for undertaking operations, international experience has been shared directly through joint conferences in both Korea and the Philippines. These have been followed by preliminary domestic conferences bringing together officials from participating ministries, provinces, and guns (counties), and including staff members who will be responsible for the success of the community development program when it is launched.

The present, as a time of beginnings, is an appropriate occasion to restate soberly the concept of community development, to take stock of its tools and its relations with other programs that also seek to stimulate a development within the same communities, to weigh the conditions peculiar to Korea that affect the prospects for achievement in this country, and to relate rural community development to other processes directed at developing the greater community which is the Korean Republic.

III

Since community development became a self-conscious device for rural improvement in less-developed countries more than a decade ago, there have been innumerable attempts at definitions, with varying emphasis on this or that facet. The 1948 Cambridge Conference gave this as a definition:

"A movement designed to promote better living for the whole community, with the active participation and, if possible, on the initiative of the community, but if this initiative is not forthcoming spontaneously, by the use of techniques for arousing and stimulating it in order to secure its active and enthusiastic response to the movement."

This definition developed from an effort by British administrators to prepare colonial people for impeding self-government, a status that some of these have now achieved.

In October 1955, a team of consultants to the International Cooperation Administration, after visiting India, Pakistan, and the Philippines, found that community development in each country expressed itself as "a concrete program of action" with "administrative structure," "budget," "personnel," "material resources," "plans," and "goals."

The team described community development as "an operation whereby the technical government services . . . are channeled to and coordinated at the community level," and as "a method and an operation designed to complement the improvement of conditions from above, by the improvement of conditions through the initiative of the people themselves."

Later in the same year the United Nations defined community development as "a process designed to create conditions of economic and social progress for the whole community with its active participation and the fullest possible reliance upon the community's initiative." Community development "implies the integration of two sets of forces making for human welfare, neither of which can do the job alone: (1) the opportunity and capacity for cooperation, self-help, ability to assimilate and adopt new ways of living that is at least latent in every human group; and (2) the fund of techniques and tools in every social and economic field, drawn from worldwide experience and now in use or available to national governments and agencies."

More recently Prof. Irwin T. Sanders, of the University of Kentucky, has pointed out

Footnotes at end of speech.

that community development may be viewed in any or all of four ways, viz.:

1. As a process of change from a condition in which, e.g., a few make decisions for all about matters of common concern, to a condition in which many participate in the decisions.

2. As a method, or way of working to achieve a goal.

3. As a program, or set of procedures for accomplishing a set of activities, e.g., improvement of health, welfare, agriculture, education, recreation, etc.

4. As a movement, or crusade, dedicated to progress as its supporters define progress.

Viewed as a process, the emphasis, or focus, is upon what happens to people, socially and psychologically. Viewed as a method, the emphasis is upon some end, or ends, to be achieved, i.e., as a process with an objective. Viewed as a program, emphasis is upon method and content, i.e., upon activities to accomplish results in respect to specific matters of health, welfare, agriculture, education, recreation, etc. Viewed as a movement, emphasis is upon a program and its emotional content, i.e., upon an idea, as interpreted by its adherents. Sanders remarks in reference to community development as a movement that it is "a special kind of program that holds unusual promise and one worthy of unabashed commitment by those . . . who want to see poverty and illness alleviated among the great masses of underprivileged humanity."

Community development, then, is something to be perceived whole. Its full meaning can be understood only by viewing it in many ways, not like the elephant in Aesop's fable that was examined by blind men carefully in separate parts—trunk, tusk, ear, leg, side, and tail. The blind men, never having seen the animal whole, but each having touched only its nearest part, naturally were left quarreling among themselves after the elephant passed by. One maintained an elephant is like a snake, another that it is like a bone, a third that it is like a fan, and the others, respectively, that it is like a tree, wall, and rope. We could quarrel among ourselves endlessly and futilely over the nature of community development like the blind men unless, in addition to studying the parts, we can see the living whole of a creature that is more than the sum of the parts of its anatomy.

IV

The tools and procedures of community development are neither mysterious nor unique. They are familiar, many of them, to those who engage in the usual forms of group work, or seek to establish cooperative relations with communities in order to attain specific ends such as better practices in respect to agriculture, health and sanitation, education, etc. They are known also to administrators and others who work with groups of people in a variety of relationships, other than authoritative, to achieve practical purposes. The adequacy of the tools and procedures is the subject of inquiries by social scientists seeking to understand social attitudes and structures, or to refine methods in group dynamics, community activities, etc. The methods most suitable in any specific country or situation will depend much upon the attitudes of the villagers in the particular society. They can be anticipated best by those who understand the purposes of community development and know the local situation. Tools and procedures should be reviewed carefully in the light of early experience, noting the circumstances under which failures and successes occur.

The community development program of India has made at least one significant contribution to the tools of community development that can be useful for administration everywhere. This is the creation of a very small group, separated from any responsibility

ity for decisions or operations of the program, with responsibility for observing continuously, for supplying a running account of program operations, and for making periodic evaluations of methods and results. A recent survey of the Indian program by Ernest Witte states:

"The evaluation reports are tremendously interesting and valuable and this seems to be a unique contribution to Government. No other major ongoing independent governmental agency seems to exist which devotes itself to measuring the effectiveness of an operating program in which it has no authority. Its findings (not its running reporting) are public."

Even the evaluation itself needs recurrent reevaluation; Witte continues:

"Although this evaluation program is a positive contribution, it has some potentially dangerous aspects of concern to a program like community development."

"Naturally, it is easier to measure progress in things than the progress of people and the two do not necessarily go together. Thus in the early reports emphasis was placed upon such things as the number of acres reclaimed, the miles of roads built, and so forth. But these are only the byproducts of real community development. Its real objective is to change people so that they will think and act for their own and their communities' improvement. Fortunately, the evaluation staff is understanding more of the real objectives and is striving for more adequate measurements by which to judge results."

This hazard is faced not only by evaluation teams; it confronts all who bear any responsibility for program operations. Witte points to dangerous pressure for early visible results that is characteristic of every country with a community development program, and can be sensed already in Korea. He says:

"District or other officials want to make a good comparative showing and sometimes understand the physical evidences of progress better than the more intangible ones. Thus in a number of instances (and in the other countries as well) there was unmistakable evidence of what might be termed 'authoritative community development.'"

The distinguishing essence of community development, in my opinion, is that it assumes a responsibility for approaching a community whole, for eliciting popular participation in selecting goals and planning projects, as well as participating in their execution, and for developing the practices, attitudes, and initiative through experience that will continue indefinitely to generate guided change:

"The study of human wholes lies today on the borderline between science and art," says Robert Redfield of the University of Chicago in his "Little Community." Fractional analyses are useful but, as Lawrence K. Frank of Massachusetts Institute of Technology cautions, these cannot be "safely used for dealing with an organized whole, as we see in medicine which must integrate all the separate findings of the life and medical sciences when it approaches the single, identified organism—personality."

The necessity for viewing a community whole, as well in its parts, is matched by the necessity for shaping a program so as to create impact on a community as a whole, not simply on its parts. There is no competition between parts and the whole, either as the subject of analysis or in the structure of program. The Korean Government, as noted earlier, already has initiated a number of programs aimed at improvement of one phase or another of rural community life; viz, health and sanitation, agriculture, education, etc. This is beneficial and there must be no slackening of these programs.

In examining community development in India, Pakistan, and the Philippines in 1955,

a team of consultants of which I was a member reported:

"When we examined community development activities as programs of action we found elements not expressed in definitions of community development as concepts and processes. There is a substantive content in all such programs which lies beyond the resources of individual groups, without which 'better living for the whole community' remains an idle phrase. This substantive content consists of the traditional Government services in agriculture, medical care and public health, education, the building of roads, etc. In large measure the programs we examined are based upon the idea of strengthening these Government technical services, and of stimulating local community organizations to make the most efficient use possible of them."

"Community development programs are based upon the twin principles of (a) strengthening and coordinating Government technical services in agriculture, public health, education, etc., and (b) stimulating an awareness within the village of needs and group self-help potential in attacking these needs, in cooperation with Government."

This is to say that a community development program and educational, health and sanitation, agricultural or other programs that touch rural communities are mutually interdependent. Separate substantive programs and community development programs in the same village are not competitive, but complementary.

Experience in other countries corroborates this; in recognition of the importance of the whole, the practical trend is toward recognition of a mutuality between single-purpose and multi-purpose programs. The United Nations reported in 1955:

"A trend toward comprehensiveness or multiplicity of function in programs that originated for a single purpose in a specialized field characterizes recent programs of rural improvement in economically underdeveloped areas. A single purpose project may in many cases take root most quietly and easily, and can therefore serve as a spearhead of wider community development. However, the relationship of the various aspects of life especially in the rural community require that the concept of multi-purpose development be introduced as soon as possible in the programs."

V

Community development proceeds on the assumption that people who live in the same village constitute a community which will act together for common purposes. This may or may not be true. Caste, religion, faction, and class create serious cleavages within the same village in some countries, that resist the unified approach of community development and prevent villages from becoming a social unit.

In Korea, fortunately, villagers are a relatively homogeneous people. Castes are absent, religious differences are not seriously divisive, recent land reform has weakened class lines, and family overrides faction. Marcus Scherbacher says:

"With this very broad family system you have a natural feeling of family and community responsibility because you have whole villages with the same name, of the same family. And although you still find villages of only one family, the great majority (72 percent or even 80 percent) of a village will carry the same name."

Anyone who has set foot in a Korean village can testify that the people are friendly and frank, ready to discuss their problems without waiting upon lengthy preliminaries to disarm suspicions, overcome barriers, or even conform to ceremonial codes prescribing how interviews or business relations shall be conducted.

Korean villages have strong traditions and much experience in sharing and in cooperation. Some of these are deeply rooted in the past as well as flourishing in the present. Group warehouses date from at least the 17th century. There are innumerable kaes, or groups, organized for savings, public works, farming, recreation, health, mutual help, meeting the occasion of marriage and funerals, and a host of other purposes. In 1937 some 480 different kinds of kaes were distinguished in Korea.¹² Bands of farmers weeding rice to the encouraging chant of a leader like a crouching football team responding to the urgings of a coach, dot the landscape in season.

These and other forms of traditional cooperation among villagers have not added up to community development in the past, for they have been directed mainly toward making life flow more smoothly in traditional channels, rather than toward the production of development and change. Yet they are favoring elements in a society seeking consciously to make its way in new directions.

The regeneration of rural society itself, with modest help from outside, is an idea not wholly new or foreign to Korea. The recent land reform had its precedents in past centuries. During the era of Japanese domination thoughtful studies were made and proposals advanced to guide action. From one of these, published in 1931, I note among "Proposals for Some New Institutions" the following items:

1. Institutes for headmen and their leaders of the villages.
2. Institutes for keywomen of the villages.
3. Culture centers in the villages.
4. A rural worker-training center, which included improved agriculture and home economics schools in its program to aid poor farmers, elevate their living level, and enrich the cultural life of the entire rural population.

A passage on village leaders is still worth quoting:

"We have seen what one man can do in the villages. These village headmen are usually the most respected men, with a high degree of culture and refinement, but usually they belong to the old schools of thought, admitted to be inadequate to meet the new day. With a little help for them in seeing and understanding the new day with all its complicated problems, they can become unparalleled leaders to regenerate rural Korea. Why not help them? They are the short-cuts in making over the rural communities. Their services are generally gratuitous. All the expenditure involved would probably be the financing of two or three leaders and their travel expenses until the institutes can be organized and managed by the village leaders themselves. It certainly is very little compared to the great good that can reasonably be expected to ensue. Present-day social, economic, and political high spots and their relations to their own villages are probably all that needs to be pointed out to them. Democratic ideals and a scientific attitude toward life will need emphasis. When once started, it is reasonable to expect that they themselves will make their own adjustments. All they need is a little help to make a turn . . . the point I want to stress is that all this does not require an expenditure of a big sum of money. It is within the reach of the people's ability."

This, written more than a quarter century ago, has a very modern and timely ring.

Its thesis is confirmed by contemporary studies exploring foundations for the present program.¹⁴

VI

"First of all, the Korean culture needs to be emphasized to bring the Koreans to their own, as in the case of the discouraged Danes. Then there is the need to recognize the

Footnotes at end of speech.

equality, if not supremacy, of the Korean culture in the past and to let it develop as a part of the integrated whole of human culture; the emphasis is legitimate and right."

The prospects of community development for Korea, like any other program, rest upon the potential resources, material and spiritual, of Korea. There is ample reason, as has been pointed out, to launch a program here with confidence. Great need, technical knowledge, local leadership and resources are present. These are substantial ingredients that justify an effort and hold promise of success. Community development can produce better living and more active citizenship.

It is useful to temper our optimism, nevertheless, with realism. Rural community development can stimulate agricultural, livestock, fishery, and forest production, cottage industries, health and sanitation, education, cultural activities, and recreation. It cannot be expected to set up great industrial enterprises, nor to substitute for great national public works like railroads, main highways, or large reservoirs.

Community development can contribute toward a more favorable balance between people and resources, but there are limits; a too rapid increase of population can be one.

The census of 1949 reported that 42 percent of the population of South Korea was under 15 years of age. This is extreme. In Norway and Switzerland the proportion was around 24 percent, or less than three-fifths that of Korea. The list of nations with any higher proportions of youth than Korea—and these only very slightly higher—includes 15 Asian, African, and Latin American countries that, with scarcely an exception, face seriously unfavorable relations between resources and population. In all these nations, including Korea, steps are being planned and taken to lower the death rate. Meanwhile the birth rate in these nations, including Korea, remains high. As a matter of plain arithmetic this sets the stage for a population explosion.²⁶ Can community development, or indeed any other form of economic development, keep pace in Korea?

In India, family planning is at least nominally a point in the community development program. In Japan, where no community development program exists, a family planning program in the hands of welfare and home demonstration agents apparently is being pushed much more effectively than in India. For a variety of reasons, national population policy among them, the birth rate in Japan fell from the high rate of around 33 per thousand in 1949 to a low of around 18 in 1956, making the current birth rate of Japan comparable to that of France.²⁷ So great a decline within 7 years is history-making.

Two-thirds of Korean farmers in 1949 cultivated farms of less than 1 chungbo (1 hectare) in size.²⁸ To what extent increase in production (agricultural and otherwise) can outpace the growth in numbers in Korea is a grave question. The time to consider this problem is now, while the country engages in heroic endeavors to raise the level of living of the Korean people.

Korea, like many other nations, faces hard facts of geography. Among such countries are Finland, the Scandinavian countries, and Switzerland. Those countries have been obliged to balance population and resources, and to build their futures on the foundations of their heritages, geographic, economic, political, and cultural. They are doing so with a success that yields a high material level of living and a rich cultural life to their people. Their achievement and their stability command the respect of the world, and—not to be overlooked in a paper

on development—attracting an enlarging flow of foreign visitors that enriches private and public coffers while it promotes amity and enriches the cultural life of many people. Korea might wish to consider inclusion of such aims in her community development program, for she still possesses priceless resources in cultural treasures, landscapes of extraordinary charm and beauty, and an hospitable and responsive people.

Community development is at the center of one of the great problems of our day. The basic problem of people everywhere is how to maintain continuity or persistence of their cultural group and their community organization while changing.²⁹ Community development rejects the view that blind forces alone control our social life and govern the direction of change; it is founded on a belief in change guided by human choices and human strivings. Community development is designed to produce change without social disintegration by binding the people into the making of their own future.

History has thrust Korea into a political limelight, separated from an opposed system by a thousand yards—or by a river. Even within the Republic itself is a restored area north of the 38th parallel, many of whose present inhabitants lived for a time under the other system, affording them a basis in personal experience for balancing life under one system against life under the other.

This location presents Korea with great problems. It also presents Korea—and the United Nations—with great opportunity. There are factors favorable to grasping it. The size of the Republic holds the conception and operation of national programs within manageable scope. The Government and people are willing to make efforts and to advance in new directions, and to demonstrate here the fruits of freedom in a small nation.

In my opinion, although Korea is starting later than other Asian nations, it has a chance to make itself a leader and showplace before the world of what rural community development can do materially, politically, and culturally. Such a prospect is capable of evoking dedication to a national effort as to a moral crusade. By requiring participation of people in working out their own problems and destiny, it can cement people and government together through a common effort. It can generate stability while it generates progress.

Is it really possible to do this in Korea? I have been told here, as elsewhere in Asia, that I do not know Asians, including Koreans; they have to be told. They have been told for centuries, they say, and can learn no other way. Although I have had my feet on the ground in the villages of five Asian countries, I am not an expert on Asia. So I shall give not my own reply, but that of a Korean general in the military zone when I asked him recently if this description of Asians is true. His reply was simple; he said the Korean people want government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The U.S.S.R., by its statements to the United Nations, regards community development as unnecessary, not to say undesirable, where a strong central plan governs a nation's economy. It has no place in its economy for popular participation in making as well as executing the plans. It wants the labors of the people and their acquiescence. Community development, on the contrary, invites the participation and initiative of the people in both planning and execution. Therefore, it poses an issue that Koreans, with others, understand, an issue above and beyond the material products that community development is capable of creating.

²⁶ Quoted from social development in the British colonial territories, report of the Ashbridge Conference on Social Development,

1954. Colonial Office miscellaneous publication No. 523 (n.d.), pp. 6, 7.

²⁷ Community development programs in India, Pakistan and the Philippines, team 1, International Cooperation Administration, p. 9.

²⁸ United Nations, Bureau of Social Affairs, Social Progress through Community Development, p. 6 (1955).

²⁹ Irwin T. Sanders, *Theories of Community Development*, Rural Sociology, March 1958; reprinted in *Community Development Review*, June 1958, p. 31.

³⁰ Rural Sociology, March 1958, entire issue.

³¹ M. L. Wilson, community development program in India. Issued by Community Projects Administration, Government of India, 1956.

³² Ernest E. Witte, Community development in selected countries, *Community Development Review*, March 1957, p. 43.

³³ Models for study of community organization. *Community Development Review*, June 1958, p. 1.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 40.

³⁵ Social progress through community development, op. cit., pp. 8, 9.

³⁶ Philippines-Korean Community Development Conference (1958), pp. 30, 31.

³⁷ Loc. cit.

³⁸ Helen K. Kim, *Rural Education for the Regeneration of Korea* (New York, 1931), pp. 110-112.

³⁹ John E. Mills, ed., *Ethnosociological reports of three Korean villages* (by Nam, Kyu Back; Park, Joon; Yoon, Eul Byong). UNC/OEC for Korea, A.P.O. 301, San Francisco, Kwangju Gun Survey (by Seok, Seh Kyun and Lee, Yun Sook). Publications in community development, No. 1, April 1958. UNC/OEC for Korea, A.P.O. 301, San Francisco.

⁴⁰ Kim, op. cit., p. 84.

⁴¹ Frederic Osborn, *Population: An international dilemma*. A summary of the proceedings of the conference committee on population problems 1956-1957. The Population Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

⁴² Tachi Minoru, the population problem, *Japan Quarterly*, vol. V, No. 1 (1958).

⁴³ "Improving agricultural production alone will not be sufficient to eliminate all the economic difficulties of Korean farmers . . . The life of the average Korean farmer could be described as a continuous struggle against hunger, heavy taxes or imposts, and usurious interest rates; a yearly gamble against the weather in which the farmer often loses; a continuous repetition of patient, persistent efforts to produce good harvests from poor unfertile soils; and a hungry search for additional land to put under crops." FAO-UN Report for United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, Reconstruction and development of agriculture, forestry and fisheries in South Korea, 1954, pp. 75, 76.

⁴⁴ Lawrence K. Frank, *Models for study of community organization*, *Community Development Review*, June 1958, p. 23.

The Real Basis for the Foreign-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the recent column by Walter Lippmann, "The Duty of Rich Nations," which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator CASE of New Jersey on Thursday,

Footnotes at end of speech.

January 29, 1959, contained an effective and reasoned argument for placing our foreign-aid program on a moral basis instead of on the basis of self-interest and power politics.

Mr. Lippmann's views, of course, are not new. I was present on the floor of the House on June 6, 1956, when THOMAS J. DONN, then a Representative from Connecticut's First Congressional District, made an unforgettable plea that we revive the effectiveness of foreign aid and rekindle public support of it by placing it on the right basis.

Senator DONN has continued over the years to advocate a foreign-aid program that adequately expresses the highest traditions and principles of this Nation. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted in the Appendix excerpts from Mr. DONN's speech on the floor of the House, a speech which so eloquently defines the moral basis for foreign aid:

Our foreign-aid program should not be based solely on expediency, self-interest, Communist competition, or the cold war, but rather upon conviction and principle.

We have discovered in the last century one key to a shared sense of moral solidarity in the principle of the general welfare. This is the principle upon which our entire foreign-aid program should properly rest, for involved in it is the idea of universal brotherhood of men.

Over and over again we have heard it said that the problem of coping with communism is primarily an ideological or a spiritual one. And this is why we must found our foreign-aid program on a great moral principle.

If the basic cause of communism and its threat to our society is on a spiritual and ideological plane, the missing element in our policy of coping with it must be spiritual and ideological.

We can find this missing element in our foreign policy by rediscovering why we hold our democracy so dear and why we should endeavor to share its underlying principles and beliefs and blessings with our fellow men. Democracy is based on a Judeo-Christian ethic concerning the nature of man, his essential worth and dignity, and his inherent God-given rights and freedoms. Man is a valuable being.

Here is where we find the real reason for a foreign-aid program. Thus, we understand that we are engaged in this tremendous project not only because we must resist communism, not only because we must make ourselves secure, not only because we must have strong defenses, but more importantly, because it is the right thing to do.

This is what actually motivates us in the conduct of our affairs at home.

This is why we will not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, or national origin in our immigration laws.

We will oppose segregation in all its forms as a violation of the basic rudiments of Christian charity and another form of Hitler-like racism.

We will support measures to eradicate slums from our large urban centers which to our friends abroad are incomprehensible in the light of our high standards of living.

If God has blessed us with fertile land and a population with a high degree of technical skills and initiative, we shall recognize our responsibility to find ways and means of sharing our surpluses and skills with other peoples of the world who are less fortunate.

Thus, in our foreign aid programs, we should be prepared, when asked, to tell our foreign neighbors who need assistance why we want to help them—that one of our principal motives is to help them establish and maintain a free society. We should be

able to tell them why we attach such importance to freedom, and why we are interested in sharing it with them; that it is the nature of man which is at issue.

We should discuss these matters in our churches and civic groups, in our schools and universities.

We should call for volunteers and, like the Communists, develop cadres of young people to dedicate their lives in whole or in part, to serve these ends, both here and abroad. We have never lacked for volunteers when wars, in the traditional sense, have broken out.

But this is a new kind of war—the cold war—but a war nonetheless. And it is a war to the finish between freedom and tyranny.

The American people should realize that these problems are not to be confined to Government action only; we all have a stake in the outcome and we all have a role to play.

Those who recognize these things, have a responsibility to act and to give leadership to others.

We need bold and imaginative leadership to infuse and permeate our foreign policy with this vitalizing element. The people of the United States are ready for it. For this is not a suggestion to introduce an element not already existing on the American scene. It is rather a suggestion to recognize it, and to draw more heavily from our spiritual ideals in the shaping of our foreign policies and our objectives, in the conduct of our foreign-aid programs, and in the content of our propaganda. Let us not be ashamed to explain our ideals publicly, and, above all, let us act as though we really believed in them.

If such a dynamic or positive element were infused into our national thinking on foreign policy it would tend to emphasize the quality rather than the quantity of our assistance programs.

The magnitude of aid would not be so much the measure which is often based on immediate threats of loss to the Communists.

The measure would rather be the economic and social needs of the country or area and our own ability to help on a long-term and consistent basis.

The people who receive our cooperation would not be made to feel that they are simply pawns in an international power struggle between the East and the West.

They should feel that we are doing these things because it is the right thing to do.

And I suggest that the American people and their representatives in Congress would be more willing to appropriate the necessary funds for these programs if they had sufficient confidence that those in charge of our foreign policy had clear objectives and knew what they were doing.

What these people need above and beyond all the technical skills we can give them is to find a way of life which will have some meaning and idealism in it.

They need to discover the essential worth and dignity of the human person, to develop a sense of self-respect as well as earn and receive the respect of others.

The personnel which we send abroad either under Government programs or through private organizations should be carefully selected on the basis of their suitability and capability to express and demonstrate these ideals to the people in the underdeveloped countries.

If we continue to flounder and drift in the conduct of our foreign affairs, we shall ultimately lose all the respect which our present position of leadership requires.

Should this happen, the cause of freedom and justice in the world will be lost.

I earnestly and devoutly believe that we of the United States have the greatest responsibility in this struggle. We are on the

right road, and the legislation which is before the House will assist us in reaching our proper objective.

That objective is a world at peace under law. A world in which free men use and enjoy the blessings of creation and live in harmony with God and each other.

Plea for Conversation—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of our colleagues to two of the most significant statements I have read in some time.

In addition to the sincerity of purpose and the generosity of spirit they both manifest, they are unusual in that they each reach the same conclusion and make the same suggestion from positions which too often in the past have seemed irreconcilable.

The first is a brief address delivered by Mr. Lansing P. Shield, president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, before that organization's annual congressional dinner here in Washington.

The second is an article prepared by Mr. Arthur J. Goldberg, special counsel of the AFL-CIO, which he adapted from an address delivered at the University of Wisconsin and which appeared in a recent issue of the *Commonweal*, a leading Catholic magazine.

Both Mr. Goldberg and Mr. Shield are deeply disturbed that American labor and industry have allowed themselves to harden into positions of hostility and have failed sufficiently to recognize their mutuality of interests and the need for unity in facing the economic and political challenge from Soviet Russia.

Both men see the urgent need to reestablish channels of communication between management and labor, to encourage them to listen to each other. And both men propose as a means of accomplishing this that a national conference or assembly be called of responsible leaders in business, labor, and government for the purpose of discussing—away from the tensions of the bargaining table—some of the issues of mutual interest and of great concern to all our people and to the safety of our country.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed substantial and pleasant relations with both groups. But this fact has enabled me to appreciate the truth of the analyses of Mr. Shield and Mr. Goldberg and the wisdom of their suggestion.

They are especially important, I believe, since neither gentleman—so far as I know—was aware of the other's proposal.

Both statements represent a high degree of statesmanship and of clear-sighted objectivity, and I recommend them to the thoughtful study of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the Record the remarks of President Shield. The article by Mr. Goldberg will be included at a later point.

REMARKS BY LANSING P. SHIELD, PRESIDENT, NEW JERSEY STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, 225 ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1959

An unusual gathering of leaders of government, organized labor, and industry such as this provides an opportunity for all of us to achieve a better understanding. In these critical times, is there anything more urgent than the development of teamwork between these three important segments of our society? And this applies particularly to New Jersey—the most highly industrialized State in the Union.

Despite unparalleled prosperity and spectacular achievements in mass production and mass distribution, our economy in New Jersey and throughout the Nation is labeled as a high-cost one—and as each month rolls by, the break-even point of both industry and government rises. We are living in a plush economy. Because of high costs, world markets are slipping away from us.

Within the last 12 months, Khrushchev, Mikoyan and company have made trade agreements with 11 countries. During that same period we haven't signed a single agreement. The cold war with our adversary overseas has turned into a hot economic war and it's no wonder he already claims certain victory. As a Nation we are losing out to a competitor who has a built-in, low-cost austerity program. His economy, contrasted with ours, has a constantly lowering break-even point and the cost of living in Russia is being steadily reduced.

The complete answer to the dilemma in which we find ourselves does not lie solely in reducing Government spending, freezing prices and wages nor in further mechanization. We already lead the world in that area (I'm referring to mechanization—not spending) and it's ironical that the more we mechanize, the higher go our costs. The President has warned us that unless we reverse this trend which is weakening us both internally and externally, it may be necessary to put our economic body into a straight-jacket in the form of wage and price controls. It is up to us to choose now between teamwork and dictatorship or the freedom of choice may be taken away.

As leaders in Government, business, and labor, we have been fighting small battles among ourselves instead of presenting a united front to our enemy.

As an example, industry and organized labor meet annually or biannually at the bargaining table and then withdraw until the next battle. Between political campaigns the liaison between government and industry also leaves much to be desired.

In our preoccupation with the problem of integration in race relationships probably unconsciously we have been practicing segregation in our economic relationships.

A form of class warfare is adding fuel to the flames that are licking at the foundations of our society. A columnist in the New York Times recently pointed out that "both political parties seem to be solidifying along the lines of class interests."

Can anyone say there is a conscious, common effort to promote integration and understanding between organized labor and management—and to a somewhat lesser degree, between government and industry?

Recently, recognizing my own shortcomings in this area, I invited to lunch a well-known labor leader in a neighboring State and a U.S. Senator. After 2 hours in which we exchanged views (no holds barred) all three of us came away with a better understanding of the problems of the others and we all wanted another meeting.

This week one of the top labor leaders in New Jersey told me the time was overdue for management and labor to bury the hatchet, particularly in view of the international situation. It is heartening to find that leaders in every field are becoming aware of the necessity for government, labor, and industry to close ranks.

May I respectfully suggest to the representatives of Federal and State Governments present here tonight that industry would be glad to join any effort to bring about a closer working relationship with government and labor. Perhaps a better relationship might be stimulated by a conference of leaders in Washington, followed by meetings at the State level. Such action would not only be good business and good politics, but would be a definite first step toward the objective of developing unity.

I am sure every member of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce is ready and eager to develop closer relationships and teamwork with all groups which are interested in strengthening our economy. We must have unity to be productive—we must be productive to be strong and we must be strong to remain free.

A Sane and Strong Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence's article of February 5 is an effective, sober reply to those Democrat presidential hopefuls who are perpetually endeavoring to undermine the faith of the American people in this Nation's military defenses.

It is interesting to note that these same critics of this administration's accomplishments in maintaining an effective defense were also here, on the Capitol scene, during the Korean fiasco, but had no comments then on the measure of the effectiveness of the Democrat administration's military preparedness at that time.

The article follows:

U.S. POWER SEEN SUFFICIENT TO DETER A RUSSIAN ATTACK

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 4.—Despite a concerted effort to scare the Congress into appropriating more money for intercontinental missiles, and the apparent attempt to play politics with national defense, the truth is that a world war is less likely today than it has been at any time since the close of World War II.

The outstanding fact is that the United States has sufficient military power today to deter the Soviet Union from making an attack. The price of such an attack is too big for the Kremlin to pay—for this would bring in retaliation the almost total destruction of all its major cities and the death of millions of people from one end of the Soviet Union to the other.

The average man is a bit confused by the persistent propaganda that tells him, "the Russians are ahead." But it is important to keep in mind these points:

1. The Soviets must go great distances across oceans with their missiles to hit at us.

2. The Soviets, in delivering their first blow, must simultaneously knock out every missile base and every air base in this country and in the territory of our allies in Europe and north Africa as well as in the Far East. It must be a 100-percent score.

BOAST HELD EMPTY

3. The Soviets must also knock out every U.S. submarine that is armed with missiles and every American or allied aircraft carrier at sea than can launch bombers carrying nuclear weapons. This, too, must be a 100-percent score.

4. The Soviets boast they can strike at targets with pinpoint accuracy, but one wonders how at a given moment a missile is going to find the exact spot that each submarine happens to be or the exact location in the air of each plane of America's fleet of heavy bombers. The unknown location of American warships is a deterrent, no matter how many missiles Russia has. The U.S. Air Force, moreover, here and overseas, keeps in the air in periods of crisis a certain number of nuclear bombers.

5. The Soviets not only must time their attack so it will knock out every allied base in Pakistan, Turkey, Italy, Spain, North Africa, as well as in Britain and France, but must make sure at the same time that all bases in this country are completely destroyed.

REPRISAL CONSIDERED

6. If the Soviets should miss any of these targets, they would promptly receive in reprisal a sweeping attack with H-bombs that would cause incredible devastation. It probably would take only 50 missiles or bombs to knock out 50 of their cities.

All these points, summed up, merely mean that the United States and her allies today still have the deterrent power they have been depending on for several years now. President Eisenhower at his press conference emphasized that the United States has a "balanced" defense. But the words "equivalent" or "balanced" do not convey the total significance of America's power to deter an enemy from attacking.

It is being said that the United States is failing to match each weapon now being produced by the Soviet Union. But the Soviets have need for more long-range weapons than America, because the Western allies have bases which are a short distance from the targets in Russia, whereas the Soviet air forces and missiles must travel across the Arctic or span the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean to reach America.

REDS' OBJECT: FRIGHT

There are, of course, many boasts being made nowadays by the leaders in Moscow. The purpose is to frighten America and her allies into submission to Soviet demands. But, as Mr. Eisenhower recalled at his news conference, the Soviets have bragged falsely in the past that they invented the flying machine, the automobile, and the telephone, and there's no reason why their claims about the performance of other inventions in the weapon field now should be accepted.

The United States Government has taken what is termed a "calculated risk." This means that it assumes the impracticability of any such simultaneous attack by the Soviet military machine as would destroy the American capacity to retaliate on a massive basis. The Kremlin would be taking a dangerous risk—the risk of terrible destruction—if they miscalculated in the use of their attack weapons.

HELD A STALEMATE

So the military situation is truly a stalemate in the sense that both sides have enough power to deter the other from initiating a war. Under the circumstances, there is little point in adding lethal weapons on a quantity basis merely to make sure that

the rubble and masses of dead people in cities in the Soviet Union are pounded to smaller pieces by more missiles.

America's position is secure primarily because the Soviet leaders are never expected to favor the suicide of their nation. Meanwhile, improvements in technology can add little to the security of either side—for the power to destroy another nation now is as efficient as it ever needs to be.

Plea for Conversation—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Plea for Conversation," by Arthur J. Goldberg, of the AFL-CIO, which should be read in conjunction with an address by Mr. Lansing P. Shield, president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, which appears at an earlier point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

PLEA FOR CONVERSATION

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America made a profound contribution to the philosophy of labor-management relations by recognizing the inter-relationship of the workers' welfare and of the union's welfare to the well-being of the entire industry. In itself this recognition of mutuality of interest was not foreign to the philosophy of the American labor movement, which has fortunately been free of theoretical class-warfare ideology. But Hillman's contribution was to pay more than lip service to the idea: to set up institutional forms and to mold the thinking of his associates and others in the labor movement, and of his and other managements, to this concept of interdependence.

It is more than thirty years since the Hillman approach to mature labor-management relations became established and accepted in the clothing industry. How widespread has its acceptance been in the entire labor-management scene?

Superficially, the portents in this field are good. Labor unions are strong in membership and resources, and they have weathered the recession without fundamental organizational weaknesses. Despite widespread unemployment and underemployment, unions are negotiating new contracts which provide higher wages and improved benefits. Big strikes are few; major setbacks even fewer. Spokesmen for both major political parties, when they are overseas and therefore not campaigning, boast of our free democratic trade unions. Even at home—and even when campaigning—both parties extol free collective bargaining, and only the most neanderthal among them attack the concept of trade unionism. Each year the Bureau of Labor Statistics adds more collective-bargaining agreements to its already bulging files. Nonetheless, I suggest that if we probe beneath the surface we will find that we are a long way from universal achievement of the Sidney Hillman type of labor-management relations.

One large geographical area—the Deep South—has eluded organization by unions in many industries. The southern textile industry functions in large part on a non-

union basis, as it has for many decades. Great sectors of the clothing and garment industries in the South are also nonunion. So, too, are much of the construction industry and broad areas of the service trades in which various unions have jurisdiction. Even in organized industries the South has become increasingly a haven for runaway shops and factories. To say that the state of labor-management relations in the South is by and large unsatisfactory is an understatement.

Or take the problem of the white-collar workers. The technological revolution in America is producing a constantly smaller number of blue-collar workers in relation to an increasing proportion of technicians and subtechnicians, engineers, and subengineers, management and administrative people of various kinds. Yet, with few exceptions, unions have not found the technique with which to bring the increasingly large number of this type of industrial personnel into the labor movement. And, with few exceptions, managements have resisted the organization of these workers.

Even more serious than this resistance to the organization of white-collar workers is a hardening of attitudes in areas already organized. This intangible factor is, in my opinion, the most serious problem of all. After some 20 years of responsible collective bargaining in the major industries, we might reasonably expect a certain measure of understanding and goodwill, of ability to see the problem of the other side, of mutuality of efforts to reach solutions satisfactory to both. Indeed, 10 years ago we seemed to be on the road toward achievement of mutual respect and understanding in our major industries; the Wilson-Reuther agreements at General Motors, the Murray-Fairless agreements in steel, and others that could be mentioned, all pointed to an era of maturity in labor-management relations. But in the recent past I see a hardening of attitudes, and retrogression rather than progress in understanding. Management is tougher, unions are tougher, and the results are not good for either side.

Throughout American industry there is a widespread movement away from genuine acceptance of and cooperation with unions. In their place we see a philosophy of labor-management relations that aims at keeping unions at arm's length and seeks, wherever possible, to go around the union to its members. This philosophy treats unions as necessary evils; it does not see them as constructive partners in achieving harmonious and productive labor-management relations.

What reasons can be given for this polarization of viewpoint? I do not believe that it can fairly be attributed to an overreaching on the part of the American labor movement.

Of course, situations can exist where the comparative bargaining strengths of unions and employers are not in balance. There are situations in which a labor surplus exists, union loyalty is small, and the market is such that the employer can afford to forego production for a period of time; there are also situations where the opposite is true. Economic injury can occur when too great bargaining power exists on either side, although it is one of the essentials of our free economic system that we do not interfere to redress every individual instance of economic disequilibrium so long as there is no general pattern of imbalance.

The real question, however, is whether it can be said that on the whole labor exercises too great economic power vis-a-vis the employers. Here I would unhesitatingly say that in the total picture greater strength is still on the side of the employers. The American industrial scene is certainly not one in which poor, downtrodden, profitless business enterprises have every last penny extracted from them by powerful labor unions. Wage and profit statistics do not paint such a picture, either for the economy as a whole or for those

industries in which the large unions—usually denounced as "monopolies" by labor critics—exist.

If the hardening of attitudes which I see is not due to economics, then, what is its cause? I am not sure that I know, although I know that something has happened. Perhaps the change in climate is largely a by-product of our political scene. However successful collective bargaining may appear on the surface in organized industries—and I am, of course, questioning even this—politically, legislatively, and philosophically labor and management today stand apart, and the degree of polarization of viewpoints in these areas is far greater than in collective bargaining.

If we were to believe the political spokesmen of industry, for example, labor and its allies are determined to socialize America, a claim which everyone should know is plainly nonsense. And, to be entirely fair, I recently read a speech by an outstanding and respected labor leader charging a great American corporation with seeking a Fascist America—a charge which, in my opinion, is equally nonsensical.

In some measure the current hardening of attitudes is certainly due to the philosophy behind the Taft-Hartley Act, which speaks of encouraging both collective bargaining and individual bargaining—a complete contradiction in terms. Then, too, there is the fact that today we have a new generation of leadership in business, and, to a lesser extent, in labor. The generation passing from the scene developed mutual understanding and sometimes even friendship from their wartime experiences in governmental posts such as the War Production Board and the War Labor Board; on both sides those of the present generation are more inclined to be organization men, with all of the parochial characteristics of that breed.

Whatever the causes, the opportunities for conversation, for a sensible and realistic exchange of views between the leaders of labor and the business community, are becoming fewer and fewer. And the stereotype images, indeed the caricatures, are taking the place of reality. When the two sides meet, as they do now more and more infrequently, they meet almost solely at the bargaining table.

The bargaining table, of course, plays an indispensable and essential role in our labor-management scene, but it has never been known as a place where one could think out loud about basic problems: every word counts too much. Thus, in the period of growing estrangement between labor and management, one of our most conspicuous lacks is an area where men of divergent viewpoint can meet and exchange ideas, rather than make debating points, and where they can think realistically about our common future.

Take the question of old age as an example. The collective-bargaining table has obvious limitations as a forum for providing an adequate contribution, both by management and labor, to this complex problem. If a union in the course of collective bargaining raises the question of developing a program for retired employees, the discussion is likely to revolve around the narrow point whether, in law, the union has a right, and the company the obligation, to bargain for workers already retired. But, putting the legal question aside, can there be any doubt that both industry and unions have an obligation toward employees and members who have devoted long years of their lives to their respective interests? I have the deep feeling, unsupported by evidence, that if we could discuss this problem frankly and mutually, outside the collective-bargaining table, joint programs could be evolved which would have a beneficial impact both within and without the framework of collective bargaining.

Save for the collective-bargaining conferences, however, there is little joint exchange

of opinion. Where, then, do management and labor express their views? The answer is clear: Almost everywhere except together.

The Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce, composed of our leading businessmen, migrates to Hot Springs, locks itself behind closed doors and unanimously assures itself that labor is ruining the country. The National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce go respectively to New York and Washington for annual conventions, at which a host of the participants are already convinced that the labor movement and liberal politicians are the root of all evil.

The labor movement does essentially the same thing. We talk to ourselves in our conventions and in our executive council meetings, we adopt our maximum positions and we hurl these neatly mimeographed resolutions over the fence at the opposition, which picks apart the commas and semicolons and answers them.

There have been occasional efforts, of course, to bridge this gap. Back during the war some leaders in the CIO proposed an industrial council plan. Many people in management saw it as a blueprint rather than an idea, and promptly proceeded to tear it to bits. Perhaps to industry the phrase connoted a sort of codetermination. If so, I would say, let us forget the name.

American labor has not the slightest interest in codetermination. While it recognizes the right of our European colleagues to proceed by their own lights, American labor has considered the European experience and has concluded that it infinitely prefers to make its gains through collective bargaining rather than through any joint control of industry. No responsible American labor leader wants to take over management's prerogatives. American labor completely respects management's rights and regards it to be not only the right, but the responsibility, of industry to manage its plants. Only out of well-managed, profitable enterprise can American labor expect to make the gains in wages, hours, and working conditions which it desires.

Even where the term "industry council" was not used, however, and hence where there was no chance that the phrase itself produced misunderstanding, recent attempts to reach a rapprochement between labor and management have failed. In 1955, for example, the National Association of Manufacturers invited George Meany to address its convention. When he accepted in all good faith, he was subjected, as he sat on the platform, to a barrage of critical oratory that certainly did not contribute to mutual understanding. Is it surprising that he replied in kind?

The problem is that a philosophic chasm separates labor and management in America. Instead of narrowing, this chasm widens every year. It is essential therefore that we search for honorable methods of bridging this gap. As one step in this direction, I would propose a labor-management assembly, modeled after the United Nations Assembly, to serve as an instrument for bringing together the leading figures in American industry and the American trade union movement for periodic examination and discussion of the issues which affect us all and in which we find so little common ground.

I suggest that this labor-management assembly be convened under the auspices of the Government of the United States and that the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor act as cochairmen. But I immediately add that this need not and should not be a Government-dominated organization, any more than the ILO, on the international level, is a government-dominated institution, although government participates along with labor and management representatives in its functioning. I view the role of government as providing prestige, of supplying

facts, and of bringing together a secretariat for the conduct of the meeting.

To achieve any beneficial results, the labor-management assembly I am suggesting would have to meet at regular intervals with top-level attendance and top-level thinking from both sides. It would have to be attended by the chairman of the board and the presidents of representative big and small corporations, and by the presidents of trade unions, both accompanied by adequate staffs. I would propose that the present membership of the Business Advisory Council, enlarged by representative small businessmen, constitute the industry representation. The general board of the AFL-CIO, on which sits at least one representative from each affiliated union, large and small, would constitute labor representation—with the proviso that respectable unaffiliated unions should of course be invited.

I would hope that the labor-management assembly issue no statements unless they were unanimously agreed upon and unless the common denominator achieved was higher than agreement that sin is bad and morality good. If the labor-management assembly is to be successful, it must be a place to discuss and think about important issues in the labor-management area on a broader basis than is possible in collective bargaining—not to fight and bicker over the words of a contract or a resolution. If the discussions are to be profitable, they should be off the record except for agreed upon statements, so that no one need be concerned that his remarks will be cited against him. Indeed, I visualize more and greater benefits from small discussion groups under the auspices of the labor-management assembly than from general plenary sessions.

Finally, I would hope that at the periodic meetings ample opportunities would be provided, as at international assemblies, for social intercourse between individuals in the respective groups—something that has been increasingly lacking since the wartime agencies functioned and the importance of which cannot be overestimated. I believe that our top level labor and management representatives must be brought together for a period of as long as 2 or 3 weeks, once or twice a year, under circumstances in which they have no alternative but to talk; and when they are through talking, they should talk some more.

Participants would have plenty to talk about. A good example of a problem we are all concerned about is inflation. If one reads the industrial press, inflation is caused solely by rising wages. If one reads the labor press, inflation is the end result of superprofits and administered price policies. Is either side right, or are they both wrong? If each is right, why is inflation a worldwide problem—in underdeveloped countries, in countries that are primarily agricultural, in countries that export, in countries that import more than they export, in countries with effective labor movements and in countries with quite passive, or nonexistent, labor movements? Whatever the answer, if there is an answer, the problem is rarely discussed by responsible leaders of labor and management sitting together.

And what about automation? How often do the top leaders of labor and management get together to discuss all of the implications of automation, except for the very limited treatment that can be given to this all-important subject by their representatives trying to hammer out a collective bargaining agreement before a strike deadline? Even the whole issue underlying the "right to work" laws has never been adequately discussed except in a political setting. It is ironic that in the recent political campaign, "right to work" laws were supported by many companies whose industrial relations would be fearful of the stability of

their personnel relations if they did not have a union shop.

What about the problem of corruption in the labor-management field? It is no secret that many businessmen have gloated over Dave Beck and Jimmy Hoffa and consciously or unconsciously cast them in public speeches as symbols of all labor leaders. On the other side of the fence, many labor leaders are happy about the revelations concerning Nathan Sheffermann and the businesses represented by him, and they label them as characteristic of all businessmen. Yet businessmen and labor men both know better; they deal with each other, and they know that the vast majority of both groups are honest. Should not this be talked about frankly and candidly so that legislation in this most important area can be based upon facts rather than slogans?

The questions could be multiplied. What about our educational system, in which both labor and management have a vital stake? What about national defense? Is it too much to hope that a labor-management assembly, with the help of academicians and public figures, could discuss the implications of John Galbraith's thesis that we have reached the state of an affluent society and must seek goals other than steadily increasing production of consumer goods? The list of subjects which could be discussed and which are not now being discussed is endless.

I am, I believe, a realist. I know that creating a forum such as I propose will not solve, and could even aggravate, the problem of reaching mutual understanding. I am aware that at a meeting such as this men will read prepared speeches, setting forth their maximum positions and that the pressure from their own side against concessions may dim the chance of fruitful discussion. But I am similarly aware of what the General Assembly of the United Nations, with even greater problems, has accomplished, as well as what it has not accomplished, in relaxing international tensions.

Without expecting too much, and without even hoping for too much, I believe that a labor-management assembly would be good for labor and management and the American public. For if we make no effort, the alternative is a widening of the chasm, a hardening of attitudes, and eventually the development of a militant class consciousness—the absence of which has been one of the strengths of democratic America.

What is called for is a greater recognition of mutuality of interest. Mind you, mutual respect does not mean artificial unanimity of thought. Within the framework of mutual acceptance and mutual respect, there is wide room for diversity of opinion. But can we not work, labor and management alike, to solve common problems through the development of a program which will promote the Nation's economic health, and will advance the growth of both business enterprise and labor? It seems to me that in both management and labor there must be the vision and imagination needed to develop a program based on the premise that what is good for America is good for those who own and manage and for those who belong to our free trade unions.

Gen. William Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, Gen. William Donovan, a lifelong friend of mine,

passed away yesterday at the Walter Reed Army Hospital where he had been a patient for a long period of time. Only a few days ago I sent my dear friend of football and first World War I days a message through a mutual friend. No man could know "Wild Bill" Donovan, as he was affectionately called, without respecting and loving him as a man. One of the great contributions which my friend made to his country was the fine example of patriotic citizenship that he set before the youth of our country. His was a life dedicated to the service of the United States. Few men have honored and ennobled his country in the field of patriotic service in the U.S. Army and in the diplomatic service to the extent that he has honored and ennobled it. Bill Donovan, you have honored your country and your fellow citizens beyond any words of mine can adequately express. The heartfelt sympathy of Mrs. Reed and me are extended to Mrs. Donovan.

As a part of my remarks I insert the following excerpt from the Washington Evening Star of February 9, 1959:

HONORED AS ATHLETE

He was honored in quite another field in 1955 when Columbia University presented its athletic award to him to commemorate his days as one of the university's great quarterbacks and his 50 years of devoted service as an alumnus.

The general was one of the founders of the American Legion, although he differed with the Legion when it sought special benefits for able-bodied veterans.

Throughout the postwar years he often asserted that the United States was losing the cold war with the Soviet Union and called for stiff measures to combat it. He urged use of the best brains and most courageous spirits to wage an economic, political, and psychological counteroffensive to Soviet subversion throughout the world.

He also called for a just and reasonable security program in government and warned against "muddle headed" thinking on the subject.

C. R. "Pink" Gutermuth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday night the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts conferred another honor upon one of this Nation's great conservationists.

At the annual banquet in Houston, Tex., the association gave C. R. "Pink" Gutermuth its distinguished service award.

NASCD President Nolen J. Faqua cited Gutermuth for his long years of successful effort in promoting management of the Nation's soil, water, wildlife and related sources. The award is given in recognition to soil conservation districts and in dedication to their principles of "Conservation—development—self-government." The association represents the more than 2,700 farmer-supervised

soil conservation districts throughout the United States and its Territories.

Former recipients of the award include Ervin L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, first Chief of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service; and Donald A. Williams, present SCS head.

Gutermuth has been the vice president of the institute, an influential private organization with headquarters in Washington, D. C., since 1946. Prior to that he was secretary of the American Wildlife Institute. He currently is a trustee and the secretary of the North American Wildlife Foundation, vice chairman of the Natural Resources Council of America, and a trustee of both the Wildlife Society and Stronghold, Inc. (Sugar Loaf Mountain, Md.).

He is chairman of the steering committee for the annual National Watershed Congress that is sponsored by more than 20 leading industrial, agricultural, and conservation organizations. From 1934 to 1942 he was first director of education and then director of fish and game of the Indiana Department of Conservation.

In 1957 he received the Leopold Medal of the Wildlife Society, the highest award of that professional organization of wildlife scientists.

Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the State of New Mexico:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

Memorializing the Congress of these United States to extend the fullest rights, duties, and blessings of statehood upon Hawaii by admitting her to the Union of the United States of America

Whereas over 99 percent of the pupils in the in the public schools of Hawaii are citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the half million people of the islands include among their members large numbers of three great racial groups who speak five of the greatest languages heard around the world; and

Whereas members of nearly 50 language and racial groups and subgroups have long been associated together in amity and mutual esteem in the public schools of the Territory; and

Whereas as long ago as 1851 the islanders secretly petitioned these United States to be taken under our protection; and

Whereas the islands of Hawaii were annexed by joint resolution of Congress in 1898 and established as a Territory by law in 1900; and

Whereas the people of the Territory have amply demonstrated their capacity for self-government and self-reliance; and

Whereas the people of the United States must demonstrate to the world that our published ideals of liberty, fraternity, and equality are in truth a living creed to which we adhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to admit Hawaii to statehood without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the members of the New Mexico delegation to the U.S. Congress.

ED V. MEAD,

President of the Senate.

HAL THORNBERRY,

Chief Clerk of the Senate.

MACK EASLEY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ALBERT ROMERO,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Washington: A City in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have throughout my legislative career, been intensely interested in the problems presented by the rapid growth of our metropolitan centers. I have also keenly felt the need of having our Nation's Capital as the showplace of our great country. It is for this reason that I was extremely interested in a recent article appearing in *Changing Times* concerning the critical municipal problems facing the District of Columbia.

This article is all the more interesting in that it points up the fact that the voteless citizens of Washington are forced to look to Members of Congress from all areas of the Nation as their representatives. Because the District of Columbia has for many years been denied its right to local self-government, we are compelled to be members of their city council. I do not think that it is any reflection on our services to say that part-time attention by an overworked Congress is no substitute for a vigorous, locally elected municipal government. The serious problems the District now faces reflects this fact.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article "Washington: A City in Trouble."

WASHINGTON: A CITY IN TROUBLE

A pilgrim to our Nation's Capital comes to behold the Lincoln Memorial's brooding majesty and the classic grandeur of the Capitol. He sees these noble sights and is proud. But occasionally a visitor turns away from Washington the Capital to inspect Washington the City. What he discovers then may damage his patriotic pride. Washington is a city in trouble. Our "showplace of democracy" has some shocking shoddy exhibits on display.

Suppose, for example, that you pass up the tourist shrines for a look at the principal downtown shopping area in this capital of the free world. You expect something impressive of the core of a city of 2 million, our 11th largest metropolis. But what do you find?

"Downtown" is a characterless conglomeration of obsolete, narrow-fronted struc-

tures along a scant half-dozen blocks of F Street and G. Most of the buildings are three or four stories high, their upper floors blank and grimed from long disuse. There is nothing here that the citizen of Omaha, Kansas City or Duluth could not match or surpass right at home.

You think, perhaps, that you have missed the main stem? Then roam farther. You may happen upon Connecticut Avenue, known in the travel literature as "fashionable." Here there are a number of shops of modest distinction. Still, not even the most provincial visitor would mistake it for Fifth Avenue.

Wandering in the opposite direction from downtown is even more distressing. Quickly you encounter the welter of cut-rate feasting establishments that line Ninth Street and Seventh, many of them quite shabby and all of them cluttered.

The culture-minded might note in passing the absence of that standard ornament of great capitals, an opera house. Washington has a local operatic troupe of some merit—three productions a year—but no opera house. When New York's Met comes here on its annual tour of the provinces, it holds forth in a movie house. There is no adequate home, either, for ballet, orchestral concerts or chamber music. Congress recently authorized construction of a National Cultural Center in Foggy Bottom. Money to build it, however, will have to be raised by public contributions.

WHAT'S GOOD ENOUGH FOR HOGS

Painful as these observations may be to the out-of-towner, more and worse spectacles await. Just outside the business zone lies a morass of classic slums, acres and acres of them—starkly ugly, desperately overcrowded and dilapidated.

"The hog house on my farm," a western Senator recently declared on the Senate floor, "would be a much better place to house families than many of the places within sight of the Capitol."

His indignation caused no stir. Washington is inured to such protests, heard whenever legislation concerning housing in the city is considered. Inevitably, there is a picture in the paper showing the distinguished lawmaker gingerly eyeing a tottering privy in a trash-heaped backyard with the Capitol dome looming in the background. The periodic reappearance of this photographic cliché evokes little comment. There is silent disapproval but no sense of outrage.

Perhaps a tourist compound ought to be established, bounded by the White House, the Capitol, the Jefferson Memorial and Arlington Amphitheater. No special penalty would be necessary for border violations. What you would see would be punishment enough.

Yet, not even the most discerning tourist can begin to plumb the depth of Washington's troubles. He may observe that a great deal of the Northwest section bears the scars of creeping blight. But he could only guess that this area contains the city's "wickedest precinct," where many hard-working, struggling families live surrounded by disease, crime, and delinquency. Here more than a quarter of the homes are deficient in three or more respects, such as being overcrowded or lacking adequate plumbing or water supply. Incomes average less than \$250 a month, although even modest family living here calls for about \$400 a month. During the past year, schoolteachers were buying lunches out of their own pockets for hungry children, and 1,300 children were absent from school because they had no shoes.

This area has been staked out for a renewal program featuring demolition of hopeless buildings and rehabilitation of those worth salvaging. How successful this effort will be remains to be seen. Bad as conditions are,

they are better than those that existed until recently in the Southwest quarter. There, behind the stately Government buildings on the Mall, housing was so far gone that it was leveled to the ground. It will be replaced with handsome town houses and luxury apartments that few of the area's former residents can afford to occupy.

Clearing Washington's slums is complicated by the fact that it is becoming a black city. Already 48 percent of the District of Columbia's residents are Negroes, and soon they will outnumber whites.

The colored Washingtonians are not shiftless Uncle Toms. A high proportion are well schooled and hold white-collar jobs. But the low-income slum dwellers also are predominantly Negro. And, unlike their white neighbors, they cannot escape the city by moving to the suburbs. By and large, the Maryland and Virginia suburbs do not welcome Negroes.

The inevitable, unanswered question is, How can the city's congestion be eased when so many of its people have no other place to go?

THE PENALTIES OF GROWTH

But Washington's woes are not just the worries of its colored residents. White Washingtonians are bedeviled by dilemmas, too.

Take traffic. Washington's big industry, government, is not on the rim of the business district but smack downtown. Over half a million people fight their way into the heart of the city every morning and back out again at night. Some 400,000 come by car, nearly 200,000 more by public transit, mainly buses that vie with private autos for street room. There are five private transit companies, regulated by four public agencies.

The ebb and flow of this mighty tide produces monumental, snail-paced traffic jams on the arteries leading north and east to the Maryland suburbs. Traffic to the Virginia suburbs is bottlenecked at the Potomac bridges, which bear the frightful burden of one of the world's heaviest traffic concentrations. Six solid lanes converge on one span that, alas, has room for only three and built for two.

Or take the water supply. The city proper quaffs the Potomac. So do some suburbs. Others are supplied by private wells, subdivision wells, and several systems tapping nearby streams. Some water systems are publicly owned, others are private utilities. Twenty-five different water rate schedules are in effect. What you pay depends on where you live. The cheapest rate applies in the District. In some suburbs, water costs nearly four times as much.

So far, there has been enough water to go around, despite occasional droughts in the suburbs. But the region's thirst has grown stupendously. The water table has dropped and already dependence on wells is risky. Competition for the Potomac's bounty has become so keen that someday the river could be drained dry before it reaches Washington.

The suburbs are clawing each other in their anxiety to preempt future water supplies. One Virginia suburb, Falls Church, makes a tidy profit peddling water to its neighbors.

Or take the Potomac itself. To the casual visitor, this watery expanse looks like an elegant recreational resource. But no Washingtonian would willingly dip a toe into it. The Potomac is scandalously polluted. Its waters are thick with debris and silt and fouled with raw sewage. Only 32 percent of the solids are removed from sewage before it is dumped, so to speak, in the front yard. If it rains too hard, however, untreated sewage overflows directly into the river. The situation is most noisome in midsummer. Then the Potomac's flow becomes so leisurely that a drop of water takes 40 days to pass the city. In the meantime, tides slowly

swish the accumulated filth back and forth before the city.

Washington's problems, of course, are not novelties. Every big city worries about stagnation downtown, the traffic buildup and the drain of vitality to the suburbs. These are repercussions of explosive growth. Washington has earned its growing pains by doubling in size since 1940. A decade ago, it was solemnly foreseen that the population would reach 2 million by 1980. It has hit that mark already.

IS ANYBODY IN CHARGE?

The real puzzle is why this city, so much more fortunately situated than some, should be so helpless before its problems. Much of the time it appears to be apathetic to the point of criminal negligence. On other occasions, as when a proposal for a new Potomac crossing was stalled in a dispute over the comparative esthetic merits of a bridge versus a tunnel, it simply looks inept. Shouldn't a city whose one big industry is government do a better job of governing itself?

One basic trouble is that the power to govern is Balkanized. The city proper is no city at all, but a compact Federal enclave of 70 square miles known as the District of Columbia. The real Washington is a metropolitan area covering nearly 1,500 square miles. While the District of Columbia is under Federal jurisdiction, the actual city also embraces two Maryland counties, Montgomery and Prince Georges, two Virginia cities, Alexandria and Falls Church, and two Virginia counties, Arlington and Fairfax. In total, counting all units from the U.S. Government and two sovereign States down to the smallest trash-collection district, some 79 governments have a finger in running Washington.

Still, one can't put all the blame on the multiplicity of jurisdictions. Washington would be in trouble if it never had outgrown the District of Columbia. Its local governments is an anomalous freak unlike anything else in the land.

The District, remember, is neither city nor State. It isn't even a Territory. Its citizens have no governor, no council, no mayor. Like convicted felons and mental incompetents, they have no vote in either local or national affairs.

In the first half of the last century, Washingtonians did elect a city council and for a period chose their own mayor. As late as the 1870's they were choosing members of one house of a local bicameral assembly and a nonvoting delegate to Congress. Since 1878, however, the District has been run by a three-man Commission appointed by the President. Two are civilian residents of the District, the third an Army officer chosen from the Corps of Engineers.

Structurally, the local government is an administrative hodge-podge. An issue of land-use planning, for instance, is likely to be caught in a snarl involving the National Capital Planning Commission, a Federal body headed by a resident of St. Louis, Mo.; the Redevelopment Land Agency, an independent Federal body; the National Capital Housing Authority, still another independent agency; the highway department, a division of the District Government; the National Park Service, a Federal agency with duties all over the United States, its Territories and possessions, perhaps even the Commission of Fine Arts and the Bureau of the Budget, which has global worries.

There is a body known as the National Capital Regional Planning Council intended to provide a meeting ground for these diverse interests and their Maryland and Virginia counterparts. But it has neither money nor power.

FIVE HUNDRED MAYORS TOO MANY

For that matter, even the proconsular District Commissioners have little final author-

ity. The actual seat of power is on Capitol Hill, in Congress. Both Senate and House have standing committees to make law for the District of Columbia. In effect, the city has two separate but overlapping city councils. The current mayors are elected by voters of South Carolina and Nevada. Since few Congressmen or Senators are anxious to lavish their eminence on municipal matters of no consequence to their constituents, assignments to the District committees are not eagerly sought.

A national legislature of 531 members makes a cumbersome town council. City ordinances have to run through the same legislative mill as multibillion-dollar measures affecting the security of the Nation and the peace of the world.

Under such conditions, Washingtonians themselves hardly can be blamed for not running a more efficient city. They are alert, intelligent and perhaps more solidly organized into vocal neighborhood associations than the people of any other city. But their disenfranchisement obliges them to focus on neighborhood concerns. They wind up obsessed by petty problems, often apathetic to big ones.

At the same time, a high proportion of Washingtonians are transplants from elsewhere in the Union. They tend to consider themselves citizens of Kalamazoo or Keokuk, or wherever they hail from, who are temporarily resident in the Capital. This is license for indifference to local issues, except when a local matter touches some sensitive nerve. Then they needle their Senators and Congressmen from back home into backing their individual views. Sometimes this bigtime lobbying on smalltime matters reaches ludicrous proportions, as when almost 100 separate bills were introduced in Congress to block the Government from obtaining a needed building site that happened to be owned by a farflung and politically hep organization.

Washington's lack of control over its civic destiny produces a curious lack of local leadership, too. There are no industrialists of the stripe whose zeal for civic betterment has meant so much to other cities. Washington's businessmen are limited primarily to real estate, retailing, and local banking. There have been some recent stirrings of civic consciousness, but so far few men of vigor and vision have emerged to tackle the city's problems.

Able men who live beyond the city limits find ample uses for their talents in their own backwaters. Washington's homegrown leaders meet one of two fates. Either they make a bid for national stature, trading on opportunities that naturally abound in a national capital, or they attain some innocuous local celebrity such as becoming chairman of the Cherry Blossom Festival. But their chances of becoming effective city leaders are slight.

So here bumbles your Nation's Capital, a city more populous than 17 different States, with nobody in charge and everybody hobbled. If George Washington could return today, he might be amazed to see how the city he and Major L'Enfant conceived had outgrown their vision. Yet, one wonders. Would Washington just sleep here?

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Four Hundred Million Dollars To Be Spent—But Where and for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 236, at the request of the Department of State, which provides for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange-of-persons program and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, has introduced the companion bill, S. 455, for himself and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, in the other House.

I include here the text of two letters I have received from the Department of State, together with information on progress made to date in the coordination of the international educational and cultural relations of the United States.

I include here the text of my bill, H.R. 286, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] has cosponsored with me as H.R. 1987.

Finally, I include here the text of a splendid background article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch by Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of that great newspaper. This article shows conclusively, I think, that this legislation is long overdue and, further, why it must be enacted without further delay.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 8, 1958.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Last year the Department endeavored to obtain, through legislation which you sponsored, the establishment of the position of a Special Assistant to the Secretary for International Cultural Relations. As you know, the Department has for some time recognized the need for the creation of such a high level position, to be filled by Presidential appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in order to achieve the important objective of having a coordinated, governmentwide effort in the field of our exchange-of-persons and other cultural programs with foreign countries.

In the last session of Congress S. 3112 (companion bill to H.R. 10031), providing for the establishment of such a position, passed the Senate but was not acted upon by the House. The urgent need for having a Special Assistant to the Secretary, however, remained.

In order to deal with the problem on an interim basis, and until legislation can be obtained which will give this position the

status which the Department believes it should be accorded, there has been created within the Department by Executive order the position of Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Coordination of International Education and Cultural Relations at the GS-18 level. The Honorable Robert H. Thayer, former Minister to Rumania, who has more recently served as special assistant to the Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research in the Department, has been selected to fill this position.

It is our hope that legislation similar to S. 3112 can be obtained in the next Congress. Knowing of your deep interest in this matter, I hope that we may continue to look to you for assistance in this regard.

If you should wish to discuss this matter at further length, I shall be happy to meet with you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE
SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 2, 1959.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I enjoyed very much listening to your speech at the panel on the performing arts during the IIE Conference last week and only regret that a meeting with the Under Secretary at 4 o'clock made it impossible for me to stay until the end of the meeting and take the opportunity of meeting you. I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of a progress report which I sent the Secretary recently and hope for an early chance to meet with you and discuss the increasing number of problems with which I am necessarily confronted in this job.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. THAYER.

To: The Secretary of State.
Through: S/S.

From S/IC—Robert H. Thayer, Special Assistant to Secretary of State for Coordination of International Cultural Affairs.
Subject: Progress Report on Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations.

Since I have assumed the position of Special Assistant for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations the following actions have been initiated:

1. A meeting has been held, called and chaired by Under Secretary Herter, of representatives at the Under Secretary level of 15 Government agencies engaged in the field of exchange of persons, technical assistance, etc., to explain the basis for the creation of the position of Special Assistant. The minutes of this meeting are attached (tab A) together with a copy of the charts used by Under Secretary Herter at the meeting (tab B).

2. At Under Secretary Herter's request, these agencies have designated individuals at the Assistant Secretary level upon whom I have personally called to discuss preparations for the issuance of questionnaires in the conduct of a survey of what those agencies are doing in this field. A list of these agencies with the name of the individuals designated is attached (tab C).

3. Questionnaires have already been forwarded to IES, ICA, USIA, and the Department of Defense with the request that this information be provided by the end of this month, if possible.

4. A task force has been organized at the working level to set up and staff a clearinghouse of information which will be kept current and maintained as a basis for planning the coordinated U.S. effort, country by country; a brief prospectus of this clearinghouse is attached (tab D).

5. I am making personal calls on the Presidents of the principal foundations to try to persuade them to conduct their own survey on what all non-Government agencies are doing in this field and to set up a clearinghouse for this information. I have had encouraging reactions from Dr. Heald of the Ford Foundation and particularly from Dr. Gardner of Carnegie Corp.

6. In cooperation with ICA, I hope to organize a 2-day seminar of seven or eight leading university presidents at some such place as Arden House for the purpose of discussing with appropriate representatives of State, ICA, USIA, and Defense the problem of whether the type of education being given to foreigners visiting the United States annually is appropriate to the objectives of our overall foreign policy.

7. In cooperation with ICA, I am discussing the assignment of a research officer to make a study of whether, in carrying out our programs of exchange of persons and technical assistance, we are making appropriate use of the available facilities of the universities of the United States.

8. I am preparing a cabinet presentation of plans for the coordination of the work of all U.S. Government agencies in this field, including a draft of an Executive order to be signed by the President directing that such coordination be the responsibility of the Secretary of State.

9. I am under continuous pressure from various parts of the Department to name a specific date on which I shall be prepared to take over the operating functions of the sections of the public affairs area now engaged in the exchange of persons and international, educational, and cultural field. These sections include the International Educational Exchange Service, East-West contacts staff, UNESCO relations staff, cultural presentation staff, arts and monuments adviser, cultural planning and coordination staff, and the Executive Secretariat of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. However, until my functions as coordinator have been more fully developed, and the above described coordinating plans further advanced, I believe that I should devote all of my time to this larger and more important effort and postpone the transfer of operating functions. In any event, I would expect the actual operation of the various sections of the public affairs area to be carried out by a deputy under by general supervision, and I believe it most important that this deputy should be selected with particular care.

REPRESENTATIVES OF U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ENGAGED IN INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS PROGRAMS

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Robert A. Kevan, Assistant to the Secretary of HEW for International Affairs.

U.S. Information Agency: Saxton Bradford, Deputy Director, Policy and Planning.

Department of Labor: George Lodge, Assistant Secretary.

National Archives and Records Service: Dr. Robert H. Bahmer, Deputy Archivist.

Department of the Interior: Royce A. Hardy, Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources.
National Science Foundation: James M. Mitchell, Associate Director (Management and Public Affairs).

Library of Congress: Rutherford D. Rogers, Chief Assistant Librarian.

Department of Agriculture: Clarence L. Miller, Assistant Secretary.

Department of Defense: Charles H. Shuff, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Military Assistance Programs (Office of Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs).

Smithsonian Institution: Mrs. John A. Pope, Chief, Traveling Exhibition Service.

Department of Commerce: Ralph Homan, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs.

Department of the Treasury: T. Graydon Upton, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission: John A. Hall, Assistant General Manager for International Activities.

International Cooperation Administration: James H. Smith, Jr., Director, ICA.

PROPOSED CLEARINGHOUSE OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES OF AGENCIES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT—A PROSPECTUS

THE OBJECTIVE

To make it possible for those planning a program of educational and/or cultural activity in any foreign country to be accurately informed concerning existing U.S. programs in that field in order that such planning can take its appropriate place in an effective, coordinated U.S. effort.

THE PROBLEM

To set up an organization with modern, mechanical facilities adapted to maintain information on activities of U.S. Government agencies in the international educational and cultural field; to keep such information current in the various categories appropriate for use in coordinated planning; and to maintain evaluated information on the tools necessary for the conduct of such programs.

DISCUSSION

This clearinghouse should be charged with maintaining current information on all U.S. activities, country by country, in a form usable at any time for general information purposes. The clearinghouse should be appropriately staffed, not only to catalog existing activities of Government agencies, but also to keep information on the tools useful to the conduct of these activities by the agencies concerned, such as an evaluated list of area specialists, teachers of English and individual foreign languages, up-to-date methods of language teaching, current educational and cultural needs of individual countries, etc.

The clearinghouse should be charged with the responsibility of disseminating to various Government agencies detailed information regarding related activities of other agencies and should be prepared to issue upon request special reports covering information in its files or from other sources. All interested agencies should be represented directly or indirectly in the clearinghouse to keep their agency currently and appropriately informed of its resources.

The clearing house should be charged with the responsibility of maintaining a public bureau of information which would answer requests for information from private, non-government individuals and institutions with legitimate interests.

It should be emphasized that this information clearinghouse is not intended to be a place which would contain only an inventory of activities, but is to be a center where readily available information can be collected, processed, and disseminated as an aid to the general coordinating problem. Its existence is based on the theory that com-

plete knowledge of all programs in the educational and cultural field being conducted by U.S. agencies in any one country will enable agencies to fill existing gaps, prevent duplication, and generally facilitate effective, coordinated action in that country.

It is understood, of course, that the maintenance of such a clearinghouse will require a substantial staff and the annual expenditure of considerable sums of money for maintenance and servicing. This staff should consist of an adequate number of technicians to operate the most modern machinery for making the information contained therein available in its most usable form, as well as individuals qualified to process the information and do such evaluation as may be possible. Research and reports personnel should also be attached to the clearinghouse.

It is hoped that nongovernmental institutions can be induced either to set up a similar clearinghouse of activities in the educational and cultural field in which they are engaged, in which event a close liaison would be maintained between the two clearinghouses, or else to participate in the U.S. agency clearinghouse in whatever manner may be appropriate.

H.R. 286

A bill to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange of persons programs and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there shall be in the Department of State an assistant to the Secretary of State to be known as the Assistant for International Cultural Relations (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "assistant"), who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The annual rate of basic compensation for the position of assistant created by subsection (a) of this section shall be established by the Secretary of State in an amount not to exceed the annual rate of basic compensation established by section 106(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 for Assistant Secretaries of State.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of the assistant, under the general direction of the Secretary of State, (1) to coordinate the international exchange programs of the Department of State under section 32(b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, or other provisions of law relating to the exchange of persons, with a view to assuring joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of such programs, and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs, and (2) to perform such other functions as may be assigned by the Secretary of State or prescribed by law.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
Feb. 1, 1959]

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS TO BE
SPENT—BUT WHERE AND FOR WHAT?

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—This year the American Government and American private institutions will spend more than \$400 million on educational, cultural, and technical exchanges of persons with free and neutral nations, yet no one knows exactly where the money goes or can estimate the value of these programs to this and the other countries.

An attempt to correct this situation has been made in the appointment of Robert H. Thayer, former minister to Rumania, as Special Assistant to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations.

His selection last month followed Senate passage last session of a bill jointly sponsored by Democratic Senators J. WILLIAM FULLBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, calling for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State to do this needed job. A similar bill died in the House but legislation to make Thayer an Assistant Secretary of State is expected to be approved this session.

The need for a high-level official to study, coordinate, and subsequently perhaps to supervise more than a score of major exchange projects, was emphasized in a recent report by the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. The report said in a forward:

"Government programs in international education are both extensive and varied. In view of their cost, their worth is a matter of concern to the U.S. Government and the American taxpayer.

"A major obstacle to appraising their value has been the fact that nowhere has it been possible to find an ordered body of information of how many programs and of what kind are currently in operation."

The 251-page report was the work of five experts on the subcommittee staff and in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The report itself said in part:

"Although some informal and irregular intra-agency relationship exists, no single executive or legislative agency or committee has an overall responsibility for coordination of these programs. . . .

"An accurate calculation of total expenditures by the U.S. Government for international educational activities cannot be made from data presently available. Not even estimates of some of the costs are available."

The report, both a survey and a handbook, is the most definitive study yet made of these programs, yet it lacks timely information about the system the Soviet Union uses to get greater returns for the money it spends on similar exchanges.

Thayer doubts that his or any other Government agency can get adequate information about the Soviet system of educational, technical, and cultural exchanges. Both the Communist government and the Communist Party have had for 30 years a worldwide system of recruitment for young people and technicians to come to the Soviet Union, later to its satellites, for education and indoctrination. This enables the Kremlin to use the services of Russian-trained nationals in local revolutionary and subversive activities.

It is known that last year at least 654 young people from the free world went to Russian schools, whereas only 19 Russian students enrolled in free world educational institutions. It is not known how many students the Soviet bloc nations exchanged among themselves.

It is not known how much the Kremlin spends annually on its entire international educational, cultural, and technical exchange program. It may be more or less than the amount spent by Americans.

Thayer, who has been on his new job for about 6 weeks, estimates roughly that the Government and American private organizations will spend a total of \$429 million this year on about 250 exchange programs. The general breakdown follows:

	Million
Nongovernmental—\$215 million International Cooperation Administration	\$129
State Department	20
Defense Department	35
U.S. Information Agency	10
U.S. share of multinationals agencies	20

The nongovernmental institutions include such famous and respected names as the Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, and Guggenheim Foundations, which consider improvement of public-health conditions as part of the educational and technical programs. Their lesser operations extend down to the inter-national programs of American universities and religious organizations.

Far more information is available about nongovernmental projects, individually, by countries, and even continents, than about the Federal programs. There is considerable cooperation among the larger foundations to avoid duplication and competition.

The International Cooperation Administration's part in the Government's share is mostly for technical assistance. It was not until this week that the ICA made public its outlays by countries for its overall economic and military aid. For much of its technical and educational activities the ICA uses the equivalent of millions of dollars in local currencies it receives from the sale of surplus agricultural products abroad. The House report estimated these technical assistance programs provided training and teaching opportunities in the United States and abroad for about 11,800 persons in fiscal year 1958.

The State Department's operations are mostly for the Fulbright scholarships which the Arkansas Senator initiated in 1946. They are financed chiefly by local currencies and credits obtained from the sale of American wartime materials. Later laws provided additional funds in local currencies running into the equivalent of unestimated millions of dollars. The \$20 million listed for the State Department is an annual appropriation in American money for supplemental payments to Americans abroad and, in exceptional cases, to foreigners studying in this country. There were more than 6,000 participants in these programs in 1957. About a third were Americans studying or teaching abroad.

The Defense Department expenditures, roughly estimated, range from the cost of American military advisory missions in allied and neutral countries down to the training of foreign noncommissioned officers in this country.

Similar but far smaller unlisted expenditures are made by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Public Health Service, and others.

The U.S. Information Agency's \$10 million quota covers libraries abroad, its educational broadcasts and distribution of books, magazines, and motion pictures.

The multinational agencies' outlays go mostly to the United Nations educational, scientific and cultural organization and the Organization of American States, formerly the Pan-American Union.

The House committee report hit only the high spots of the problems faced by Thayer. Although the five experts had unusual access to all Government departments and agencies and worked for more than a year, they made no positive recommendations. Their criticisms were by implication.

Thayer told the Post-Dispatch he thought it would take more than a year for him and his small staff to assemble the basic information essential for policy recommendations to Federal agencies. He emphasized that the Federal Government could not dictate to the private groups, only suggest informally the benefits of cooperation and coordination.

"The first step," he said, "is to establish a clearinghouse of all pertinent information, governmental and private. . . . Once we have the basic information, the next step will be to keep it current and available. We shall start with about 15 agencies and 10 countries. We hope to have the latest IBM

machines to keep track of every exchange activity, including the nongovernmental, in every country.

"Such complete information about the major programs in all countries would enable the American agencies to coordinate their programs and avoid duplication. It might be found that we were doing enough in one country and that new efforts could be more advantageously put in some other country."

Thayer said he thought such information should be available both in this country and the other participating countries. One unanswered question is whether lists should be kept of individuals benefiting from the exchanges. The theory advanced by opponents of lists is that if a participating country came under control of the Communists, the participants would be among the first to be liquidated.

Persons advocating the individualists idea argue that the local Communists would have such information anyway and that it is desirable to follow up the careers of the participants to determine whether the programs are worthwhile. The follow-up process is just getting started in some Government agencies.

Once the information clearinghouse is established, Thayer said, there could be a coordination of Government expenditures and policies and closer cooperation with the private agencies.

Eventually, it is believed, it would be more efficient if a single section of the State Department had overall policy control over the governmental exchange programs, comparable to the direction given American foreign aid by C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Thayer's experience has been chiefly as a lawyer and foreign service officer. He is 57 years old, a son of the headmaster of St. Mark's preparatory school in Massachusetts. He attended Amherst College and Harvard University, where he was a member of the exclusive Porcellan Club. He was in the New York law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham and Taft.

In 1926 he married Virginia Pratt, whose family fortune stemmed from the Rockefeller oil interests. He was an assistant district attorney for New York County from 1937 to 1941, when he entered the Navy as a lieutenant commander and emerged in 1945 as a commander. He was an assistant to John Foster Dulles at the San Francisco U.N. conference in 1945. He lost his contest for a seat in the House from Brooklyn in 1946.

From 1951 to 1954 he was assistant to the American Ambassador to France, in charge of SHAPE relations. In 1955, he was appointed American Minister to Romania. He returned to this country to serve in the intelligence and research division of the State Department.

Let's Hope the Flagmakers Get Another Job Real Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Reading (Pa.) Times:

LET'S HOPE THE FLAGMAKERS GET ANOTHER JOB REAL SOON

We hope the flagmakers will take it a bit slowly in the production of the new 49-star flag dictated by the admission of Alaska into the Union. For we hope by the time the 1st session of the 86th Congress completes its chores, Hawaii will be the 50th State.

We are impelled to this thought by the news in the papers the other day that the first session of the Legislature of the State of Alaska got underway and we fell to wondering whether a similar conclave might not be getting into action in Honolulu about this time next year.

The State of Alaska has many problems before it. It will have to evolve its own way of life and legislate accordingly. And Alaska's way of statehood is bound to be quite different, up there close to the Arctic, close to Red Russia, and still fairly close to the main body of the States, from that of other States. We in the older 48 States must not expect miracles day after tomorrow. We must let Alaskans feel their way and if they occasionally do something which we do not see eye to eye with, as fellow Americans we must try to understand them.

In the meantime Hawaii has made its big pitch for statehood. Since Alaska has now been admitted, it is our view that not a single argument against Hawaiian statehood can hold water any more. What's sauce for Alaska should be sauce for Hawaii, too.

Address of O. R. Strackbein, Chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, Before the National Wool Growers Association, Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech made by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the National Wool Growers Association at its annual convention in Portland, Oreg., on January 28, 1959:

Woolgrowers in the United States have been interested in tariff protection for many years, going back several generations. It has been a continuing fact that the leading wool-producing countries of the world have been able to produce this fiber at costs well below our own; and wool production in this country could not have survived without tariff protection.

Of course there are those esteemed academic economists who say that any industry that cannot compete with imports should be rooted out. Inability to compete with imports without a tariff, they say, is convincing evidence of inefficiency. These economists, so-called, are wholly unrealistic, however, in their stubborn oversight of the factors that make for higher costs here, some of them the direct result of national legislation. They also do not say to what use the range lands of the West should be put if they were no longer to grow wool. But for wool growing millions of acres of land would go to waste and presumably should be left to the coyotes and jackrabbits.

Unfortunately, the free-trade philosophy as expounded by the economics professors not only took hold in Washington 25 years ago, but it has become deeply imbedded there. This intransigence, of course, is not all to be attributed to the power of the professors. They gained some very powerful allies who had a financial stake in exports, and without whom the professors would have been helpless. We have only to mention the automobile, the electrical, the steel, international oil, rubber and farm implement industries in the industrial field; and cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, soybeans, and a few other farm crops in the agricultural field, in order to understand the strength of their allies. The industries that have become interested in exports in the past 25 to 40 years number among them the largest in the United States, and, of course, wheatgrowing is one of the leading farm operations in the country in terms of acreage. Cotton, tobacco, and rice, though planting lesser acreages than wheat, are also important in some sections of the country, particularly the Southern States.

Then, too, there are the industrial importers who seek a low tariff or a complete removal of the tariff so that they may obtain their raw materials at the lowest prices. The largest importers today are the international oil companies. Petroleum and petroleum products have taken the lead in our import trade, having recently surpassed coffee beans.

Together with those who believe that freer trade will lead to peace of the world, such as the League of Women Voters, various religious associations, etc., these various allies make a formidable combination and wield tremendous influence in Washington. It was they who supplied the State Department economists with the powerful support they needed.

Strangely enough, the wheatgrowers, flour millers, and cottongrowers, who have been so ardent in their support of the trade-agreements program and GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), are themselves thoroughly protected against import competition by restrictive import quotas. They seem to see nothing illogical in advocacy of freer trade for everyone else while insisting upon and getting extreme protection for themselves.

It is no exaggeration to say that these highly protected agricultural groups have wielded a great deal of influence toward the extension of the trade-agreements program from time to time since 1934. Under it, as you know, there has been carried out a relentless reduction of tariffs. Since its beginning in 1934, our protection in general has been reduced a full 75 percent, mostly through actual tariff cuts, but also by following a policy not to raise specific duty rates as a means of keeping in step with increasing prices. Today the United States is one of the low tariff countries of the world. Well, what has all this come to?

It has brought us to an unfortunate situation indeed. It has brought us to the point where Congress has in effect lost its power to make the tariff and to regulate our foreign commerce.

You may well wonder how this could have happened here in the United States; and may rightly ask, are we not a free people? Do we not have constitutional government? Do not our elected representatives carry out the will of the people?

If so, and if the Constitution places the responsibility for our tariff and for the regulation of foreign trade on Congress, as indeed it does, very clearly and unmistakably, how could it come about that Congress has lost its control in this field?

This is a natural and a logical question.

Let me bring the situation home to you in a little more concrete form. During the past year there has been a great interest in the

import of meat, both in the form of dressed lamb, live cattle, and beef. In both instances the mounting imports add up to a considerable threat to prices, especially in some parts of the country. Therefore, it would seem logical to put on some restrictions, even if only temporary, as a means of regulating imports in such a way that they would not inflict serious injury on the growers and producers of lamb and beef in this country.

Very well, what steps should be taken?

To answer this question it now seems necessary to ask another: Who regulates our foreign commerce or who adjusts the tariff?

It should not be necessary to ask such a question, since everyone, or nearly everyone, whose affairs bring him into contact with such matters, knows that Congress is responsible for the regulation of foreign commerce and for making the tariff. It says so in the Constitution as plainly as anything can be said in English. No one disputes it; not even the free traders.

Yet, something has happened. Something has indeed operated to turn the power of Congress to regulate foreign commerce into a fairytale, something to tell little children.

Today the chance of obtaining legislation to put down the threat of dressed lamb imports or of live cattle and beef imports is about as good as siphoning dry the Pacific Ocean with a soda straw.

What, indeed, has happened? Several things have happened.

The combination of export industries, import interests, free-trade theorists, etc., already described, among others, has been in support of State Department trade policies. This support made possible heavy majorities in Congress for the trade agreements program.

This fact, in turn, made it possible for the State Department to take the power delegated by Congress to the President to enter into trade agreements and use it as a means of dealing Congress itself out of its own power, and setting that body aside, like a useless and helpless assemblage.

Not only was it possible for the State Department to do so but it accomplished the feat so thoroughly that even today Congress seems to be unaware that it is tied hand and foot; and is just as free to carry out its constitutional mandate as is any man at any time to dishonor himself, to break his word, and to run out on his commitments.

That is how free Congress is in the field of its original jurisdiction and direct responsibility, i.e., in the field of tariffs and trade.

This is so because the State Department, practicing a brand of statecraft of which Machiavelli himself might have been proud, put Congress neatly into a box and nailed down the lid.

You are entitled to ask how the State Department could accomplish such a feat. The answer is that it could do so only because Congress itself was willing or indifferent; but, whatever the blame upon Congress, the Department succeeded.

How?

It used international executive agreements as its instrument. Mind you, Congress authorized such agreements in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which it subsequently extended each time it expired, until today; but it did not authorize some of the far-reaching provisions inserted in such agreements, especially in GATT, the master agreement made in Geneva in 1947.

Like the serpents or pythons seen in the Laocoon statue, the State Department threw its coils around Congress in the form of international commitments. Before Congress knew it, the coils had gained a deathly grip that bade fair to paralyze the whole body, so far as tariff legislation is concerned.

For example, the State Department agreed in GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) to the renunciation of import quotas; in fact, proposed this ban to the other countries. As a means of persuading them to accept this provision the Department agreed to three exceptions, designed to accommodate the other countries. Only one of these exceptions applied to the United States, namely the use of import quotas to protect agricultural products if a government program called for crop restriction. In this country this exception was recognized in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and it was under this section that the import quotas on wheat, wheat flour, cotton, peanuts, and a few other crops were imposed. Thus was gained the support of these agricultural groups.

Other countries could use import quotas if they suffered from balance of payment difficulties, i.e., dollar shortage; and they have used this exception extensively to restrict imports from this country. It is not available to us. Underdeveloped countries also may use import quotas to protect their industries. We, of course, cannot.

Now, in agreeing to the renunciation of import quotas as a means of regulating trade, the State Department was committing the future Congresses of the United States not to use one of the important and effective means, and sometimes the only effective means, of regulating foreign commerce. What did this do to the constitutional power of Congress to carry out such regulation? The State Department had deprived Congress of a very important instrument.

Beyond that the Department also bound a number of products on the free list and numerous tariff rates at existing levels. This was the same as a commitment that Congress would leave these items alone and in fact, retire from the field.

To say then as the State Department has often said, echoed by other executive officials, that Congress is still free to legislate in this field is, to repeat, the same as saying that Congress is free to repudiate the State Department and therewith the international commitments of this country.

A more pernicious and morally repugnant interpretation could hardly be contrived. If Congress is free to act only by violating the international commitments of this country then it has no freedom at all, unless we want to go to bed morally with the Russian dictatorship.

This is the point of degradation to which the State Department has brought our Congress, so far as its constitutional function of regulating foreign commerce and shaping the tariff is concerned. Thus has been destroyed the responsiveness of Congress to the electorate. It is no longer of avail to you to vote for a Congressman or Senator if you have in mind his doing anything for you by way of regulating imports. You may not know it but you have been disfranchised as effectively as if your vote had been taken away or the ballot boxes closed.

And let me tell you that it will stay this way unless a lot of people open their eyes and do it soon; and then do something about it.

This is not all.

You have perhaps heard of the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act. It has been sold to the public through all means of communication as a remedy against serious injury from increased imports resulting from tariff reductions. From 1934 to date every President has said clearly and emphatically that the trade agreements program and the tariff reductions made under it will not be allowed to injure or jeopardize domestic industry. Every Secretary of State since 1934 has likewise gone to Congress and testified before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Commit-

tee, not only confirming the Presidential statements but emphasizing and reinforcing them. Other public officials have done the same, not only once but numerous times.

I am sorry to have to say that either the level of official integrity in the highest reaches of our Government is shockingly and unacceptably low, or the right hand does not know what the left one is up to.

No decent citizen can read the record with respect to the escape clause, comparing the solemn Presidential assurances and those of Cabinet officials over the years, on the one hand, with the actual record of performance, on the other, without a blush of shame. It is as clear a case of roughriding over principles and noble professions, from what is no doubt regarded as a safe position of strength, as can be found anywhere.

The Presidents since 1951, when the escape clause was first made a part of the law, after having existed in the form of an Executive order, have refused upon one pretext or another to put into effect 7 unanimous decisions of the Tariff Commission; and out of some 28 total affirmative recommendations where serious injury or a threat thereof was found by the Commission, the President has proclaimed only 10, and these were largely small cases. The Tariff Commission itself has failed to find injury in over half the cases coming before it. Across the board, therefore, the number of cases that succeed in getting through the Tariff Commission and the President represents a low batting average, indeed; and the President has in nearly all the cases in which he has accepted the Tariff Commission's recommendations and proclaimed an increase in duty or imposed a quota on crop imports watered down the Tariff Commission's recommendation.

Altogether, the record comes close to nullification of the statute.

It is not as if the congressional intent were unknown. Congress has successively amended the escape clause to make its meaning clear and to tighten its provisions for more sure protection of American industry, agriculture, and labor. Yet the output at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue has remained the same. Congress might as well have saved its breath.

The only remedy to this incredible situation lies, and must lie, in Congress itself. Certainly the State Department will not surrender the power that it has become accustomed to exercising. Quite the contrary. It has sought to make its grip permanent by negotiating the articles of a new agreement for an international trade organization in which it proposes U.S. membership. It is known as the OTC, or Organization for Trade Cooperation, and would sit in Geneva. In time the OTC would perform the broad control over our trade, as was proposed for the ITO (International Trade Organization), which failed to gain congressional approval in 1950.

Should Congress approve our membership in this new organization (the OTC) it would represent a final bowing out by that body from its responsibilities to the people. In the field of tariffs and trade, not only in policy-making but in administration, our form of Government would be changed without a constitutional amendment and without recourse. Congress would have blessed its own burial.

This must not come to pass. I hope that you will take very seriously the situation as it has developed and that you will lend a vigorous hand in helping to set Congress in an upright position once more in this field.

The ultimate fact is that all these usurpations of power by the executive have been and are being justified in the name of international relations. The contest with Russia has in recent years been used as justification for almost anything. Yet the fact is that the ousting of Congress from its seat of constitutional power in the regulation of

foreign commerce was well launched and solidly anchored before our cold war with Russia began. The cold war is therefore only a handy way of justifying what had already been done for other reasons.

The truth is that the Russian military challenge, if anything, makes it all the more necessary that we preserve our industries as a matter of public policy. Congress has, indeed, recognized this through the national security amendment of the Trade Agreements Act. This amendment, like the escape clause, however, has also become a virtual dead letter in operation. Not one order has been issued under the amendment by the President although about half a dozen cases have been heard by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

As for the Russian economic challenge, it should be clear that we cannot meet it through tariff reductions. GATT Conferences in Geneva or anywhere else. If we are really concerned over the Khrushchev trade challenge we must set up a government trading corporation that can import and export quite outside of the considerations that guide private international trade.

We must be able to meet prices in competition with Russia without regard to profits. We must be willing to practice dumping where this would become necessary. We must be willing to offer higher than the market price for imports in order to prevent Russia from forcing certain shortages of raw materials on our industries, by forestalling her preclusive buying. We must be able to do many things that do not go with private export and import trade carried on for profit.

GATT would certainly take exception to any such actions by us and might hobble and hinder us. We should therefore be looking after our freedom to act according to Russian moves; or to forearm ourselves by making ready our own governmental machinery to meet any developing Russian trade challenge, rather than going before GATT with hands extended for more snug-fitting manacles.

The notion that Russia's economic challenge is an argument for freer trade is a mark of upside-down thinking. The trend will be the exact opposite since all Russian trading is done by the state without regard to profits.

What the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy seeks is a remedy against serious injury from imports on the grounds that it was never the express policy of the Trade Agreements program to reduce tariffs to such a point. Quite the contrary. We fully agree with the reduction of unnecessary barriers to trade but vehemently deny that inability of an American industry to compete with imports is any indication of either inefficiency or uneconomic status. Our industries carry cost burdens that are the result of public policy, such as high wages, farm price supports, social security, etc. These cost burdens represent an outright interference with the free market and, further, represent the opposite of free trade. Yet they appear to be here to stay, or at least for an indefinite period, rightly or wrongly.

Foreign countries with which we have trade agreements know that we entered the agreements with the reservation that any duty reduction could be modified or withdrawn if imports seriously damaged a particular industry in this country. Therefore there is no proper ground for complaint by any country if we raise the duty on imports of a product or put on a quota that prevents or remedies the injury. It is understood all around that that is our right, just as other nations have the same right. There would be room for complaint only if we should make the changes in duties or quotas capriciously or without proper investigation of the facts.

To prevent such capricious action we have hearings and investigations by the Tariff Commission. Their findings should, therefore, be the end of it (1) unless someone could successfully impugn the fairness of the hearings process or upset the factual basis of their findings; or (2) unless the Commission recommended duty rates or quotas more restrictive than the level from which they had been reduced.

If we gain recognition in actual practice of this simple principle you will be able to go before the Tariff Commission and have your case resolved on the facts; and that, I am sure, is all that you are entitled to and that is all you ask. Until that day arrives you will have to fight for your rights, and I am sure you will do that too.

Hon. R. Walter Riehlman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, we learn with a great deal of regret that our distinguished colleague, the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York, has reluctantly decided to relinquish his membership on the House Select Committee on Small Business.

Mr. RIEHLMAN's recent appointment to the very important new Committee on Science and Astronautics and his continuing membership as the second ranking Republican member on the Committee on Government Operations and ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the Committee on Government Operations, makes it virtually impossible for him to give the required time and attention to the duties involved in the Small Business Committee.

As I have said, we as Members of the House on both sides of the aisle regret to learn of Mr. RIEHLMAN's decision, but we bow to the inevitable since we realize the vast amount of time which would be required in his new committee assignment on the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Our colleague's interest in national defense has long been well and favorably known and the kindred duties in connection with the national defense on the two committees which he retains are of the utmost importance.

Mr. RIEHLMAN has said that his interest in small business and small business problems will not be diminished and I know we will call on him for the advice and counsel which he is so capable of giving after 12 years of outstanding service on the House Select Committee on Small Business.

At this point I would like to include Mr. RIEHLMAN's announcement in which he sets forth the several reasons for giving up a committee service in which he has always shown selfless and dedicated service.

Mr. RIEHLMAN's statement follows:

RIEHLMAN ANNOUNCES TERMINATION OF SERVICE ON SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

WASHINGTON, February 11, 1959.—Congressman R. WALTER RIEHLMAN announced today

that he has reluctantly decided not to accept appointment to the House Select Committee on Small Business for the 86th Congress. RIEHLMAN has served on the committee for 12 years and, due to the retirement of Representative William Hill, of Colorado, would have been the ranking Republican member. RIEHLMAN stated, "It is with a great deal of personal regret that I turn down reappointment to the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives. During my 12 years' service on the committee many accomplishments have been achieved in the interest of small business."

"I have had a vital interest in the affairs of the small businessman for many years," RIEHLMAN continued, "and I do not intend to let that interest lie dormant as a result of this decision. I shall continue my efforts in behalf of small business and I shall continue to cooperate with every proper movement in the interest of our small business economy."

In emphasizing his recent appointment to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, RIEHLMAN said, "this committee will undoubtedly become one of the most important in the House of Representatives, not only because of the tremendous responsibility it will have in keeping America in the foreground of scientific research and astronautical development, but also because of its close relationship with the development and maintenance of our national defense. Committee activities will encompass relatively new fields and hearings will be quite extensive."

RIEHLMAN pointed out that the Science and Astronautics assignment, in addition to those as second-ranking Republican on the Government Operations Committee and ranking Republican on the Military Operations Subcommittee, would require a great deal of time and effort.

"I am convinced," he continued, "that there would not be enough hours in the day to do an efficient and effective job on all three committees. It was a question of time and I came to the conclusion that I had to give up something. In the final analysis, I decided to concentrate my efforts in the fields of space development and national defense."

"The small businessman in America is faced today with countless difficulties. A great responsibility lies with Small Business Committee members in this 86th Congress and I hope, for the sake of the small business community, that it will be fulfilled with sincerity and objectivity."

"My membership on the committee has been both enjoyable and profitable over these past few years. I have been afforded a chance to see this important area of our economy in operation and have gained a much more extensive knowledge of its conditions and requirements as a result. I leave with reluctance and I want to emphasize the fact that I do so only as a result of my increased assignments in other areas."

Churches and Synagogues in the National Capital Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following summary prepared by the department of research and church planning, Council of Churches, National Capital Area, Washington, D.C.:

A STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF CHURCHES AND SYNAGOGUES IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA

DEFINITION OF "NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA"

The National Capital area includes the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.; and Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; Loudoun and Prince William Counties, Va., are being included in the classification as they are becoming more urbanized.

COUNCIL OF CHURCHES NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA

The Council of Churches, National Capital

Area, is an interdenominational, ecumenical Protestant agency through which 300 churches representing 30 denominations express themselves in service to the community. Departments of the council are Christian education; institutional ministry; radio and television; research and church planning; social welfare; youth and young adults; and united church women.

In addition to the departments listed there are many active committees, a few of which are Boy Scout advisory; campus ministry; churchmen; civil defense; community life; ecumenical relations; evangelism; public meetings; and Government personnel.

Number of churches by religious groups in the National Capital area

Churches	District of Columbia	Prince Georges County	Montgomery County	Arlington County	Fairfax County	Alexandria	Total
Protestant.....	451	187	165	70	186	69	1,108
Roman Catholic.....	41	31	15	6	8	5	106
Jewish.....	16	2	5	1	0	2	26
Eastern Orthodox.....	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Other.....	3	0	0	1	0	0	4
Total.....	518	230	185	78	174	76	1,251

COMPOSITION OF RELIGIOUS POPULATION

On the basis of surveys and censuses made by Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant research organizations of the population in the National Capital area, it has been found that approximately 5 percent of the total population is Jewish and 13 percent Roman Catholic. The estimates of Protestant membership range from 40 to 50 percent.

According to a study of church membership in the States and the District of Columbia made 3 years ago by the National Council of Churches, the District of Columbia ranked third highest. The proportion of church members in the total population of the United States is 61 percent.

On the basis of the population of the National Capital area, which is now slightly in excess of 2 million, the Jewish membership estimate will range from 85,000 to 100,000; the Roman Catholic membership would be approximately 260,000, and the Protestant membership would be estimated from 800,000 to 1 million.

The largest Protestant denominations in the National Capital area are Baptists, Methodist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Disciples of Christ, Seventh-day Adventist, and the United Church of Christ (formerly Congregational-Christian and Evangelical and Reformed).

Nine Baptist bodies have a total of 300 churches, 7 Methodist groups have 243 churches, the Protestant Episcopal Church has 109 churches, three Presbyterian denominations have 70 churches, 4 Lutheran bodies have 61 churches. The Disciples of Christ have 23 churches, the Seventh-day Adventists have 21 churches, the United Church of Christ have 14 churches. There are 15 Christian Science Churches, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have 8 churches, the Unitarians have 8, the Church of the Brethren have 7, and the Evangelical United Brethren Church have 6 churches.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON RELIGIOUS BODIES

Questions concerning religious bodies and organizations can be directed to the Council of Churches, National Capital Area, 1751 N Street NW., Decatur 2-3132, for answer or referral.

The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. maintains a Washington office at 122 Maryland Avenue NE., Lincoln 4-2350.

The international headquarters for the Seventh-day Adventists is located in Takoma Park, Md.

Other Protestant groups which maintain headquarters offices with regional or national functions are:

Baptist, 1626 16th Street NW., Columbia 5-1526.

Disciples of Christ, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Lincoln 6-9156.

Episcopal, 1702 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Executive 3-7878.

Lutheran, 2633 16th Street NW., DE 2-1910.

Methodist, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Lincoln 3-5038.

Presbyterian, United States, 22d and P Streets NW., North 7-7747.

United Presbyterian, U.S.A., 1229 Connecticut Avenue NW., Executive 3-4526.

Marine Combat Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, together with so many of my distinguished colleagues I have been seriously disturbed over the actual effects of the cut in the Marine Corps strength to 175,000. As you know, this is 25,000 marines below the figure this Congress considered to be the minimum necessary to provide on an austere basis the three Marine divisions and three air wings required by law.

We are now beginning to be told by the Pentagon what we tried to impress upon them in the last session of Congress. The three full divisions and three air wings required by law cannot be maintained by a 175,000 man Marine Corps.

A recent article in the New York Times by the able military reporter of that newspaper, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, describes the effects of a cut to 175,000 Marines in terms of lost, deactivated combat units. Six of the twenty-seven infantry battalions of the corps and the equivalent of six air squadrons will be deactivated by July.

This latest cut then can only come from the combat strength of the divisions we tried so hard to establish as the

Nation's force in readiness. I commend this sobering fact to the Members as a matter for serious concern.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this brief analysis of the Navy budget by Mr. Baldwin in the RECORD. It includes a concise statement of what is happening to the combat strength of the Marine Corps:

THE NAVY BUDGET: FLEET WILL REMAIN AT CURRENT SIZE BUT AIRCRAFT INVENTORY WILL BE CUT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Navy's share of the administration's defense budget for the fiscal year 1960 will maintain a fleet of approximately the present size.

Some 864 ships, the same number as are now in service, are scheduled to be in commission in the next fiscal year; 389 will be warships and 475 will be supporting vessels, amphibious craft, and so on. The Navy's active aircraft inventory will drop to 9,117 by June 30, 1960, compared with 10,533 on June 30, 1958. Only some 7,200 of these will be operational. Forty-seven percent will be jet-powered.

Fourteen attack aircraft carriers will be maintained instead of the 15 of last June, but new Forrestal-type carriers are replacing the old wartime Essex class.

SUBMARINE WAR STRESSED

The 1960 budget will maintain 16 carrier air groups—2 of them replacement groups—the same number as this year. More than 600 antisubmarine aircraft will be modified with new radar, and 2 new antisubmarine warfare task forces will be organized.

Patrol and warning squadrons will increase from 39 to 42 and the reorganization of the Naval Air Reserve, to orient it toward an antisubmarine mission, will continue.

The manning level for the active fleet will average about 81 percent of normal war strength per ship and squadron, about the same as this year.

With new procurement funds the Navy will buy 668 aircraft, which is less than one-half of the annual procurement needed to maintain an active operating naval air arm of 7,200 planes.

AIR ARM SHRINKING

Officials believe that given the present rate of procurement of piloted aircraft, the naval air arm will decrease to 4,000 to 5,000 aircraft by 1963-64.

There is also considerable concern about the growing obsolescence of the fleet. The 1960 shipbuilding program provides for 18 new ships, including a conventional-powered aircraft carrier of the Forrestal class, 6 guided-missile destroyers and frigates, 3 more nuclear-powered submarines and 8 other vessels.

Nine Polaris missile-firing submarines had been provided prior to the 1960 budget, but the administration has withheld funds for some of them and has adopted a building program of about three a year and one aircraft carrier every other year.

The 1960 budget contains funds for long leadtime items for three more Polaris submarines, in addition to the nine already provided, but does not authorize or provide funds for the full costs of the three additional submarines.

The building program also includes the conversion and modernization of 13 old ships, including a cruiser, 8 destroyers, and 4 other vessels.

The present naval construction program of about 20 new ships a year is less than half the number needed to replace overage ships if the operating fleet's present size of 864 vessels is to be maintained.

The Marine Corps is already undergoing a reduction from an authorized strength of 200,000 to 175,000 during the current fiscal

year; its strength is to remain at the 175,000 level in the fiscal year that begins next July 1. President Eisenhower's budget message declares that "the Marine Corps will continue to support three divisions and three air wings in their traditional state of high combat readiness."

MARINES DEPLORE CUTS

The Marine Corps flatly disputes this. Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, the commandant, has testified that the current reduction to 175,000 men will mean the elimination of 6 battalion landing teams out of the corps' current 27, and the elimination of 6 air squadrons.

The Marines will activate additional anti-aircraft battalions to operate the Army-developed Hawk missile, designed for use against low-flying aircraft.

During the next 18 months an old aircraft carrier—the *Princeton*—is earmarked for use as a Marine helicopter landing ship. The use of this carrier, which will be operated with no material physical alterations, will give the Marines three ships from which to practice the technique of helicopter assault. Two have already been specially converted.

The administration's 1960 budget provides funds for maintaining a total of 1,030,000 Reserves, both Army and Air National Guard, in a paid status, as compared with 1,082,000 this year.

The President's budget envisages funds during the fiscal year 1960 for 330,000 Army reservists, 360,000 in the Army National Guard, 75,000 in the Air National Guard, 145,000 in the Navy Reserves, 48,000 in the Marine Corps Reserve, and 72,000 in the Air Force Reserve.

The Army National Guard will man an increased number of Nike anti-aircraft battalions, and the Naval Reserve will provide at least cadre crews for 48 destroyers or destroyer escorts by the end of 1960.

The Air National Guard, its aircraft already 90 percent jet-powered, will be furnished more modern types in 1960.

The average cost of maintaining a Regular serviceman in uniform increases from \$3,885 annually in 1958 to \$4,150 in 1959 and to a figure estimated at \$4,220 in 1960. This is chiefly due to pay increases and other added costs.

Address by Hon. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, Mississippi Valley Association Banquet, Chase Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., February 2, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1959, I had the privilege of listening to an address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON at the 40th annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis, Mo. This distinguished American is particularly qualified to discuss water resources and water utilization problems. While Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Senator SYMINGTON suggested to President Truman the idea of creating the Materials Policy Commission, headed by Mr. William Paley. The Commission made an excellent projected survey of the general resources requirements of this country over the next few decades. It made

a stern warning of the ever-increasing need for better water management in this country, necessitated by the great growth of our population and the tremendous and growing demand of industry for fresh water. In fact, to the great surprise of those who take water resources for granted, the Commission stated that by 1975, of all our resources, the No. 1 American shortage by that time will be fresh water. In his address before the Mississippi Valley Association, Senator SYMINGTON gave graphic examples of the ever-increasing need of fresh water and the insatiable thirst of such industries as the chemical and atomic and aluminum industries for phenomenal additional quantities.

Senator SYMINGTON made an earnest plea for a national water policy, and his seven-point program in that connection deserves national attention and consideration and for that reason I, under unanimous consent, insert in the RECORD a copy of his address for useful reference and research material in connection with water resources, water management and water utilization legislation:

Thank you very much for the honor of being with you at this 40th annual convention.

I have followed the activities of the Mississippi Valley Association for many years.

Your work in developing a consistent and intelligent policy for the use of water in the vast subcontinent of this valley area is of vital importance to the entire country.

As a Senator, my particular interest has been the State of Missouri and the development of its water resources. The work you have done for this State has been outstanding.

Many thanks for the advice and cooperation you have given to me and my State over the past years, and I look forward to many more years of our working together.

No river valley has played a more important role in the history and growth of this country than has the Mississippi Valley.

Exciting images of the past are evoked by the names: Lewis and Clark, DeSoto, Marquette and Joliet.

Picturesque days are recalled by the names Mark Twain, Mike Fink, memories of the sidewheelers, and Abe Lincoln's float trip to New Orleans.

Since the days when the wilderness was conquered and the great steamboats became queens of the river, the Mississippi Valley has been settled.

Thanks to the efforts of many of you here tonight to a large extent, the rivers themselves, either have been or are being tamed.

But these rivers are not only a part of our history. They are vital to our present. The Mississippi Valley is the heartland of America, and its rivers the great arteries of commerce.

Their great past and present is to be followed by an even greater future.

For they are the most vital resources of the decades ahead.

Too many people take water resources for granted. They believe we will always have an abundance.

This is dangerous thinking, for without an adequate supply of water, our civilization and our industry will not be able to expand to meet the needs of tomorrow.

Tonight I should like to discuss briefly two recent developments which show the ever-increasing need for better water management in this country.

Both have occurred since the end of the Second World War.

One is the great growth of our population. The other is the tremendous and growing demand of industry for fresh water.

Many people have studied the population explosion now taking place in this country and the rest of the world.

But it has been studied primarily in terms of its effect on schools, on cities, and on industrial production.

Comparatively little attention has been paid to how this population increase will strain the water supply of our country.

In 1952, the President's Materials Policy Commission, headed by Mr. William Paley, issued an excellent survey of the resource requirements of this country over the next few decades.

This study was based on what we would be most short of 25 years from 1950—16 years from now.

To my great surprise, as well as that of many others, the No. 1 American shortage in 1975 will be fresh water.

The study pointed out that between 1900 and 1950, per capita water consumption in the United States has doubled.

Because our population has also doubled in that period, the demand for water had thus actually increased four times.

The Presidential Commission predicted a similar doubling of per capita consumption over the period from 1950 to 1975, as the Nation's standard of living rose; and with it the use of such luxury items as air conditioners, automatic washers, etc.

This famous report issued a stern warning that steps should be initiated now to assure an adequate water supply for the growing population.

The warning was based on a 1975 population projection of 193,400,000.

But this 1950 estimate has turned out to be far too modest. Our country is growing so fast that, under present projections, the 193 million point will be reached, not in 1975, but in 1965.

By 1975 we will have in America a population of more than 230 million, perhaps more than 240 million.

This would create an immense water supply problem even if the per capita consumption remained constant.

But it will rise with our standard of living, and therefore become even greater.

This country, and the Mississippi Valley in particular, is blessed with a large supply of fresh water. Properly utilized, it cannot only support this huge population but give the people an ever-increasing standard of living.

The Nation as a whole, however, has certain water problems, posed by nature.

Many areas have insufficient water supplies; and because of maldistribution of both rainfall, and access to water supplies, increasing control must be exerted over our water.

Such control will involve a conscious choice on our part. If we are willing to spend the effort and the money, however, the years ahead can see better living for all citizens.

If we do not heed the warnings of such studies as the one referred to above, the consequences are equally clear.

Now as to the increasing use of water by industry.

Since the war, such industries as the chemical and atomic and aluminum industries have grown tremendously.

And they have an insatiable thirst.

The amount of water consumed by an atomic energy plant is classified. But public figures do exist on some of the other industrial plants.

1. Water and oil may not mix, but 10 gallons of water are required to refine 1 gallon of gasoline.

2. Three hundred gallons of water are needed to turn out one barrel of beer.

3. With the growing interest in paper and steel mills in Missouri and the Mississippi Valley, it is significant to note that 64,000 gallons of water are needed to make 1 ton of sulfate paper; also 65,000 gallons to make 1 ton of steel.

4. A pulp mill requires more water each day than does a city of 50,000 people.

5. The Fairless works of the United States Steel Corp. on the Delaware River uses as much water daily as the cities of Buffalo and Boston combined.

In 1950, not counting the streamflow used mechanically to generate hydroelectric power, the water used by industry weighed almost 50 times the total of all other used materials combined.

Industrial consumption can only increase with our industrial growth; in fact, the President's Commission predicted that the total amount of water used would nearly triple in the 25 years from 1950 to 1975.

But even more important is the percentage share of all water used in the United States which goes for industrial use.

In 1950, it was estimated that industry withdrew 43 percent of all water used.

In 1975 estimates are that this percentage will be increased to 62 percent.

Is it not rather startling to realize that, during the Second World War, plans for building at least 300 industrial or military establishments had to be abandoned or modified because of inadequate water supply.

In the opening of the President's Materials Policy Commission report, it was stated that by 1975 access to good water might become the most important factor in deciding where to locate industries.

This is most significant for us here in the Mississippi Valley. It presents both a challenge and an opportunity, for we are blessed with an abundance of water.

If we shape our water management plans to provide an adequate industrial supply, the areas along the rivers of this valley will be able to attract more and more industry.

Associations such as yours will continue to play a key role in seeing that these Federal and State plans are best suited to developing the industrial potential of the areas served by our rivers.

If we plan wisely, we need never fear the ever growing thirst of industry.

If we do not, some of our brightest hopes for industrial development will be snuffed out before we know it.

Civilizations have always been dependent on water.

Early civilizations flourished on the banks of the Nile, the Tigris, and the Tiber.

Though our cities no longer need lie on the banks of our rivers and lakes, we are no less dependent on water.

In a sense, our dependence is even greater, for as these studies show, water is no longer as abundant as it was to the ancients.

The supply is not shrinking. But we use it more.

As our population and industry grow, we must think in terms of the very real possibility that, unless we plan wisely today, we will have a water shortage tomorrow—even in our now water-abundant areas.

To meet the demands of the future, therefore, it is imperative that we adopt a national water policy which will provide an adequate supply of this vital natural resource.

I present seven proposals.

Some are now being taken haltingly, some not at all.

All of them should be followed resolutely:

First, We must have a coordinated program of flood control, water storage, and power development through the construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs, wherever feasible, on the rivers of the Nation.

In this connection, I second the proposals General Itschner made earlier today in re-

gard to the preservation of future project sites.

Second, I support the program of cooperation between Nation and States for organization and development of local watershed districts to control water runoff at its source.

This program has run into unnecessary delays. These must be overcome.

As the program is expanded, we will be better able to conserve and preserve a supply of fresh water on the land where it falls.

Third, Our stream-pollution-control programs should be accelerated.

We should place first priority on interstate cooperation in the control and prevention of pollution; second priority on Federal grants-in-aid to towns and cities for the construction of sewage-treatment plants, along with other water-purification facilities.

Fourth, There should be a cooperative national and State program for the reclamation of used water by the removal of waste, and through the use of purification processes.

Fifth, We should have a cooperative national and State program for the development of new ground water reservoirs, including the presently unavailable underground lakes and streams.

Sixth, We need a national research program designed to investigate the possibility of inducing rainfall through artificial means; and also to consider the development of a practical method of removing salt from sea water.

Seventh, Finally, a coordinated program is necessary to assure proper navigation of our water arteries wherever economically feasible, so as to provide the fullest utilization of these natural streams of commerce.

These programs cannot be carried out without the sympathetic aid of groups, such as yours, people with interest in, and devotion to, the cause of water resource development.

In establishing the details for this water management program, particular attention should be given to the problems of geographical distribution of our water resources.

As the Materials Commission stated: "If a single word were used to sum up the water problems of the United States, that word would be maldistribution—maldistribution in regard to time and geographic areas."

In the past, maldistribution was not a great problem because the center of our population was always near the Atlantic Ocean.

This center has been moving steadily westward, however; and indications are that it will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

With reference to the point of navigation in this program, may I comment on the situation here in the Mississippi Valley.

In this connection, we know that the potential of our valley has not been fully utilized.

The upper Mississippi, Ohio, and Illinois have been dredged to a depth which allows full utilization of their navigation potential. Annual traffic on these rivers ranges from 20 million tons on the Illinois to some 80 million tons on the Ohio.

By contrast, with a record volume last year, the Missouri River carried only a little more than half a million tons.

The Missouri is the poor relation when it comes to navigation. It is the only major segment of the Mississippi River system lacking a 9-foot channel.

This association has been a strong proponent of a 9-foot channel for the Missouri.

I have consistently supported such a channel in the Congress, and I intend to continue to do so, because this channel would bring more industry and prosperity to our State.

Yes, the great volume of water in the Missouri can be used to attract the water-consuming industries of the future, and if it is a fully navigable stream the attraction will be twofold.

In recent years it has been disturbing to see how our national policy toward rivers and harbors has been deteriorating.

As example, the President's budget for the fiscal year 1960 did not request a single dollar for either new construction or new planning.

This is false economy.

Such public dollars as are saved by eliminating dollars for water control and utilization can result over the years in heavy losses to private enterprise and our communities.

In addition, each year that we postpone the benefits of flood protection, we increase the danger from annual floods.

Recent disasters in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia underscore this fact.

None of us will ever forget the flood tragedy of the Kansas City area at the start of this decade.

Planning and construction to correct and improve our water position should be continual and orderly. It should not come in uneconomic spurts.

For it does not make much sense, when building a house, to put the roof on a bit at a time.

And so, my friends, this national problem involves the interests of all our States, and all our people.

In the future, as in the past, the Mississippi Valley Association can play a vital role in striving for a successful solution to this problem of fresh water.

Such a program will bring greater prosperity, not only to this rich valley, but also to the entire country.

The future of our society depends on our ability now, to plan wisely for coming generations.

What a tragedy if future growth is stunted by any failure on our part to plan against water shortage.

It is written in the second chapter of Genesis: "The Lord God took the man and put him into the garden * * * to dress it and to keep it."

Let us all band together to keep this garden in which God has placed us, and make it even richer for the generations to come.

Coast Laboratory Is Dedicated to Learning More About Universe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, all San Diegoans are very proud of the rapid advancements we have made in our scientific and industrial community. The varied and highly specialized talents required in the complex technology of the scientific and industrial world in nearly all fields are today found in San Diego. The companies and organizations situated in San Diego enjoy the reputation of being recognized leaders in their respective fields.

An important contributor to scientific advancement is the John Jay Hopkins Laboratory of Pure and Applied Science, which is located in La Jolla. This organization, also known as the General Atomic Division of the General Dynamics Corp., is researching all areas of science with a dedication to make our country a better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the fol-

lowing article by Mr. William Hinds, science writer for the Washington Evening Star. I heartily recommend Mr. Hinds' article as interesting and informative reading.

COAST LABORATORY IS DEDICATED TO LEARNING MORE ABOUT UNIVERSE

(By William Hines)

LA JOLLA, CALIF.—In an industry so hectic that its leaders frequently complain that "practice has outrun theory," it is refreshing to find a place dedicated to helping theory catch up.

Such an establishment is the John Jay Hopkins Laboratory of Pure and Applied Science, also known as the General Atomic Division of the General Dynamics Corp. An out-of-this-world sort of place atop a sun-drenched mesa in one of the pleasantest parts of the globe, Hopkins Laboratory is dedicated to learning more about the universe man is already beginning to explore and exploit.

Supervised benignly by a roly-poly young genius named Frederic de Hoffmann, about 300 scientists and 250 helpers search for truth in every state of nature man can reproduce in the laboratory. They heat thin gases to a million degrees and accelerate shock waves up to 100 times the speed of sound. They chill materials down to within a few degrees of absolute zero and then bombard them with radiation.

Why? To see what will happen; to learn more about the nature of things.

RESEARCH EXPENSIVE

That this kind of scientific doodling costs money can hardly be doubted. General Atomic officials concede they haven't made any money yet and probably will operate in the red for another 5 or 6 years. But they point out that you can push basic researchers only so hard, and they are content to wait for something to turn up.

"Something" in the missile area already has turned up, in the form of a \$1 million (first year) contract from the Pentagon's Advanced Research Projects Agency. The only public knowledge about this feasibility study contract is that it is related to the possible development of a new concept of propulsion of controlled nuclear explosions.

Beyond this, the Pentagon has muzzled GA so thoroughly that its officials decline even to discuss the scientific theory behind controlled explosions—despite the fact that theories are nonsecret.

This is not GA's first incursion into the missile field, though the company has no production contracts. It is, however, looking into the behavior of materials under the sort of radiation conditions that might be encountered in space.

FINDS LIMITATIONS

"It's getting to the point where electric circuits can't stand as much total radiation as a man can stand," Dr. Victor Van Lint observed. Dr. Van Lint, a lanky Indonesian-born, Netherlands-raised physicist who speaks with only the wisp of a Dutch accent, is a GA specialist in solid-state physics. One of his chief projects is investigating how transistors, diodes and other semiconductors behave in the presence of radiation at temperatures around 200° below zero Centigrade.

They don't behave well. "I've made it a rule that there are to be no transistorized components in our electronic measuring devices when we run these radiation tests," Dr. Van Lint said.

In his work, Dr. Van Lint—like the other scientists here—has access to some of the finest equipment available. One of the features of the laboratory is a powerful linear accelerator, a kind of a straight cyclotron, that kicks subatomic particles up to speeds near that of light.

The laboratory was a dream of the late John Jay Hopkins, who created General

Dynamics out of a series of mergers of smaller companies. GD is now headed by Frank Pace, a former Secretary of the Army.

UNUSUAL PLANT

A striking thing about the Hopkins Laboratory is the physical layout. The chief feature is a circular building surrounded by two larger arc-shaped buildings rather as the orbits of electrons circle the nucleus of an atom in the classic atomic conceptions. The buildings are extreme in their architecture, apparently hanging from exposed steel girders.

The effect, while avant-garde, is pleasant, as are the carefully tended gardens, the building fountains, the splashing reflecting pools, and the trees. Next year there will be a swimming pool.

As might be expected, worker turnover is low, notably among the scientists.

"I'm here to stay," said Dr. Van Lint. "This is the finest compromise I can imagine between academic research and industrial compensations."

Which seems to mean they pay him well and leave him alone—and who could ask more of a boss?

Federal Education Plan Popular With Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the Clarksburg (W. Va.) Exponent of February 7, commenting on the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which was approved in the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL EDUCATION PLAN POPULAR WITH STUDENTS

The college student-loan plan written into the National Defense Education Act last year has turned up a major surprise in popularity.

It was substituted for a \$75 million scholarship program after an intellectual wrestling match in the closing weeks of the last Congress. The lawmakers in their infinite wisdom killed the scholarship plan and put a \$295 million, 4-year loan program in its place.

Few educators thought it would work. For, as Dr. Arthur Flemming, former president of Ohio Wesleyan and now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare declares, up until recently, college-loan funds had gone begging.

The most optimistic prediction was that not more than 800 of the 1,950 U.S. institutions of higher learning would take part in the new Government student-loan program.

In the first 4 months, 1,230 colleges and universities have applied for participation, asking for \$62 million in Government money for this year.

This figure is double the amount Office of Education now has in sight. Congress appropriated \$6 million to get the program started this year. A supplemental \$25 million is being asked to run the program until June 30. Unless the colleges are being over-optimistic in estimating student demand, it won't be enough.

Loans applied for now are expected to be small, to run students short of cash through this college year. For the next college year

beginning in September, it is believed that loan applications will be larger, to cover a full 9 months. But Office of Education has so far requested only another \$31 million for the year beginning July 1.

Congress originally authorized, but has not appropriated for the student-loan program, \$47½ million for the first year, \$75 million the second, \$82½ million the third, and \$90 million the fourth. This \$295 million total would take care of 590,000 1-year loans of \$500 average.

No student will be permitted to borrow over \$1,000 a year, or \$5,000 over 5 or more years. Interest is 2 percent while the student is in college, and 1 year thereafter. Then the interest rate goes to 4 percent. The loan must be repaid in 10 years.

There is a 10 percent forgiveness every year for 5 years to students who go into grade- or high-school teaching. To this extent the loan program is a scholarship.

Also, the law offers fellowships to graduate students preparing for college teaching. They will provide grants of \$2,000 for the first year, \$2,200 the second, \$2,400 the third, plus \$400 a year for each dependent.

One thousand such fellowships were to be granted the first year. But in the first 4 months of the program 6,000 applications have been received. This response is likewise far heavier than was anticipated. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick will make the first 160 grants early in February.

Last October DHEW Secretary Flemming declared that scholarships would still be needed, in addition to the loan and fellowship programs. The original plan was to give up to \$1,000 a year for 4 years to exceptional students who could not pay for a higher education.

Unexpected popularity of the loan program, however, has shelved the scholarship idea. It is not mentioned in President Eisenhower's new budget. The administration's austerity program may have had something to do with killing it.

If the loan program turns out to be as good as it now looks, Secretary Flemming is of the opinion that corporations and private foundations which have granted most of the scholarships in the past may change their programs.

An Up-To-Date Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 30 is a clear statement on the value of President Eisenhower's recommendations for a realistic agriculture program.

The President's program would protect the farmer from an abrupt drop in income as well as relate his parity to present day prices and cost, rather than those of a period long past. If parity for the 12 major commodities was set at 75 percent to 90 percent based on average market prices of the past few years it would cut the annual \$5.4 billion price support expenditures approximately in half. In these times of excessive Government spending, such potential Government savings should be considered in legislation which will also free the farmer from his Federal chains;

JUST A START

President Eisenhower's farm message proposes to start the country, including the farmers and taxpayers, out of the unholy mess resulting from 25 years of Government giveaway to a minority of farmers—most big, factory farmers.

Consider the record, as revealed by the message:

Only 12 of the 250 farm commodities share the subsidies which this year will cost \$5.4 billion, a sum equal to nearly a third of all the income taxes paid by all the corporations in the country.

Half the wheat farmers (the big ones) get 90 percent of the wheat subsidy. Twenty percent of the cotton farmers (the big ones) get 75 percent of the cotton subsidy.

The average subsidy to a rice farmer with 100 acres or more this year is \$10,000. Same for cotton.

By July 1, the Government will have \$9.1 billion tied up in surplus crops, most of which it cannot sell, some of which it can't even give away. All but 15 percent of this is in three crops—wheat, corn, and cotton.

It might not be so bad, as the President says, if this were a temporary helping hand to needy farmers, if it were helping to solve any problems. But it isn't. It's making them worse by continuing artificial incentives to create surplus crops.

The President had a word for it: "Intolerable." Instead of outmoded parity he would link price supports to recent average prices and thus protect the farmers from abrupt catastrophic price drops. Or, if Congress wants to stick to parity, he asks for a flexible system with a lower floor, encouraging crop planning to respond to the market.

His plan doesn't contemplate abandoning the subsidies but merely urges, in the name of commonsense, that they be cut down a little. But from the partisan outcries with which vote-conscious Congressmen have greeted the suggestion, you would think he was out to ruin agriculture.

Pentagon (AFL-CIO) Union Group Suggest Drastic Change in Civilian-Military Staffing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently the AFGE Council of Defense Lodges of the District of Columbia area made up of 18 AFGE locals representing civilian employees of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Office of Secretary of Defense, proposed changes in the civilian-military staffing in a special report prepared by its research committee. The report was approved by the delegates and sent to the national president, James P. Campbell, of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO. The council has outlined what it considers are key weaknesses in the Department of Defense personnel and manpower administration which are causing waste of both defense funds and manpower.

It is my belief that this study, coming from a combined group of career civilian employees, working at the Pentagon, contains substantial ideas and proposals for badly needed improvements in de-

fense manpower and personnel policies. In the coming space age we need to develop more imaginative ideas and proposals for personnel administration which will at least keep pace with modern developments in missiles and air-power weaponry.

Although many committees of Congress and special commissions appointed by the President have studied this problem of dual staffing and employee utilization in the Department of Defense, there has been little progress by military and civilian leaders in facing up to needed changes in personnel administration. We, in Congress, the union leaders, the veteran organizations and others are besieged with countless individual cases involving often tragic personnel problems created in the first place by ineffective Department of Defense personnel management. Dual staffing and civilian-military conflicts have often been the primary cause. To solve such a problem, case by case, as we in Congress try to do, is costly and time consuming. It does not get at the root of the basic problems. It is for this reason that we should carefully study the proposals that this combined group of Department of Defense employees have so courageously offered. It should be clear to many of us that basic and far-reaching policy changes in Department of Defense personnel administration are long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the Record at this point the report of the Council of Defense Lodges. The officers of the council are: Mr. A. E. Casgrain, of the Department of the Army, president; Mr. Walter M. Siesko, Naval Research Center, vice president; and Mr. Richard Raymond, OGC, secretary-treasurer.

The report of the Council of Defense Lodges—AFGE—outlined:

1. Under present organizational structure, civilian control of Department of Defense activities is largely a myth. The transient nature of appointive officials at top DOD levels has created a situation where for practical purposes, operational control, particularly in manpower and personnel matters, has been defaulted to the military.

2. Promotion and career opportunities for career civilians in DOD and throughout the services, has largely been stagnated by continual placement of fulltime active duty, military personnel in civilian-type jobs in spite of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, and congressional and other committees.

3. Directors of civilian personnel at all echelons, and particularly in the support services at headquarters, are subordinated to, influenced, and coerced by numerous layers of unnecessary military supervision.

4. The assignment of retired military personnel is constituting a direct infringement upon the spirit and intent of the civil service system. If pending DOD legislation is endorsed, many retired military personnel will be collecting two incomes from the Government for doing jobs they should not have been assigned to in the first place.

5. Military personnel, in many instances, is being sent to colleges or universities, at taxpayers' expense, not to train for defense readiness, but to prepare for retirement and better civilian jobs in business and industry. By comparison, civil service employees in DOD receive little or no extended training or career development opportunities.

6. Domination of the civil service system by military officials and control, particularly in DOD, is creating a militarized executive branch. The defense council officers, the Members of Congress from the metropolitan area, and even private lawyers have received an endless flood of personal grievances as a result of dual, or military supervision, causing tragic personality conflicts. The council's recommendations include:

(a) That in the future, all personnel exercising responsibilities for the selection, promotion, retention, and discipline of civilian employees within the support services be composed wholly of status civilian supervisory employees, and that the military have no voice whatever in such matters.

(b) It is believed that the influence and pressure exerted by highly placed military personnel, or by civilian cliques dominated through military pressures derives from the fact that the military is in almost 100 percent control of the position of higher supervisory management in all of the permanent supply and service type bureaus, even though the permanent personnel of such bureaus are composed entirely of civilians. This undemocratic and managerially unsound situation can be corrected only by the replacement of the military chiefs of all of the civilian bureaus under the Department of Defense with high caliber career civilians, and by restricting the military to positions of an advisory nature and to positions essential for the conduct of liaison with the offices of the several Chiefs of Staff.

(c) These and similar suggestions have been offered in the Hoover Commission report and in many, many other studies. The Government unions and many Members of Congress believe that it is time for action on this situation. It is our understanding that the British have already civilianized their support agencies. In this space age we should follow the lead of the best personnel management in our great American business enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, the results of this comprehensive survey of personnel conditions in the Department of Defense is strong confirmation of my contention, made in a recent letter to Chairman Murray of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, that the interests of the Nation would be best served by removing military jurisdiction from civilian employees in the Government service.

Do Drafts Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record I include two pieces of extraneous matter.

I am inserting two articles that appeared in the February 5, 1959, Denver Post. One article, by Norman Thomas, raises certain basic and provocative questions about military conscription in a democracy. His remarks should be seriously considered by Members of Congress. The other article is an editorial that also raises certain questions about the draft which, I do not think, were adequately answered in the debates last week. I hope that Members of

Congress shall have a chance to reconsider these problems again as a result of a less hurried look by the Senate:

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 5, 1959]

DO DRAFTS WORK?—AN OPEN LETTER TO CARL VINSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

(By Norman Thomas)

This morning I heard Gen. Lewis B. Hershey argue briefly for a 4-year extension of the Selective Service Act. His arguments, as I understood them, confirmed my opinion that the act should not be thus continued.

The weight of his argument was not the necessity of conscription to fill the diminishing size of the army in the age of nuclear warfare, but its value in giving a Government agency control over the lives of all our young men: who should be deferred and what they should do to keep a deferred status; what scientists may have to be called or recalled by peacetime conscription into military service which at present does not pay enough to attract them, etc.

I am a Socialist believing in social planning, but I am a democratic Socialist who considers this degree of control over all our youth far more consonant with communism or fascism than with any sort of democracy of free men. It is to be justified, if justified at all, only by the magnitude of a danger that can be met in no other way. And that has by no means been proved.

Gone from General Hershey's statements were the familiar arguments of advocates of compulsory military service. No longer is such service commended for the impartiality of the burdens it lays on all youth. As for the old argument of the character-building effects of compulsory military service, that is conspicuously refuted by the growth of crime, juvenile delinquency, and the general cult of violence.

Neither is there any evidence that Selective Service stimulates interest in a foreign policy which would give us a security that no armament in a nuclear age can provide.

On the contrary the fatalistic acceptance of an indefinite continuance of the military cold war is evident in the demand for a 4-year extension which automatically discourages an intelligent drive for universal disarmament.

What General Hershey asks is relief for taxpayers who don't want to pay for the kind of expert military forces nuclear warfare demands. I question, however, whether even here our present system does not add to total costs. Has your committee inquired?

To be sure the general also incidentally mentioned good guidance his system gave young men. (So did the Germans laud their system in the days of Kaiser Wilhelm and Hitler.) My own contacts with outstanding young men confirm Adlai Stevenson's statement: "Every young man who has served in our Armed Forces knows the incredible waste of our present system of forced but short-run service." There are better ways.

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 5, 1959]

IS THE DRAFT DOING THE JOB?

There seems to be little doubt at this time that Congress will vote to extend the draft law, known as the Universal Military Training and Service Act, beyond June 30, the date when it would expire if no extension were provided.

Secretary of Defense McElroy and Charles G. Finucane, assistant secretary in charge of manpower, are quite insistent that a continuation of the draft is necessary—although only 8,000 men a month are now being called and the armed services are in the process of trimming their strength by 250,000 men, to make a total of about 2¼ million by June.

Concern over national defense, stimulated by Russian success with space devices, is such that Congress will not take too critical a

view of the request from the Pentagon. Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, has said the hearing on the draft extension bill will be brief.

The draft has now been a part of our national life, since 1940, except for a brief recess of 17 months in 1947-48. It is the first peacetime draft the United States has ever had—a byproduct of the cold war.

Only the Army is now making use of the draft, but military leaders and most Congressmen are convinced that the importance of the draft is the incentive that it gives to young men to enlist "voluntarily" in the services of their choice.

But for the draft, the flow of "volunteers" would dry up quickly.

Any battles that may develop over the extension bill probably will relate to the length of the extension, whether for 2 years, as advocated by some Democrats, including Adlai Stevenson, or for 4 years, as advocated by military chiefs.

There may be some effort to alter the draft age limits (now 18½ to 26 years) to 19 to 25. The practice of deferring fathers, which has seemed to be a stimulus to early marriages, may be questioned.

Unfortunately, there is little inclination in Congress at this time to give the whole manpower problem the kind of thoughtful study which Mr. Stevenson and others would like to see it receive.

Is the draft wasteful of manpower, as some claim it is? Would a "professional" defense force of experts in scientific weapons provide better protection for less money than the draft system, under which men are "lost" to the services as soon as they have received 2 years of technical training? There are widely divergent views on these questions, as indicated in the adjoining column by Norman Thomas.

Is there any connection between juvenile delinquency and the outlook on life which youngsters subject to a draft law acquire, as some fear, or does military service give youth a greater sense of responsibility, as certain military leaders contend?

These are serious questions. The answers will not be easy to get, but a Congress which finds time to investigate so many subjects, profound and trivial, should try.

Federal Aid to Airports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending legislation on Federal aid to airports, the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on February 5, 1959, is most timely and pertinent:

SAFETY IS PARAMOUNT

The American Airlines crash in New York City, with its loss of 65 lives, underlines the importance of President Eisenhower's proposal that all future Federal aid to airports be used exclusively to improve flying safety. The plane might not have crashed had a safety beam guiding rate of descent been available on the runway approach which was being used. Such a beam is available on the opposite approach.

In the past some Federal airport money has gone for waiting rooms, baggage depots and other terminal facilities. There are bills before Congress to continue this diversion of funds into what the President described as

his press conference yesterday as "nice, lovely administration buildings." But safety should be the paramount consideration in allotting Federal money for airport construction.

Mr. Eisenhower's statement to reporters brought into the open a clash of philosophies between the budget-conscious administration and congressional sponsors of legislation to increase Federal spending for airports—including terminal buildings. Bills before the Senate and House Commerce Committees would not only extend Federal aid for up to 5 years but would authorize a jump in annual allotments to the States (on a 50-50 matching basis) from this year's \$63 million to \$100 million a year. And a portion of the money could be used for buildings to shelter and serve waiting passengers, provide ticket offices for the airlines and otherwise to afford comforts and conveniences to the public and business interests. Yet, as the President stressed, the Federal Government does not build depots for railroads or buslines.

Under the administration bill no Federal funds would be available for anything but such safety-promoting facilities as runways, control towers, taxiways and the like. And appropriations would taper off in the next 4 years from the present \$63 million to \$35 million a year. Administrator Quesada of the Federal Aviation Agency recently told a Senate Commerce subcommittee that facilities "beyond the gate" having nothing to do with public safety should be the responsibility of the State or local authorities. Surely, when there still is so much to be done to make flying safer, it is wrong to use Federal funds to provide for the comfort and convenience of passengers rather than for protecting their lives.

Birthday of the Mountaineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. This month my home State of West Virginia observes the 92d birthday of one of its proudest and noblest institutions, West Virginia University at Morgantown.

The university was chartered February 7, 1867, in the fourth year of our State's existence. It was born from a merger of Monongalia Academy and Woodburn Female Seminary, and was at first known as the Agricultural College of West Virginia. It assumed university status and its present name in 1868.

The university is one of the cultural and educational centers of our State. It has grown from humble beginnings to a giant institution which dominates the city of Morgantown. Its enrollment has climbed markedly to the neighborhood of 8,000 full-time students, and an additional 6,000 in its various extension services.

The university now has 17 separate divisions and is fully approved by accrediting institutions. It enjoys a reputation for academic excellence.

This month brings more than a birthday anniversary to the university. On the first day of February, the office of the president of West Virginia University was filled by Dr. Elvis Stahr. Dr. Stahr is

uniquely qualified by way of education and experience to administer the affairs of our university. His arrival has been welcomed by alumni and other West Virginians as the opening of a new era in the steady growth of the university.

Dr. Stahr succeeds another admirably qualified and able man, Dr. Irvin Stewart, who is returning to the classroom at his own request. Dr. Stewart steered the university through its difficult and hectic period of explosive postwar growth, and the present quality of the University will stand as a monument to his skill, resourcefulness and determination.

The proudest new achievement of the university is a vast new medical school, now being completed. The center, which cost many millions of dollars, is one of the largest, most up-to-date and completely equipped centers in the United States. Its benefit to every West Virginian will be of lasting significance.

In a less-serious vein, it should be pointed out that the university's football and basketball squads have enjoyed great success in recent years, and have attracted much favorable publicity to our State. Both football and basketball squads have long records of being undefeated in play within the southern conference, of which the school is a member. The West Virginia gridiron forces have contributed many players to professional ranks in recent years, and the basketball teams have numbered no fewer than three men selected for All-American mention in the past decade. The 1958 basketball squad was chosen national champions by the Associated Press, and this year's squad is again given high ratings.

Every school and college within the university has produced graduates who have attained leadership and outstanding recognition in their chosen fields; this is a tribute to the high quality of instruction which the university maintains. As the university moves into another year, plans are already laid for new growth, for new advances. I believe the university merits fully the words expressed in one of the school's marching songs, "It's West Virginia, It's West Virginia, the Pride of Every Mountaineer."

Educators Support Amendment to National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 of this session I introduced H.R. 2437, the purpose of which is to amend section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Under title X of the act, section 1001(f) now reads:

(f) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure un-

der authority of this act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

My bill proposes to delete section 1001(f)(1), so that the negative disclaimer affidavit would be written out of the law; the section as thus amended would then concern itself only with the oath of allegiance as it now exists in section 1001(f)(2).

I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that my position in this matter has the support of a goodly number of educators and college administrators.

Under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the Record a letter from Mr. Donald M. Love, secretary of the faculty of Oberlin College in Ohio, wherein he expresses the views of the faculty in this matter:

LETTER FROM DONALD M. LOVE, OBERLIN COLLEGE, ON DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT IN NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: I am writing for the faculty of Oberlin College to express strong opposition to title X, section 1001(f)(1), of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which reads:

"No . . . funds . . . shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Our opposition is not directed against the oath of allegiance (title X, sec. 1001(f)(2)) which the act includes, but only to the foregoing quoted provision, which is, in effect, a test oath. Such test oaths have aroused resistance many times before in the course of English and American history. An individual is compelled to make a statement disclaiming objectionable associations and beliefs in order to gain the benefits of the program. In our view, this is unnecessary and unreasonable.

The provision of the oath concerning belief is particularly repugnant. We object to the notion that an individual should be penalized because of a mental state where no overt act has occurred. We fail to see how justice can be done in any proceeding to enforce this provision concerning the content of a human mind. We agree heartily with the late Justice Jackson, who said:

"Our forefathers found the evil of free thinking more to be endured than the evils of inquest or suppression. They gave the status of almost absolute individual rights to the outward means of expressing belief. I cannot believe they left open a way for legislation to embarrass or impede the mere mental processes by which those expressions of belief are examined and formulated. This is not only because individual thinking presents no danger to society, but because thoughtful, bold, and independent minds are essential to wise and considered self-government."

Suspicion directed at the students and teachers in our colleges and universities is completely unwarranted. Their understanding of and devotion to freedom and the cause of democracy is not surpassed by any other group in our society. We concur in the statement of Mr. Bentley Glass, president of the American Association of University Professors, who commented on the test oath as follows:

"If an individual refuses to sign, he raises a suspicion that he is unworthy of public trust or benefit. If he signs, he endorses the pertinency of the general suspicion about him and his kind which is embodied in the requirement."

The stand now taken by the Oberlin faculty against the test oath in the 1958 act is fully in accord with its proudest traditions. In 1952 the faculty unanimously adopted a resolution which included these statements relevant to the present issues:

"Times of crisis present sharp challenges to the professed values of a democratic society. At such times it is tempting to measure all things by the rough standards of unity, loyalty, and orthodoxy. The inevitable tendency is to restrict such fundamentals of democracy as discussion and debate, and even to make divergence of opinion appear dangerous."

The Oberlin College faculty regards all forms of interference with intellectual freedom, discriminatory loyalty oaths, censorship, and other restrictions on free speech and thought as inimical to the democratic way of life."

In view of the objections and considerations stated above, we earnestly request that the test oath incorporated in title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 be immediately repealed.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. LOVE,
Secretary of the Faculty.

FEBRUARY 6, 1959.

As another example, Mr. Speaker, I bring to my colleagues' attention a communication from President Courtney Smith, of Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania, who, on February 5, wrote to me:

I was pleased to learn of the position you have taken, in H.R. 2437, in opposition to the disclaimer affidavit * * * and am hopeful that this requirement will be repealed by the Congress.

Accompanying this letter was a statement indicating Swarthmore College's position.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the Record the Swarthmore College statement:

FEBRUARY 4, 1959.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE STATEMENT TAKES
COLLEGE OUT OF STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM
UNDER PRESENT LAW

Swarthmore College, on the action of its board of managers and faculty, has voted not to participate in the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 unless title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the act is repealed. The college does not find unacceptable the loyalty oath, or affirmation, of allegiance required of all students receiving loans under the program, but it does oppose the disclaimer affidavit of belief as being contrary to American principles and to the principles of sound educational procedure.

Swarthmore College is opposed to the requiring of any commitment from students as to belief or disbelief as a condition to their receiving loans made in aid of their education. The freedom, privacy, and integrity of individual beliefs is a crucial aspect of America's constitutional tradition, and these as-

pects of belief were precisely what the men who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights intended to protect.

As an educational institution Swarthmore College believes that strong citizens in a democratic society are produced in an atmosphere of freedom where ideas do not need to be forbidden or protected. The college has confidence in its students and in the educational process itself, confidence in the efficacy of free inquiry and debate to reveal error.

In view of its action Swarthmore College will, as proves necessary, provide loans to students with established need at the same rate of interest contemplated in the Government's program.

COURTNEY SMITH,
President.

Remarks by Gen. T. D. White, Chief of
Staff, U.S. Air Force, Chamber of Com-
merce Dinner, Lubbock, Tex., January
23, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1959, the last of the B-25 aircraft were phased out of the Air Training Command inventory at Reese Air Force Base in Lubbock, Tex., Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, upon the invitation of the city of Lubbock, attended the celebration commemorating the occasion.

The people of the Lubbock area were highly honored by the presence of General White. General White is a distinguished American, an officer of real stature in the field of aviation and national defense. He has made, and is making, a tremendous contribution to the cause of peace and security. The people of the Lubbock area were deeply grateful for the recognition which was accorded to them and to Reese Air Force Base by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

The people of the Lubbock area were also honored and pleased to have in attendance at the ceremonies in Lubbock on January 23 the able commanding general of the Air Training Command, Lt. Gen. Frederic Smith. January 23 was a red letter day for aviation in the south plains area and a memorable day in the life of Reese Air Force Base.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record at this point a speech delivered by General White at the chamber of commerce dinner in Lubbock upon the occasion of his visit to that area:

REMARKS BY GEN. T. D. WHITE, CHIEF OF
STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE, CHAMBER OF COM-
MERCE DINNER, LUBBOCK, TEX., JANUARY 23,
1959

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct pleasure to be here this evening and I wish to thank the members of the Lubbock Chamber of Commerce for inviting me to join in the observance of this very significant event.

The keen interest and enthusiastic support which the citizens of Lubbock have consistently extended to the Air Force is a matter of record. I want you to know that

all of us in Air Force blue deeply appreciate the fine relationship which exists. I am sure that those individual members of the Air Force stationed here at Reese Air Force Base particularly value the warm atmosphere of cooperation and understanding which prevails between the Air Force and your community.

The event which has brought us together today marks the end of an era here at Lubbock and in the Air Force. The graduation of the last class of pilots to be trained in conventional aircraft at Reese Air Force Base is another milestone in Air Force history, and another rung in the ladder of progress which has become an Air Force trademark over the years. Since the establishment of Lubbock Army Air Field during the early days of World War II, Lubbock has been constantly associated with the growth of this country's airpower. Thousands of pilots have received flying training here in bomber, fighter and transport aircraft—more than 7,000 of these pilots during the war years alone. With the exception of the 4 years between 1945 and 1949, when the base was on an inactive status, the sound of aircraft has been very much a part of your life here in Lubbock. You can be justly proud of the very significant part which the citizens of Lubbock have had in the rapid growth of this Nation's air strength.

Actually, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to expand this thought to include the whole State of Texas, and to give well deserved recognition to its remarkable place in Air Force annals. I doubt very much if there are many pilots in the Air Force today who have not, at some time or other, served at a Texas base and enjoyed living in a Texas community. Military aircraft have been operating in the skies over Texas since 1910 when the Army's first machine—known as Aeroplane No. 1, Heavier-Than-Air Division, U.S. Aerial Fleet was flown by Lt. Benjamin Foulois from the drill field at Ft. Sam Houston. We have certainly come a long way since that time to the jet aircraft now operating out of Reese Air Force Base and other bases throughout the world.

The significant factor in the changeover here at Lubbock lies in the fact that the class which graduates tomorrow from the B-25 basic training course, is the last group of Air Force pilots to take their basic-flight training in conventional aircraft. All of our basic and advanced training bases, and half of our primary training bases have now converted to jets. This, I feel, is an excellent indication of the depth of the modernization of our training equipment, and of the extent of the progress which has been achieved. I do not want to give the impression that the Air Force has now achieved an all-jet status. This is not true. We still have several thousand conventional support aircraft in our inventory, and will continue to have them for some time to come. However, all of our combat aircraft in the Strategic Air Command, Tactical Air Command, and Air Defense Command are modern jet aircraft—B-52's, B-47's, F-100's, F-102's, F-104's, and F-105's—to name but a few of our primary operational aircraft. The record of the last 50 years in the development of airpower is one of tremendous advances; and one of which our country can indeed be proud.

Daily, we are reaching—and passing—milestones in the Air Force—some, as is the case here at Lubbock, with a momentary pause as we prepare to take the next step forward; others, as routine transitions from one phase of Air Force growth to the next. Actually, there is no single day that passes in which, somewhere in the farflung activities of the Air Force, some significant event is not taking place—the opening of new installations and incidentally the closing of bases—a necessary concomitant of change and progress, the conversion to new aircraft and the achievement of new aeronautical records,

or the demonstration of new heights of readiness. I think it is good, when time permits, to highlight these achievements, rather than let them slip by unnoticed. In this way, we in the Air Force, and you, the people of our Nation, are constantly reminded of the continuous effort—day and night, 365 days a year—which is being expended toward providing a modern, capable Air Force second to none.

I sometimes think that we, as a nation, have come to take such progress for granted because of the fantastic age in which we live. Very little surprises us any more; we have become almost inured to the unbelievable technical developments which have been occurring in recent years. Perhaps, if we were to pause here for just a moment and consider the speed with which we have been traveling along the road of scientific progress during the past 50 years, it would be easier to grasp the impact of the great changes which have taken place.

If one were to attempt to choose a field of activity most symbolic of the great industrial and scientific progress of our Nation over the past 50 years, I think you will agree with me that airpower would be a logical choice. The development in airpower reflects the magnificent scientific and industrial achievements which have contributed so much to our present national stature, and it is, I think, indeed symbolic of the remarkable growth of our Nation during this period of time. I would like to cite three specific examples of the amazing progress which has occurred in modern aviation, examples which, I think, are a measure of the scientific and industrial advances of our Nation during this period.

In 1903 the Wright brothers achieved man's first powered flight at Kitty Hawk, N.C.—a flight which lasted 12 seconds and covered a ground distance of 120 feet. Compare this to the flight made in 1956 by B-52's of the Strategic Air Command, which with the aid of air-to-air refueling techniques, circled the globe in 45 hours, flying 24,325 miles without landing.

In 1909 Glenn Curtis set the world's speed record for aircraft in his *Golden Flier*—a startling 46.8 miles per hour. In 1956 Capt. Milburn Apt flew the X-2 research aircraft to speeds up to 2,100 miles per hour, and last year Capt. Walter Irwin flew an operational fighter interceptor, the Lockheed F-104, at over 1,400 miles per hour.

In 1911 Gen. Hap Arnold set an altitude record of 3,260 feet. In 1956 Capt. Ivan Kincheloe flew the X-2 to an altitude of 126,000 feet—nearly 24 miles.

These are, of course, but a few of the many examples of rapid progress which could be cited in both military and commercial aviation, but they are indicative of the giant technological steps which have been taken during this relatively short period of time. They are admittedly taken from the spectacular, but are nonetheless typical of our direction and our rate of travel in that direction. They symbolize the rate and extent of progress achieved by this Nation.

It has not been an easy task to adjust to such rapid and continuous progress. The Air Force must not only be constantly looking into the possibilities of the future, but must also shoulder the equally grave responsibility of maintaining our day-to-day capability at peak performance. This is no simple job considering the rapid rate at which scientific barriers are being overcome. It is entirely conceivable that a breakthrough in certain critical development areas could render a modern force obsolete within a few years. The tried and true weapons of the past—the spear, the bow and arrow, and gunpowder—lasted for centuries as useful weapons. On the other hand, the conventional aircraft is now, for all intents and purposes, obsolete as a combat weapon—its service life, about 50 years. The operational life of each new de-

velopment has been less enduring than the one before. Each new improvement has brought us closer to and made us more dependent upon science and industry. I might add here, that as each new weapon system is developed, the dollar cost of the high performance and complexity which must be engineered into that system is also progressing upward at an alarming rate.

The value of, as well as the necessity for, progress has become ingrained in our day-to-day thinking and actions—not progress for the sake of progress alone, but progress to maintain the best in airpower for our country's security. The rapid succession of scientific achievements by our own country—and we cannot overlook the recent remarkable scientific exploits of the Communist powers—has established time as one of our most valuable and critical resources. An environment of haste and urgency imposes grave responsibilities on those who chart the future of this Nation. It makes doubly important the requirement for clear understanding, correct decisions and decisive action, and it places a premium on obtaining maximum efficiency and effectiveness from every ounce of resource invested in the security of our country. No possibility should be overlooked which would contribute to our national security. At the same time, cool and steady judgment is required to stay on the straight path and to avoid the dangerous detours which overenthusiasm and premature optimism can bring.

In this respect—and this, I feel, is a very appropriate example of the need for cool heads and clear thinking as we rush toward new goals—there have been many predictions that unmanned, automatic super missiles will soon dominate the earth, while orbiting platforms dominate outer space; or perhaps, more modestly, that some new kind of conventional projectile, or some remodeled surface or subsurface vehicle, will soon make everything else out of date. I am not implying that fulfillment of any of these predictions is impossible—or even improbable. However, it should be noted that they all contain a time equation that is not solved by the free use of the word soon. Further, it has not escaped my attention—nor, I dare say, yours—that most of these predictions are heralded as promising to make one military vehicle obsolete. That vehicle is always the manned aircraft. Older vehicles and ways of war appear in these vague prophecies as somehow more useful than ever. Before I can be persuaded that the airplane is finished as an effective weapon system, other arguments must be used than those filled with phrases like in the near future, in the not too distant future, and just over the horizon.

The key to the Air Force approach to its job lies in mission performance. To do our job well, we must invariably select the best weapon systems—regardless of any emotional relationship to the traditional weapons of war. If missiles, for example, can do the job better, they will be used. If manned aircraft can do the job better, they will be employed. Thus far, critical examination of the various possibilities before us indicates that our weapon systems of the future will be mixed—that is, we will need a force of both manned and unmanned systems. This conclusion is based upon the simple fact that there are certain advantages and disadvantages to both systems. We intend to exploit the best features of each to obtain the best results. You can be assured, however, that if future developments indicate that man is no longer a required item in our weapon systems—we in the Air Force will be the first to admit this—loudly and enthusiastically supported, I am sure, by our combat aircrews who daily are faced with the grim possibility that the next takeoff may be all the way. There are no more ardent supporters of unmanned vehicles than

those combat experienced airmen who have fought their way to and from targets.

Despite the great advances in unmanned systems, however, I feel that manned aircraft will be a vital contributing factor to national security for some time to come, and also that its logical successor, manned spacecraft, will assume equal importance in the future role of aerospace power. The judgment and reasoning ability of man have been required for many years to assure complete accomplishment of the Air Force mission, regardless of the sophistication of the equipment. I do not think that this will change in the future. Man and his powers of decision and his ability to reason will continue to be paramount—perhaps decisive—in space.

As the development of airpower has progressed through the years, each new step taken to improve our air capabilities has led to, and through new problems in technology and survival. The one common denominator which has existed throughout the whole history of this development is man—man in an airplane, man at altitude, man at high speed, man under extreme g. forces. Thus our energies and efforts have been oriented in a clear and direct line toward the ultimate goal of man in space. Unfortunately, man is the one facet of our program whose basic design is not readily subject to engineering changes. Therefore, it is necessary to design around him as the weakest structural link—albeit, the strongest intellectually—in the overall chain.

In this connection, I am again reminded of the many and varied contributions to the growth of airpower which have their roots here in Texas. In the summer of 1926, for example, the now famous School of Aviation Medicine was established at Randolph Air Force Base in San Antonio—by Texas standards of measurement, a neighboring community of Lubbock. The establishment and remarkable growth—both in size and stature—of this institution is another striking illustration of the Air Force's long-term interest in manned space operations.

Although the Air Force space medicine program can actually be traced back to the first Aviation Medical Center at Minneola, Long Island, in 1918, I feel certain that this center originally did not concern itself to any great degree with the problems of manned satellites and spacecraft. It was here, however, some 40 years ago, that the original seeds of the aeromedical program were sown. From that time on, aviation medicine has been geared to the problems encountered by aircrews as aircraft attained greater speeds and higher altitudes. The primary concern of this program was to engineer man into an environment which was not basically favorable to his well being. This was true in the early program and it is still true, culminating in our extensive efforts to place man in space—not man who, like some of our experimental animals, is thrown out into space momentarily and recovered alive, a passive passenger in a space vehicle, but thinking, reasoning, useful man—man who is fully operational in his new environment. This has been and continues to be the ultimate goal of our biomedical program.

The official space program began when the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine established its department of space medicine at Randolph Air Force Base in San Antonio in 1949. It was here that earnest research was initiated into the technical aspects of manned space flight. In conjunction with other more recently established Air Force human factors laboratories, problem areas related to the task of placing man in space have been constantly under investigation by Air Force research teams. Today, the School of Aviation Medicine is recognized as the unquestionable leader in its field. Its contributions to Air Force space programs and

to the national space effort are widely recognized and acclaimed, and its unique status as one of the few complete in-house research capabilities in the Air Force today is indicative of the imagination and foresight that has marked the work of the pioneers in this field. Although we fully recognize the fine contributions of other interested agencies in this field, there is no doubt in my mind that the Air Force has the finest space medicine program in existence. This is, I am sure, an extremely comforting thought to those airmen who will eventually be manning our spacecraft and whose lives will be dependent upon the results of the long years of research conducted by these aeromedical teams.

It has been a privilege to talk to you tonight. Although my discussion has dealt primarily with the progress and growth of the Air Force, let me reiterate that this is only one phase—albeit, a very typical and significant phase—of the advances in our national defense strength. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to measure in simple terms the contributions of each of the services—plus those of science, education, and industry—to the overall defense posture of our country. The Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force all hold complementary roles in preserving the security of our Nation and that of the free world. Daily these roles are becoming more and more interdependent, and the achievement of an integrated national defense team has become a reality. Never before has the word "teamwork" carried such a significant and vital meaning.

While I have taken the opportunity tonight to talk primarily about the Air Force, let me add before closing, that many of the factors which have been contributed to our progress have been the direct results of the teamwork between the services and the scientific and industrial talent this country is so fortunate to possess. I am confident that the integrated power of our military services—complemented by the knowledge, skill, and experience which science and industry constantly invest in the national defense effort and backed up by understanding and interested citizens such as yourselves—comprise a truly formidable force which will serve our country well in the accomplishment of its aims for lasting peace throughout the world.

New York Times Urges Equalization of Military Retirement Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the New York Times which calls attention to an oversight in the Military Pay Act of 1958. January 26 I introduced a bill, H.R. 3284, which is one of a number of bills designed to correct that oversight. This article explains why this legislation is necessary:

TO RIGHT A WRONG

The military pay bill enacted by Congress a year ago established two groups of retired personnel. Those members of the armed services who retired prior to the passage of the legislation received a 6-percent retired-pay increase; those who retired

after the legislation was enacted are receiving a considerably higher pay—for the same rank and the same length of service.

In the case of the former group the historic principle of keying retired pay in proportion to active pay was violated; in the case of the latter group it is retained. In other words, last year's military pay bill created two classes of military citizens—first and second grade.

This discrimination was voted by the last Congress despite the recommendations of the Cordiner committee, which made a comprehensive study of means of increasing the attractiveness of a service career. The committee explicitly stated that "military retirement and its firm tie-in with active-duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system The incentive value of [the] military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active-duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted."

To many retired personnel, the 1958 Pay Act appears to have broken faith. Congress owes it to men who have served long and well to right a wrong.

The South Ward Boys' Club of Newark, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today in this great city of Washington, we are honored to have visiting us a fine group of children from the great city of Newark, N.J.

Their visit magnifies for me the importance of the youth of America and the role many of our adults are taking to help prepare them for the future when from among their numbers will come those who will take our places as guardians of our Nation.

The children—numbering 50—here today are enjoying the sights of our Capital City because of the efforts of a civic minded and determined group of men. What these men have accomplished should be a shining beacon for all adult Americans. I would like to give a brief outline of their activities.

Led by Mr. David L. Warner, a successful Newark businessman, this group formed the South Ward Boys' Club of Newark, N.J., in January of 1956. Within a few months, the club, because of its outstanding accomplishments, gained affiliation with the Boys' Club of Newark, N.J., and the Boys' Club of America.

Joined with Mr. Warner in this very worthwhile endeavor, both in its inception and through its 4 years of activity, are many of the leading business and professional men and public officeholders of the area.

In 1957, two new and very important divisions of the South Ward Boys' Club were founded. They are the Mothers' Club and the Fathers' Club. More than

600 parents are enthusiastic and hard-working members of these divisions. They are interested in the welfare and future of their children.

The youth membership in the South Ward Boys' Club has grown steadily. From a handful in 1956 it now numbers close to 1,500. Significantly, I think it should be pointed out that membership is open to all children regardless of race, creed, or color and that the membership represents all walks of life in the highly populated south ward of Newark, N.J., which is a part of the 12th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

In helping prepare our youth for the future, the South Ward Boys' Club engages in many educational and recreational endeavors. Today's visit to Washington is the fourth annual trip to the Capital City sponsored by the club. Each year a different group of children make the visit. And as he did on the first three occasions, Mr. Warner again is chaperoning his flock.

Today's tour will cover visits to the White House, my office in the New House Office Building, the Capitol, the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, the Supreme Court, Lincoln Memorial, Arlington Memorial Cemetery, and Mount Vernon.

I know today's visitors will be awed by the things they observe, just as their predecessor visitors were awed. And, I know also, that they, like their predecessors, will leave Washington with a great respect and reverence for the Nation which is their own.

The Washington tour is only one of the major activities of the club. Since its inception, the club has provided a varied and extensive educational and recreational program for its youthful members.

This has included visits to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y.; historic shrines in the State of New Jersey, special children's theater shows in Newark and at the New Jersey seashore; sporting events in Newark and New York City, and in particular baseball games of the world champion New York Yankees; outings to the many fine amusement and recreational parks in the New Jersey-New York area.

There also has been a wide range of participation sports for the youngsters, such as swimming, golf, baseball, basketball, track, and field. Many of the youngsters have become very proficient in the sports of their choice. In 1957, the club's basketball team won a statewide tournament.

Presently, the club is conducting a drive to build a modern headquarters where there can be a further expansion of the activities of the youthful members. I know the drive will be successful, for the men and women have the determination to bring to success any undertaking in which they participate, particularly when it affects our youth.

Through all of its activities, the club has geared itself to one aim—building character in the youth of America and to prepare them for adulthood when they can take their places as dedicated and responsible Americans. Each one of these people who have made the South

Ward Boys' Club and its activities possible deserve the resounding applause of all Americans. As one who has had the opportunity of observing first hand their activities and the fruits of their efforts, I salute them.

Through my observations, I have become fully convinced that the boys' clubs have become the greatest organization for the building of character outside of the church, and in closing I would like to recite the boys' club code:

I believe in God and the right to worship according to my own faith and religion.

I believe in America and the American way of life . . . in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I believe in fair play, honesty, and sportsmanship.

I believe in my Boys' Club which stands for these things.

Certainly, it is a code that might well be recited time and again by all Americans.

A Definition of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1959, Dr. Charles Malik, President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, addressed the New York State Bar Association. I commend both speeches to all interested persons.

The following three paragraphs from Dr. Malik's remarks are particularly noteworthy. They state, simply and clearly, a definition of freedom:

The cause of freedom, my friends, is identically the cause of free institutions. Fundamentally these free institutions are seven: the family as the inviolate group unit of society; the free press, including freedom of expression in general; free political activity, including independent political parties; freedom of association, including inviolate clubs, societies, trade unions, circles of friends; free but fully responsible economic enterprise; the university as an independent citadel of truth; and the church in its absolute autonomy as the custodian of supernatural truth. It is these seven free institutions that make America.

The battle of freedom is more than the battle for national independence and self-determination; it is more than the battle for free international association in accordance with objective interests; it is more than the battle for freedom from want; it is more than the battle for freedom from the softness and degeneracy of materialism. The authentic battle of freedom is the battle for the freedom of the human person, and the human person is really free only where and when these seven institutions are free and vigorous.

It can be shown that it belongs to the nature of things that there be just these seven free institutions and none other.

I was pleased that the Secretary of State indicated that the administration is closely examining the question of this country's relationship to the International Court of Justice. Mr. Dulles stated:

There is a serious need for all of us to develop a respect for law as a basis for stability and confidence. Those nations which do have common standards should, by their conduct and example, advance the rule of law by submitting their disputes to the International Court of Justice, or to some other international tribunal upon which they can agree.

As I have recently indicated, we are closely examining the question of our own relationship to the International Court of Justice with the view of seeing whether ways and means can be found to assure a greater use of that Court by ourselves, and, through our example, by others.

Here is a major way by which the rule of law, about which we hear so much, can be advanced. I sincerely hope that the Department of State will speed its examination of this question.

If Only the Justices Had Been in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., in its February 4, 1959, issue entitled, "If Only the Justices Had Been in Moscow." I believe that the subject of this editorial will be of interest to this body and should be called to your attention. The editorial follows:

IF ONLY THE JUSTICES HAD BEEN IN MOSCOW

It is wished that every Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and the judges of the Federal Appeals Court in New York could have been in Moscow to hear James E. Jackson, Jr., the U.S. Communist Party's secretary for Negro and southern affairs, sing the praises of Premier Khrushchev. Perhaps that would have opened their dreamy eyes to the Communist menace in this country.

The courts have been duped into the false logic that American Communists do not plot to overthrow the Government by force, that they simply intend to exercise peaceably their right to vote and thereby influence the form of government. If they had been in Moscow this week, their unrealistic views would have exploded in their faces.

Jackson once was tried for advocating the forcible overthrow of the Government. He and other Communists were freed by the New York Appeals Court on the almost unbelievable logic that they taught revolution in theory only, not in practice. Similarly, the Supreme Court's decisions in subversion cases have taken a soft approach to the Communist threat.

Now Jackson praises the Soviet Union which, incidentally, is dedicated to destroying the United States. Now he publicly vows "to follow firmly the Marxist-Leninist line." Can there be any doubt that Jackson and his kind are guilty of the most infamous form of treachery? Can there be any doubt as to where his loyalties lie in the life-or-death struggle with communism?

Until the U.S. Supreme Court recovers its senses and awakens to the real threat of communism it shall remain this Nation's secondary enemy in its efforts to maintain freedom in the world. Oh, how it is wished that the Justices could have been in Moscow to hear Jackson's confession.

Strong Leadership for Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat Party has asked for strong leadership from the President and here they have it. The following editorial by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on February 5, 1959, is an excellent discourse on President Eisenhower's fight against further deficit spending by the Federal Government:

PRESIDENT CARRIES ECONOMY FIGHT (By Gould Lincoln)

Democrats in Congress who are rushing bills for greatly increased housing funds and for airports—increasing the President's budget by hundreds of millions—have had the responsibility for big and irresponsible spending thrown directly in their faces by Mr. Eisenhower. Furthermore, this issue of big spending, with increased danger of inflation and a weakened dollar, will be hammered home by the President throughout this session of Congress and the session which will run next year at least until the national conventions are held for nomination of Democratic and Republican presidential candidates. If big Government appropriations and authorizations for future expenditures increase the cost of living and devalue the dollar in the next 18 months, the Democrats will have to bear a good part of the responsibility—if they persist in their present course.

PRESIDENT'S WARNING

President Eisenhower at his press conference yesterday pertinently commented that the Democrats—who are galloping toward a further unbalanced budget and big deficit spending—have made no suggestion for increased taxes to meet this situation. That, he said, would be the courageous thing to do. But, he continued, the American people do not want increased Federal taxes. He might have added that the Democrats are equally aware of the fact. The President did point out that the Federal Government relies on the income tax for the great mass of its receipts or collections from the taxpayers. These income taxes, ranging up to 92 percent of big incomes, soaring through many brackets, are a continuing and heavy burden, from which all relief will be effectually shut off by big spending and unbalanced budgets.

This economic issue, the President insists, will be fought relentlessly by him. He has warned that he will press it again and again. Whether it calls a halt to big Democratic increases in his \$77 billion budget is still to develop. From the speed with which the Democrats have put forward the big spending housing and airport bills it could be predicted that the Eisenhower balanced budget will be swept aside.

The weapons of the President against the big spenders is his veto power. While he has repeatedly pointed out he does not say whether he will veto a measure until it is actually before him, the President has been so forceful in determination to hold the line there seems no doubt he will use the veto when the time comes. It takes a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress to override a Presidential veto. Despite the big Democratic majorities in Senate and House, a combination of Democratic conservatives and

Republicans may make it difficult to press the big spending bills to final victory.

ROCKEFELLER ASKS NEW TAXES

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, considered a probable contender for the Republican presidential nomination next year, is going ahead with big spending plans for the State. Unlike the Democrats in Congress, however, he is proposing increases in taxes to pay for the big new items of expenditure. This is the crux: he seeks a balanced budget by increasing taxes, while the Democrats in Congress do no such thing. Further Governor Rockefeller bars any compromise on his tax plan. In other words, if the citizens of New York are going to have increased facilities and a continuance of other facilities on the same scale they now have, they must pay for them—not in some dim, distant future, but now.

President Eisenhower, if you listen to the Democrats, is proposing nothing for housing in his budget, or for airports and safety of air passengers. The truth of the matter is that the Eisenhower housing program calls for Federal expenditure of \$1.6 billion as compared to the Democratic program of \$2.9 billion, a difference of \$1.3 billion in expenditures over a period of years. For air travel safety, the President has included in his budget \$375 million. The Democrats have increased this to \$575 million, and they provide money for building administration buildings and facilities at airports—the same kind of thing the railroads built when they constructed depots. As the President pointed out, the Government did not build depots, either for the railroads or the buses.

The Eisenhower airport bill, on the other hand, directs itself to one factor and one factor only—improving the safety of flying, in the air, the takeoff, and the landing of airplanes and their passengers. In the President's opinion, the localities should look after the handsome airport buildings which so many desire—instead of having that cost put on the Federal Government. This, however, does not appeal to the big spenders.

The Democrats may bust the President's budget wide open. That may not be the only thing they bust open, if they succeed.

Soviet Subs Increase in Numbers and Require Early Completion of Intracoastal Waterway System in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, according to our best information, the Soviets have many more submarines than we do and have been rapidly increasing their numbers. According to a recent dispatch, Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, the submarine has progressed faster than the antisubmarine warfare capability to combat it. This underlines for all of us the necessity of early completion of the Intracoastal Waterway system in the United States by the construction of the Cross Florida Barge Canal. This link between the eastern seaboard route and the gulf and Mississippi portions of our U.S. Intracoastal Waterway is neces-

sary if we are to have a protected course for the transportation of oil from the western oil-producing areas in the United States to the industrial north-eastern areas of our country. It has been estimated that the cheapest method of insuring the availability of this oil is to build this canal. Congress should not let this year expire before it starts the construction of this congressionally authorized project. I include here two articles which have valuable information on this subject:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Dec. 15, 1958]

SOVIET FLEET SECOND ONLY TO U.S. NAVY—HAS 500 SUBS, ACCORDING TO JANE'S REPORT

LONDON, December 15.—Russia now is a first-class naval power, second only to the United States, with a submarine force of 500 "its most formidable defensive arm," according to Jane's Fighting Ships 1958-59, published today.

The world-famous naval reference work says there is evidence Russian shipbuilding and marine engineering resources are being concentrated on nuclear-powered vessels, which involves the conversion of existing plants.

"In recent months it has become clear that the overall technological lead which the United States held over Russia is diminishing."

The activities of the major naval powers "points to the certainty of intensive submarine warfare in any future hostilities."

Naval administrators the world over had been shaken out of the orbit of conventional ships, conventional propulsion and conventional weapons.

REVOLUTION IN STRATEGY

"Naval architects and maritime experts are becoming increasingly aware of the revolution in naval strategy and thinking and in global sea warfare that the advent of the nuclear-powered submarine has caused."

"With their increase in size, propulsive power and destructive power, submarines are coming to be regarded by the principal naval powers as the capital ships of the future."

There have been notable advances in the technical development and operational capabilities of American submarines and the U.S. Navy's atomic submarine lineup now is very formidable.

"The concentration of undersea power has been reflected in the composition of fleets," Jane's says.

BATTLESHIPS OUTDATED

Battleships are rapidly becoming extinct, cruisers are following them into obsolescence (except in the United States and U.S.S.R.) and there has been a great resurgence of specialized warships of the destroyer or frigate size.

Among the nuclear powers there was little reason to expect the aircraft carrier to disappear yet, but the carriers of the future probably would be limited to about half the size of the existing largest vessels.

Aircraft carriers will continue to be the core of the new streamlined British Royal Navy.

Britain has ordered four guided missile destroyers of about 5,500 tons displacement each fully loaded, but it will be some years before they will join the fleet.

One feature of U.S. policy is the readiness with which warship construction programs are financed. Another was the tenacity with which they are holding on to various obsolete warships.

"But it is in future naval programs that the U.S. Navy shows such strength of purpose and technical foresight."

There had been two significant developments in Russian naval policy in the past year.

"The deadwood in the shape of obsolescent warships has been cut out and the men and resources needed to maintain the old ships have been diverted to the development of new weapons."

"And there has been a considerable increase in Russian naval activity on the high seas."

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Jan. 27, 1959]

NAVY RATES U.S. SUBS BETTER THAN RUSSIA'S, BUT REDS HAVE MANY MORE

WASHINGTON, January 26.—The U.S. Navy is satisfied that Russia's submarine cannot match the performance of American subs, boat for boat.

But the great and growing number of submarines that Russia could throw into action worries the Navy considerably.

This two-sided picture was given to the Senate Armed Services Committee today by Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates, Jr. and Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations. They testified in a closed briefing session.

Part of the testimony was made public. It included the appraisal of the submarine situation and a discussion of the Navy's growing nuclear power. Burke especially sounded alarmed about the Red subs.

Gates said the Navy will be able to hit harder than ever with a nuclear punch, both from submarines able to launch Polaris missiles from underwater and from carrier-based jet attack planes.

Burke emphasized the Navy needs more missiles, jet aircraft, carriers and fighting ships in general.

The admiral said the Navy will have 113 active submarines by next July 1, but Russia will have about four times as many.

"Of greatest concern to the Navy is their submarine force numbering about 450," Burke said.

"Since World War II the submarine has progressed faster than the antisubmarine warfare capability to combat it," he said.

Here's the way Gates put it:

"Russia's submarines cannot match ours, boat for boat * * * (The great numbers that the Soviets have) impose a grave threat not only to our control of the seas but to our ability to defend the country against missile attack."

Gates and Burke were before the committee to supply a briefing on the condition of the Navy. Gates made it clear he is supporting President Eisenhower's defense budget. Burke did not challenge these figures in his statement, but made it clear he is not satisfied with the current rate of replacement for ships, planes, and weapons.

The Curtis Bill: Additional Tax Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert the following letter from a valued constituent and friend, C. Herbert Cornell, president, Fidelity Bank & Trust Co., of Minneapolis, Minn. Mr. Cornell calls attention to

H.R. 3149, believing it to be one source for additional tax revenue:

FIDELITY BANK & TRUST CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 9, 1959.
The Honorable ROY WIEB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROY: You fellows in Congress are constantly looking around for additional tax revenue. Well, don't overlook the possibility of the Curtis bill, H.R. 3149.

Huge sums of tax free earnings are piling up in the big mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. This money will never be distributed to the members in dividends. Do you know because of this tax advantage that the savings and loan associations have, that the Twin City Federal Savings & Loan Association has grown in a period of 4 years, from less than \$100 million to over \$300 million? My projection shows that within a period of sometime between 5 and 10 years, the savings and loan industry in the Twin City area will be bigger than the banking industry. This is possible only because of the tax advantage.

I do urge you to support the Curtis bill, H.R. 3149.

Very truly yours,

C. HERBERT CORNELL,
President.

William Mountjoy Garrard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, death came last year to an outstanding American who had made one of the greatest contributions to the American cotton industry of any individual in our time. William Mountjoy Garrard, Sr., of Greenwood, Miss., was one of the founders and a highly successful general manager for many years of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association. He made the Staple Cotton Association known throughout the cotton trade as the foremost organization of its kind.

Mr. Garrard's greatest contribution to cotton, however, was more than through his work with the Staple Cotton Association. His leadership in helping to formulate sound cotton policy throughout the cotton trade was vastly beneficial to the American cotton farmer and all segments of the cotton trade.

Under unanimous consent, I am including an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal and a resolution by the board of directors of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association in tribute to Mr. Garrard:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal]

WILLIAM MOUNTJOY GARRARD

The Mississippi Delta and the cotton world mourn the loss of an outstanding leader, a man who devoted the major share of his life to the improvement of conditions in the area in which he lived.

William Mountjoy Garrard was an inspired man whose devotion to an idea resulted in the development of the greatest cooperative cotton marketing organization in the country.

Yet that was only the beginning of his work and his responsibilities. Innumerable

civic projects succeeded because he directed them. He gave of himself without reserve, and the results of his devotion to the delta are felt in the economic, cultural, and spiritual life of the community.

The bounty that he gave was returned to him in the form of the love and esteem of his friends, neighbors, and community.

He will be missed, but the memory of the man and his accomplishments will remain forever in the consciousness of the delta.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. WILLIAM MOUNTJOY GARRARD—RESOLUTION

Be it resolved, That we the members of the board of directors of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association and the Staple Cotton Discount Corp., meeting jointly, wish to pay tribute to the memory, and to express our heartfelt grief at the passing, of our beloved Will Garrard, who joined his Maker September 8, 1958.

His hand more than any other guided this association through the rough road of its early existence.

His mind more than any other has directed this association through the narrow path of high standards and ethics for which it is known today.

His spirit, his determination, his drive, his enthusiasm, and his high optimism and confidence during times of adversity have been the leading factors in creating this association which stands today as a memorial to his lifetime endeavor.

For all of these the members and staff of this association will be forever grateful.

The longest shadow of his fine life, however, is cast upon our memory in a warmer and more personal way.

Any association member (and there were many) who through the years came to ask his advice will cherish the memory of a smile which bespoke of the joy of living—a sparkle of eye that indicated uprightness, honesty of purpose, confidence, and a lack of fear both physical and mental, a directness of nature and a warmth of personality which have endeared him and his memory to each and everyone of us.

We have lost wise counsel, it is true, but our greatest loss is that we have lost a friend.

May the lengthening shadow of his fine character and personality remain with our association through the years to come.

Be it further resolved, that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this association and corporation and that a copy be sent to the family of William Mountjoy Garrard.

Martin Steps Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and editorial:

HONOLULU, T.H., January 8, 1959.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Would you be so kind as to have enclosed Honolulu Advertiser editorial inserted in body of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

It is the very least we Hawaii DAV's can ask, as Joe, like yourself, has been our good friend these many years.

With kindest personal regards and all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAPSIN,
Chairman, Committee on Employment
Security, Department of Hawaii,
DAV.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Jan. 8, 1959]

MARTIN STEPS DOWN

His full name is JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., but he is known internationally as JOE.

JOE MARTIN has been in Congress since 1925. In all those years he served the Republican Party and the Nation ably and with integrity.

Now, ailing at 74, he has been deposed as Republican minority leader in the House of Representatives where he used to be Speaker. JOE MARTIN, who won admiration and respect even from opponents, is saddened today. In time, when he realizes that his countrymen are proud of his record and envious of his reputation, that sadness should pass.

It has been a long and fine career for JOE MARTIN, whose father was a blacksmith. The son, eldest in a family of eight children, because a newspaper reporter early in the century and still publishes a newspaper in North Attleboro, Mass. He entered Congress when Nicholas Longworth was Speaker, becoming minority leader during the New Deal.

It has been said that he would rather have been Speaker, which he was, than President of the United States, which he might have been. Had he been more personally ambitious he could have quelled the Wendell Willkie boom in the 1940 Republican convention at which MARTIN presided. Had MARTIN done so he probably would have been the Republican candidate that year.

JOE MARTIN now has been replaced by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, a man still in his fifties, who was majority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses. White House neutrality may have contributed to the downfall.

JOE MARTIN at 74 has nothing to be ashamed of, everything of which to be proud. He still retains his seat in the House of Representatives and probably can have it as long as he wishes. His work will be lonelier now, but he will be just as loyal, courageous, and wise as ever.

HONOLULU, T.H., January 8, 1959.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: We [majority of Hawaii's DAV's] regret that you stepped down as Republican minority leader. And I, personally, cannot find the right word to express my deep regret.

In the last 12 years I have read practically all of your comments and speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and you have shown utmost consideration for the war-disabled, the small businessman, the 1-acre-and-a-cow farmer, and, not least, the laboring man.

Anent enclosure, I am forwarding the original of this Honolulu Advertiser editorial (January 8, 1959), "MARTIN Steps Down," to Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS requesting that she have same inserted in body of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Also, I am taking the liberty of forwarding copies of this letter—with true copy of editorial—to department commander, DAV, Massachusetts; department commander, DAV, Hawaii; and, of course, to the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

With warm personal regards and every good wish.

Sincerely,

JOE CAPSIN,
Chairman, Committee on Employment
Security, Department of Hawaii,
DAV.

Gen. William J. Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the world lost a great soldier, a great diplomat, and a distinguished citizen in the passing of Maj. Gen. William J. (Wild Bill) Donovan.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial and article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., February 9, 1959:

GEN. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN

William J. (Wild Bill) Donovan's life had most of the ingredients of a medieval legend in our time. He lived it to the full as soldier, adventurer, advocate and servant of his country.

One of Buffalo's most famous sons, he faithfully fitted the many roles in which he was cast in the past half century. Through World War I—in which he richly earned the sobriquet of "Wild Bill" as commander of "The Fighting 69th" of the Rainbow Division—he was a fearless fighting man; he practiced his profession before the courts of the land from the lowest to the highest tribunal; as chief of the shadowy Office of Strategic Services during the last war, he directed its almost incredible exploits of espionage and valor and gained his greatest fame.

Although he had all the appearance of the handsome, dashing hero of his lifelong adventure story, General Donovan shunned the reputation of swashbuckler. On the battlefield, he seemingly courted death but he was a clever tactician and strategist. He brought these same qualities to his practice of the law and put them to brilliant purpose in the hazardous works of the supersecret OSS. It was his skilled brain that masterminded sabotage and engineered the breathtaking escapes of thousands of allied soldiers from behind enemy lines.

General Donovan's career was studded with successes in every field except one—that of politics. He was disappointed when he sought the governorship of his home State and even more so when he failed to be appointed Attorney General under Herbert Hoover. Perhaps it was as well that he didn't become bogged down in the jungles of the political life. It could very well have curtailed his services in other fields to which he devoted his unique skills. And besides he was not a practitioner of compromise, an art not without its uses in politics. His country can be grateful to this man to whom the overworked description of dedicated must surely be applied. His is a monumental loss.

TYPICAL DONOVAN ACTION INSPIRED POEM BY
KILMER

One of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan's typical acts during World War I wasn't even mentioned in the day's dispatches. It was heralded, instead, in a poem by Joyce Kilmer, who had earlier written "Trees."

A lieutenant and his squad had been partially buried in a dugout by a shell explosion. General Donovan—then colonel of the "Fighting 69th" Regiment—helped dig them out.

Sergeant Kilmer witnessed the incident and it inspired him to write "Rouge Bouquet." Several days later, Sergeant Kilmer was killed while serving as General Donovan's adjutant during the crossing of the River Ourcq under shellfire.

The poem was read publicly for the first time at Sergeant Kilmer's funeral. Reproduction rights have been purchased by the Buffalo Evening News. The poem follows:

"ROUGE BOUQUET"

"(By Joyce Kilmer)"

"In a wood they call the Rouge Bouquet
There is a new-made grave today,
Built by never a spade nor pick
Yet covered with earth 10 metres thick.
There lie many fighting men,
Dead in their youthful prime,
Never to laugh nor love again
Nor taste the summertime.
For Death came flying through the air
And stopped his flight at the dugout stair,
Touched his prey and left them there,
Clay to clay.
He hid their bodies stealthily
In the soil of the land they fought to free
And fled away.
Now over the grave abrupt and clear
Three volleys ring;
And perhaps their brave young spirits hear
The bugle sing:
'Go to sleep!
Go to sleep!
Slumber well where the shell screamed and
fell.

Let your rifles rest on the muddy floor,
You will not need them any more.
Danger's past
Now at last,
Go to sleep!
There is on earth no worthier grave
To hold the bodies of the brave
Than this place of pain and pride
Where they nobly fought and died.
Never fear but in the skies
Saints and angels stand
Smiling with their holy eyes
On this new-come band.
St. Michael's sword darts through the air
And touches the aureole on his hair
As he sees them stand saluting there,
His stalwart sons;
And Patrick, Brigid, Columkill
Rejoice that in veins of warriors still
The Gael's blood runs
And up to Heaven's doorway floats.
From the wood called Rouge Bouquet,
A delicate cloud of bugle notes
That softly say:
'Farewell!
Farewell!
Comrades true, born anew, peace to you!
Your souls shall be where the heroes are
And your memory shine like the morning-
star.
Brave and dear,
Shield us here.
Farewell.'"

Whither Israel's Arabs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a most illuminating article on the Arab peoples who still live in Israel. The article was written by Gideon Welgert and appeared in the American Zionist, January 1959 issue:

WHITHER ISRAEL'S ARABS?

(By Gideon Welgert)

JERUSALEM.—Minorities all over the world to this day undoubtedly represent a thorny

problem. If this is true of such states as the United States and Russia, where after long periods the minority questions are far from being solved, it is all the more true about Israel.

People tend to forget how young Israel is, for 10 years in the life of a nation is as nothing. In Israel, in addition to the usual problems presented by minorities, religion, race, and culture, another one—a unique one, it must be admitted—must be added in order to present a true picture of the situation in the country.

Those Arabs who remained in Israel in 1948 after the rest of their compatriots fled across the borders, suffered a sudden and enormous psychological shock. From being a large majority, they suddenly found themselves reduced to a very small minority, bitterly disillusioned in their former leaders, and yet sharing with them the hatred and bitterness against the new, young State of Israel. This is the dilemma, then, which only now is being about to be solved from within.

It is only at the present time that some of the Arabs themselves, and the intellectuals mainly, are beginning to profess openly a more pro-Israel attitude (and without the fear of being branded by other Arabs as traitors) and to understand that man lives not by bread alone, and that in addition to economic and social progress in the first decade of their new life in Israel, the striking of cultural and intellectual roots must follow.

Who are these Israel Arabs? Mostly rural folk living in over a hundred villages in Galilee and the little triangle they comprise 175,000 Moslems with their own religious courts, judges (kadis), court of appeal (Sharia), and about 200 clergymen; over 45,000 Christians of the various communities with 160 churches and full freedom to observe their religious doctrines; some 27,000 Druse, part of a small tribe living mainly in the Lebanon and Syria and known for their toughness and secret religion; and hundreds of followers of the Baha'i sect, as well as the Circassian community.

Thirty-five thousand Moslems inhabit the little triangle, that stretch of land only a stone's throw from the Jordan border, running from Jenin, in the north, and southward to Petah Tikva. In 1949 these people, living in 22 villages, were given the choice of staying on their farms in Israel or leaving for Jordan to become refugees. They decided to throw in their lot with the young State of Israel and stick to their farms for better or for worse.

Even the most pessimistic ones, those who have numerous complaints about the military rule to which they are subjected and which still requires them to carry permits for traveling outside their zone, will admit today that very few regret their decision of 9 years ago.

In 1949 the entire area had some 15 wells producing 1.5 million cubic meters of water, enough to irrigate about 2,000 dunams (500 acres). Today, 6 Arab villages have drinking water on tap, while 45 wells produce 22 million cubic meters of water, which irrigate 30,000 dunams (7,500 acres) or 80 percent of all arable land in the district.

In 1 village, Tirah, 700 new rooms were built in 9 years. There are 3 secondary schools with 170 pupils. Another 25 attend agricultural schools, while 30 attend Hebrew University, including 15 from 1 village alone, Talyba. While during the mandate there was no local council, there are now four. Hundreds of radio sets, and gas cookers, electricity, drinking water on tap, roads, banks, clubs, and modern communication facilities have made their appearance in this exclusively Arab region.

Or take the case of Nazareth, the largest Arab urban center in Israel. For decades

this town had lain dormant and listless, its inhabitants coming to regard unemployment almost as a profession. The town was off the beaten track of civilization, and apart from a handful of pilgrims, arriving for Christmas, and Easter, there was little activity, with the people seeking work in Haifa, Jaffa, and Acre. When Israel took over control the population numbered 23,000 and employment presented a major problem.

Since then, the Government administrative center for the entire northern district has been moved to the capital of Galilee, as the town is now known. Hundreds of housing units have been built and local workers have experienced an unprecedented boom. Two major industrial enterprises have opened, and instead of there being surplus manpower, new labor must be recruited from the agrarian hinterland to meet the mounting demand for workers.

There are Moslem, Christian, and Druse volunteers in the Israel armed forces, ranging from privates to officers. Altogether 417 members of various minority groups serve in the regular police and in the border police. An Israel \$130,000 housing project has been completed for Druse ex-soldiers who had flocked in 1948 from the nearby Jebel Druse in Syria to fight alongside the Israel army to beat off the armed invasion of Galilee by Syrian and Lebanese troops.

Another thorny problem dating back to the war of liberation is now being tackled. It involves the economic well being of 20,000 persons (about 3,500 families), all of them Arab displaced persons who at the height of the fighting had left their villages and whose houses were destroyed.

The Government has allocated \$20 million to be used over the next few years to solve the problem by means of providing compensation for land abandoned, and/or new agricultural units in exchange, the building of housing projects in areas where these persons are mainly concentrated (mostly in Galilee) and the provision of long-term loans enabling them to acquire new livestock and equipment, as well as technical and professional assistance.

Many of these persons are refugees who were allowed to reenter Israel under a reunion of families scheme, in addition to infiltrators who had returned illegally and were later allowed for humanitarian reasons to remain.

The government policy toward the Israel minorities has foundered on several crucial issues. First, there is an urgent need for a thorough streamlining of procedure: there are still cases of abuse and overstepping of authority by both civilian officials and junior army officers working among the Arabs. The authorities have been slow to inform the Arab population that such conduct is not the official policy of the state.

Then there is the serious problem of hundreds of secondary school graduates who can find no employment open to them. One solution might be the establishment of a liaison office in Nazareth to help and advise graduates. As it is, many of them sit around idly in cafes, becoming easy prey to Communist propaganda.

But little has been done to eliminate one sore point—the dissatisfaction of the intellectuals among the minorities, a group which has been sitting on the fence for the past decade, not knowing to which side to extend its loyalties. Only toward the end of last year was a serious effort made, for the first time, to engage this class of Arab in a free and open exchange of views with key Israel officials dealing with Arab affairs in order to encourage them to come out with their grievances.

But apart from teachers and officials, the Israel authorities must reach in a similar manner a great number of Arab local and municipal councillors, members of the free professions, students at the Hebrew Univer-

sity. If activities in this field proceed at the present slow pace, however, it will take years to reach an average of 2 to 3 persons of this group from each of the over 100 Arab villages. The same holds good in the absence of any drive in adult education, eradication of illiteracy in rural areas, opening of clubs, lectures and the provision of mobile cinema units.

As in the wider sphere of Arab relations, where the main reason for the difficulties is the inner weakness and absence of any political, social, and cultural ideas which mark Arab nationalism, and this in turn leads to the gradual acceptance of Communist ideology, so too, do anti-Israel and Communist principles spread among Israel's minority group.

What remains to be done? It is certain that Israel can do nothing to isolate her own Arab minority completely from the ideology of Arab nationalism sweeping the region today.

There are two signs emerging recently which show a gradual thawing in the frozen posture of fence-sitting of the past. One is the gesture made by Fares Hamdan, the Knesset member from the little triangle. At the time of the declaration of the United Arab Republic and the Arab Union, he openly declared himself for the Jews of Israel by signing a contract investing capital in a joint Jewish-Arab industrial enterprise in his native village. "I believe," he said, "that this is the only correct way open to us Arabs in Israel—confidence in the Jews and a deep conviction that our fate is joined together forever. Let us hope that there will be other such projects."

A second development, minor though it may appear, is no less significant. It is the emergence of a feeling among Arab intellectuals that the time has come to care for the welfare of the village and that they are the ones to initiate such a move. In various villages, Arab school principals have for the first time begun organizing their village communities on their own initiative.

Availability of Funds for Doing International Business—Address by Hon. George A. Blowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in and impressed by a speech made before the World Trade Center Seminar in Boston, Mass., on January 29, 1959, by the Honorable George A. Blowers, Director of the Export-Import Bank, on the "Availability of Funds for Doing International Business." This is a subject of paramount interest to me and I am confident that my distinguished colleagues would benefit from the information in the address of Mr. Blowers and it is a pleasure for me to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address follows:

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DOING INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS—ADDRESS BEFORE THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SEMINAR, BOSTON, MASS., JANUARY 29, 1959, BY GEORGE A. BLOWERS, DIRECTOR, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Because of the short time I have at my disposal, I shall without preliminaries jump

right into my subject. I shall try to give you in broadest outline what the various national and international agencies are doing so as to have time to particularize on the activities of the Export-Import Bank in this field.

Right after the last World War it became obvious that if the economies of the various nations of the free world were to be rehabilitated and brought into production under a free enterprise system, by ways which would obviate the necessity of using autocratic means for forcing savings and capital growth, it would be necessary for the United States through public and private channels to create a huge outflow of investment capital. Such capital was needed not only to rebuild war damaged factories but to build whole new industries. In the developing economies the need was broader. Foreign loans were and still are required for the broad social overhead type of investment.

I need not recount for this sophisticated audience the steps which have been taken by our Government over the years to rebuild and rehabilitate war-torn economies on the one hand, and to speed the process of economic growth in the developing countries on the other. Recent events in Europe should be cause for great pride and satisfaction to our Nation. The Common Market and the general progress toward increased convertibility are evidence that through our efforts and the efforts of the people of Western Europe these economies have been restored to health and vigor.

In the underdeveloped economies progress and success are not so evident. Here the progress must be slower because it is a problem of developing human resources along with material resources. In spite of this, if we look at the statistics we find that the rate of growth has been rapid on every front. In most cases the increase in production has been at a more rapid rate than in the United States, while in Latin America it has been explosive.

International agencies and agencies of the United States Government have been making funds available for development purposes year after year and in the last few years at an accelerating rate. Last year alone the Export-Import Bank loaned and approved allocations under existing credits in the total amount of \$1 billion. The International Cooperation Administration disbursed \$1,219,000,000. The Development Loan Fund loaned \$513 million. Public Law 480 surplus agricultural commodity sales were in the amount of \$1.039 billion. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development loaned \$770 million, and transactions of the International Monetary Fund totaled \$1.2 billion. It is true that the funds made available by the International Monetary Fund are not considered to be for development purposes, but they keep the wheels of trade turning and help the development process.

Judging from announcements made during the last few months, it seems to be evident that our Government intends to maintain or to step up Government assistance to the developing countries and to do whatever possible to stimulate an increased flow of private funds for investment abroad. The administration, in fact, is committed by public pronouncements to request of Congress increased funds for existing agencies and funds for agencies to be brought into being. So far, we have heard of such assistance for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in the amount of \$2.6 billion, for the International Monetary Fund in the amount of \$1.4 billion, a supplemental appropriation for the International Development Fund of \$225 million, and a new appropriation of \$700 million for fiscal 1960 with authority to increase their guarantee program to \$1 billion. Funds will be required too, for the new Inter-American Development Bank and for a development bank in the

Middle East, if those countries should request such an institution.

Constant agitation from Washington for private enterprise or private lenders to become more active in this field and to take over a larger share of the burden does not mean that private enterprise has not been doing a magnificent job. Today, direct private investment abroad is estimated to amount to \$25½ billion. Total U.S. investments abroad are estimated at \$54 billion. I think there is no doubt that private investors will invest abroad in increasing amounts as the host countries put out the welcome mat and convince American investors that the climate is healthy for such investment.

Having given you this very brief outline of what our Government, the international agencies and business have done in making money available, I should like, with your permission, to use the rest of my time to tell you about your bank—the Export-Import Bank, what it does and how it assists U.S. business while at the same time assisting our Government's foreign economic policy objectives. I say your bank because all of you as taxpayers are shareholders in the Export-Import Bank.

The \$1 billion capital of the Export-Import Bank was subscribed by the U.S. Treasury. In addition to this, we are authorized by Congress to borrow from the Treasury up to an amount of \$6 billion. This gives us a total lending capacity of \$7 billion. The Bank was established in 1934 and its purpose from its inception has been to move U.S. goods into the export market without competing with private lenders and without making unsound loans. Those charged with its management soon discovered that the bank could best serve this purpose by assisting the borrowing countries to increase the productive capacities of their economies, thereby creating the means of repaying loans and at the same time increasing purchasing power for additional U.S. exports. This feature has given our loans a self-liquidating character as regards dollar costs. Since the emphasis is generally on projects which will either earn or save dollars for the borrowing country, it has had the additional effect of making our Bank a development bank from the point of view of the borrowing country. Even our balance of payments loans or so-called ball-out loans have served the purpose of keeping trade from stagnating and development from retrogressing. It is my firm conviction these loans have served a real developmental purpose in preventing financial and payment crises in developing countries from reaching the panic stage and the stifling proportions of our own growing pains crises of 1899, 1873, 1884, 1907, and 1929.

Over the years the Export-Import Bank as the principal lending agency of the U.S. Government has been able to bring sound financial judgment to bear on the problems of our trading partners. I believe this has been one of the Bank's greatest contributions and I am able to say this in all modesty because I am a relative newcomer to the board—actually the latest appointee.

Measured in dollar amounts, what has been the activity of the Bank? During its life, the Bank has authorized loans approximating \$10 billion. The Bank has actually disbursed \$6,586 million, of which \$3,272 million have become due and have been repaid. During calendar year 1958 our Bank disbursed about \$650 million. Let me, with a few figures, give you some idea of what the impact of our loans has been. During 1958 our board made every effort to stimulate exports—remember we were all fearful of what might happen to our economy that year. We estimate our loans helped move \$1½ billion of exports. Since total exports, excluding military hardware, amounted to about \$16.5 billion, this means that the Export-Import Bank loans helped move about 7½ percent

of our total exports for the year. Let me emphasize that the impact of our foreign loans is felt throughout the country. We have estimates which indicate that an order for one Lockheed plane creates business in 38 States. We have evidence that two credits totaling \$16.5 million for power equipment generated orders of \$24.9 million which were distributed among 40 companies in 15 States. Loans of \$61.5 million for the development of a steel mill in Chile generated 7,807 orders with 780 suppliers, and a cement plant in Sumatra, 1,000 separate orders.

A fact about our operations which is not generally realized is that our loans offer a real stimulus to private investors to invest abroad. Estimates indicate that each \$2 loaned abroad by the Export-Import Bank draws \$1 of private investment. From 1952 to 1958 we authorized in round numbers \$1½ billion in new credits, which were supplemented by commercial bank participations to the extent of \$366 million. Let me point out that these participations were for the account and risk of the commercial banks and without recourse to the Export-Import Bank. In addition to these participations by commercial banks there were non-recourse participations by suppliers and others to the extent of an additional \$205 million, and there were equity investments in the enterprises financed to the extent of \$265 million. These various participations add up to a total of \$836 million of private capital, which accompanied our lending of \$1½ billion. And I repeat, this private investment was without benefit of guaranties and entirely at the risk of the private investors.

I have not spoken of our so-called Cooley loans. At the risk of encroaching on Mr. Allison's subject, I would like to say just a word on this subject. This Cooley program was slow to get started, not because of problems within the Bank but because of the time necessarily required to agree on complicated details of sales agreements for agricultural commodities. After agreement is reached, considerable time is required to order and ship the grain before the money becomes available to the Export-Import Bank.

The result has been that in making loans we have kept pretty well abreast of the money at our disposal with the exceptions of India and Pakistan and we are willing to stand on our record. We have made to date 53 loans in 5 countries for a total equivalent of approximately US\$24 million.

Time is getting short, so let me say just a few words as to what this means to you as a taxpayer. First, let me emphasize our activities have not cost you 1 cent! For the first half of this fiscal year net profits from our operations have amounted to \$41.4 million. This, of course, is after paying all administrative expenses and \$18.7 million to the U.S. Treasury as interest on monies borrowed from them. We estimate that for the full year our net profits will approximate \$82 million. You might also be interested to know that during the 24-year life of the Bank we have paid to the U.S. Treasury \$196 million in dividends on their equity investment in the Bank and we have paid to them a total of \$238 million on money borrowed. I will not say that all the losses on our books are good, but to date the losses we have had to write off have been small, amounting to only one-twentieth of 1 percent of loans made. Against possible future defaults we have been able to accumulate out of earnings a reserve of \$528.4 million, equal to just about 16 percent of outstanding loans. As a bureaucracy we have been a dismal failure. After 24 years of life in a climate conducive to expansion, we remain a small organization with only 224 employees.

I wish to apologize for the number of figures I have used but this is a broad field and in condensing it the fluff fell out and the figures remained. I shall be glad to answer any questions you may have.

National Security and Hydroelectric Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days we have witnessed the strange spectacle of a foreign government launching a campaign of recrimination in the American press against our Government's award of a contract for two hydraulic turbines to an American company in preference to a British firm.

Letters have been sent to American newspapers by the British Information Service, an agency of the British Government, quoting the British Ambassador to Washington and the president of Britain's Board of Trade as, in effect, impeaching the honesty and integrity of U.S. Government officials.

The president of the British Board of Trade, a government agency similar to our Department of Commerce, the British Ambassador and the British Information Services speak for Britain and British interests, not for the United States.

The direct approach of a British agency to American newspapers, with its implied slurs at American officials and policy, has met with a mixed response. One segment of our press has been quick to echo the British position.

In sharp contrast, the Oakland Tribune, of Oakland, Calif., speaks up for America.

The Oakland Tribune published the following editorial on January 28 under the heading "British Campaign":

Attention was called yesterday in these columns to the unhappy state of mind of much of the British press over the awarding of a contract for hydroelectric equipment by the U.S. Government to U.S. firms in preference to lower priced British equipment.

Now we learn that the comments of the British press were government inspired, and that a campaign has been launched in this country by the British Information Service, an agency of the British Government.

The San Francisco office of the British Information Service is sending out letters to financial editors and the city desks of newspapers in this area, and no doubt elsewhere, referring to the preference for American equipment over British as a slap in the face for Britain.

It refers to a statement by Sir David Eccles, president of the British Board of Trade, also a British Government agency, in which he said:

"Rejection of this tender is hardly consistent with the ideas of interdependence and freedom of trade upon which the two Governments have agreed. The rejection came as a shock and nothing that the U.S. Government has so far been able to tell us in any way reduces my disappointment."

Then the letter refers to vehement protests made by the British Ambassador in Washington, who among other things said of the U.S. Government's explanation: "Tell that to the marines—sailors won't believe you."

It was not necessary that the United States give any explanation, but it did. It was pointed out there is a Federal statute known as the Buy American Act, designed to give preference to American products by the U.S. Government. It was also pointed out the purchase was made in conformity with requirements that Government expenditures be made, wherever possible, in areas of unemployment.

It also was made clear that security requirements had to be met, in this case the availability of parts when repairs might be needed and the availability of the machine tools needed to turn out replacements in the event of a major emergency.

I am happy to see the Oakland Tribune speak up for America and American employment, security and interests, and I am not surprised. The assistant publisher of the Oakland Tribune is William F. Knowland, who served his State of California and the Nation with distinction in the U.S. Senate for 14 years and retired voluntarily at the close of the recent session as Senate Republican leader.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the clamor which has been raised over the rejection of this English company's bid on two hydraulic turbines I would like to present this case in its proper perspective.

There has been an obvious effort in some quarters to represent this action as having shut out all foreign competition for such contracts.

The facts are that foreign overseas manufacturers during the past 7 years have received orders from American governmental agencies for 14 giant hydraulic turbines totaling 1,526,000 horsepower, 24 hydraulic turbine driven generators with a combined rating of 1,295,210 kilovolt-amperes, and 399 heavy power transformers.

Each year increasing millions of American tax dollars have gone into procurement from foreign suppliers of heavy equipment for our expanding federally owned or publicly owned power production and transmission facilities.

All of the 14 hydraulic turbines above mentioned have been supplied or are on order from the English Electric Export & Trading Co., Ltd., of Stafford, England, the foreign bidder on the two turbines for the Greers Ferry Dam in Arkansas over which the present British-inspired controversy has arisen.

Of the 24 generators of foreign construction, this company has built or has contracts to build the 12 largest, and also a 13th generator of lesser rating. It also has received the contracts for 39 of the 399 heavy power transformers being supplied from overseas.

With reference to two of these transformers, the English quarterly review *British Affairs*, stated in March 1957, as follows:

Two of the largest transformers ever built have been ordered by the Tennessee Valley Authority from the English Electric Co. of Stafford. The transformers are for the Authority's new power station at Gallatin, Tenn. When they are ready they will form one of the heaviest loads ever shipped from Britain.

Fifty British heavy transformers for other governmental power systems in the United States were ordered from another English company, bringing the

British total for this type of heavy electrical equipment to 89.

Governmental procurement of the remaining foreign-built electrical equipment is divided between Swiss, Austrian, Italian, and British firms other than British Electric. It is evident that the latter has not done badly in this overseas competition for our hydroelectric power generation and transmission equipment market.

Industry data submitted to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization shows, with reference to heavy power transformers, that in 1951 the Federal Government purchased none from overseas. In 1952, 27 percent of the purchases were from overseas, in 1953 50 percent, in 1954 40 percent, in 1955 60 percent, and in 1956 they exceeded 80 percent. This data applies to transformers only.

In 1956 the Corps of Engineers bought 26 percent of all its power equipment, which includes turbines, generators, and circuit breakers, from foreign sources, the Bonneville Power Administration 39 percent and the Bureau of Reclamation 47 percent.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers has installed or purchased 37 heavy power transformers with a total rating of 2,692,000 kilovolt-amperes in the Chief Joseph Dam, The Dalles Dam and the McNary Dam—

An industry statement filed with Director Leo A. Hoegh, of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization states.

Also the Corps of Engineers has two foreign manufactured hydraulic turbine-driven generators, each with a 73,684-kilovolt-ampere rating, in the McNary Dam.

Also the Bureau of Reclamation has three large power transformers (kilovolt-ampere rating totaling 130,000) and six sizable hydraulic turbine-driven generators purchased from abroad and installed in this area.

Also, 32 heavy power transformers of foreign origin have been installed or ordered by the municipal power systems of Seattle and Tacoma or by the public utility districts in the area. They have a combined kilovolt-ampere rating of 2,372,000. In the same category are 10 hydraulic turbines totaling 1,140,000 horsepower, and 10 large hydraulic turbine-driven generators.

The same report states that the Tennessee Valley Authority has purchased 45 heavy power transformers with a total of approximately 4,098,000 kilovolt-amperes from foreign sources and has issued a letter of intent for the purchase of three 60,000 kilovolt-amperes hydraulic turbine-driven generators, while the power authority of the State of New York has purchased some 32 foreign-produced transformers with a total kilovolt-ampere rating of 4,098,000, identical to that of TVA.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider these facts, particularly those which apply to Federal projects for which Congress has appropriated the funds, the question must arise whether these wholesale foreign purchases are in the interest of our national economy, welfare, and security.

Yet, when the question arises there is an outburst from British officialdom and the British press which is reflected in several of our own newspapers, and the occasion seized upon is the rejection of one award to a company which has received previously many awards from American governmental agencies involv-

ing millions of dollars. They would have us subscribe to the view that it is un-American to be for America.

I do not know of any prior occasion when an award of an electrical equipment contract was denied when an English company was the low bidder, although I do recall such an instance when a Japanese firm entered the low bid.

Now what are the facts in this most recent case which has so aroused our British friends?

The Corps of Engineers last July advertised for bids on two turbines for the Greers Ferry Dam in Arkansas, English Electric was the only foreign bidder. Four of the five American companies manufacturing hydraulic turbines entered bids. The bids were opened September 4. The English company's bid was \$1,450,700. The lowest American bid, that of the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., of Philadelphia and San Francisco, was \$1,757,210. The difference between the low foreign bid and the lowest American bid was \$306,510 or approximately 19 percent.

May I say at this point that Federal Government specifications officially recognize that from 45 to 55 percent of the American contract price for the design and manufacture of hydraulic turbines represents the labor cost.

Baldwin-Lima Hamilton estimated that 207,250 man-hours of work were directly involved at its plant in construction of the two Greers Ferry turbines, and that an additional 81,000 man-hours would be provided by its immediate suppliers, a total of 288,250 man-hours.

I do not have an estimate of the total labor costs on this contract, but I do know that the construction of hydraulic turbines requires highly specialized techniques and skills, and that the average earnings for all labor in American manufacturing industries as of last October was \$2.13 per hour.

On this basis, had the contract been given to the English company, which already has received many such contracts as I have pointed out, American wage earners would have lost \$612,000, or double the difference between the English and the American bids.

Or, if we take the 45 percent minimum percentage recognized in Federal Government specifications as the proportion of labor costs to contract price in manufacturing hydraulic turbines the loss would have increased to \$790,744 had the English company's bid been accepted.

The award of the contract, therefore, provided a net gain to the American economy of at least \$300,000 and more than 7,200 weeks of productive employment to American citizens in an area where 6 to 8.9 percent of the total labor force is currently unemployed according to the January report of the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security.

The award of this particular contract to the lowest American bidder instead of to the foreign bidder was clearly justified, in my opinion, on economic and social grounds, in addition to that of national security expressed by Director Hoegh and upheld by Secretary Dulles.

American wage earners buy American goods in American shops and stores.

Foreign labor does not.
American wage earners pay Federal, State, and local taxes.

Foreign labor does not.

American employment and American households support our schools and colleges, our churches, and our civic and religious institutions.

Foreigners do not.

Americans man our military and industrial defenses.

Foreigners do not.

When Government tax money is paid out for Government projects and facilities American taxpayers are entitled, in my opinion, to have that money paid to fellow Americans with the realization that the benefits of these expenditures will accrue to all Americans in national security and an expanding economy, particularly where qualified American workers and taxpayers are unemployed.

Why should American jobs be sacrificed because British labor is content to work for one-half or one-third of our wage scales, thus permitting his employer to underbid American industry on public contracts?

I concede that this was not a factor taken into account by the Director of OCDM, but offer it as supplemental justification of his determination.

The decision was based solely on national security considerations.

Congress in 1933 passed the Buy American Act, designed to grant American producers a 25-percent differential over foreign suppliers on Government purchases on which both domestic and foreign bids were offered.

Written into that law was a provision that empowered authorities, regardless of any differential, "to reject any bid or offer for materials of foreign origin if such rejection is necessary to protect national security interests."

In 1954, the Buy American Act was superseded by Executive Order 10582 which, in effect, reduced the differential to 6 percent but retained the national security exception stated above.

It is, of course, the sovereign right and duty of any nation to protect its national security.

Director Hoegh's decision was consistent also with the national security provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 which strengthened and expanded similar provisions in the 1954 Extension Act.

Section 8 of the 1958 act directs the Director of OCDM to investigate and determine the effects on national security of any article upon request of the head of any department or agency, upon application of an interested party, or upon the Director's own motion.

If, as a result of such investigation, the Director is of the opinion that the said article is being imported into the United States in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall promptly so advise the President.

Then, unless the President determines that the article is not being imported in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the im-

ports of such article and its derivatives so that they will no longer threaten to impair the national security.

A definite standard and criteria were written into the law to guide the Director and the President in arriving at a determination.

Congress directed that the Director of the OCDM and the President consider:

First. Domestic production needed for projected defense requirements.

Second. The capacity of domestic industries to meet the projected defense requirements.

Third. Existing and anticipated availabilities of the human resources, raw materials, and other supplies and services essential to national defense.

Fourth. The requirements of growth of such industries and such supplies and services including the investment, exploration, and development necessary to assure such growth.

Fifth. The character, use, and quantity of the imported articles under investigation as they affect industry in the United States and the capacity of the United States to meet national security requirements.

These considerations are not optional with the Director of the OCDM or the President. They are statutory requirements and not subject to the whims of foreign trade expansionists or foreign press releases.

These provisions were written into the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 by the House and retained by the Senate. The Senate added a further consideration to be recognized by the Director of the OCDM and the President in arriving at a determination of the impact or effect of imports of a given article on national security.

I quote:

In the administration of this section, the Director and the President shall further recognize the close relation of the economic welfare of individual domestic industries; and any substantial unemployment, decrease in revenues of government, loss of skills and investment, or other serious effects resulting from the displacement of any domestic products by excessive imports shall be considered without excluding other factors, in determining whether such weakening of our internal economy may impair the national security.

Thus the authority of the President to deal with imports which threaten to impair our national security is unequivocal.

Nor is the question of reciprocity involved where a nation's security is at stake.

Britain drastically restricts imports which compete with British industries which she considers essential or strategic.

She does this under the Safeguarding of Industries Act of 1921 as extended and amended.

She does this through a rigid system of import licenses and exchange permits.

She does this through her British token import plan, described by our own Department of Commerce as follows:

The British token import plan, established with the United States in 1946, enables eligible U.S. manufacturers or other eligible

U.S. firms to export to the United Kingdom token shipments or specified commodities whose importation from other dollar sources is otherwise generally prohibited by the British Government.

Participants are permitted to make shipments under the plan in an amount not exceeding 30 percent of the individual certified firm's average annual exports of specified commodities to the United Kingdom in the base years 1936, 1937, and 1938.

The years 1936, 1937, and 1938 were depression years in which the total exports of the United States to all countries averaged less than \$3 billion. The British token plan permits slightly over 500 American firms which were exporting to Britain in those depression years to export annually now 30 percent of what they exported to Britain then.

I am informed that there is no record of any heavy electrical equipment—generators, hydraulic turbines, transformers, or circuit breakers—having been supplied to British industry by any American manufacturer in recent years.

In fact, according to testimony presented before the Ways and Means Committee at the hearings held last year on renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, such export would be impossible even if American manufacturers were able to overcome the British low wage differential and enter competitive bids. I quote from the testimony cited:

Since its creation in 1947, the Central Electrical Authority of Great Britain has limited the procurement of power and transmission equipment to domestic (i.e. British) suppliers because, as its official report to a parliamentary committee of inquiry states: "It would be unwise for the electricity supply industry (of England) to be dependent upon foreign manufacturers for spares and maintenance."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that if it is unwise for England to be dependent on American or other foreign suppliers for spares and maintenance, it is unwise for the United States to be dependent on British suppliers for spares and maintenance of power and transmission equipment.

Britain's own policy and enactments demonstrate that when the President of Britain's Board of Trade speaks so glibly of interdependence and freedom of trade upon which the two governments have agreed, his statement, like many British products, was made exclusively for export.

I am not aware of our Government having ever formally acceded to the doctrine of interdependence with any nation, although I know that some lip service has been given to that concept in the executive branch.

In any event we are not dependent on Great Britain for hydraulic turbines, generators, or heavy transformers, although we might well be if we continue to rely largely on foreign sources for such equipment.

There are, as stated previously, five companies in the United States that manufacture hydraulic turbines, three of them located in areas that presently have a labor surplus, frequently referred to as distressed areas.

There are five companies manufacturing hydraulic turbine generators; synchronous condensers above 10,000 kilovolt-amperes, two of them located in labor surplus areas.

There are six companies manufacturing power transformers above 10,000 kilovolt-amperes, five of them in labor surplus areas, and only three companies manufacturing power circuit breakers of 1 million kilovolt-amperes interrupting capacity and above, two of them located in labor surplus areas. Governmental agencies have purchased 81 circuit breakers from foreign countries.

Should the foreign manufacturers elect to bid on all Federal Government jobs, they could, if present policies are continued, take over the bulk of production of all heavy power-producing equipment purchased by the agencies of the Federal Government—

The industry brief filed with the Director of the OCDM tersely states.

Since 1953, 70 percent of the hydraulic turbine generator business in the United States has been placed by governmental agencies, Federal and State, and the industry estimates that 60 percent of hydraulic turbine business is affected by policies of the Federal Government.

In brief, the Federal Government has become the principal buyer of heavy power-producing and transmission equipment, all highly vulnerable to disaster or sabotage.

It can buy foreign at the risk of many months delay in the event of breakdowns requiring repairs or replacement, or it can buy American with necessary parts and repair skills readily available.

It can buy foreign at the risk of increasing unemployment and the loss of specialists and technicians through shutdown of our own strategic industries, or it can buy American and assure our continued security in this highly important field.

Let us not be overwhelmed by the protestations of foreign agency leaders that we are breaching ideas of interdependence and freedom of trade when we endeavor to safeguard our own national security.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko and the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 12, marks the birthday of Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of many distinguished and gifted Poles who played a signally important part in our War of Independence. Today in observing the anniversary of his birth we once more pay our respects to his memory and express our gratitude for his great services.

Kosciuszko was born into a middle-class family on February 12, 1746, 213 years ago. In his early youth he showed

unusual liking for books and study, and his relatives—his father died when he was 13 years old—did everything in their power to educate him. After he finished the Royal School in Warsaw, he earned a scholarship to study in France where he entered the famous Mezieres Military School, specializing in artillery and engineering. While in Paris stories about the American Revolution fired his imagination. He decided that this was a fight on behalf of a good cause. He borrowed money from friends, sailed for America, and arrived in Philadelphia in August of 1776. There he applied for military service; immediately he was admitted and charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware. His success in this first assignment earned him a colonel's commission. From then on, a high place in our Revolutionary War was assured him. Everything he did was done with distinction, and in October 1783, Congress made him a brigadier general.

With the end of the fight for our cause here, he sailed to Poland, to engage there in the fight for Polish freedom.

Unfortunately all his efforts to that end were unsuccessful. He ended his gallant career in exile in Switzerland, where he died on October 15, 1817.

Today Americans of all rank and creed solemnly observe the anniversary of his birth and do homage to his memory.

Forty Million Frenchmen Can Be Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, at yesterday's press conference President Eisenhower very ably summed up the disastrous consequences of profligate spending and urged the practice of frugality to avert the shrinkage in the value of the dollar.

Recent history has recorded many examples of these disasters in other nations, in addition to the 52-percent decrease in our own dollars' purchasing power. A recent example, but by no means the only one, is the tragic example of the great nation of France which is now struggling desperately to salvage what it can out of the wreckage of inflation. This story is ably set forth by Herbert Bratter in the current issue of *Banking*. Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the *Record* at this point:

In France, a wealthy land with socialized basic industries and banking, we have seen in recent years a Laocoon engaged in an endless struggle with the seemingly unconquerable serpent, inflation. In the early postwar years, inflation in France drew its strength from the concentration on investment and construction, rather than on production of consumer goods. In the early 1950's investment was again stimulated by the Korean war. Foreign aid in big amounts has been obtained from the World

Bank and Fund, the Eximbank, and other sources. At home the successive governments have sought to check inflation with everything in the book: price rollbacks, materials allocations, price controls, forced loans, recall of 5,000-franc notes, a free gold market, indexed bonds, exhortation, new forms of taxation like the value-added tax, support prices, subsidies, general monetary controls, devaluation, and other measures.

Still we have seen French governments determining the prices of scores of manufactured products, apart from the products and services sold by the nationalized enterprises: railroad, subway, and bus fares; gas, electricity, coal, and gasoline. We have seen a three-man official committee with wide powers—the Action Committee for the Defense of Purchasing Power—created to police the national price structure. Yet, at least until DeGaulle, there has been no sign or hope that France can for long get out of inflation's grip. The nation seems only to have got mired ever deeper in the economic slough which makes its appearance when manmade regulations are substituted for the free play of the marketplace.

Too many groups in France, as pointed out by former Premier Mendes-France, think they can beat inflation by creating more of it. And, when not engaged in getting a group advantage at the expense of the total community, the Frenchman of today concentrates on group and personal hedges against inflation rather than exhibiting a determination to see the evil exterminated.

We could, if we would, learn something from others' experiences with inflation. History is replete with innumerable stories of nations brought to ruin by currency corruption. The trouble with history is only this: No one pays any attention to its lessons when the group to which he belongs—labor union, farm organization, veterans group, pension lobby, Government employees, construction industry, shipping, producer of foreign-aid goods, or whatnot—sees an immediate group gain to be got.

Nonetheless, it may be instructive and constructive here to turn the spotlight on some of the complications of life under intermittent and almost chronic inflation in our own times in France, using that country not at all as the worst exhibit that could be found in our time, but rather because of the great importance of France to Europe and the West.

One may see what has been happening to the franc over the years by comparing that unit with its former self. By 1954 in terms of purchasing power a franc was equal to only 1.163 part of a 1914 franc. An item which in 1914 could be bought with 100 francs, by 1938 cost 670 francs; by 1949 it cost 1,220 francs; and by 1954 it cost 1,630 francs. Since 1954 the process of shrinkage in buying power has continued.

Reflecting the economic, financial, and social problems generated by this dwindling of the franc's value are the following headlines taken at random from a file of 1957 newspaper clippings on France. They could be readily duplicated for other years:

"French Austerity Spurred"; "France Fires on Inflation—Blank Cartridges?"; "Paris Price Curb Meets Hostility"; "French Miss Target in Price Fixing"; "France Freezes Prices in Fight on Inflation"; "French Labor Unrest"; "French Drive on Prices Joiled"; "Price-Wage Curb Baffles France"; "Rich France Economically Sick"; "French Exhorted to Tighten Belts"; "Inflation Wrings France"; "Sliding Wage-Scale Dilemma."

As every traveler knows, the ailing franc, with its foreign exchange value artificially pegged almost continuously until the last devaluation of December 1958, has fostered a widespread black market. Flouting the official exchange rates under the very eyes of the police in Paris and almost everywhere else have been those "furtive men in their

all-weather uniforms of shabby raincoats who lurk in the streets," importuning male tourists with their offers of spicy post cards and cheap francs.

For all that French central bankers and successive finance ministers could show in the way of accomplishment, the disease that was consuming the franc was beyond their power to cure. All sorts of official devices were resorted to with the aim of checking the decline and the loss of public confidence in the currency. Many of these devices, indeed nearly all of them, dealt with symptoms rather than fundamental causes of the inflation. Repeated periodic doses of inflation, brought about not only by war and its aftermath but as well by inadequate official economic and fiscal policies, wrought their effect not only on the economic and political life of the nation, but on social behavior and morals. Every Frenchman, almost, seems to have devoted a large part of his thought on how to save "his."

Should he hoard gold coins? Could he evade the tax collector? Was there some way to send capital to safety abroad? Were ordinary stocks and bonds any longer wise investment media?

ENDLESS INDEXES

Such have been the questions being asked daily in France. When no one knows what bread will cost tomorrow and when the price of a subway ride or a newspaper is subject to change by bureaucratic edict, the cost of living becomes a preoccupation for everyone. As Finance Minister Ramadier told the National Assembly in 1957, "It is no exaggeration to say that the value of the franc is tied to the cost-of-living index." And—he might have added—vice versa. In fact, the supposedly logical Frenchman has painted himself into a corner; for money, which the dictionary calls the measure of value, in France has its own value measured by the things it is supposed to measure. Here, indeed, is a pretty mess.

EFFECTS IN A NUTSHELL

"In inflation," remarked a former resident of France, "everyone in business makes money, even if he is not smart. The smart ones, of course, make a lot of money. But there is no competitive weeding-out of weaker businesses. Inflation leads to big profits, which are reinvested in the business—retained earnings, self-financing. This can have bad effects, the consumers' interests tending to be neglected. Also, the influence of the central bank is weakened. Thus, when in 1957 the Bank of France took steps to tighten credit, it took a considerable time before you could detect a slowdown in investment. That is, business investment was not heavily dependent on borrowing. So inflation, which is a bad thing from a monetary standpoint to start with, compounds the evil. Monetary controls tend to be undermined."

"An outstanding weakness in the French economy is the budget," this observer continued. "Why? Because so many activities which formerly raised their own revenues are now under the government's wing. For instance, housing used to be built for rental. Because of inflation, however, rent controls were instituted years ago and building for rental is no longer economic. So what happens? The government, of course, steps in and finances residential construction. It may do this by paying subsidies, or by guaranteeing mortgage credit, or in other ways. At any rate, the government has to garner the people's savings for this purpose, by taxation or borrowing. In the latter, the budget tends to become unbalanced and the deficit gives rise to more inflation. That is an example of an inflation spiral, the original inflation indirectly causing another round of inflation later."

"Whereas in years gone by savings banks lent on mortgages, now the savings they gar-

ner are collected in turn by the Caisse des Depots et Consignations, which lends them to the Treasury. The latter, in turn, uses the money to finance housing loans or to invest in nationalized enterprises. France's budget trouble is largely a matter of investment not being channeled normally."

In describing what four decades of creeping inflation had done to thrift habits in France, the U.S. News and World Report in 1957 (Aug. 23) quoted a French banker as saying: "I bought an annuity before the war that should pay me \$2,000 yearly. It pays only \$80 a year now. I don't even bother to collect it." The current income on \$10,000 worth of war bonds bought at par in 1914 was only \$1.80 a year. The cost of clipping coupons on bonds—which by law must be deposited with banks for this purpose—exceeded the value of the coupons in many cases of prewar bonds, because of inflation.

PENSIONS—11 CENTS

Similarly, the magazine further reported, the cost of maintaining files for paying pensions was greater than the pensions themselves. Some 160,000 World War I pensioners were collecting monthly pension payments worth but 11 cents; 500,000 collected 25 cents; and the rest, 75 cents a month. That was in 1957. Since then the real value of the pensions has further shrunk.

Where there is a prolonged and certain decline in the value of money, all that a businessman needs to do to keep in the black is to maintain his inventory. In France this fact helps explain the large increase in retail stores since 1945. Prices have kept creeping up despite all official price controls and subsidies. Periodically the official foreign exchange value of the franc has been adjusted, always downwards, and generally only after its value has already been lowered de facto.

Successing groups victimized by inflation had posed grave problems of public finance. Taxes have had to be raised repeatedly and deficits have had to be financed by borrowing from the public on more and more onerous terms and from the central bank, with additional spurs to the inflation process. The Frenchman is notorious for his aversion to direct taxation, as witness the Poujadist movement of small shopkeepers a few years ago. In 1956, as one of the steps to find money for the new old-age pensions, the Government resorted to a 2 percent levy on the reserves of corporations—a capital levy.

INDEX—TIED BONDS

In its efforts to attract buyers for its bonds the Government has resorted to index-tied issues, notably in the cases of the two Pinay loans of 1952 and 1958, with their gold-price clauses. These issues have been very successful. Other governmental and private bond issues have employed the index device in a variety of forms. Moreover, commodity and service price controls have been widely employed in the Sisyphean task of stabilizing the cost of living, including rents and wages. What this tremendous task costs the Nation in terms of economic waste is anyone's guess.

In 1956 France was reported to be spending 70 billion francs a year to keep consumer prices under control. This sum did not include the payroll for officials, but rather the budgetary cost of tax exemptions, food subsidies, the sale of gas at low prices, the removal of import duties on meat, eggs, vegetables, potatoes, etc.

The variety of controls and the minutiae of official interferences in the economic process make French life today seem complicated, indeed, to an outsider, as some examples will make clear.

A decree published in the Journal Officiel last March tied rents for buildings used for commercial, industrial, or handicraft purposes to the index of 250 consumer articles

instead of that of 213 such articles previously used. To link the 2 indexes a coefficient of 1.4793 was applied. Likewise, by this decree, all public and private contracts bearing an index clause are carried out on the basis of the 250-commodity index. For joining the old and new series different coefficients apply to the old and new index series for foodstuffs, light and heat, manufacturers, and services, respectively.

Determining which index number gives the best measure of the declining purchasing power of the franc gives rise to long arguments in France; and it is reported some juggling of the indexes has taken place. Thus, by substituting in the index the price of one kind of wine for that of another, it is claimed inflation has been concealed. An article in *Le Monde* in March 1958 challenged the validity of the index of 179 commodity prices at retail to which the guaranteed minimum wage was tied.

In France, as elsewhere, farmers have a powerful political voice and farming plays an important role in the economy and cost of living. Controls, therefore, are exercised over farm rents and agricultural prices. Indeed, control over prices of industrial products and over wages in industry to an important degree is motivated by the desire to placate the farmer.

Last May the French Government raised guaranteed minimum farm prices by 3 percent above the 1956-57 level, in view of the increase in minimum agricultural wages and the rise in the price index of products consumed by farmers.

Both the price of wheat and that of bread—vital elements in the French cost of living—are controlled by the government. While on the one hand wages are linked to the cost of living, the price of wheat, although itself a component of the cost of living, is in turn based on indexes of living costs, materials' prices, and wages. The price of wheat is a pilot price, directly and indirectly influencing the price pattern of farm products as a whole. And the average national wheat price, as published in the *Journal Officiel*, is an important element in the determination of farm rentals.

General DeGaulle's program of political and economic stabilization involves stricter government controls over the economy. Suggestive of the problems the General faced in suppressing inflation last July was the refusal of the farm organizations to accept the DeGaulle proposals for limiting food price increases. Instead the farmers insisted that, in accordance with previous governmental promises, the price of wheat be raised by 12 percent. The new government sought to limit the increase for wheat to 5 percent. In its effort to bring the general price level down, the government appealed to producers to cut prices voluntarily by from 2 percent to 5 percent.

In a compromise between wheat farmers and the government in July, the price of wheat was raised by 7 percent; and at the same time the prices of barley and corn were raised 11 percent and 10 percent, respectively. The price of sugar beets, also an important commodity in France, is based on the price of wheat. While, therefore, the price of sugar has gone up with that of wheat, the retail price of bread is independently regulated.

A country gripped by inflation finds it harder to sell goods abroad and easier to buy imports. Hence import controls of one sort or another, or of various sorts at once, are imposed. This has been the case in France.

An illustration of the nature of this form of dirigisme was the drafting last September of new regulations governing imports of capital goods costing more than 1 million francs per unit. Importers were required to supply evidence that the goods to be imported were essential and promised to improve the foreign trade balance. Moreover, importers were obliged to deliver such im-

ports immediately to productive enterprises and not to inventory.

Although France has a shortage of housing that, according to the French National Statistics Institute, will last a century—since the construction of new dwellings is not keeping pace with the population growth and there is a constant migration from country to city—new building is being held down by credit restrictions. These owe their origin to the need to combat inflation, as a result of which residential construction has had to be financed by the central bank itself, an inflationary process.

HOUSING AID

French state aid for housing—reported the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* last year—takes the form of building premiums of 600 francs per square meter in the case of ordinary apartments and 1,000 francs in the case of those built under the social homebuilding plan. The premiums serve to lower the cost of building credits granted by the *Credit Foncier* for 5 years, after which they are converted into long-term loans. The *Credit Foncier* lacking the necessary funds, the latter are mobilized by means of bills discounted by the banks. Mobilization bills over and above the amounts allocated to the banks are taken up by the central bank. (On September 30, 1957, of 746 billion francs of mobilization bills created in respect of housing credits, 674 billion were in the portfolio of the Bank of France.)

We have already mentioned French resort to indexed bonds, such as the two Pinay loans, as devices to attract inflation-wary investors. In addition, other methods have been applied to the same end. While France is not the only country to have used such novel financial devices during the postwar years, it probably has relied upon them more extensively than any other. It is not without parenthetical interest in this connection to read that a former New York bank officer, John E. Rovinsky, has proposed that the Treasury issue "2 percent tax-free income consols," with interest to be adjusted annually to reflect changes in the BLS cost-of-living index.

How France has employed this idea in its security offerings during recent years may be seen in the following example. The return to the investor, including repayment of principal, being in part based on such criteria as the price of gold on the free market in Paris, prices of specific commodities or services, industrial turnover, industrial production, and the like.

Electricité de France, a government corporation, was the first French issuer of securities carrying a purchasing-power guaranty in terms of the product sold by the issuer. In October 1952 it offered bonds with a par value of 16,000 francs, the annual interest on which was fixed as the equivalent of the average selling price of 100 kilowatt-hours in the preceding year or 720 francs, whichever should be the greater. The bonds were made redeemable between 1958 and 1968 at the greater of either the average price of 2,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity or 16,000 francs. For this purpose the electricity price was determined by dividing the company's total revenue by the number of kilowatt-hours of electricity sold.

The electricity issue was very successful and was followed by similar ones for coal, railways, and gas, as well as other electricity issues. As a measure of their popularity, in April 1955 the yield on securities of public industrial enterprises with a purchasing power clause was 3.72 percent, while the yield on issues of the same enterprises not carrying such a clause was 5.95 percent.

How inflation affected the prices of securities may be seen from the following figures. It will be noted that, while bonds of the traditional kind with straight interest and redemption features declined in market

value, those tied to an index of the price of gold coins or of commodities or services appreciated. The figures in the table are based on 1949=100.

	Dec. 31, 1955	Oct. 31, 1957
Rente perpetuelles (consols).....	124.2	104.6
Loans of public enterprises.....	133.7	106.3
Private loans.....	121.1	105.7
Public index loans.....	206.7	231.1

Source: *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, Nov. 7, 1957.

Despite the inflation which has plagued France repeatedly and indeed almost constantly since the war, there are still French people who save: "Aunt Suzanne" who from lifetime habit regularly put part of their income in the savings bank or less secure places. The writer has heard of an American lady who was taken into a French home as an overnight guest in 1957. The mattress felt rather lumpy. On investigation, the visitor found that it had been stuffed with paper franc notes, thus exhibiting on the householder's part a surprising confidence in a sick currency.

According to the National Credit Council, 437 billion francs of new savings were made in 1957 in readily mobilizable form—savings accounts, treasury bonds, and time deposits. But the newspaper, *Le Monde*, called this partly illusory, stating that the increase in time deposits merely represented a transfer from sight deposits. Nonetheless, current savings by thrifty Frenchmen during an era of inflation must be sizable. In 1958, through August, savings deposits increased by 162 billion francs to 2,086 billion.

A Government-imposed ceiling limits the amount an individual in France may have in a savings deposit account to 1 million francs. This ceiling appears to have its origin in the traditional regard of savings banks as having been designed for the person of small or moderate means. It does not seem to make much sense from the standpoint of the authorities perpetually combating inflationary forces. But, on the other hand, savings banking in France seems to be destined in the long run to yield to the comparatively greater attraction of indexed bonds.

Under a 1948 law, owners of balances illegally held abroad were permitted to repatriate them subject to no other penalty than a special levy of 25 percent. The opportunity, however, was not seized by the capitalists in question. Therefore, in an effort to get some of those assets back to France, the Government suspended for an indefinite period the 25 percent penalty on the sole condition that the owners sell their foreign exchange on the official exchange market, or have their balances sent to France in the form of gold to be sold on the Paris gold market.

As another step in helping restore confidence in the franc, the government late in 1957 ordered all French banks to surrender 30 percent of their dollars held abroad as a forced loan on which they would receive 3 percent interest.

Whatever anti-inflation program is under taken in France, the difficulties it will encounter are described thus by ex-Premier and ex-Finance Minister Mendes-France: "All Frenchmen condemn inflation. But they have tolerated it so long that one may wonder whether, in their heart of hearts, they have really disapproved of it, and whether they are not under dangerous illusions as to its effects. Since 1914, the economists, the parties in power, indeed the whole country have been struck by the surprising convenience of inflation, considered as a method of financing. Does it not allow, at least for a time, considerable expenditures to be made, whether military or civilian, current expenditures as well as investments, and all this

without incurring the inevitable reaction of the taxpayer? ... Even if inflation has obvious disadvantages, a large part of the population believes it can escape them: the workers by a rise in wages, business leaders by an increase in their nominal margin of profit, capitalists by a de facto or de jure adjustment of their holdings on a sliding scale."

Harvey Seeds Post No. 29, American Legion, Department of Florida, Miami, Fla., Petitions Congress To Act Favorably on Pending Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1959, Harvey Seeds Post 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, Miami, Fla., at a regular meeting, petitioned the Congress to act favorably on certain pending legislation for the benefit of veterans.

In doing so, Harvey Seeds Post 29 is continuing under its present able leadership a fine record of service for veterans. The accomplishments of the members of this outstanding post in community service are equally well known and regarded.

Their respectful petition should be accorded full consideration by the appropriate congressional committees. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ACT FAVORABLY UPON PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR AND ON BEHALF OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT, THEIR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN

Whereas, Harvey Seeds Post 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, Miami, Fla., is one of the largest posts of the American Legion in the Southern States and has a proud and unbroken record of service to the disabled veterans, widows, and children of veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas the National American Legion has mandated its officers to secure certain legislation for and on behalf of veterans, their widows, and children, by the 86th Congress, 1st session, such legislation being long overdue; and

Whereas such legislation is incorporated by the National American Legion in the 3-point American Legion pension program of 1959 for increase in certain classes of pensions and disability payments, and relief of restrictions that deny pensions to veterans, their widows, and children in certain classes; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that such legislation is long overdue, since prices, wages, salaries, retirement pay and benefits, have soared in recent years, and the 3-point program is based on the same reasoning that has won public and legislative support for increases in pay to teachers, Congressmen, Government workers, the military, and trade union members; and

Whereas Harvey Seeds Post 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, has given careful and serious study to individual bills offered in Congress to implement the 3-point program of the American Legion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Harvey Seeds Post 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, in regular meeting assembled, at Miami, Fla., this January 30, 1959, That the post hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon the following items of legislation heretofore introduced in the 86th Congress, 1st session, to wit:

1. A bill to provide that veterans age 65 shall be deemed to be totally and permanently disabled for pension purposes, similar to H.R. 2433.

2. A bill to provide that veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while hospitalized, similar to H.R. 258 and H.R. 2434.

3. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, and their dependents, similar to H.R. 2436.

4. A bill to provide pensions for widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans on the same basis as is provided for widows and children of deceased World War I veterans, similar to H.R. 257 and H.R. 2435.

5. A bill to provide for increased rates of death compensation, and of disability and death pension, payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to widows and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict.

6. A bill to amend section 301 of the World War Veterans Act of 1942, to provide that certain term insurance held by World War I veterans shall be considered as fully paid when the insured reaches the age of 65, similar to H.R. 170; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly certified by the officers of this post, be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Florida in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the members and officers of the post in attendance at the meeting when this resolution be adopted, whose signatures are affixed hereinbelow, do emphasize their personal interest in the favorable action of such proposed legislation.

HENRY J. HALAM,
Commander.

Attest:

JOS. A. FRIEDMAN,
Adjutant.

Members of Harvey Seeds Post 29, American Legion, Miami, Fla., who signed the foregoing resolution on January 31, 1959: George Clark Smith, vice commander; William E. Cox, vice commander; C. J. Santucci, vice commander; Arthur W. Morrow, executive committee; Paul E. Hood, executive committee; John P. Ullrich, executive committee; Axel R. Carlson, executive committee; James T. Ross, trustee; Lewis J. Worrell, trustee; Cameron F. Craig, finance officer; Elmer Wesbrod, chaplain; James C. Akers, executive committee; William R. Simonds, trustee; James Kytte Williams; M. D. Herrington; Ferdinando Gabriele; Louis Galy; Freeman Cagle; George S. Flichman; Kay S. Thurston; Harry B. Peterson; Capt. Walter M. Frank; Chaplain Frank L. Titus; John J. Yazum; John C. Cuthbert; Arthur J. Smith; George C. Barth; Kalman M. Rucker; Bertha T. Cowan; George S. Selgman; V. L. Gilmer; I. F. Gilson; Etan W. Schaub; Joseph A. Bogowski; Frank L. Smith; C. C. Mead; R. J. Waitte; Elsie M. Gooley; Mike Zorio; Capt. John Pahl; Joseph J. Kincaid; William T. McMorris; Ralph W. McMorris; Paul P. Forand; Edgar K. Tepper; Leo P. Herbert; Reginald A. McHugh; Murray McDonald; W. L. Zimbleman; John A. Peddard; A. J. Parks; E. L. deBroigne; William P. Dix; John Stapleton; Orlando Aschiero; Lamar W. Boye; Woodrow W. Matz; J. M. Kearney; Harry A.

Dunham; James Harrington; Arthur G. Keene; Andrew F. Burnell; Joseph A. Tiesi; Joseph Allegra; Arthur D. April; Harry J. Piemonos; Rhotie R. Jackson; Ray Jewett; Stephen A. Russell; Roland A. Saye; John F. Anderson; Albert J. Schmacher; Theodore R. Wilder; Albert W. Kolstner; George Parkhurst; Max Froom; B. J. Deckorg; Garry J. Jansen; John H. Cerda; Harry N. Parker; Joseph F. Catanzaro, Jr.; Marshall E. Pen-ton; C. E. Tiromar; M. R. Pellacani; James J. Harvey; James T. Megas; Egiato Cicci; C. E. Hazlett; Clarence G. Smallwood; Helen P. Purkey; Charles P. Eckhart; Alfred Manning; J. O. Tibbits; Adolph Scheer; Joseph W. Eden; Max Rozen; Wm. A. Scheer; John C. Cuthbert; Jacob Gerson; Frank C. Oher; Fred Karcher; John Broad; Clair De Coma; Albert F. Du Verger; Joseph A. Ryan.

Which Comes First, a Strong Enough Defense or a Balanced Budget?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are disturbed by this administration's failure to understand and support the need for leadership in missile development and in space exploration.

They are disappointed in the strategy whereby the administration hopes to become popular in the elections of 1960 by appealing to the material interests of our people, at the expense of national security.

This is a shortsighted and risky policy that completely underestimates the character and the patriotism and the commonsense realism of Americans.

In the crucial debate now underway, the American people will not be satisfied by vague reassurances. Out of this debate they expect a rebirth of bold, imaginative and pioneering leadership, limited only by the cost of survival.

On this urgent need, the people must be heard, and speaking for them is the challenging editorial titled "Surrender on Missiles" that appeared in the February 6 issue of the Boston Herald.

Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SURRENDER ON MISSILES

Defense Secretary McElroy the other day announced this country's retirement from the long-range missile race. The United States will not attempt to catch up with the Soviet in this field; even may be consenting to a 3-to-1 superiority by the Soviet. This announcement should have shaken the country to its foundations. We appear to have surrendered to our enemy clear priority in the decisive weapon of the future.

Now we can have an effective defense without matching the Russians in every other weapon. We could not possibly match them man for man. Our need for submarines is less than theirs. We ought in fact to tailor our whole defense system to our special requirements.

But there is no counter to Soviet missiles other than missiles of our own. Here is a whole new fourth dimension of warfare, which is not ships at sea or armies on land or planes in the air. But more than that, it

is a dimension which is crucial. We could have in the years to come command of the air, command of the sea, and command of land areas within our defense positions, and still lose if we lacked adequate missile strength.

We are at present relying on B-47s for 90 percent of our potential for delivery of nuclear bombs. Yet these are obsolete, or soon will be obsolete, against Russian air defenses. Moreover, Secretary McElroy conceded the other day that our bases in Europe are vulnerable to medium-range Soviet missiles. And, finally, we must face the danger that any loss of confidence in this country's powers of deterrence will make our allies disinclined to permit us to remain in these bases.

Even the program for the B-58s to replace the B-47s has been cut down. And the Polaris missile for firing from submarines has had its range cut from 1,500 miles to 800 miles.

This is a dark picture, and it ought not to be made any darker than it is. The defense budget does provide for more B-52s capable of firing the Hound Dog air-to-surface missile to paralyze enemy air defenses. There are to be funds to keep a third of the aircraft of the Strategic Air Command on 15-minute alert at all times.

The administration is not asleep. Within the confines of a \$41 billion defense budget it is working wonders.

But what Americans ought to be asking is whether this is enough. By what coincidence does the administration find that an adequate defense fits into a balanced budget?

There is abundant evidence that the American economy can meet considerably increased defense costs. Last year the Rockefeller Studies Group, warning that the balance of power would shift to the Soviets in 2 years, urged an immediate increase of \$3 billion a year in the defense budget and similar increases each year for the following 6 years. The Committee for Economic Development has said that there is no factual basis for the notion that we are near some breaking point in defense spending. "We can afford what we have to afford," the CED stated.

We must face it: bigger defense would mean heavier taxes. Missiles are not cheap. But the price of preserving our place in modern weaponry—and with it the effectiveness of our foreign policy—is within our ability to pay.

Housing Bill Is Big, but Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members will be interested in the views of the Denver Post in support of the housing bill, as expressed in an editorial on Thursday, February 5, 1959:

HOUSING BILL IS BIG, BUT SOUND

When the omnibus housing bill now being rushed through the Senate reaches the President's desk, he will face a difficult decision. The Senate bill certainly calls for bigger spending on housing than the President wants.

Yet if he vetoes it, he will be turning down a sound bill that represents a compromise among Democrats and Republicans in the Senate.

This would be a severe blow for the moderates on both sides of the aisle, and would probably touch off all-out fiscal war between the President and Congress.

The central difference, moneywise, between the President and Congress on housing is in urban renewal provisions.

The program began in 1949, but is only now beginning to gain real momentum (land for Denver's first project, Avondale, is now being acquired).

Now more than 400 cities have waked up to the opportunity urban renewal gives them to rejuvenate worn-out urban areas and build up their tax bases. Requests for funds in 1958 totaled nearly \$600 million.

But the bottom of the urban renewal pot has nearly been reached. As of December 31, only \$23 million of the \$1.3 billion allocated in urban renewal's first decade was left uncommitted.

The President's remedy for this was a quickie bill to put up another \$100 million to last through June and then \$200 million a year thereafter.

He also sought to cut the Federal share of urban renewal costs from two-thirds to one-half in order to make the Federal funds stretch further.

That would mean a 50-percent hike in the cities' share of urban renewal costs.

Liberal Democrats in Congress, such as urban-minded Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, former mayor of Philadelphia, countered with a \$600-million-a-year proposal.

CLARK and his allies claimed, with some justification, that the low amount the President wants would only increase the urban renewal backlog (some cities now estimate they will have to wait 5 years for funds) and that the increase in local costs would discourage urban renewal just when enthusiasm was mounting.

The President's bill would certainly hit Denver hard.

Thus the \$350 million a year provision in the Senate bill (over a 6-year period) is a fair compromise between the demand for urban renewal funds and the need to hold spending within reason.

The other main excess in the bill, from the President's point of view, is a new authorization of 35,000 public housing units. He recommended none for the coming fiscal year.

Yet some public housing is necessary if urban renewal itself is to go forward.

One of the requirements for an urban renewal project is that all families evicted from the project area must be rehoused in dwellings that are safe, sanitary, and which they can afford.

For many families, only low-cost public housing fits this prescription.

Denver again furnishes an example. Families now living in the Avondale renewal area can be absorbed in Denver's current public housing facilities.

But before another urban renewal project can be undertaken here, more public housing must be developed. Without it, urban renewal here is stymied.

If the omnibus housing bill reaches the President's desk in its present form, he should approve it. Its provisions are essential to the future health of American cities.

Impertinent Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with the recent revelation that the U.S. C-130

transport was deliberately shot down over Soviet Armenia near the Turkish border, the visit of Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan will have to be reevaluated. Our own State Department, in releasing the transcript of the intercepted radio conversation among Soviet fighter pilots who attacked the unarmed American transport plane last September, indirectly accused Mikoyan of lying about the incident.

In light of these revelations, therefore, I am pleased to include in my remarks two editorials from the Western Michigan Catholic published at Grand Rapids.

Both editorials are by Msgr. Joseph C. Walen. The first, entitled "Why Salaams to Mikoyan?" appeared on January 15, 1959; and the second, "Impertinent Guest" was published on January 22:

[From the Western Michigan Catholic, Jan. 15, 1959]

WHY SALAAMS TO MIKOYAN?

(By Msgr. Joseph C. Walen)

It was refreshing indeed to hear the voice of Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, raised in protest this week over the near-fawning welcome accorded to Anastas Mikoyan on his current tour of this country.

According to Cardinal Cushing, Mikoyan is a "bloody henchman in the murderous crimes committed by Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev. The outspoken prelate further charged that these crimes include "the massacres of his own free Armenian republic, the Ukrainian massacres of 1932-33 and the Hungarian massacres of 1956."

RAPS PRAISE BY BUSINESS

The Cardinal went further. He castigated "American business leaders and certain American business circles now singing the praises of Soviet Russia, thereby drowning out the cries for help and sympathy of the Hungarian people, upon whom, in effect, the American Nation has turned its back. It has permitted them to be crushed by the Soviet dictatorship and Red army."

The amount of newspaper and radio-television coverage accorded the visit of the Soviet first deputy premier leaves no doubt about the propaganda success of his jaunt to swanky, exclusive clubs in our larger cities.

I believe that the extent to which the news media went to record details of this trip border on the ridiculous. Who cares that he spent \$9.29 at a modern supermarket near Washington? Inasmuch as so many of the editors of the metropolitan dailies pride themselves about their ability to smell out press agents' stunts, it is all the more startling to have seen them fall for a phony interest shown by Mikoyan in some of our American institutions. His giving candy to a child in the supermarket mentioned above was hokum at its corniest.

Mikoyan even had the gall to question the historical fact alluded to by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message last Friday that the Communists regarded agreements as mere scraps of paper.

THOSE RED FEELINGS

In a Hollywood meeting attended by movie bigwigs Monday he is reported to have said that on the contrary there are some people who think that the imperialists keep international agreements only when it suits them. He is further quoted as claiming: "We also have the feeling that you have violated agreements."

I wonder why the Soviets have that feeling. Would it be because the Soviet press reports international events accurately?

SAINTS AND TRAITORS BOTH

At the same meeting he advised the Americans seriously to stop thinking of themselves as saints and the Russians as traitors.

It would be better, he said, if we took the attitude that both at times are saintly and both at times perfidious. Who wants to bet that Pravda will carry that remark about the Reds being at times perfidious?

This lionizing of Russia's No. 2 representative by many representatives of big business here has more than one American citizen scratching his head. Yet it might be well to rifle through our newspapers of the thirties and recall that recognition of Russia was urged not so much by the braintrusts and eggheads in the Roosevelt administration (as is commonly believed now) but by big business groups. Their foremost spokesman was Publisher William Randolph Hearst.

In that perspective the action on display these last few days does not come as a huge surprise.

Victor Riesel, the articulate, competent columnist on labor-management problems in this country, wrote Sunday what he claims is an exclusive report on the meeting of Mikoyan and outstanding labor leaders in this country in Washington on January 6.

ROUGHED UP BY UNIONISTS

According to Riesel, the going-over he received from Walter Reuther, Jim Carey, Joseph Beirne, and others was the "roughest 2½ hours Russia's second in command has had since he shot down Hungarian children in Budapest streets."

Among the many questions directed at Mikoyan was one by Jim Carey who asked why there is no capitalist party in Russia after Mikoyan had brazenly asked why there is no labor party in the United States.

Riesel's Sunday column, if we accept its accuracy, was the most fascinating I've read on Mikoyan's trip. It provided a view of the leaders of America's organized labor roughing him up with down-to-earth questions, and unmasking the motives of a representative of a movement which claims to be interested in the welfare of human beings.

Mikoyan's trip, so favorably accepted by many influential Americans, is leading to a meeting for him with President Eisenhower next Saturday.

WHAT GOOD?

On the basis of past performance by the Russian leaders, what good can come of any agreements between Mikoyan and the President? I think the President was grimly accurate in his statements to Congress last Friday.

Egg-throwing Hungarian refugees might not typify an American welcome to representatives of foreign governments. But Mikoyan and his kind have never been concerned about good manners, nor have they ever rewarded good manners either by individuals or by nations. There is no reason to believe he has been changed by his current visit.

Cardinal Cushing's commentary on Mikoyan's good will tour might well be the one which will stand out above all the others when history sifts the facts from the phonyisms.

[From the Western Michigan Catholic, Jan. 22, 1959]

IMPERTINENT GUEST

(By Msgr. Joseph C. Walen)

If you have read only a little bit of history about Red Russia you have arrived at the conclusion that the Soviets recognize only one way—their way.

The trail of self-righteous platitudes left behind by Anastas Mikoyan in his recent jaunt through this country emphasizes this conclusion.

Thanks to the wonders of our communications media Mikoyan's blatant propaganda statements have been transmitted to millions of Americans. He has perverted the freedom of our press to spread the treacherous Communist line which inevitably strangles freedom of every kind.

It should have been no surprise to Americans to find Mikoyan an impertinent guest. He showed no interest in two-way courtesy, though President Eisenhower had requested Americans to be polite to a high-ranking representative of a foreign government.

But Mikoyan in turn used our news channels to dodge pertinent questions about Russia's actions and policies by attributing only laudable motives of peace to the Reds and by simultaneously accusing the Western Powers of warmongering.

The climax of his performance of spouting anti-American blasts was reached by his statements on NBC's "Meet the Press" program Sunday. He flagrantly refused to answer valid questions. He backed down on previous statements that the Russians are not all saints. He hid lamely behind an excuse of "lack of space" when he was needed by the New York Times representative, Harry Schwartz, why Russian newspapers blithely omitted Mikoyan's references in his early speeches here to Russian mistakes.

Furthermore, he would not give on the program even the slightest assurance that Vice President Nixon would be given a chance to present American views to the Russian people through Soviet news media. But if you reflect about the validity of such assurances by Russians, on the basis of past performance, then it would be a waste of confidence to trust any commitments made by Mikoyan, publicly or privately. Thus again—there are only one-way streets for the Russians.

I think that the dreadful contrast between the credibility of Russian and the American news media must be carefully remembered by our citizens. One of the most reprehensible and snide quotes attributed to Mikoyan on his visit was reported from New York. In his appearance there before the big-money members of the Economic Club he boldly claimed that only lies and libel are kept out of Russian newspapers. He further is reported to have accused American newspapers of a lack of understanding of the free press concept. He then asserted: "When 1 millionaire has 10 newspapers and 10 million have none, that is not freedom of the press."

This last quotation is spit-in-the-face behavior by a guest who is given the chance by American newspaper, radio and television owners to present Russia's alleged policies. Mikoyan's gall to make the claim that Russia's present news media speak for all its people was hypocrisy at its rawest.

The owners of American newspapers, including the millionaires, have their faults, but all their defects combined are a speck compared to the ruthless censorship of the Russian Government over all news handling.

In criticizing our press for its coverage of Mikoyan's statements here, we Americans might deplore lack of some on-the-spot censorship by its reporters of the malarkey in some of his talks. Too many of his remarks were an insult to us. I suppose that our dedication to the cause of the freedom of the press leads both news media and their customers here to permit such malarkey to be so widely read and heard. Thus it's all the more difficult to swallow his slurs on the reliability of our news coverage and his totally untenable defense of government-controlled news media.

Some representatives of Government and the press here might now plead for "equal time" for Vice President Nixon in Russia. I don't think it would be granted because I don't think that Khrushchev and Mikoyan would be interested in letting the Russians know about America's policies in the world today. Anyway, arrogant Anastas would probably like to remind us again that the Russian newspapers don't have the space to report fully the statements of American officials—as the American papers did to his journey and comments.

The deftful dodging by Mikoyan of facts of the day in his tour is evidence of a nimble intelligence and also of a contemptuous disregard of the amenities of friendship.

The cause of the freedom of discussion, interpretation, and news presentation requires us to print or broadcast accounts of the opinions and actions of officials of our own and of foreign governments. The consequences of service to this principle might lead us to wonder occasionally whether truth will win, particularly in the wake of an experience such as Mikoyan's visit. But history shows truth does prevail and the temptation to suppress even malicious attacks on this Nation's integrity and peaceful intentions must be overcome.

The problem now arises whether our President should ask Americans to be polite as well as dedicated to a free press when a boor comes to visit us.

Proposed Increase in the Federal Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as an extension of my remarks, a statement by Mr. Robert G. Dunlop, president of the Sun Oil Co., in regard to the proposed increase in the Federal tax on gasoline. Mr. Dunlop's comments are as follows:

There is no justification for any increase in the Federal excise tax on automotive gasoline. The proposed 50 percent increase in this tax would be an unfair and unreasonable levy on American motorists, already staggering under exorbitant highway user taxes.

Federal, State, and local taxes on motor fuel now equal a national average of 9 cents a gallon, or 40 percent of the service station price of regular grade gasoline, exclusive of the tax. No other commodity essential to daily living is anywhere so highly taxed. Now it is proposed to boost the Federal tax another 1½ cents a gallon, making it 4½ cents.

The excuse given for such a shocking proposal is "to make highway related taxes support our vast highway expenditures." This is a misleading statement. Highway users now not only are paying all the Federal highway expenditures but are paying, in addition, hundreds of millions of dollars that are being diverted to nonhighway purposes.

In the 1958 fiscal year highway-related tax collections by the Federal Government totaled \$3.6 billion. But only \$2.1 billion were earmarked for highway purposes. The remaining \$1.5 billion—or 42 percent of the total amount collected—were paid into the Treasury's general fund for other Federal activities that have no relation to highways.

If the Federal highway program requires more revenue than is produced by the earmarked taxes, then Congress should earmark for that purpose taxes already being paid by highway users and not place a greater load on the country's motorists.

The plea is made that if this is done, the new Federal budget cannot be balanced without the imposition of additional taxes in some other form. A balanced budget is imperative. But certainly it cannot be logically argued that motorists, as a group, solely

are responsible for paying taxes to keep the Federal budget in balance. Surely, if the budget cannot be balanced by reducing contemplated expenditures, then the obligation of keeping it in balance should fall on all Americans.

I sincerely believe that the present situation urgently calls for a reappraisal immediately by Congress of the scope and of the method of financing of the Federal program set up in the 1956 Highway Act. This action should be taken before any further tax burdens are placed on highway users.

Farm Price Supports in the Existing Pattern of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, few, if any, areas in the United States are untouched by subsidies. Subsidies are as old as our Government and long have been used as an acceptable and serviceable adjunct to the free economy. Condemnation or praise of subsidies are academic and unrealistic unless the public purpose of the subsidy is taken into account. The above are general conclusions from an historical review of Government subsidies made by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives of the United States.

What constitutes a subsidy? A definition is very difficult. Some would think of a Government subsidy as Federal moneys or their equivalent paid out to individuals. But this would exclude legislation under which certain groups in the economy are authorized to directly increase their "take" from the total economy. By such activities, the same purpose and result is achieved as that of a direct subsidy paid out to the same group. One of the first official acts of the Government of the United States was to enact a tariff to protect the growing industries of the infant Nation. Another gave preference in custom duties to goods imported on American ships. Both were designed to improve the competitive position of domestic businessmen and enhance the growth of American industry. In this respect, both were subsidies, although nothing was paid out directly by Government.

Early in the history of the United States, our Government recognized the need for improved transportation. Public lands, direct contributions, and loans were used to encourage construction of canals. Later, similar contributions were made to many railroads. Mail subsidies developed and supported other means of transportation and have been used extensively. The first mail subsidy was reported in 1845. More recently, millions of dollars have been paid out to subsidize the merchant marine. Hearings with reference to postal deficits also suggest considerable subsidy in the form of low postal rates, the benefits of which accrue to certain publishers.

For the reasons suggested above, it is perhaps desirable to avoid the notion of a subsidy in terms of cash paid out and think in terms of a welfare state. The evidence of the welfare state are actions by the Government designed to improve the economic position of specific groups or classes of the population. All actions of the Government, in fact, fall in this category. The promotion of public health, education, and the maintenance of order and tranquility are all costly activities of Government which directly benefit the public. We think of the welfare state as one which is interested in specific activities for specific groups of people, and, sometimes, as in the case of graduated taxation, to the economic detriment of other groups. The attempts of the Government to achieve a leveling off process both in individual incomes and in human welfare benefits some and penalizes others. The activity of the welfare state includes not only cash paid out to individuals, but also the levying of tariffs, the creation of stockpiles for surplus products either by the Defense Department or in the Department of Agriculture, marketing agreements, and the like. Perhaps it is desirable to list some of the specific activities which seem to fall in this category.

At the head of such a list certainly one finds the graduated income tax. Older, however, and more important in its time, was the protective tariff. Activities under the antitrust laws also fall in the welfare category. Of the more recent devices, the following come quickly to mind: Bank deposit insurance, the conservation of natural resources, transportation subsidies, school-lunch programs, Government assistance through charitable organizations, price-supports for farmers, defense stockpiles, allocation of defense contracts to job deficit areas, old-age and survivors pensions, minimum-wage laws, job insurance and separation pay, and labor legislation giving unusual privileges to unions.

It is not the purpose to evaluate these programs. It is only proposed to show their antiquity, on the one hand, and more recently the extent of the activities of the welfare state both in direct subsidies and in other programs with similar objectives.

Virtually every person in the population of the United States would seem to be a receiver of benefits from one or more of these activities. The entire nation, in one way or another, is affected by the various programs, whether for industry, for labor, for the young, for the aged, or for agriculture. It seems inappropriate, under a condition where activities of this nature have gained such wide acceptance as in the United States, that the public, through its legislators, should withdraw from support of any group unless that program had failed in its objective, or an improved program was conceived. Who in the United States has the right to say of another, "You get too much."

The program for support of farm prices was designed to improve individual incomes in agriculture. It was also designed to equalize farm and non-farm

incomes and to create agricultural purchasing power, thereby improving the market for goods produced by others. There were no important failures. Until better programs have been proved, farm price supports have justified their position in the welfare state. They should be reexamined and amended to keep them abreast of the changing facts of the world, but they should not be abolished.

The programs for price supports for farm products have, in fact, contributed much more to public welfare than was planned in the original objectives. Through distribution programs, hunger has been largely eliminated in the United States and significant contribution has been made to reduction of hunger in other lands. Growing farm efficiency has made it possible for a declining number of farmers to produce food for an increasing domestic population for less total dollars. This is no idle achievement in a nation where inflation is the general rule. In terms of progress in the solution of basic human wants, it seems quite likely that the farmers of the United States who produce food have made a greater contribution than any other group in the world during the period beginning in the middle 1930's.

Daggers Against Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Congress should read with interest the report about the Central Intelligence Agency by Charles Edmundson, formerly a reporter for the *Fortune* magazine, and with the Foreign Service.

This article appeared in the February 1959 issue of the *Progressive* magazine:

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY: DAGGERS AGAINST DIPLOMACY

(By Charles Edmundson)

In his recent Saturday Evening Post article, "The Story Behind Quemoy: How We Drifted Close to War," Stewart Alsop tells of the part played by the Central Intelligence Agency in almost starting war with Communist China in 1954 and again in 1958. For the first time a mass-circulation publication revealed that beginning early in 1950 the CIA supported and masterminded "commando-type guerrilla raids on the [Chinese] mainland, which were sometimes mounted in battalion strength."

Alsop does not, of course, tell all of the CIA's activities in heightening tensions in the Far East. But he does describe in detail the role of "Western Enterprises, Inc." (a cover name for the CIA project) in raiding the mainland from Quemoy and the Tachens:

"The Western Enterprises—ostensibly soldiers of fortune—were responsible for organizing and equipping the Nationalist guerrillas who raided the mainland from the offshore islands. . . . Until early 1954, the islands were pretty much their exclusive playground. By that time they had settled

themselves pretty comfortably on the islands."

Although neither the White House nor Congress had yet made up its mind whether the offshore islands belonged to Mao Tse-tung or Chiang Kai-shek, the CIA decided the matter for itself and proceeded with systematic raids against the mainland. The results, direct and indirect, were enough to provoke the brink-of-war crisis of September 1954 and October 1958. The United States and the world were twice taken to the precipice by a secret bureau whose activities are unknown to Congress, the press, and the people until long after the event—if they are ever known.

The raids from Quemoy and the Tachens are not isolated instances of CIA activity. They are representative. As currently operated, the CIA is far more than an intelligence-gathering organization. It is an activist group which steps in boldly to dictate foreign policy in areas not covered by decisions of Congress, the State Department, or the White House. The CIA operates clandestinely in every country in the world, including several where the State Department and the press are forbidden. It executes its projects without concern over the reaction of the public. The incidents it provokes are never acknowledged, yet can be decisive in shaping—or misshaping—public opinion, and foreign policy.

All the machinery of government publicity is used to make CIA-induced incidents serve preconceived domestic ends. The public can thus be propagandized into believing whatever the CIA and its Old Guard allies in the State Department or the military want it to believe.

Not long ago I asked a distinguished career ambassador, "When CIA operatives are at work in the country to which you are accredited don't the incidents which they create shape policy in such a way as to take control largely out of your hands?"

"I couldn't agree with you more," the ambassador replied. He told of CIA activities in his country which had damaged American prestige and influence over a whole continent.

The CIA works under the direction of the National Security Council, the Nation's supreme body in deciding military policy. Chairman of the NSC is the President himself and there are four other members: the Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The Director of the CIA is not a member, but as its adviser on all intelligence matters he sits in on most important sessions and has a voice in Security Council discussions and decisions.

According to the basic statute, the CIA's functions are limited to gathering and interpreting intelligence. A final catchall clause, however, authorizes the CIA to perform such other functions and duties relating to security intelligence as the National Security Council may direct. This would not appear to authorize the organization of guerrilla raids . . . in battalion strength or the deployment of agents provocateurs in the territory of cold war adversaries. But the CIA has engaged in such activities on a broad scale.

Funds are not lacking for any schemes the CIA may see fit to adopt. In his book, "Central Intelligence and National Security," Harry Howe Ransom, a political scientist at Harvard, quotes estimates of national intelligence expenditures as high as \$2 billion a year. "Several hundreds of millions of dollars annually," he writes, may be budgeted directly to the CIA, with the rest going to the Army, Air Force, Navy, State Department, and several other agencies which also gather intelligence. Nobody knows the exact amount the CIA gets. The Bureau of the Budget is forbidden by law to disclose the figure. Congress itself, carefully blindfolded,

passes CIA appropriations as disguised items in the budgets of other bureaus.

The CIA's total personnel, American and foreign, is estimated at about 16,000 persons. The "Little Pentagon" being built for the CIA across the river from Washington—at a total cost of \$55 million—will have a capacity of at least 10,000 persons. Small wonder that more thoughtful Senators and Representatives are disturbed to see such a rich and far-flung empire operating in the vital fields of foreign affairs, hidden from the eyes of Congress and the press.

In reality, the press, with correspondents in most foreign capitals, knows much more about CIA operations than does Congress. Many foreign correspondents with whom I have talked would like nothing better than to report how the CIA often distorts international relations. But the editors at home long ago decided to regard the CIA as a sacred cow.

Perhaps the most glaring failure of the press, from the standpoint of public policy, has been its acquiescence in the State Department's repeated and sometimes incendiary statements that all the Americans held prisoner in Communist China are held illegally and in violation of international law. Every well-informed correspondent and editor in Washington knows that many of the prisoners have been U.S. intelligence agents, whom China has as much right to hold as the United States has to imprison Rudolph Ivanovich Abel, the Soviet master spy.

The reading and comparison of scattered items (always buried obscurely on inside pages) in the New York Times is sufficient to show that at least some of the prisoners are CIA agents. Confessions by some agents who have been released and others still held have been printed in the Times, the Washington Post, and other newspapers. At a press conference December 3, 1956, President Eisenhower pointedly refused, contrary to Secretary Dulles' practice, to say that all the Chinese prisoners are illegally held.

But such items go unnoticed, and when Secretary Dulles or Assistant Secretary Walter Robertson make speeches saying that the imprisonment of all the men is illegal, barbarous, and an affront to the dignity of the United States, doubtless 99 percent of the public believes them.

It is understandable that newspaper editors are reluctant to print the full story of U.S. intelligence agents captured in China. But to protect the integrity of public opinion they might at least warn Secretary Dulles that they will not forever remain silent while the State Department belligerently misrepresents facts. They could at least refuse to cooperate in the effort to propagandize and bamboozle the American public to the point where a rational China policy becomes a political impossibility.

President Eisenhower, according to his biographer, Robert J. Donovan, questions the wisdom of driving "the Chinese ever deeper into an unnatural alliance with Russia." But the Dulles brothers have been doing just that. Besides the raids from the offshore islands, Western Enterprises, Inc. for several years helped supply and direct a large remnant of Nationalist Chinese forces against the Communist Chinese from the northern border of Burma.

The Nationalist Chinese were never more than a nuisance to Communist China, but they were a real peril to Burma, which feared that Peiping might retaliate against the Burmese for harboring hostile forces. When Burma's own army was unable to deal with the Nationalist Chinese, Prime Minister U Nu protested to the U.S. Ambassador in Rangoon. After this proved useless he took his case to the United Nations. Feeling mounted so high among Asian and African delegates that something had to be done. Eventually a four-power conference—the United States,

Burma, Nationalist China, and Thailand—was held and as a result 7,000 Nationalist Chinese and their dependents were evacuated to Formosa, although some 3,000 of Chiang's veterans still linger in Burma.

In this period the CIA and the Air Force cooperated in running an Air Resupply and Communications Wing. The wing's "mission in a global war," explained the New York Times, "would be to fly into enemy territory and drop supplies to United States or Allied agents operating there." Operations over China were extensive and occasionally a plane was shot down or accidentally crashed. Early in 1953 the plane of Col. John Knox Arnold, commander of the 581st Air Resupply and Communications Wing, was shot down over China, and Colonel Arnold and 13 other Americans were captured. After 2½ years the Chinese released all 14 of them. At a press conference arranged by the U.S. Air Force in Tokyo, Colonel Arnold said that under pressure he had "told the Chinese things they shouldn't know." By this time some members of Congress had become concerned over the trouble-making potential of the Air Resupply and Communications Wing and the operation was suspended.

In mid-August of 1953, the CIA brought off what it apparently regards as its most dramatic coup. This was the overthrow of Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh of Iran, accomplished with all the packed drama of a television scenario. The CIA was so proud of this masterpiece that it leaked the details to Richard and Gladys Harkness for a remarkable story published in the Saturday Evening Post November 6, 1954.

The coup was planned in a picturesque hostelry in the Swiss Alps. Allen Dulles flew there on August 10, 1953, to join his wife, ostensibly for a vacation. Soon they were joined by Loy Henderson, U.S. Ambassador to Iran, and by Princess Ashraf, the attractive and strong-minded brunette twin sister of the Shah. By a remarkable coincidence the late Brig. Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, formerly U.S. adviser to the Iranian Gendarmerie, happened to be touring the Middle East, and was in Teheran, the capital of Iran, at the same time.

The Shah sent a military detachment to Prime Minister Mossadegh to inform him that he was dismissed. When Mossadegh refused to resign and took charge of the capital with armored jeeps and tanks, the Shah and his wife fled to Rome.

Others did not give up so easily. Some members of the Iranian Army had remained loyal and the support of others was won with black bags comfortably filled with rials (a total of \$19 million was spent). A few days after the flight of the Shah, an innocent-looking troupe of jugglers and trapeze artists began a parade toward the heart of Teheran. Their numbers swelled miraculously, and they began to chant "Down with Mossadegh," "Long live the Shah." The chant became an angry shout. The paraders were transformed into an aroused populace. As if by prearrangement, pro-Shah elements of the army joined the demonstration. After a half day of bitter fighting, Mossadegh was overthrown, and the Shah and his bride flew back to the capital.

In the background of all this were, of course, the oilfields on the north shore of the Persian Gulf. It is not irrelevant that Sullivan & Cromwell, the Dulles brothers' former law firm, is the longtime legal counsel of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., whose billion-dollar property interest on the Persian Gulf was saved by Mossadegh's overthrow. The international oil cartel, whose American members were then and still are under prosecution by the U.S. Department of Justice, found it easier to negotiate with the Shah than with Mossadegh, whose efforts to deal with American independent oil com-

panies had been frowned upon by the State Department.

Congress seemed well enough pleased by what happened in Iran, but 3 months later it was jolted by reports out of East Germany. On November 17, 1953, the New York Times reported that the East German government had seized scores of persons whom it accused of being agents provocateurs. They had been caught, the East Germans claimed, with plans to blast railroad bridges and stations, burn factories and government buildings, and assassinate officials. In the prisoners' pockets were found, the East Germans said, faked food stamps and counterfeit bank drafts to upset food rationing and bank credit.

Something else piqued Congressional interest. Most of the captured agents were former Nazis, headed by Gustav Gehlen, who had been a major general in the Nazi army, and papers found on the captured agents included a list of West German anti-Nazis for slaying. Apparently the former Nazis were using their spy roles as cover for settling old scores.

An informal committee of Congress, with Senator Mansfield in the lead, demanded to know what was going on. Army intelligence, which was also operating in Germany, hastily gave the CIA full credit for the Gehlen affair, and this view was supported in the trials in East Germany. Four of the Gehlen group were executed, 11 were given life imprisonment, and those who escaped to West Germany were presumably culled from the American payroll. Thereafter intelligence operations in Germany were limited mostly to such ventures as digging a 2,000-foot tunnel into East Berlin to tap Communist telephone and telegraph trunklines—an enterprise discovered in 1956.

Using the CIA, the United States is able to react quickly when an alien power or ideology shows sign of gaining ground in the Western Hemisphere. In May 1954 the CIA found that a secret shipment of 1,900 tons of arms from Czechoslovakia was being unloaded at Puerto Barrios, Guatemala. Although there were no Communists in the cabinet of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman, his government had been charged with Communist sympathies. Allen Dulles warned the National Security Council that action was urgent. Two Globemasters loaded with arms were flown to Honduras and Nicaragua. Within a week an exiled Guatemalan officer was leading an armed force across the border from Honduras and the Arbenz government was doomed. The coup deposing Arbenz was so easily executed that the State Department apparently forgot to do much subsequently about the conditions which helped give rise to pro-Communist sentiment in Guatemala.

It is not generally known that Radio Free Europe, which appeals for public contributions through the press, radio, and television, is an arm of the CIA and depends on the CIA for most of its funds. When a knowledgeable correspondent like Cyrus Sulzberger of the New York Times refers to Radio Free Europe as a private agency he puts the word "private" in quotation marks. Most of the Free Europe Committee directors are industrialists such as Irving S. Olds, former board chairman of U.S. Steel, and Eugene Holman, head of Standard Oil of New Jersey. One may reasonably question if the ideas of such men are suited to the development of propaganda appealing to repressed populations.

According to Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, Woodrow Wilson professor of government at Williams College, "Radio Free Europe is designed to conduct psychological warfare more vigorously than the Voice of America, with the object of instigating revolution and promoting what Life magazine called 'the necessary disintegration of the Soviet system.'" In 1956 Leslie Bain, Budapest correspondent for the Reporter, blamed Radio Free Europe

for helping raise the Hungarian revolution to a tempo which uselessly sacrificed thousands of Hungarian patriots after their cause had proved hopeless. The broadcasts, he wrote, kept repeating a refrain from Ambassador Lodge's speech in the U.N., "America will not fall you . . . America will not fall you," after it was clear that nobody was going to Hungary's aid.

In the spring of 1958 the Oxford University magazine *Isis* lifted a corner of the United States-British espionage curtain and revealed part of what was behind it. The authors were Paul Thompson, 22, and William Miller, 24, assistant editors of *Isis* and former members of a secret branch of the Royal Navy. When the authors were prosecuted for breaching the British Official Secrets Act, the public prosecutor stated in court that parts of their story were true. The Associated Press quoted the Thompson-Miller article:

"All along the frontier between East and West from Iraq to the Baltic and perhaps farther are monitoring stations avidly recording the least squeak from Russian transmitters, ships, tanks, airplanes, troops, and control stations.

"It is believed, perhaps rightly, that this flagrant breach of the Geneva Convention can provide accurate estimates of the size and type of Russian arms and troops and the nature of their tactical methods.

"In order to get this information, the West has been willing to go to extraordinary lengths of deception. British Embassies usually contain monitoring spies . . .

"An airplane loses its way. Behind the frontier, tape recorders excitedly read the irritated exchanges of Russian pilots, and when the latter sometimes force the airplane to land, an international incident is created and reported in the usual fashion."

Accounts in the American press complement the story of the Oxford students. Hanson Baldwin, of the New York Times, and others have written of flights by the U.S. Air Force across the boundaries of Russia. In the January 1958 issue of *Missiles and Rockets*, Associate Editor Seabrook Hull gave some details:

"The Strategic Air Command still provides the United States with an overwhelming retaliatory power over the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, according to Pentagon experts. . . . Numerous and continuing SAC flights over the sovereign territory of the U.S.S.R. demonstrate this. . . . Their [SAC] aircraft continue to fly over the Soviet Union with a relative degree of immunity. It is true that modern Russian fighters attack our bombers with major advantage of altitude, speed, and maneuverability. It is also true that they score some hits. But so far no attacks have been made by the Russians with missiles [possibly] because they don't want to tip their hands."

Time more than once has written of U.S. military planes making spy flights over Russia. In its November 3, 1958, issue *Time* quoted Soviet refugees as saying that high-altitude U.S. photo-reconnaissance planes flying in from the west made a nighttime penetration of Russian airspace in late 1956 or early 1957. *Time* said on its own authority that the Russians had seen such planes on their radar—proof that they are not asleep at their oscilloscope."

The most fundamental of all civil liberties is the right of the citizen to make up his mind on public issues without having the facts concealed or distorted by his government. The record shows that the CIA, in cooperation with the State Department, systematically contravenes this principle. A few examples of what is happening creep obscurely into some of the better newspapers, but nowhere, save in a few liberal publications, are Americans warned of the potential consequence of the far-flung operations of the secrecy-ridden CIA.

Public opinion can with effort make itself felt in the most public of Government bureaucracies. But bureaucracy operating in the dark, utterly insulated from public or congressional opinion in the delicate field of foreign affairs, is about as far removed from the democratic process as it is possible to conceive. Democracy is vitiated at home. Abroad, CIA activities are used by leaders like Mao Tse-tung to stir up hatred of the United States and generate more support for Communist dictatorship.

For 4 years men like Senators MANSFIELD, MORSE, and KEFAUVER have tried to get Congress to set up a committee to keep check on the CIA just as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy keeps Congress reassured in that vital field. Congressional participation in the supervision of the CIA has been recommended by the Hoover Committee on Government Reorganization, by a special Hoover Commission task force headed by Gen. Mark Clark, and by the Senate Rules Committee. But a bill to achieve this has not been passed by either House. Four such bills died in committee in the past session.

Other bills are being prepared for the current session of Congress, and the temper of the new Congress is likely to prove more favorable. But the needed legislation will not be passed unless the public and the press demand action. Too many men high in Government gloat over the cops-and-robbers exploits of the younger of the Brothers Duilles.

Where and When Will It End?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a current article by C. Wilson Harder, writer of a weekly column of national distribution geared to the interests of small business. It is important reading for an understanding of the myriad problems confronting the small businessman:

For quite some time, the Nation's independent businessmen, voting through the National Federation of Independent Business, have urged unions be made subject to Nation's antitrust laws. So far, Congress has not seen fit to do this.

This stand by the Nation's small businessmen is not based on an antilabor, or labor-baiting attitude. Rather, the question goes much deeper. It is possible that unless some curb under law is placed on labor leadership that the welfare of the Republic will be impaired.

There is something corrosive about unlimited power to an individual. In olden times there was seldom a king who did not abuse his power. But the modern labor leader is not only unfettered in his use of power, he also has the problem of pushing for more and more to put on a good show for the membership. This abuse of so far uncontrolled power, plus the drive to seek justification by getting more and more for the membership, seemingly has no end.

Perhaps one of the best concrete examples of this fact is found out in California. In the food industry, this State is recognized as the birthplace of the supermarket, and thus, is also perhaps the place of origination of the grocery clerk's union. Over the years the union has pushed wages up to a point where

any grocery clerk not making \$125 per week is unusual. In addition, there are numerous paid holidays, and on some, if the store stays open to accommodate the public, double, and even triple time must be paid.

But now the clerk's union has dreamed up a new demand. It is now being sought to get the employer to finance a fund to pay for psychiatric treatment for clerks who "crack up" under the high pressure of their jobs.

Nothing is said about owners who might "go nuts" trying to keep up with this merry-go-round. It seems doubtful anyone ever contracted neuroses from stacking cans of peas on a shelf.

Thus, this demand by the union bosses would seem absurd on the fact of it, if it were not a part of a very sly strategy in applied psychology. If union leaders can get over to their members the idea that they are being driven into all kinds of neuroses for the enrichment of the boss, more ill feeling is created for the employer; greater dependence on the union is built up.

It is doubtful that any grocery clerk has ever considered that he has a psychosis brought on by weighing out the sugar, or stacking up the coffee cans. But it is a safe bet that in due time, the union will sell him on the idea that his job, and his employer, is "driving him nuts." After that is accomplished, who knows what will be the next objective of union leadership? Perhaps the next thing will be to seek a Mother's Day bonus for every clerk who had a mother, on the grounds that the employers owe a debt to the mothers who made it possible for the boss to hire them as clerks.

New Help for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of our Small Business Committee, I am particularly interested in the activities and progress of the Small Business Administration which, as you know, has been made a permanent agency by the Congress.

The 85th Congress legislated a Small Business Investment Act as a means of providing more adequate long-term financing for small businesses throughout the land. The job of getting the Investment Act into gear is the responsibility of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Wendell B. Barnes. He has tackled this work with alacrity and now has the Small Business Administration Investment Division about ready to prove its value to the national economy.

Paul Wooton, the veteran Washington and congressional correspondent, recently interviewed Administrator Barnes on this subject for the publication, *Dun's Review and Modern Industry*. His article is most enlightening and well done, and I believe Members of this body will be interested in reading it. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Appendix of the Record. It reads as follows:

NEW HELP FOR SMALL BUSINESS—SBA CHIEF BARNES GIVES SOME POINTERS ON THE NEW LAW AIMED AT EASING THE LITTLE FELLOW'S FINANCING PROBLEMS

(By Paul Wootton)

The brandnew Small Business Investment Act will do more to stabilize and strengthen the overall economy than any peacetime legislation since the passage of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

So says Wendell B. Barnes, head of the Small Business Administration, which will administer the law passed by Congress last August to provide financing facilities for small businesses.

EVERYBODY BENEFITS

Barnes' optimism is based on the fact that this new concept of corporate financing can be applied to a large percentage of the country's 4.3 million business establishments. He feels that his enthusiasm is shared by most of the financial community.

Lack of capital which has retarded the growth of thousands of small businesses now can be overcome, Barnes believes, by the establishment of private investment companies which will lend needed funds for sound financing, expansion, and new product development. The loans can run from 5 to 20 years. State and local development companies also may obtain loans for site acquisition and plant construction for small concerns.

While a major long-term effect of the act will be the establishment of new companies, Barnes points out that the immediate benefits will come from providing going concerns with funds for modernization and expansion.

TAX RELIEF SPURS GROWTH

However, tax benefits provided for in the act already are resulting in the creation of new companies. Corporations with no more than 10 stockholders now have the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships. An original investor in a small business may deduct stock losses within certain limitations. A taxpayer also has the option of paying the estate tax over a period up to 10 years if the estate consists principally of small business holdings. A small business is allowed a 3-year carryback on new operating losses, and it may write off 20 percent of the cost of depreciable, tangible personal property in the year of acquisition. The writeoff, however, is limited to \$10,000. The minimum accumulated earnings credit is increased from \$60,000 to \$100,000.

Administrator Barnes points out that licensed small business investment companies will be privately owned and privately operated. He sums up the main features of the Investment Act as follows:

HOW IT WORKS

Licensed companies will make loans and purchase debentures issued by small business concerns. The debentures are to be convertible into stock.

Small business investment companies will be licensed only after the need for small business financing in the area has been established.

Licensed companies must have a minimum of \$300,000 paid-in capital and surplus, but the Small Business Administration can purchase a maximum of \$150,000 of subordinated debentures. In addition, SBA can lend such companies up to 50 percent of their capital and surplus. For the purposes of the act, these subordinated debentures can be treated as capital.

Licensed companies are exempt from the Securities and Exchange Commission's requirements of 300-percent asset coverage against borrowings and are eligible for certain discretionary SEC exemptions.

SBA will charter investment companies if State officials cannot grant such companies powers to operate under the act.

Private funds must be employed in the program to the maximum possible extent. Federal funds to the extent of \$250 million are authorized for loans to licensed companies and to State and local development companies. Of this sum, \$50 million has been appropriated.

Funds also are available for use of schools and State agencies in research on the problems of small business.

An SBA division is in operation helping small concerns obtain Government contracts.

REGULATIONS AREN'T SO TOUGH

There have been some complaints that the regulations implementing the act are too technical and complex. Barnes admits the regulations are not simple, but they follow the requirements of the act.

Although they are set up to make loans to small concerns which have been unable to obtain long-term loans, the small business investment companies are not going to grant loans without reasonable assurance of repayment. They will look for concerns with prospects for growth.

Barnes points out that loans extended to implement promising product ideas can foster business growth and advance the economy as a whole.

MAJOR HEADACHE: INVESTIGATION

A problem that will be common to all the investment companies is the high cost of investigating small concerns. Some think 10 applicants will have to be examined for each 1 accepted. The investment companies will be looking for concerns whose net income can be brought up to the \$150,000 or \$200,000 level before they are turned over for public financing. However, the small business investment companies will have to compete with other concerns making venture capital investments. The SBIC loans are in no way subsidies.

Ten or more persons (fewer if permitted by State laws) may join in setting up a small business investment company. The SBA will purchase \$150,000 of the company's subordinated debentures to help it get organized. They will be junior to other obligations of the company.

For the capital advanced to the small business, the investment company takes debentures which are convertible into the stock of the small business. It may also make secured loans of 5 years or more.

Banks and other investors may acquire the stock of the small business investment company. Bank holdings of such shares may not exceed 1 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. Efforts will be made by some companies to confine stock ownership to the community in which the enterprise will operate.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The percentage of borrowings of an investment company to its paid-in capital and surplus may not exceed a ratio of 4 to 1 without SBA approval. SBA will charge 5 percent interest on subordinated debentures purchased from the SBIC. The 5 percent rate also will apply on loans from SBA to SBIC. An SBIC may obtain stock of small business concerns only through the conversion of debentures.

SBA is precluded from buying more than \$150,000 of subordinated debentures in any one small business investment company where several are owned by the same group. Financing extended to any one small business concern by an SBIC may not exceed 20 percent of the investment company's capital and surplus without special permission.

Existing State chartered investment and State development companies may convert to an SBIC with the approval of SBA.

SBA may make loans to State development companies, but the total loans outstanding may not exceed the total amount put up by other sponsors. Provision is made, in addition, for loans for specific small concerns.

What Can You Do About High Taxes?—One Answer Is: Demand Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared on February 5 in the Sidney Record-Enterprise in my district.

While the editorial deals with the problems of taxation and balanced budgets at our State level, nevertheless the same, and reasonable, approach applies equally to our own problems in the Federal Government.

It is time for more and more of our people to answer the question in the title of this fine article: "What Can You Do About High Taxes?—One Answer Is: Demand Less."

If these problems are ever solved, it will be by the people themselves:

WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT HIGH TAXES?—ONE ANSWER IS: DEMAND LESS

According to what we read in the daily newspapers the Republicans are divided in their reaction to Rockefeller realism. The Democrats, naturally, will make all the political capital they can out of the unpopular situation created when a hand reaches out for a larger portion of the pay envelope.

The average person is not particularly interested in the political implications of the situation; he knows that what we are being asked to do is pay for commitments already made. The specific figure is that 81 percent of the increase in our State budget is either mandated by law or obligatory. The commitments were made by a Republican legislature under a Democratic Governor.

New York State is a high-tax and a high-cost State; the result is that we have too many manufacturers and businesses ready to move out and too few ready to move in. Our government has not been conducted efficiently—that is a statement of business fact, not political innuendo.

Governor Rockefeller made the statement on Monday that "the interest that must be paid on bonds makes the cost of capital construction projects more than 50 percent higher to the taxpayer." He is trying to establish sound fiscal policies and that means raising the necessary added revenue to meet our expenditures.

Under the heading of economy Governor Rockefeller has refused to fill 9,000 requested jobs that he considers nonessential. He seems to be withstanding pressure extremely well, but there are forms of pressure that cost us too much money, and are beyond his control unless the public demands action.

To be specific there are the costs involved in building schools—the costs that come from pressure exerted from the time the architect draws up a new set of plans—no such things as standardized plans available. The architect, because of pressure from his professional group, will get a percentage fee that will net him around \$50,000 to \$60,000 on most schools being built in our State today.

The common laborer and the craftsman also have been able to bring pressure to bear so that their rate of pay on school buildings is inordinately high, and bolstered by such devices as traveling time and such gimmicks. When State money is included in a local project you must accept the formula under which State contracts are written.

Governor Rockefeller stated on Monday that "State aid to local communities exceeds a billion dollars, which is about half of the total budget." On January 29, a speaker addressing the municipal law section of the New York State Bar Association said that 61 cents of every State revenue dollar goes to localities in the form of State aid. That means that the true cost of local government in New York State is camouflaged by our beneficent State government.

When you hear that a village or town pays a certain percentage, the State contributes so much and the Federal Government pays the rest you are being asked to believe that the added money comes from somebody else. It comes from you—the only difference is that when your dollar goes to Albany or Washington and comes back as State or Federal aid it has somehow shrunk in the process.

Governor Rockefeller is asking us to pay for what we, on a local level, keep demanding; we will have to demand less if we want to cut down the high cost of living or doing business in New York State.

A Realistic Approach to Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert an editorial from the Pasadena Independent of January 22 which is worthy of note:

A REALISTIC APPROACH TO VETERANS' PENSIONS

In his budget message President Eisenhower called for tightening requirements for veterans' pensions "according to effective tests of need, both as to income and as to net worth."

In other words, a veteran who doesn't need a pension shouldn't get one.

Mr. Eisenhower asked Veterans Administrator Sumner Whittier to propose legislation to do the job. If the bill is introduced it will run into a heavy flak of opposition from those veterans groups which seek greater, not less, benefits for men who donned uniform, whether or not they were wounded or even went overseas.

A new organization, the Veterans of World War I, seeks \$100 a month pension at age 60 for all World War I veterans, no matter how short their war service or how high their current income.

If they should get their way, the Government would have to do as well by World War II veterans and Korean war veterans. It is estimated that by 1965, this across-the-board pension would go to 4.8 million men, more than a fifth of the Nation's 23 million veterans.

At present more than 1.3 million veterans and surviving relatives draw more than \$1.1 billion in annual pensions. Much of it is justified. But many get help not for service disabilities but for injuries and illnesses incurred long after service. Many get pensions just for the disabilities resulting from old age, despite the fact that they have ample savings accounts and reasonable annual incomes from other sources.

To cite one example, a 78-year-old Californian who served for 7 months during World War I entirely within the United

States has drawn \$78.75 a month tax free for 90 months. He and his wife have other income of \$4,701 a year plus total worth of \$58,238.

The President wants to limit pension payments to the difference between the amount needed to live decently and a veteran's other income.

For instance, if \$3,000 a year was set as the amount necessary for an elderly couple, then the veteran who now gets the maximum non-medical pension of \$945 a year and no other income would be given a sizable income boost.

But the veteran who also gets social security payments of \$1,200 a year and has \$1,000 a year outside income would take a cut. And the veteran who has outside income above \$3,000 would get nothing at all.

One could argue that such a plan stifles initiative. To some extent it does, but most men reaching pension age have already established their incomes.

One could also argue, as Kipling did, that "Tommy" is forgotten except in wartime. But since 6.6 cents of every Federal tax dollar in the new budget goes to veterans' programs, this argument doesn't hold much water.

The 23 million living American veterans and their families are such a sizable portion of the total population that any across-the-board pension plan would just about mean that half the country was drawing forced largess for the other half.

A \$100 a month flat pension is unreasonable and unrealistic at a time of growing national debt and a need for heavy defense expenditures. Old Soldier Eisenhower's plan is both realistic and fair.

Business in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the activities of organized labor and their participation in each election campaign underscores the importance of businessmen protecting their interests through similar activity.

The debacle now unfolding in the State of Michigan where under the policies advocated by certain leaders of organized labor we see a great State literally going broke must give us pause. The inflationary impact of each new round of wages and the demand for more and more hand-outs from Government sends the inflationary spiral and threatens the security of all of us, and especially the very recipients of these so-called benefits.

The leading daily newspaper in my home county, the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa., has editorialized on the subject of greater activity on the part of businessmen in the field of politics and I am privileged to include the splendid article as a part of these remarks:

BUSINESS IN POLITICS

There's politics in business to be sure, but the ideal situation in these days finds business in politics, not only on a local basis but State and national.

Yesterday's edition of this newspaper carried a picture showing a delegation of West Chester citizens, many of them businessmen,

boarding a bus for Philadelphia where they took part in the launching of the political participation program of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Purpose is to encourage and aid retailers and others to take a more active part in politics.

That is as it should be in a day when business finds itself very much a part of politics whether or not it wants it that way. Since it is on the paying end, it makes sense that it should also be active on the policy-making end.

Businessmen must make their voices heard or accept the consequences. That is the challenge that comes from the board chairman of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce who himself is a top executive of a large department store. He puts it this way: "Government decisions . . . have a tremendous impact on the retailer's right to manage. He must make his voice heard—or the decisions may be made without any consideration of his views." Moreover, the retailer is in a unique position to furnish leadership in national and community affairs because "no other person is closer to the people."

Advice of this nature, coming from business leaders and organizations, is being heard to an ever-increasing extent—as it should be. And, naturally, it isn't directed at retailers alone, important as their participation in political work is. The entire business community is at the mercy of political actions of one kind or another. The policies adopted and implemented into law in Washington, at the State capitals, and at all other centers of government will determine what kind of country we are going to have.

Any citizen who thinks himself above political affairs lives in a dream-world. Any citizen who shirks his political duty is asking for trouble. In the long run, the quality of government is more important to business than the quantity of its sales.

It is well that our local chamber of commerce is awake to the importance of active participation, and that its committee, headed by Robert L. Beling, saw fit to make a trip to Philadelphia to see what the situation is at present and what the future may be.

In this way our local chamber along with others will not be caught napping when legislation affecting businessmen is proposed.

Countering Labor Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recent reports concerning increased unemployment, it might be well for all parties concerned to give careful consideration to the penetrating discussion in the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of February 10, 1959:

COUNTERING LABOR COSTS

The Federal Reserve Board has directed official attention toward one deeply disquieting aspect of the current economic recovery. It is that unemployment figures have not improved in concert with other indexes reflecting the business revival, or in the same degree that they improved during initial recovery from the recessions of 1948-50 and 1953-55. The FRB comment was contained in a staff study submitted to the Senate-House Economic Committee and came just prior to release of the Government's January jobless statistics—showing unemployment of

4.7 million, compared with 4.1 million in December.

There are some lessons to be learned from this relatively gloomy picture on employment. Continuing increases in labor costs through union-negotiated contracts for higher wage rates and steadily expanding fringe benefits prompted industry to do two things. One was to invest heavily, prior to the recession, in plant modernization and introduction of automation, with the result that productivity has increased in recent months without need for comparable rehiring of workers. The FRB points out, for example, that auto output last December was only 4 percent below December 1956, but that it was accomplished with 20 percent fewer production workers. Similarly, the Board suggests, such labor cost obligations as social security, vacation payments, tenure rights, and so on, have caused industry to be increasingly cautious about adding to its work force until long-term need is amply demonstrated.

If these are valid explanations for much of the slowness in reemployment organized labor itself should take a hard look at its pattern of ever-increasing demands and their impact on the overall job picture.

Anger, Sorrow, and Disgust Displayed in Hospital Morgue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the terrible loss of life in the ever-increasing highway accidents is causing consternation among our citizens in all sections of the country. The heartaches which result from these accidents are in most instances beyond description.

A very fine article appeared in the January 26 issue of the Shamokin News-Dispatch following a head-on crash which resulted in the death of four persons. This article, written by Staff Writer Harry Deitz, gives a heart-rending account which inspired the headline, "Anger, Sorrow, and Disgust Displayed in Hospital Morgue." I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include this article which might in some way contribute to serious reflection in our efforts to eliminate this unwarrantable loss of human life on the Nation's highways.

ANGER, SORROW, AND DISGUST DISPLAYED IN HOSPITAL MORGUE

(By Harry Deitz)

A veteran police officer turned away in disgust; a young nurse, her white uniform stained with blood, grimaced and a doctor looked stoically at the three bodies lying in the small morgue.

No one had to say what each was thinking—that another accident involving a teenage driver had taken its toll; that a short time before there was life in each of the three young bodies.

The doctor turned to make notes. "It's a darn shame," he mumbled, "that the State can't do something to stop tragedies like this."

In the far corner of the room, a relative looked at the contorted face of a lifeless

young girl. He shook his head affirmatively, identifying her as his niece. She was 18 years old.

Outside, a young husband walked down the hallway toward the closed door. His hand trembled as a police officer led him into the room. He took a long look at the bodies on two of the three stretchers. There was silence, followed by an outburst before the husband was led away for sedation.

Upstairs, a green light flashed on the switchboard and the operator plugged in one of the cords. "I'm afraid I have bad news for you" her voice trailed off to a choked whisper.

She turned back to three police officers standing near a desk. "You never get used to this," she said. "Every time it gets a little tougher." She fought back an outburst of emotion then turned to plug in another cord—"Sunbury Community Hospital."

The three victims in the morgue were identified. There were two young mothers and a teen-age girl. All three met death in the prime of life.

In an upstairs room, a team of white dressed nurses and doctors gathered around a bed in which a 15-year-old youth struggled to hold onto his life. A nurse entered the room carrying two pints of blood. The doctor quickly performed a tracheotomy. Two other nurses attempted to staunch the flow of blood from deep gashes. But the youth took a deep breath and then there was silence. The team of medical technicians watched for the next breath that never came.

On the first floor level, a mother and her daughter paced the hallway. The mother looked toward a screened off room. The daughter said a prayer in low but audible tones "please God don't let my brother die." Inside the room another team of medical staff members was doing all that was humanly possible to spare the life of a 19-year-old boy.

A police officer, who has seen many tragedies like this, talked to the county coroner. Other officers were busy assembling notes. A news reporter stood in the background analyzing the one moment of carelessness that was responsible.

Only 3 hours earlier, there were five people enjoying life at its best. Two young mothers enroute to a happy home. Three teenagers were enjoying a ride. But the moment of carelessness turned the scene into morbid sorrow.

On the crest of a hill, one car went over the dividing line. There was a scream as rubber tires skidded over the highway. A loud crash followed and fate had stepped into the picture. Another car came over the hill and its driver stared at the wrecked sedans. "Oh my God," he uttered. Soon the area was a beehive of activity, flashing red lights, screaming sirens of ambulances, and the voice of police directing traffic.

Seven teenagers were among the spectators. Their reaction was typical of those who rarely see tragedy or disaster. A young girl turned up the collar of her jacket and shuddered as she inspected the bloodstained seats, the twisted metal, and the remains of what once had been two modern cars. Her boy friend and two other companions observed the gruesome picture.

"Boy, that sure is an accident," the one youth said as the group passed a photographer enroute to their car. "It sort of scares you."

No sooner had the group entered the sedan when the starter turned the motor over. There was a loud roar as the car zoomed away at high speed and out of sight.

An older spectator shook his head and said: "Maybe I'm old-fashioned, but if I had anything to say about it, the age limit on licenses would be increased to 21. It's always the innocent ones that pay for the mistakes of these wild kids."

Peacetime Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorials:

[From the Enosburg Falls (Vt.) Standard, Dec. 11, 1958]

FIVE QUESTIONS ABOUT PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

1. Is the present law fair and equitable?

As the present law now operates, "more than one-half of all young men will never see any military service," writes John Graham in "The Universal Military Obligation" (1958), published by the Fund for the Republic. Graham noted that in early 1957, 2.3 million or 48 percent of the draft pool of about 3 million men were classified as physically or mentally unfit by the artificial standards of the Armed Forces. (Sturdy athletes have been deferred for minor physical defects.) An additional 1.4 million men were deferred by Executive order because they are fathers. Other deferments are granted to students, certain workers, conscientious objectors, and others.

The deferment policy often discriminates against the economically disadvantaged. Those who can afford higher education can be deferred often until they pass the age when they are likely to be taken. John Graham notes, "Husbands who can afford to have children young see no military service while those who cannot are drafted."

Prof. John K. Galbraith, of Harvard, has asserted that the draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer, who benefits by lower taxes, to the impecunious young draftee.

2. How does conscription affect young men?

When a draft board takes boys to serve at low pay for the convenience of other citizens, forces them to serve against their will for 2 years plus reserve duty, it is a serious matter for the persons involved. For most of them it means postponing or interrupting college or marriage plans or their first job. The very fact that they must be compelled to serve in a society in which others may work at jobs of their own choice makes it an interruption rather than a job.

August B. Hollingshead in a study entitled "Adjustment to Military Life" in the American Journal of Sociology, March 6, 1946, said:

"The perfectly trained soldier is one who has had his civilian initiative reduced to zero. In the process the self becomes identified with the institution and dependent upon it for direction and stimulation. The ideally adjusted soldier would be a military dependent who looked to the institution for all his personal, social, and emotional satisfaction. . . . For these reasons the recruit must be remade; as any old sergeant knows, 'a recruit is not worth a damn until he has been broken.'"

3. How does the draft affect the Nation?

Thirteen years ago Halford Hoskins wrote on "Universal Military Training and American Foreign Policy" in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Today his words have a prophetic ring, with military men in the highest councils of our Government, with the mili-

tary receiving by far the largest proportion of the Federal budget (over \$47 billion this year) and often being given more than they request by a compliant Congress, and with many businesses and universities working on military contracts.

"The results of 1 year's training will not greatly affect the body politic and even after 5 or 10 years no striking change in public outlook may be apparent. Nevertheless, in the course of a generation the effects will have become cumulative even if they have grown imperceptibly, * * * and military considerations may be expected to enter more and more into party politics, governmental policy, and economic and social life."

Conscription encourages reliance on military men and methods. In a remarkable article on "The Generals and the Cold War" in the New York Times, November 8, 1958, C. L. Sulzberger notes a global trend toward placing military men in positions of national leadership. "War, of course, makes generals, and generals make war. But it is probably also true that cold war makes generals into politicians. Where does such philosophy lead? Ultimately toward dangerous adventure or into stagnation."

4. Does conscription help education?

John Graham has pointed out that "uncertainties about the draft make it impossible for young men to plan ahead, and, as a result, discourage them from getting the advance training in the sciences or professions that the country is needing increasingly."

Those who enter ROTC as an alternative to the draft in order to stay in college or postpone induction must later serve on active duty. "Like all other forms of military service, the Reserve officers' active duty period represents a burdensome interruption in his professional training, one so burdensome that the intended professional education may never be resumed," wrote Walter Mills in "Individual Freedom and the Common Defense."

Compulsory ROTC is a form of conscription within the college community, and thus represents time taken away from subjects that are of real educational value. "Many institutions devote 20 percent of their curriculum to the military sciences. On the average, it is somewhat above 16 percent," wrote Benjamin Fine in 1953, and there is little reason to believe the situation has improved since then.

One of the gravest dangers of ROTC and compulsory military training in general is the influence they have on the minds of those trained and hence on the Nation's foreign and domestic policies. In military training, as if to justify it in the first place, suspicion of enemies and the role of physical and military forces are magnified. Except among the rare few who react against such ideas there is a tendency to discount the role of political, economic and other processes of change unless they are backed by superior military might.

5. Do all political leaders and military men believe conscription is essential?

Those concerned with military strength, who are also opposed to conscription today argue that it is inefficient; it cannot accomplish the end for which it was adopted. They speak of a mobile, technically trained and highly professional force.

"Every young man who has served in our Armed Forces knows the incredible waste of our present system of forced but short-term service. He knows the money that could be saved, the new efficiency that could result from a volunteer system * * * we need more and more today a type of military personnel—experienced and professional—which our present draft system does not give us," said Adlai Stevenson on October 18, 1956.

The Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation

headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric, in its May 1957 report supported this conclusion. Cordiner said after talking to hundreds of enlisted men, "I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who don't stay." The accident rate is so high as a result of inexperienced men manning intricate weapons or equipment that the Armed Forces estimate that close to \$5 billion worth of equipment is not now operable.

In one attempt to remedy the problem Congress last year passed legislation increasing military pay. A general or admiral received an increase of \$424 a month; a colonel, \$148 a month; and a major, \$58 a month. A private first class earning less than \$100 a month previously, during his first 2 years of service would get only \$3 a month increase. Congress and the Pentagon have thus far pursued a policy of granting large increases to officers who aren't drafted and keeping the pay of enlisted men so low it is necessary to draft them.

On November 19, Neil H. McElroy, Secretary of Defense, ordered a 70,000 cut in the Armed Forces by June 30, 1959. Even then the United States will have 2,525,000 men under arms. The draft call for January is 9,000, or 2,000 fewer than in recent months.

Great Britain has decided to discontinue conscription after 1960—but as a part of an increasing reliance upon nuclear weapons.

[From the Enosburg Falls (Vt.) Standard, Dec. 18, 1958]

PEACETIME DRAFT IN 1959

Congressman-elect WILLIAM MEYER will join the growing group in Congress who will work for a return to voluntary service and an end to peacetime conscription. In his campaign he told Vermonters that the draft today is uneconomic, undemocratic and poor military policy. With Congress coming up and in the light of MEYER's election and a definite public change of attitude, a closer look at this question is in order.

TIME TO TAKE A NEW LOOK

The law presently in effect was extended 4 years in 1955 by a voice vote in the Senate and a vote of 394 to 4 in the House. Since this overwhelming vote was taken a number of changes have occurred. The use of military methods in an ideological struggle has been increasingly questioned. An era characterized by the rise of Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY has passed. More and more the catastrophic nature of nuclear war is recognized. Presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson in 1956 campaigned for an end to the draft "in the foreseeable future."

An article by Fletcher Knebel "The Fight To Kill the Draft" in Look magazine, May 27, 1958, presented the case for ending conscription and added, "A curious fact about the draft is that Americans have accepted it so placidly in recent years. Once we hated the draft with a passion."

Certainly the American people have been conditioned to accept it as a defense measure along with the terrible weapons to mass destruction. For years we have been told that the only language the Communists will understand is force. Thus, conscription and nuclear weapons symbolize our posture of strength and our unwillingness to meet world problems on a much different level of negotiation, reconciliation, worldwide disarmament, and the development of world law.

Today, however, as Knebel points out "doubts about it [the draft] have arisen" in the Pentagon and the challenge to compulsory service will grow in volume.

A majority of those present and voting at the Fifth World Order Conference, called by the National Council of Churches in Cleveland, Ohio, voted on November 21 against continuation of the draft.

[From the Enosburg Falls (Vt.) Standard, Jan. 8, 1959]

WHAT ARE THE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PEACETIME DRAFT

Proponents of a huge Military Establishment argue that weakness invites aggression, and that world peace can only be assured by emphasis on military strength. They also argue that the Nation must be prepared to fight a limited nuclear war, with the unlikely expectation that the war will remain "limited" in the heat of atomic battle.

As Americans we cherish liberty and freedom and want the rest of the world to share it and enjoy it. We have a positive duty to defend and to nourish the ideals that have made our people and Nation great. But our greatness does not rest on military regimentation or strength.

There is no simple or easy answer, nor any course that does not involve risk. But this much seems certain: communism in a revolutionary world can only be met by better ideas; by a sacrificial program of sharing our experience and resources and ideals and lives with the under-privileged two-thirds of the human race. People cannot be weaned away from communism in the Orient, the Middle East, Latin America and Africa by bayonets—only by brotherhood and better ideas, and the demonstration that democracy has a better answer for their needs than totalitarianism.

The fundamental problem of security must be met through the development of the United Nations, the use of its moral and political authority for the resolving of disputes, and by far-reaching steps toward universal disarmament. The eyes and prayers of many of the world's people are focused now on the diplomats meeting at Geneva who are attempting to work out an agreement to end nuclear weapons tests.

Instead of conscripting young men into involuntary military service, the Government should be encouraging young men and women to train for constructive service to mankind. We need a comprehensive Federal scholarship program whose recipients would form a trained manpower reserve. They would serve overseas or at home as teachers or technicians in lieu of military service. We need leadership and programs to stimulate and capture the imagination of young people and offer them a constructive alternative to sterile, tedious and disruptive military duty.

The United States has an opportunity to exert real world leadership with regard to conscription. Discontinuation of the draft here could be followed by American efforts for the international abolition of conscription. In the midst of a prolonged cold war, it is hard for either side to convince the other that it really wants peace without some clear-cut affirmative acts for peace. Ending the peacetime draft could ease international tensions, promote political settlements and disarmament agreements, and release men and resources to help concentrate on the real needs of the world's people.

The Soviet's Conduct—Vicious, Barbaric, and Warlike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 8, the editorial writer of the Long Beach Independent-Press-Tele-

gram performed a distinct public service in listing many of the acts of uncivilized conduct committed by the Soviets in recent years.

It well serves as a reminder to those amongst us who may be deluded by Communist "peace" propaganda and the daily doses of hypocrisy served up by Soviet delegates to such affairs in Geneva as the nuclear-test-ban talks and surprise-attack talks.

The editorial specifically makes the point of speciousness as regard to certain arguments that alleged "weakening of our defense posture" has anything to do with the murder of 17 U.S. airmen September 2, 1958, by the U.S.S.R.

The following is the text of the editorial written by Mr. Harry Karns:

THEY'VE DONE IT FOR YEARS

Why the sudden sense of shock and indignation?

The tape recording of the voices of Russian jet pilots who shot down an unarmed U.S. transport plane merely details something that has been going on for years.

The history of Soviet-American relations over the past decade contains a long, sad series of vicious, barbaric, and warlike actions against our airplanes, our civilians, and our soldiers.

These incidents, ranging from abduction to murder, strangely punctuate the stream of Soviet declarations of friendship and peace. Senators SRMINGTON and JACKSON seem to think that the attack on the transport is the outgrowth of recent "weakening of our defense posture."

That view is illogical, since the defense posture has become steadily stronger through the years, and in view of the fact that such incidents have been happening over a long period of time.

The attack on the transport is the outgrowth of a longstanding policy of uncivilized conduct.

Space doesn't permit the listing of all the acts of Soviet barbarism. But here are a few of the highlights:

Soviet fighter planes shot down a U.S. Navy Privateer with 10 persons aboard in the Baltic on April 8, 1950.

Soviet planes shot down a U.S. weather plane over the sea of Japan, November 6, 1951.

A Soviet fighter forced a U.S. C-47 down, and the crewmembers were held in Hungary, tried, and ransomed for \$123,605.

Soviet planes attacked and shot down a B-29 with a crew of eight over Hokkaido, Japan, October 7, 1952.

Soviet MIG's shot down an F-84 in Germany in March 1953.

Soviet planes attacked a B-50 over international waters off Kamchatka on March 15, 1953.

Soviet fighters downed an RB-50 with a crew of 17 over international waters of the Sea of Japan on July 29, 1953.

Soviet MIG's shot down a Navy P2V, killing 1 of 10 crewmembers.

Soviet MIG's shot down a U.S. B-29 November 7, 1954.

Soviet planes shot down a U.S. Navy patrol plane over the Bering Sea on June 23, 1955.

East German Communists imprisoned nine U.S. Army men whose helicopter had made a forced landing in satellite territory in June 1958.

Soviet fighter planes forced down a U.S. plane in June 1958.

Soviet jet fighters shot down a C-130 U.S. transport September 2, 1958.

The record shows that Soviet attacks on U.S. property and personnel are routine.

And now Mr. Khrushchev would like Mr. Eisenhower to come to Moscow for a friendly chat.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Association of American Colleges, the Council for Financial Aid to Education, and the National Planning Association Have Called for Increased Private Support of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, at various times in recent years many leading nationwide organizations have called for increased private giving to education. Among these highly respected and substantial groups are the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Association of American Colleges, the Council for Financial Aid to Education, and the National Planning Association.

Recently, I introduced a bill, H.R. 2440, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education.

Most corporations and individuals conspicuously fail to contribute to education the sums permitted under the Internal Revenue Code. In fact, it is the failure of the present tax laws to realize the large sums necessary for education which the Congress intended when it wrote these acts which led to the development of H.R. 2440 and other measures similar to it which are designed to correct the present situation.

Dr. Paul E. Klopsteg, distinguished president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, wrote me on January 28, 1959, that my bill, H.R. 2440, "could become one of the most important pieces of legislation in the interest of preserving the integrity and independence of our colleges and universities that has ever been passed." Clearly, if our colleges and universities are not adequately assisted in obtaining the funds without which their continued existence will be impossible, then the integrity and independence of these institutions will be ended. Both increased Federal aid and private giving is of absolute importance if our colleges and universities are to serve our growing needs as our country expands.

H.R. 2440 would allow a taxpayer a credit against income tax for charitable contributions made to institutions of higher education. In the case of an individual taxpayer, the limit on this credit would be the same as the present limit on the deduction for charitable contributions. H.R. 2440 would not give him a tax benefit with respect to more contributions than he may now include for deduction purposes alone; he may elect to treat a charitable contribution—if it is to an educational institution—as a

credit rather than as a deduction, but the total of credit plus deduction is no greater than the present allowable total of deductions.

In the case of a corporate taxpayer, the limit on this credit would be increased from 5 percent to 10 percent of taxable income—where the percentage-of-taxable-income method of computing the limit is used—and this credit would be in addition to the deduction presently allowed for charitable contributions generally; a corporation may elect to treat charitable contributions to educational institutions as credits rather than as deductions—up to 10 percent—without cutting into the amount of such contributions—along with other types of charitable contributions—which may be allowed as deductions. Of course, the same contribution cannot be counted as a credit and a deduction.

Under H.R. 2440 the taxpayer would be allowed a 2-year carryover on the credit just as he is presently allowed a 2-year carryover for deduction purposes. The Secretary of the Treasury would be directed to prescribe regulations governing the time and manner of making the election to treat a contribution as a credit rather than a deduction and imposing conditions to insure the effective correlation of the new credit section with the existing deduction provisions.

I include here a letter I have received from Dr. Paul E. Klopsteg, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the text of my bill, H.R. 2440:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE,
Glenview, Ill., February 3, 1959.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much for your letter of January 30.

As you may know, I have been either directly active in or associated with higher education throughout my career. Having been on the staff of a large State university and a large private university, and on the board of trustees of a small liberal arts college, I am familiar with the problems, so many of which could be solved with more money that the institution can truly call its own.

I have literally lived with the question of how the flow of undesignated funds from many donors could be stimulated, over a period of more than 5 years. For more years than that, I had been aware of the inevitable pressure that would come upon the colleges and universities as a result of the rapid increase in the number of young people of college age, and that pressure is now upon them. To avoid operating deficits, they must either limit their enrollments, or obtain more operating funds.

Some private institutions are already limiting enrollments, which is bound to throw increasing loads on the State and municipally supported institutions, largely to their detriment. What is needed is clearly the additional "own" money to prevent deficits as enrollments increase. The source must be one of two possible ones: either Government, or private. As you know better than I, the pressure on Government for more and more subsidy for higher education is increasing each year, and understandably so. Private individuals have reached a ceiling in their charitable giving, as expressed in percent of adjusted gross income of taxpayers. As

shown in the study sponsored by AAAS, this percentage has remained close to 4.2 for a number of years, this being the average for those itemizing their gifts. The question is how to break through the ceiling. I believe it can be done, and I believe H.R. 2440 can be the instrument for doing so.

When I published the general plan for equalizing cost of giving in Science, I had requests for 1,800 reprints, out of an original circulation of about 45,000 copies. It indicated exceptional interest in the problem and possible solutions. Great interest was also expressed by many college and university presidents with whom I spoke about it, and the usual comment was, "This is exactly what is needed. You must keep on pushing it. Of course one individual isn't in position to push such a matter very far or very fast. It was not until AAAS, an organization without vested interest in the results, but of course interested in better education and research in colleges and universities, took enough interest to have the study made that things began to move off dead center. And H.R. 2440 expresses succinctly how the job needs to be done."

As I see it, either we have no concern for the future, since "Uncle Sugar" is always available to help, or we do something to make this help unnecessary. If we have strong convictions, from experience, that much of the strength of an institution comes from self-reliance, something must be done to spark and foster self-reliance in the administration of the institutions. Up to now I haven't seen a better method than that proposed in H.R. 2440, nor has anyone within my knowledge come up with anything better. When someone tells me that it isn't the answer to the problem, that it won't work, that the Congress won't pass it, I have one reply: "Then you have tossed yourself a challenge to improve on it, because a way must be found to channel more private funds into the institutions."

I believe that most of the pros and cons are covered in my article in Science for November 16, 1956. If you would like to use any part of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a time you consider to be appropriate, I am sure that there will be every cooperation from AAAS to facilitate this.

During the next few months I shall be making a number of public addresses in which I shall discuss the subject broadly, and of course will refer to H.R. 2440 in the terms I used in my letter of January 28, quoted in yours of the 30th.

All other bills which I have seen, intended to aid higher education or research, seem to me to skate around the edges of the problem, and don't get at the heart of it. Yours does get to the root of the problem, and provides means for a solution which will automatically remain a solution with increasing enrollments; for it potentially breaks through the barrier (4.2 percent of adjusted gross income) and, provided taxpayers are properly informed, will substantially increase the percentage of increasing incomes.

You refer to the desirability of cosponsorship, which seems to me most important. Were I in Washington before March, I would be glad to help further in finding other Members who might also introduce the bill. I hope there are tried methods by which this can come about.

You may count on whatever help I can give, both personally and through organizations such as AAAS.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL E. KLOPSTEG,
President.

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—At the election of the taxpayer there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter the amount determined under this section.

"(b) INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, the amount allowable as a credit under this section shall be whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(1) the amount determined by multiplying—

"(A) the amount of charitable contributions to institutions of higher education, by

"(B) the maximum rate of tax imposed for the taxable year by section 1(a), or

"(2) (A) in the case of any individual who has elected to take the standard deduction provided by section 141 or to pay the optional tax imposed by section 3, 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, or

"(B) in the case of any other such taxpayer, 15 percent of his adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172.

"(c) CORPORATIONS.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a corporation, the amount allowable as a credit under this section shall be whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(A) the amount determined by multiplying—

"(i) the amount of charitable contributions to institutions of higher education, by

"(ii) the percentage which equals the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11 for the taxable year, or

"(B) 10 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income, computed without regard to—

"(i) section 170,

"(ii) part VIII of subchapter B (except section 248),

"(iii) any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, and

"(iv) section 922 (special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations).

"(2) CORPORATIONS ON ACCRUAL BASIS.—In the case of a corporation reporting its taxable income on the accrual basis, if—

"(A) the board of directors authorizes a charitable contribution to an institution of higher education during any taxable year, and

"(B) payment of such contribution is made after the close of such taxable year and on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year,

then the taxpayer may elect to treat such contribution as paid during such taxable year.

"(3) CARRYOVER OF CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any contribution made by a corporation in the taxable year which, but for the limitation of paragraph (1)(B), would be

taken into account in computing the credit under this section, shall (at the election of the taxpayer made for the taxable year) be taken into account in computing the credit under this section in each of the two succeeding taxable years, but only to the extent of the lesser of the two following amounts:

"(A) the excess of the amount of charitable contributions to institutions of higher education which may be taken into account in computing the credit under this section under the limitation in paragraph (1)(B) over the amount of the charitable contributions to institutions of higher education made in such year; and

"(B) in the case of the first succeeding taxable year, the amount of such excess contribution, and in the case of the second succeeding taxable year, the portion of such excess contribution not taken into account in the first succeeding taxable year.

"(d) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given to such term by section 103 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) AMOUNTS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The determination of whether or not a charitable contribution to an institution of higher education may be taken into account under this section, and the amount thereof, shall be made under section 170; except that in the case of an individual any such determination shall be made without regard to any election to take the standard deduction provided by section 141, or to pay the optional tax provided by section 3.

"(2) CORRELATION WITH SECTION 170.—No amount taken into account under this section shall be allowable as a deduction under section 170. Any amount taken into account under this section shall be taken into account in computing the limitations provided in section 170(b)(1) (but not those provided in section 170(b)(2)). For purposes of provisions of law relating to amounts allowable as a deduction under section 170, any amount taken into account for purposes of this section shall be treated as an amount allowable under section 170; and any reference in any provision of law to a specific provision of section 170 shall, where appropriate, be treated as including a reference to the corresponding provision of section 39. An amount shall be treated as taken into account for purposes of this section only to the extent that, but for such amount, the amount allowable as a credit under this section for any taxable year would be decreased.

"(3) CREDIT NOT TO RESULT IN REFUNDS.—The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the tax imposed by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowed by this part (other than this section and section 31).

"(4) ELECTIONS.—Any election provided by this section may be made only at such time, in such manner, and subject to such conditions designed to insure the effective correlation of this section with section 170, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe."

"(b) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education."

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 170(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable, etc., contribu-

tions and gifts) is amended to read as follows: "A charitable contribution shall be allowable as a deduction (or taken into account in computing the credit under section 39) only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate." (b) Section 170(c) of such Code is amended by striking out "For purposes of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "For purposes of this section and section 39".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to charitable contributions made (within the meaning of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) during taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Moral Issue: Not Segregation Versus Integration, but the Constitution Versus Usurpers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include an article by Hamilton A. Long entitled "The Moral Issue: Not Segregation Versus Integration, But the Constitution Versus Usurpers," and a review of Mr. Long's book, "Usurpers—Foes of Free Man," which appeared in the American Bar Association Journal:

THE MORAL ISSUE: NOT SEGREGATION VERSUS INTEGRATION, BUT THE CONSTITUTION VERSUS USURPERS

My 1957 brochure "Usurpers—Foes of Free Man" deals with the basic constitutional crisis started in 1937 by the Supreme Court (supporting usurpation by President and Congress commencing in 1933) by flouting the Constitution's true meaning regarding Federal power limits. That is, what its framers and adopters intended to be the meaning, as initially defined by the Court in keeping with that controlling intent. This applies to amendments also. The brochure does not discuss post-1937 cases.

The Supreme Court's decision is not the law of the land, even though in a case the decision may soundly define the meaning of particular words of the Constitution. It is the Constitution which remains the supreme law of the land (article VI), while the Court's decision and orders control only the parties to the case. The Court has no power to make general rules binding upon the people and governments of the States, nor to amend the Constitution.

The Supreme Court's decisions and orders in conflict with the Constitution do not even exist in the eyes of the Constitution; they are null and void, and they must be treated accordingly by all who are loyal to the Constitution, to the Republic (which depends for existence on a stable Constitution) and to the people's unalienable rights. The same is true regarding anti-Constitution acts, orders, and pronouncements of other officials, notably Federal judges on lower courts and the President and his subordinates, as well as acts of Congress.

The great moral issue today, therefore, is not segregation versus integration in the schools; it is, instead, the issue of the sovereign people and their Constitution versus defaulting public trustees as oath-breaking usurpers. In other words, shall the people and their State governments defend their

constitutional rights, or bow down before an anti-Constitution elite enforcing rule-by-man? Shall we have limited government, and rule-by-law under the Constitution, or usurpers supreme with unlimited power? Shall the Republic endure, or shall we allow its destruction by the weapon customarily used to this end: usurpation. (Washington's Farewell Address.)

In the famous Dred Scott case in 1856, the Supreme Court declared that sympathy for the slaves could not justify the Court's saying the Constitution meant something different from what it was originally intended to mean by the framers and adopters. Likewise today, the prohibition against the Federal Government's having power to control education, schools (so as to be able to decree and enforce integration) under the Constitution, as amended, as defined initially by the Supreme Court in this respect, must be upheld. All morality requires this; the moral leaders (such as the clergy) and idealists in general, above all others, must support this conclusion. Otherwise they are guilty of debasing the morality and ideals they profess to uphold through subscribing in effect to the antimoral precept that the end justifies the means, which spells intellectual and moral bankruptcy. If change be needed, as the people see it, they can make it, by amendment.

As to Federal usurpation of power concerning the schools of a State, its government (particularly its legislature, with controlling power) must therefore take a firm stand as follows (correcting past errors accordingly): (1) Declare all decisions and orders, judicial and executive, in conflict with the original meaning of the Constitution, as initially defined by the Supreme Court, to be null and void and that they must and will be treated accordingly. (2) Stop all evasive actions and programs, designed to get around Federal court decisions, because unnecessary and such evasion implies the decisions have constitutional validity—not so. (3) Reject suggestions which would imply that the usurpers have been correct—for instance, to have a new amendment give the States what they already possess under the Constitution: Exclusive power over education, schools. (4) Proclaim, and pass binding laws accordingly, that the State and all subordinate governments and all citizens must and will respect the Constitutions of the United States and of the State—all officials being sworn to uphold them, not decisions of usurper judges in conflict with the constitutions; all in keeping with the foregoing considerations. (5) Require by law that all officials, from the Governor down, act accordingly: (a) To oppose any troops used by Federal usurpers, make full use of the State militia (over which only the Governor, not the President, has control in peacetime, lacking a national emergency duly declared in keeping with laws of Congress), as contemplated by the framers and adopters. (The Federalist, Nos. 28 by Hamilton and 46 by Madison, for instance); (b) to oppose usurpers' force by way of a number of deputy U.S. marshals, make use of the State police and, in each county, a sheriff's posse (posse comitatus) composed of specially deputized citizens in any needed quantity with suitable arms. All in defense of the Constitutions of both Nation and State, of the rights of the people and the State thereunder and, in effect, in defense of the rights of all of the American people and all of the States.

"USURPERS—FOES OF FREE MAN"—BY HAMILTON A. LONG—BOOK REVIEW
(By M. T. Phelps)

Washington said in his farewell address: "If in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the

way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use itself can at any time yield."

Jefferson wrote in 1823:

"There is no danger I apprehend so much as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless, and therefore unalarming, instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

These classical texts may be said to form the takeoff points of this brochure by Mr. Hamilton Long, a member of the bar of the State of New York. This profound constitutional study is not only intriguing and thought provoking, but is supported by documented evidence which makes the conclusions of the author irrefutable. The brochure is extremely timely, in that it points out the evils of the day which are transforming the Federal Government into a government of men instead of a government of laws; into a centralized government of unlimited powers instead of a decentralized government with definite limited powers which the provisions of the Federal Constitution clearly indicated the framers intended it to be, and which the members of State conventions ratifying it and the people whom they represented understood it to be. Mr. Long has presented a challenge to every American citizen who believes in a republican form of government under the Constitution and who desires to preserve our American way of life: Man-over-State.

He shows beyond all reasonable doubt that the framers of the Federal Constitution intended the central government to be vested with limited powers—a concept never before adopted by any other people in the history of civilization as their governmental philosophy. His main thesis as to their intent is as follows: The fundamental principles upon which this philosophy was conceived was that man was endowed with "unalienable rights," God-given rights at birth and "that man creates government as his tools in order to secure these rights"; that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, the people; that to preserve these rights the powers of government must be circumscribed with definite limitations and that public officials must always be subservient to the will of the people; that the creature should never become the master of the creator. These convictions were deeply seated in the minds of the framers of the Federal Constitution as the result of their comprehensive knowledge of the history of governments in the past and of their own experiences with the tyranny of British rule under the colonial regime in America and oppressive measures adopted by legislatures in some of the States after 1776 during the existence of the confederation of States.

From this breadth of knowledge and wealth of experience they were thoroughly convinced, he says, that the safety and liberties of the people under the Government they were forming could only be preserved by providing in the organic law itself for adequate curbs and safeguards against the abuse of power by those entrusted with its administration; that jealousy rather than confidence must be the polar star in forming this new Government; that there must be both a limitation of its duties and a limitation of power to be exercised in performance of those duties.

These questions, the author asserts, were thoroughly explored at that time and it was the fear of the people that the Constitution as originally adopted did not fully protect them from an unwarranted restraint of their individual liberties by the Federal Government.

The coordinate branches of the Federal Government were designed to serve as checks and balances against each other and the rights reserved to the States and to the people were to serve as a safeguard against the encroachment of the central government upon individual liberties of the citizens of the various States. It was not enough, in the opinion of the people as expressed by their representatives thereafter, to create checks and balances between the coordinate branches of the Federal Government but if the goal uppermost in their minds, i.e., to keep the government, created by them, decentralized in the future it must be realized, if at all, by expressly reserving to the States and to the people all powers of sovereignty not expressly or by necessary implication granted to the central government under the provisions of the organic law. The first 10 amendments to the Constitution adopted soon after its ratification were designed to achieve that result.

The author declares, in substance, that so long as the Supreme Court of the United States adhered to the cardinal rules of interpretation of the Constitution and of statutory enactments a proper balance was maintained between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government and between the States and the central government, thus safeguarding the individual liberties of the citizens of the respective States of the Union. But when the Court no longer looks to the intent and purposes of the framers and adopters of the Constitution to determine its meaning, as it ceased to do in 1937, it aided usurpation of the powers reserved to the States as a check against centralization of power in the Federal Government which constituted the principal mechanism of the Constitution upon which the framers of that document relied to preserve to the people a definite limitation upon the powers of the Central Government.

One certainly does not have to be either a statesman, a lawyer, a judge, or an intellectual to observe and to realize that by the decisions of the Supreme Court since 1937 the powers of the Federal Government have been declared to be broadened to encompass fields of activity previously disclaimed and repudiated by the courts and by all the leading statesmen and students of government for 150 years and consequently have left only a skeleton of the rights reserved to the people and to the States. Mr. Long, in his brochure, has made this clear to the American people. This is positive evidence to all of us of the processes of national decay and the end of individual liberties in the United States.

The author in his review of the constitutional cases of the Court prior to 1937, upon which the majority of the Court relied as supporting the policy of what he terms "reverse interpretation," leads him to the opposite conclusion reached by the Court. In no instance, he declares, prior to 1937, did the Court expressly, deliberately, and voluntarily reverse a long line of consistent decisions involving the meaning of the Constitution as intended by the framers and adopters of that document. He states that in a few cases in which a prior decision was overruled, the Court was in effect choosing, of necessity, between what had come to be conflicting lines of decisions. In so doing it adopted one line of cases and overruled the other because of the need of clarification. This action of the Court, he asserts, gave no support to its 1937 "reverse interpretation" policy.

The author claims that the single proceeding entitled "The Legal Tender Cases" (*Knox v. Lee and Parker v. Davis*, 79 U.S. (12 Wallace) 457 (1871) decided together overruling *Hepburn v. Griswold*, 75 U.S. (8 Wallace) 603, decided in 1870, really constituted the only case which lends any sup-

port whatever to the reverse interpretation policy of the Court commenced in 1937. He points out that Mr. Justice Strong, who wrote the opinion for the majority of the Legal Tender cases, explained at length that the *Hepburn* case was decided by a less number of judges than the law provided; that it was a 5-to-3 decision (due to a vacancy) and that the Court had not been accustomed to hearing a constitutional question in the absence of the full Court if it could be avoided. Mr. Justice Strong further stated that almost immediately after the *Hepburn* decision was handed down, the question of reconsidering it was discussed.

A reading of the opinion in the Legal Tender cases should convince the reader that the Court felt reluctant to overrule the *Hepburn* case, as Mr. Long contends. It is also significant to note that in overruling the *Hepburn* case not a single member of the Court receded from his position in that case. The 5-to-4 opinion in the Legal Tender cases was made possible by the resignation of one of the justices who held with the majority in the *Hepburn* case while his replacement and the newly appointed ninth member of the Court joined with the minority in the *Hepburn* case, thus constituting the majority in the Legal Tender cases. Mr. Long reminds his readers that Charles Evans Hughes, in his book entitled "The Supreme Court of the United States," published in 1928 before his reappointment to that Court as Chief Justice, criticized the Legal Tender cases overruling the *Hepburn* case the previous year, saying that it was destructive of the confidence of the people in the Court.

Mr. Long says the Court's present policy of reinterpreting the Constitution according to the will or whim of its members, in defiance of the consistent decisions of the Court for a century and a half based upon the intent of those who framed and ratified it, has already made a hollow shell of that document, to be changed again and again at will by the momentary majority of the members of the Court; that this policy has not only sanctioned usurpation of the reserved powers of the people and the States by the other two branches of the Federal Government, but the Court itself has become the prime usurper of those powers which he says has resulted in unconstitutional centralization of massive power in Washington in violation of the rights of the States, and of the people, reserved to them under the 10th amendment, and has opened wide the gates to socialism-communism, which he asserts is impossible under a decentralized government.

The unforgivable sin which Mr. Long ascribes to the Court is that by its policy of "reverse interpretation" it has assumed the function and is attempting to exercise the power to amend the Constitution of the United States, a function expressly reserved to the people under its provisions. It is Mr. Long's position that an opinion of the Supreme Court interpreting a provision of the Constitution is integrated into and becomes a part of the Constitution itself and that any different interpretation thereafter placed upon it must, to be valid, be by amendment in the manner provided in the Constitution. He contends its binding effect upon the Court is therefore based upon considerations more deeply rooted than upon the common law rule of stare decisis—which is not applicable in constitutional law. In other words, his position is, in effect, when the Court has once interpreted a provision of the Constitution, based upon full exploration of the intent of the framers, it has exhausted its jurisdiction and power, under our constitutional system, to consider it further except to enforce it as interpreted, leaving any change to the amendatory process of article V.

The Court prior to 1937 never expressly enunciated this as a principle of law but its history as gathered from its decisions accord-

ing to Mr. Long's research might well be interpreted to harmonize with his views, in which the writer of this review concurs after examining the authorities cited by him.

Consultation in the Agency-Client Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered at the Western Regional Conference of the American Public Welfare Association, on October 13, 1958, in Phoenix, Ariz., by Dr. Jacobus tenBroek, captioned "Consultation in the Agency-Client Relationship."

In addition to serving as head of the speech department of the University of California, located at Berkeley, Dr. tenBroek has for a number of years been the president of the National Federation of the Blind. I believe that his address is one of the most outstanding presentations I have ever read on the subject of agency-client relationship and the blind's right of consultation in the administration of programs which directly affect their welfare and their opportunities. This right of self-expression through organizations of the blind is enunciated in my bill, H.R. 14, which is now known throughout the country as the Kennedy-Baring bill. It would protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind. For convenient reference, I have taken the liberty of quoting it below. Thirty-eight Members have already introduced similar bills since January 7, 1959.

H.R. 14

A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the formulation, administration, and execution of programs for the aid and rehabilitation of the blind, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall to the fullest extent practicable consult and advise with authorized representatives of organizations of the blind; and shall, in developing and recommending policies and procedures to State agencies, take such steps as may be appropriate to encourage such agencies to consult with authorized representatives of organizations of the blind in the formulation, administration, and execution of my State program for the aid and rehabilitation of the blind to which Federal funds are contributed.

Sec. 2. No officer or employee of any Federal, State, or other agency concerned with the administration of any program for the aid or rehabilitation of the blind to which Federal funds have been contributed shall exert the influence of his office or position against the right of the blind to join organizations of the blind. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall adopt such regulations and shall condition Federal grants to State or other programs for the blind on such terms as will prevent the

exertion of any such influence against self-expression of the blind through organizations of the blind.

CONSULTATION IN THE AGENCY-CLIENT RELATIONSHIP

(An address delivered at the Western Regional Conference of the American Public Welfare Association, October 13, 1958, Phoenix, Ariz., by Jacobus tenBroek)

Perhaps no single subject in the large and expanding province of social welfare has received more attention or stirred more controversy in recent years than the perpetually vexed question of the proper relationship between the agency worker and the recipient of services. This is, of course, a healthy and constructive concern; for no aspect of welfare is more fundamental or far reaching. The client-worker relationship is both procedural and substantive in character, both immediately practical and theoretically profound. It has to do alike with human rights and professional responsibilities, with psychological conceptions and legal formulations, with rigorous scientific method and elusive moral valuation.

The continuous ferment among social workers on this issue undoubtedly reflects parallel cleavages and conflicts in other fields of social science, pure or applied—fields such as psychology and psychotherapy, sociology and sociometry, group dynamics, general semantics, human relations, public administration, political theory, and educational philosophy. These inter- and intra-disciplinary disputes have, of course, a variety of contents and discontents; but if there is a common thread which runs through all of them it is the classic antinomy of liberty and authority—the ancient problem of reconciling the rights and needs of the individual with the demands of public order, social security, and the general welfare.

Everyone who works in the welfare field—or in any of the social sciences, for that matter—is careful to make the standard obeisance to the dignity and rights of the client, and generally to affirm the libertarian values of the democratic creed. But it will not be news to members of this audience that there have been, and there are, more than a few currents of thought and action in social casework which operate to exaggerate the weakness and dependency of clients while exalting the power and the glory of the professional practitioner of the social worker's art. To name just a few: There is a tendency, not only to take responsibility for the "whole" client, but to take whole responsibility for him. There is the tendency to become "aggressive"—and to brag about it—in tracking down potential clients and administering services, however, unwelcome they may be. There is a tendency to regard all those subject to depriving circumstances as innately inferior if not incompetent. There is the tendency to perpetuate custodial and protective practices for groups of clients demonstrably capable of rehabilitation and release.

This list of negative and authoritarian procedures might be extended a good deal farther; but it is perhaps sufficient to underline the obvious point that the homage paid to democracy by some workers and administrators may be little more than a formal ritual betrayed by contrary assumptions and practices of a distinctly antidemocratic nature.

It is not, however, my purpose to rehearse or rehash any of the familiar theoretical disputes which have a bearing upon the relationship between welfare agencies and their clients. The field of social work is, after all, preeminently one of action—and it is with the fruits of theory in practical execution that we are all primarily concerned.

Over recent years it has become increasingly evident—and our discussion here today

is further positive testimony—that the numbers of groups and individuals in the welfare field have grown restive within the confines of traditional practice and have sought to strike new balances and find new common denominators in the agency-client relationship. I should like to call your attention to one such effort, which is currently the center of very warm controversy and which holds the promise of bringing about a wholly fresh and radically different approach to the relations of agency and client. This effort is embodied in a piece of pending national legislation known as the Kennedy-Baring bill—the provisions of which are incorporated in some 60 bills already introduced into Congress and likely to be the subject of committee hearings early next year. Although the measure deals explicitly with the rights of blind persons as citizens and welfare clients, the democratic principle which it expresses has, as I hope to demonstrate, much broader application. (Even if its significance were limited solely to this category of recipients, however, it would be important for social workers in all areas to recognize and ponder the political and professional issues which it poses).

The Kennedy-Baring bill has as its stated purpose "to protect the right of blind persons to self-expression through organizations of the blind." More specifically, the measure is designed (1) to provide for systematic consultation with organizations of the blind themselves by officials responsible for the administration of programs for the blind supported by Federal funds, and (2) to prevent such officials from interfering with the right of blind people to form or join associations of their own choosing.

In short, this legislation seeks to safeguard blind persons in their exercise of three elementary rights of citizenship: The right to organize, the right to speak for themselves, and the right to be heard.

It should be apparent even from this brief description that the Kennedy-Baring bill carries implications of the greatest significance for the agency-client relationship in the field of work for the blind, and indirectly for the broader field of welfare. The explicit extension to one specified clientele group of the "right to organize" presages modifications in the interaction of agency and client which may quite possibly be as far reaching in their own way as the changes in labor-management relations long since ushered in by the advent of trade unions and the principle of collective bargaining.

I would not wish to press the labor parallel too far. The blind are certainly not a single socioeconomic class, and their voluntary associations are not trade unions. Some of their most important problems, however, such as those which arise from the programs of vending stands and sheltered workshops, do bring together blind clients and social agencies in a direct confrontation of employer and employee. I shall have more to say about these economic relations later on; for the moment, the crucial point is that the Kennedy-Baring bill promises to introduce into the traditional agency-client relationship, at least with respect to the blind, something very like the principle of collective bargaining; or, to put it another way, it seeks to introduce a novel element of mutuality and equality by virtue of which advice and counsel would no longer flow all one way—from agency to client—but would become a genuinely reciprocal exchange: a transaction among equals to which both sides would contribute and from which each may derive instruction and advantage.

The right to organize, which this legislation seeks to safeguard in the case of the blind, is sufficiently well entrenched as a democratic principle to need little justification today. Freedom of association and assembly is enshrined alongside freedom of speech and expression among the guarantees

of the 1st and 14th amendments; moreover, it has been reinforced, beyond danger of effective assault, by a long succession of historic events and judicial decisions. As recently as June 30 of this year, the United States Supreme Court declared that "Effective advocacy of both public and private points of view, particularly controversial ones, is undeniably enhanced by group association, as this Court has more than once recognized by remarking upon the close nexus between the freedoms of speech and assembly. It is beyond debate that freedom to engage in association for the advancement of beliefs and ideas is an inseparable aspect of the 'liberty' assured by the due-process clause of the 14th amendment, which embraces freedom of speech."

It may be, however, that what I have referred to as the "right to be heard"—which may be expressed in constitutional terms as the right of petition, in administrative terms as the right of consultation, and in quasi-judicial terms as the right of appeal in a fair-hearing process—is not quite so self-evident. At the level of the caseworker and of the fair-hearing appeal, this right is predominantly but not exclusively an individual right; at the constitutional, congressional and administrative levels, it is predominantly (but not exclusively) a right which in practice can only be exercised collectively. Because this "right to be heard" is less a part of our common language and accepted belief than the right to speak and the right to organize, let me take a moment to spell out what I take to be its indispensable function in the governmental process.

Despite its somewhat less than universal recognition, few principles of democratic government and public administration are in fact more firmly established or more widely practiced than this principle of the right to be heard—taken to mean the right of citizen groups sharing a common interest to be consulted in the formulation and execution of programs directly affecting them. The literature of public administration is replete with affirmations of the principle. A typical comment is that of Avery Leiserson: "There are always either formal or informal relationships between group organizations and official bureaucracies. Furthermore, it is perfectly clear that in the sense of the right to be heard, to be consulted, and to be informed in advance of the tentative basis of emerging policy determination, group participation is a fundamental feature of democratic legislation and administration." Another well-known authority, David B. Truman, has pointed out that the fundamental "rules of the game" which operate to preserve the public interest in the democratic process "prescribe that individuals and groups likely to be affected should be consulted before governmental action is taken." Indeed, he continues, "Not only is the requirement of consultation likely to be more or less automatically observed by administrative agencies in order to maximize support; the obligation is frequently explicitly written into particular authorizing statutes or into laws of general application, such as the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946."

The principle of group representation and consultation finds its most direct expression in the structure of government whenever an agency is created to serve a particular category of citizens or to promote the welfare of a group sharing common needs and interests. These are the so-called clientele agencies, of which probably the best known examples are the Veterans' Administration, and the Office of Indian Affairs. Moreover, even where public agencies are organized along functional rather than clientele lines, as Professor Leiserson has noted, "a function may be so defined that, in effect, it is restricted to a major industrial or economic group." (Examples of this would be the

Federal Reserve System, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission).

In a broader sense, at least three of the major departments of the Federal Government may be classified as clientele departments: namely, those of Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce. The main point concerning all such agencies and departments is that they have institutionalized the principle of direct consultation with those citizen groups primarily affected by their work. It should be emphasized that this principle of direct consultation is wholly distinct from other devices which may from time to time be adopted by the agency to obtain the opinion of the broader public or of interested non-clientele groups such as scholarly or professional societies. Thus the principle of client consultation within the Department of Agriculture, for example, means consulting regularly and systematically with organized groups of farmers—although the department may also seek the advice of academic specialists or other nonfarm experts. Similarly, the Departments of Labor and of Commerce have respectively developed both formal and informal methods of consultation with labor unions and trade associations, chambers of commerce and other business groups. In short, the principle of consultation—the right to be heard—means consultation first and foremost with the particular groups directly affected—not with external individuals or agencies, in or out of Government, however closely associated or professionally knowledgeable.

It is no longer a live issue whether administrative agencies should be delegated the power to make rules binding upon the groups affected by them; they have and should have the power. The issue today is rather that of rendering bureaucracy responsible and democratic. It is in this area of democratizing public administration that the role of consultation is most significant. For this function is not, and in the nature of things cannot be, adequately discharged by the formal processes of legislative oversight, executive supervision, and judicial review—which at best can only erect overall standards of regulation and make intermittent checks upon performance, or, in the case of the courts, review what has happened in the light of a negative power.

The direct responsiveness which is owed by administrative agencies to the client groups primarily affected by their policies has been convincingly shown in a widely cited article by Profs. Arthur A. Maass and Laurence I. Radway, of Harvard University. A major precept in their assessment of administrative responsibility is that "an administrative agency should be responsible to (private) groups so far as necessary to equalize opportunities for safeguarding interests, to acquire specialized knowledge, and to secure consent for its own program. This growing tendency for interest groups to participate in the formulation and execution of policy, irrespective of legislative provision, can be supported on at least three grounds: first, that such group representation is desirable to equalize opportunities for protecting and promoting respective interests; second, that the preparation of detailed regulations on complicated matters requires exact knowledge which even the best informed official may not possess and which interest groups can supply; third, that group participation in policy decisions makes possible the winning of consent for the agency's program."

In fine, the principle of consultation—the right of citizen groups to be heard—is no less serviceable to the democratic process than its companion rights of speech and association. After all, no degree of organization and no amount of speech are of any avail if no one is listening. The right to be heard is no more than the power of effective

speech in matters of direct and vital concern—the right of access to the agencies of representative government.

To many in this audience the foregoing discussion of the right to be heard may seem to be only a superfluous demonstration of the obvious. But it is not, I can assure you, always so regarded; and the right itself is often deliberately disregarded in the formal relations between welfare agencies, both in and out of government, and their various client groups. There is not now, and there has never been any regularized or systematic consultation with representative organizations of the blind by those agencies of the Federal Government—notably the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Social Security Administration—charged with the provision of services to the blind. To be sure, these Federal agencies do indeed consult regularly and systematically with professional agencies and with State welfare officers, and usually take the position that client groups should do their consulting on the State level, since it is the State agencies which collect and disburse Federal funds. But aside from the fact that these funds are for the benefit of clients rather than administrators, it is obvious that policy for these programs is made in Washington and that it is in Washington no less than in the States and counties, that group consultation can have policy significance and fruitful results. Nor is the absence of consultative machinery noticeably improved with respect to other groups of the physically handicapped, or for that matter with respect to most categories of aid recipients (the organized veterans representing, of course, the most formidable and rule-proving exception). When we turn from public programs to the private agencies, the degree of recognition given to the right of clients to be consulted in the formulation of policy is still more conspicuous by its rarity. Here the rule would almost seem to be: Clients should be overheard but not heard.

That wisecrack may in fact contain more truth than humor. I have described the principle of consultation as a democratic right of citizens; but the working relationship of the welfare agency and the client of services is not often thought of as a democratic process in which rights exist on both sides of the table. The analogies most commonly used among social workers are those of the religious confessional, the psychiatric interview, or the medical consultation. More than a few professionals blandly accept without much struggle of conscience what they take to be the inherent and inescapable authoritarianism of the agency-client relationship. Witness, for example, this comment by the editor of a national journal for workers with the blind:

"Principally the concern about agency-client relationships has centered on the custodial-paternalistic tendency in service to blind people, which is to an extent an inherent natural concomitant of any program in which society provides a service for its minority of less favored members, be the minority based on blindness or any other cause or condition. . . . The problem of the custodialism and paternalism has been reduced, to the extent that its inherent nature permits, by those of society's agencies which are in the forefront of progress. . . . Still, to expect society to be completely free of all suggestion of difference between the beneficiary of service and the rest of society is probably visionary, given human nature as it is."

However remarkable that statement may seem to you, it is very far from exceptional in the field of work for the blind. It was the American Association of Workers for the Blind which issued a convention resolution opposing the Kennedy-Baring bill—with its protection of the right to organize and the

right to be heard—as embodying a completely unsound and retrogressive concept of the responsibilities and privileges of blind persons as citizens. And it was the same association which declared, in the first sentence of its code of ethics: "The operations of all agencies for the blind entail a high degree of responsibility because of the element of public trusteeship and protection of the blind involved in services to the blind." It was the executive director of the largest national agency for the blind who proclaimed not long ago that a job, a home, and the right to be a citizen will come to the blind in that generation when each and every blind person is a living advertisement of his ability and capacity to accept the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. And it was the head of another large private agency who wrote these candid words, only a few years ago: "The fact that so few workers or organizations are doing anything appreciable to (help in the adjustment of blind people) cannot be explained entirely on the ground that they are not in the vanguard of social thinking. It is rather because they are realistic enough to recognize that the rank and file of blind people have neither the exceptional urge for independence nor the personal qualifications necessary to satisfactory adjustment in the sighted world."

Such judgments as these could be, I assure you, almost indefinitely extended. What they reflect is an attitude of moral and intellectual superiority (if not of superciliousness) on the part of those administering services to a presumptively inferior (if not incompetent) clientele. The attitude clearly suggests, in the words of a shrewd observer, "that those who need the services of the State in any social matter are sick and can only be made well through the help of a class of trained, objective, neurosis-free officials. In this only the social worker or the psychiatrist is effective."

Let me say again that most, if not all, practitioners and theorists in the casework field are unquestionably devout in their liturgical affirmations of democratic values and sincere in their professional commitment to client self-determination. But it is difficult to escape the impression that in recent years more and more categories of welfare recipients have been proclaimed incompetent to lead their own lives. Those potential clients who resist the offer of services may be put down, *ipso facto*, as unstable defectives. Unwed mothers may be collectively dismissed as unable, if not incapable of making their own independent decisions without casework services. The parents of problem children may be considered too close to the problem to evaluate it rationally; while the children of public assistance clients come to be classified as wards of the community.

However indefinite or inconclusive these custodial attitudes may be held to be in the overall field of casework, there is no mistaking their prevalence, if not their predominance, in the special field of work for the blind. Here there are certain factors, not present to the same degree elsewhere, which function to reinforce the authoritarian bias among agency workers. The first of these is simply the physical fact of blindness which is regarded almost universally as qualitatively different and far more crippling in its consequences than the run of physical disabilities or social disadvantages. "All visible deformities," to quote the blunt words of an agency psychiatrist, "require special study. Blindness is a visible deformity and all blind persons follow a pattern of dependency." It would be hard to speak plainer, or crueller, than that. Naturally it follows, for those who accept this line of reasoning, that blind people must be closely supervised and protected, not only in the specific area of need in which they may seek aid but in

most aspects of their lives, and not merely for a limited period of training or assistance but virtually from cradle to grave. Thus this proclamation of an agency administrator: "After he is once trained and placed, the average disabled person can fend for himself. In the case of the blind, it has been found necessary to set up a special State service agency which will supply them not only rehabilitation training but other services for the rest of their lives. * * * (The agencies) keep in constant contact with them as long as they live."

There is yet an additional factor in public welfare provisions for the blind which operates to perpetuate this custodial philosophy. It arises from the peculiar set of institutions and services which has been established for their benefit, particularly the Federal-State vending-stand program and the hundreds or so sheltered workshops across the country operated especially for the blind. The issue of agency control versus client freedom, the antinomy of liberty and authority, is nowhere more clearly focused, as it seems to me, than in these two special provinces of social welfare.

The sheltered workshops constitute an arena of conflict in which the interests of blind persons as employees and the interests of the agencies as management confront each other over the workbench. (Nor is this conflict merely latent; for something over 2 months last summer, seven blind employees of a sheltered workshop in Texas carried on a strike against the shop management, maintaining a daily picket of the establishment and evoking the services of a special community committee to mediate the dispute). The interests of the workshop managers are intimately involved with such things as certificates of exemption from minimum-wage standards and from workmen's compensation laws, together with authority to retain in their shops (for reasons of efficiency) blind persons fully capable and deserving of release into competitive employment. It goes without saying that workshop administrators are opposed to independent organization by their blind employees, to collective bargaining, and to the whole set of established perquisites (seniority, pension plans, and the rest) elsewhere enjoyed as a matter of course by organized labor. Here is paternalism of a very familiar kind—albeit one that should by now have disappeared from the civilized world.

No less obvious, and no less anachronistic, is the manifestation of this custodial philosophy in the operation of the public vending-stand program under the Randolph-Shepard Act. In all but a few States the program is administered under a strict system of agency control in which the blind vending-stand operators are in every sense employees of the enterprise—which functions, incidentally, very much like a commercial chain store in compelling all operators to contribute from their own earnings to support the operators of stands in unprofitable locations. The agency-control system is fervently opposed by organizations of the blind themselves, who have long sought (and in a few States have achieved) a system which permits operators to become independent owners of their businesses through the purchase of stands and equipment from the licensing agency. The rationale of the agency preference for tight and permanent control has been expressed by one prominent administrator in these straightforward terms: "The operation of the vending-stand program, we feel, necessitates maintaining a close control by the Federal Government through the licensing agency with respect to both equipment and stock, as well as the actual supervision of the operation of each individual stand. It is therefore our belief that the program would fail if the blind stand managers were permitted to operate without such control."

In such specialized areas of welfare as those of the sheltered workshops and vending stands for the blind, the existing conflict of interests between agency and client is plainly demonstrable and irrefutable. That definite vested interests in the maintenance of controls over the lives and livelihood of these client-employees have developed on the part of the agency managers is equally undeniable. But even in these extreme and agitated areas, the introduction of the principle of consultation—the right of the affected interests to be heard in the formulation of policy—can do much to reconcile the polarized interests and to make possible a more democratic perspective in which both client and administrator will participate as equal partners in a joint enterprise of mutual advantage and clear public service.

The principle of group consultation has primary applicability to the administrative process, in private welfare as in public policy—although it carries important implications as well for the individualized relationship of client and caseworker. Through systematic enforcement of this principle, welfare clients may be expected to perform increasingly a positive, rather than a merely negative and receptive, role in their dealings with the agency. The sharp dichotomy of interest and viewpoint which so often divides the two sides of the process; the invidious connotations which still persevere in the classic relationship of mendicant and almsgiver; the unilateral flow of counsel and advice over the administrator's desks—all these may be substantially reduced if not ultimately resolved by judicious and progressive application to the field of social welfare of that trinity of constitutional and human rights: the right to organize, the right to speak, and the right to be heard.

How Shall We Pay for Research and Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include here a brilliant article by Dr. Paul E. Klopsteg, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, on the subject of how the education we so badly need can raise large sums from private sources.

The article follows:

[From Science, Nov. 16, 1956]

HOW SHALL WE PAY FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION?

(By Paul E. Klopsteg)

Population trends in the United States during the past two decades, along with the changing public attitude toward higher education and research, have posed a predicament for our colleges and universities. The approaching tidal wave of increasing college enrollments—a wave that has already engulfed our lower schools and is lapping the shores of higher education—is giving administrators and governing bodies apprehension and anxiety. The predicament is the inadequacy of operating funds to keep abreast of the rapidly growing needs of the institutions.¹

¹ The opinions expressed in this article are entirely my own; they reflect no official position of the National Science Foundation.

The report of the Committee on Institutional Research* of the American Council on Education states as fundamental principles that "all accredited institutions of higher learning subscribe with varying emphases to three primary and essential aims: (a) the extension of the boundaries of knowledge; (b) the conservation of knowledge already acquired; and (c) the diffusion of knowledge through teaching, publication and other accepted methods of dissemination." It states further that "institutions of higher education are the principal instrumentality through which new knowledge is created by research scholars, existing knowledge is preserved and propagated through libraries and the minds of faculty members and students, and knowledge is disseminated through teaching and publications. In order that they may fulfill their primary and essential functions, institutions of higher learning require the utmost freedom in both their administrative and academic activities."

That these principles are truly fundamental in our society is beyond argument. The preservation of the essential freedom of research and education must be assured. Is it, in fact, assured in the future, or is freedom threatened? If we consider seriously the aforementioned predicament, there is no escape from the view that freedom of research and education, in both its administrative and intellectual aspects, is indeed threatened.

Government agencies are supplying, in growing amounts, funds for scholarly research but not to support the teaching function and other primary and essential activities in higher education. If the rapidly growing demands on institutions should bring about increasingly unbalanced budgets, substantial Federal support of all education would appear inevitable. Although present support by Government of research activities seems to have no concomitant control or intrusion, these are appearing in subtle, though not insidious ways. They develop almost spontaneously, without plan or intent, simply because the expenditure of Government funds calls for safeguards against improper disbursement and for checks to insure proper use. The exercise of such authority of guardianship of funds almost invariably becomes bureaucratic and can easily develop sinister aspects. If Federal aid to education, as well as to research, were to increase by large sums, we could not afford to remain complacent about the likelihood of increasing Government control.

Thus, although Federal subsidy appears to be a way out of one predicament, it immediately leads into another. Under the irresistible pressures that come with increasing demands on educational facilities, we are not only accepting but actively seeking more Government money, notwithstanding the probability that this carries with it increasing Government intrusion and eventual control.

The situation, though serious, is not yet hopeless. A remedy is possible which keeps complete authority of management and direction in the hands of the governing and administrative heads of our schools and colleges, where it belongs, and does not permit it to pass under the heavy hand of some Federal agency, where it might easily become lodged.

DILEMMA OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

From its very beginnings, our Nation attached great importance to the education of its citizenry. Public policy called for schools, locally founded, supported, and controlled. Colleges in growing numbers were

* Committee on Institutional Research, American Council on Education (Washington, D.C., 1954). Known as the Hancher Report.

established. Some were privately started and run by religious organizations, some by secular groups, others by municipalities and States. Attempts were made to establish a national university, but the idea of Federal support never took root. Indeed, strong sentiment prevails in the Congress, reflecting public sentiments, against Federal subsidies for education, especially at the higher levels. Unless some better way is found soon, however, Federal money for education may, by default, become the pattern for an attempted remedy for the present and impending difficulties.

Faced with the increasing pressure for more admissions, private institutions may and do take the position that they can accept only so many students, that they are under no obligation to take more, and that they will raise admission standards to limit enrollment. No one expects a college to carry a larger load than its resources allow. It may be suggested, however, that, as an institution organized to serve a public need, it may soon have to find means for expanding its capacity. As private institutions limit their admissions, the burdens are increased on those supported by taxes. Of the latter, many are under pressure and some are under compulsion to accept all qualified comers, the qualification being a high-school diploma. How can the schools, public and private, under increasing heavy demands, solve the dilemma? All of them should be expanding their facilities now to take care of future student population, which is expected to double in the next 15 years, and probably sooner.

By minor artifices we may defer, but cannot avoid, facing the problem: How shall we finance research and education? These are the solid foundation of the Nation's future, and funds for their support must be adequate to provide superior opportunities for gifted students and able scientists. Greater knowledge and fuller understanding in all fields of learning must be the goal. No equal expenditure of money can bring greater returns for the public benefit. In no other way can we achieve the freedom that comes from knowing the truth. In no other way can we as a nation hold our own on this overpopulated planet. As we face the problem squarely, we find only one solution: Assurance that a sufficient part of our vast national income will flow normally and effectively into education, to meet its financial needs as they arise.

In trying to bring this about, should we take the easy way? During the past couple of decades, a father complex seems to have come upon many of our citizens, causing them to look to Washington as the ever-present help in time of trouble, especially when money appears to be the remedy. Many people seem to think that money from the Federal Government does not cost anybody anything. The easy way then would be to look to the Government to make annual grants to cover all operating deficits in education, under a formula by which funds would be doled out to all institutions, public and private.

To do this by statute would require a highly sophisticated law under which an attempt might be made to secure fair and just distribution, with effective safeguards against abuse. These are almost unattainable specifications. If they were attainable, and if easy money were meted out year after year, the institutions would lean more and more on Federal support and depend less and less on their own efforts and resources. The disbursing agency would have the annual task of accurately and objectively budgeting the needs, beginning 2 years in advance; of gaining approval by the Bureau of the Budget;

of getting the budgeted amount through the congressional mill to an appropriation, with all the political implications of the process; and, finally, of disbursing the funds thus provided.

It is not a reassuring picture. A vast organization would be needed by the dispensing agency. It could easily become one of the greatest empire-building bureaucracies that the country has known. It would have to be vividly mindful of the fact that every college and university is in a congressional district. Could the institution in such circumstances escape governmental intrusion in its affairs, or avoid a measure of eventual control from Washington? If we treasure our heritage of freedom in thinking, in learning, in teaching, we cannot take the risk of traveling this way.

PRIVATE SUPPORT IS NEEDED

What, then, is the alternative? There is only one. The money needed to keep our colleges and universities solvent must be private, not public, money; and it must come from a great number and diversity of sources to assure complete independence from outside influence or control.

The efforts that are being made by friends of education to encourage and develop increased giving by corporations are commendable and should continue. Such gifts, though significant, cannot be more than a partial solution. Sentiment already exists against too large a fraction of the supporting funds being derived from business and industrial corporate sources. Even if it were feasible to get all needed support from them, strong antipathy against doing so would surely develop.

Desirable and helpful though they may be, gifts from business or industrial corporations are neither easy to come by nor easy to keep coming year after year. Boards of directors are trustees for the owners. They must be circumspect in either spending or giving away their stockholders' money. When the economic situation becomes unfavorable, prior actions are easily rescinded. Moreover, a large part of corporate aid is special-purpose money for specific projects or activities, to assure easy justification to stockholders. Although some special-purpose money can be well used, institutions would be hamstrung if the major part were of this kind. Keeping institutions in good balance in all fields of learning requires funds that, for the most part, are uncommitted.

In these considerations, then, there is left only one source for the kind and quantity of money needed. It is the individual whose income is enough to make him a potential donor. If he makes a Federal income tax return, he is in this class. Of his kind there are many millions. He is a major source of the Federal revenue. As a donor of gifts for the general welfare, especially education, he has not collectively distinguished himself. There are, to be sure, outstanding exceptions among individuals in all income classes, and their generosity is most heartening. But at the very best, the total of their gifts cannot now come near to meeting all needs. However generous, they cannot fairly be expected to carry the whole burden.

Although it may seem that our individual generosity is not notable, we are in fact a nation of givers, and we are almost unique in this respect. Were we not collectively generous, our Government could not, year after year, maintain its program of foreign aid for nonmilitary purposes. But we could not be collectively generous unless we were individually so. If, then, the present total of gifts for public causes is relatively low, the reason is to be found not in the individual's unwillingness but rather in his inability to be generous.

TABLE 1.—A table drawn to assist in explaining and illustrating how a simple revision of the income-tax laws would operate to make the cost of giving commensurate with the giver's income

I Group No.	II Highest surtax rate (percent)	III Gift surtax (percent)	IV Present cost of gift dollar (cents)
1.....	No surtax.....	2.....	80.....
2.....	20 to 31.....	3.....	80 to 69.....
3.....	32 to 41.....	4.....	68 to 59.....
4.....	42 to 51.....	5.....	58 to 49.....
5.....	52 to 61.....	6.....	48 to 39.....
6.....	62 to 71.....	7.....	38 to 29.....
7.....	72 to 81.....	8.....	28 to 19.....
8.....	82 to 91.....	9.....	18 to 9.....

INCOME TAXES AND INDIVIDUAL GIVING

Notwithstanding the apparent unqualified approval by Government of the taxpayer's charitable inclinations, expressed by its permission to him to deduct up to 30 percent of his adjusted gross income for legal charities, he failed in 1954 by about \$20 billion to take advantage of this exemption. Deductibility of charitable gifts must, therefore, be regarded as a gesture, not empty but unrealistic. Under this seemingly generous provision the Government exposes itself to possible loss of substantial revenue—namely, the taxes on the billions that the taxpayer might make as deductible gifts. Why has this provision failed so utterly to stir to vigorous action the generosity of individuals toward making gifts to worthy public causes?

Such gifts, approved by Government, are called a legal charity. They are the charitable contribution now deductible from adjusted gross income in the computation of Federal income tax. The term legal charity was superbly well defined in 1867 by Horace Gray, associate justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court and later a justice of the U.S. Supreme Court: "A charity, in the legal sense, may be more fully defined as a gift, to be applied consistently with existing laws, for the benefit of an indefinite number of persons, either by bringing their minds or hearts under the influence of education or religion, by relieving their bodies from disease, suffering or constraint, by assisting them to establish themselves in life, or by erecting or maintaining public buildings or works, or by otherwise lessening the burdens of government." In view of the great number of Government-approved legal charities, why have individuals declined by so wide a margin to make deductible gifts?

The answer is found in the glaring inconsistency between the Government policy of approving gifts "to lessen the burdens of government" and its income tax laws. The curious if not startling fact is that the tax laws operate to increase greatly the ability to give of those whose income makes them most able to give and to diminish drastically the ability to give of those whose income already renders that ability low. The cost of giving for persons with a maximum surtax rate of 20 percent is almost 9 times that for those at the 91-percent maximum.

How does the disparity in the cost of the gift dollar arise? Consider one of the dollars given by the person whose highest surtax rate is 91 percent. It is tax-free. But if he had not given it, Government would have taken 91 cents, leaving him 9 cents. Thus the dollar he gave cost him 9 cents. By like process, we find that the cost of the dollar for one whose highest rate is 20 percent becomes 80 cents.

Such disparity in cost of giving between those of low and high incomes, respectively,

does not harmonize with governmental approval of giving as now expressed in the income tax laws. The zooming rise in cost of the gift dollar, with decreasing amounts of adjusted gross income, is a powerful deterrent, not an incentive, to liberality. This has undoubtedly been a major cause of the restraint by the individual upon his generous inclinations. To the person with income in the thousands or low tens of thousands, there is a double deterrent to giving. The first is that, after living expenses and other normal obligations have been met out of the year's income, the surplus remaining for savings and gifts is small; thus the intrinsic value of his surplus dollar is large—relatively much greater than it is for his counterpart with large income. The second deterrent is the amount that the gift dollar costs him. The effect is to put restraint on his generous impulses and to make him take the position that the Government had better use the taxes he pays to finance the public causes that seek his donations.

The inequity of the situation as it affects the individual who may wish to support worthy enterprises is clear, and its remedy is clear. The cost of the gift dollar to the person with low income should be no greater, and preferably less, than its cost to the wealthy donor. The cost of giving should be commensurate with income. Giving should be possible for all taxpayers. With a well-designed plan for establishing the obviously fair principle that has been stated, there is little question but that greatly increased and probably adequate funds for all worthy public causes would be forthcoming. They would come from a substantial fraction of the 40 million people who now pay income tax on the basis of form 1040, in accordance with their own choices and decisions. Such widely distributed giving is in the pattern of our tradition, an expression of the democratic process. It has been the mainstay of many of our necessary and valuable causes. With growing population, their increasing support becomes imperative. Education and research present the most immediate and most critical need.

RECOMMENDED REVISION IN TAX LAWS

To remedy the disparity in cost of gift dollars under the income tax laws involves relatively simple mechanics. Several methods can be devised by which a positive incentive to giving would replace the existing negative one, and which would end the incongruity between the tax laws and the Government's approval of giving.

The essence of the scheme is simple. At present the gift dollar costs the donor the amount shown in column IV of table 1. Under the proposed plan it would cost him, in cents, the amounts shown as percentages in column 3. This makes giving no less attractive than under present laws for the wealthy, but makes it much more feasible and hence more attractive for those with moderate or small incomes. The change in laws would give the many millions in, say, the lower four groups an opportunity that they are now virtually denied: to participate effectively in truly democratic support of education and other public enterprises.

That there will be strong objections to the plan may be surmised, and some of them are easy to anticipate. One comprehensive answer to any objection is that for education there is no possible third choice; either the mounting deficits will be financed by Government, or they will be met privately. If the plan here proposed is not the answer, we face the challenge of devising a better answer. A decision must be made and action taken promptly, because the situation is critical and becoming worse.

There will be great reluctance in some quarters to do anything that might reduce

gross public revenue. But we must look at the net decrease, and, whatever it may be, it will be a low price indeed for the benefits to be derived. Here is a plan that would avoid not only the cost but the adverse political aspects of the channeling of funds through Government. The gift dollar would reach its destination with its value intact. If it is forced through Government channels, its value is reduced by one-half or more. Since in either case the money comes from the taxpayer, the saving made in eliminating Government operations would leave his income after taxes higher, on the average.

One objection raised is that a plan of this kind would be putting the expenditure of public funds in the hands of private individuals. The reply is that the possibility exists now, in the permissive deduction up to 30 percent of gross income for gifts. In principle, there is no change; in operation there is. It would not only introduce realism into the expressed approval of giving but would assure a distribution of the gifts in accordance with popular decision. The many millions of donors would constitute a valid statistical sample of the entire population. Hence their collective good judgment could be implicitly trusted, as experience and history prove. At any rate, it is not inferior in wisdom to that of a central disbursing agency.

Should it appear that the more emotionally motivated giving to some causes provided funds disproportionate to the needs, the controls built into the plan could be operated selectively. Obviously any plan must be wisely administered. Amendments to the income tax laws will always embody safeguards against abuses; the Congress will see to that.

In its most important positive aspects, once the details of the plan were wisely developed and set in operation, it would solve the deeply rooted problems of education for the long term. As population and the need for more funds for education grow, the flow of support would similarly increase. It would help to solve the immediate problems of the school districts, the colleges, and the universities. There would be adequate funds for research on disease and public health and for the support of the basic research which is one of the primary responsibilities of the institution of higher education. Community funds would benefit immediately, as would the Red Cross. Religious charities would become better able to carry on their humanitarian efforts among the underprivileged, the ill, and the disabled.

Apart from the substantial quick and long-term relief that would be provided the elementary and secondary schools, and the easement that the plan would offer higher education and other qualified causes, there is an aspect of even greater significance. Where the gift dollar goes the giver's interest follows. His interest continues as he sees the dollar to its destination and observes the intended beneficial results. On the other hand, if the money thus to be used eventually is paid to the collector of public revenue, a curtain is dropped at that point against the taxpayer's further interest in his dollars, for their destination is now obscured. No better way has appeared to stimulate a citizen's interest, and to encourage him to become active in public causes, than to make possible his financial participation in them. He becomes a better citizen. We can, in the manner suggested, make millions of better citizens. It is the way our democracy has worked in the past. This great and valuable asset to the success of our democratic process can be recaptured by making it possible once again for many millions of citizens to participate in private giving, in accordance with their own decisions.

The Federal Credit Union Act Helps Millions of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, for more than a century the credit union idea has given unfailing aid and inspiration to all who have turned to it in Europe. In the United States, too, this courageous outlook has been given all who have participated in the program since it was started in Massachusetts 50 years ago.

This past week in Washington, 175 Members of the Congress assembled at a dinner honoring those 28 original sponsors of the Federal Credit Union Act who still are Members. Accepting in behalf of 26 of his colleagues the plaque given by Credit Union National Association on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the act was Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, long a champion of the credit union movement. The 26 other Members who were original sponsors of the Federal Credit Union Act are Senators BYRD, CHAVEZ, HAYDEN, HILL, O'MAHONEY, RUSSELL, and DIRKSEN, and Representatives BROWN of Georgia, CANNON, CELLER, COLMER, McCORMACK, O'BRIEN of Illinois, POLK, RAYBURN, SMITH of Virginia, SPENCE, VINSON, WALTER, ALLEN, MARTIN, REECE of Tennessee, REED, ROGERS of Massachusetts, TABER, and WITHROW.

Representative PATMAN's address was as follows:

Many things have happened in these 25 years since Congress passed the Federal Credit Union Act.

The Members of Congress whom you have so graciously complimented this evening have supported many good legislative proposals; and not a few of these proposals have aroused in us deep convictions and inspired us to hard and thoughtful work.

Yet we can never know in advance just how a new legislative measure will turn out in practice. Measures that seem to have the greatest promise sometimes turn out poorly. Others meet with only indifferent success. And, of course, a few succeed beyond even our greatest hopes.

I know of no legislation enacted within the last 25 years which has turned out better than the Federal Credit Union Act.

The credit union movement has succeeded mostly because it has been in the hands of good people. It attracts good people. And it makes better people of all who become members of a credit union. It fosters capitalism, because it brings democracy to capitalism. It teaches not just thrift—because thrift is no end in itself—but it teaches humanity, self-help, and community reliance.

Those of us who have been privileged to work for the Federal Credit Union Act, and to work for its improvement are indeed fortunate. It would be hard to find anywhere the kind of satisfaction which comes from feeling that we have had a share in the accomplishments you have made in the credit union movement. Every community in our country is a better community because of the credit unions. Our Nation is a better and stronger Nation because of them. And the other countries of the world to which this

progressive and human endeavor has spread are also better off and better neighbors in the community of nations.

With this meaning and record behind them, the beautiful plaques which you have so generously given to the 28 Members of Congress who had the good fortune of helping to pass the Federal Credit Union Act 25 years ago are treasures beyond comparison.

The great public service which credit unions perform, and their basic soundness, had been well demonstrated before the Federal Credit Union Act was passed. At that time there were some 2,200 credit unions in the country, operating under State law. Massachusetts had enacted the first credit union law in the United States in 1909. That law worked so well that President Taft, a few years later, called its great merit to the attention of the governors of the other States. By 1934, 38 States and the District of Columbia had similar laws.

But the 2,200 credit unions which had then been established had hardly begun to meet the great problems which faced people of ordinary means almost everywhere. These were the days when installment buying was still new but gaining great momentum. Ordinary working people were being victimized by the loan sharks on an unconscionable scale. Shocking incidents came to light such as that of the man who borrowed \$30 from a loan shark, paid the loan shark \$1,080 in interest charges, and was then sued for the initial \$30. Clearly there was a great need for legislation to encourage and strengthen the credit union movement. At least the need was made clear by the vigilant and able campaigning of the late Senator Sheppard of Texas who, I might add, had the able and inspiring help of our friend, the late Roy Bergengren.

Recently I read one of Roy Bergengren's speeches pleading for this legislation—a speech he called "Credit for All the People." And I found that he said the credit union movement introduced three new banking theories, as follows:

1. Ordinary folks can develop capacity to manage their own money.
2. It puts money to work for the benefit of the people to whom it belongs.
3. The purpose of the loan is the important thing.

And to this he added, "the loan must promise a real benefit to the borrower."

Those ideas seemed somewhat radical at that time, but they were also persuasive.

Despite all the persuasive efforts, however, to obtain early enactment of Senator Sheppard's bill in the 73d Congress, the bill suffered the fate of almost all legislation to help the common man, even today: The bill was put over until almost the last moment before Congress adjourned. It passed the Senate on May 10, 1934, very late in the 2d session of the 73d Congress. Finally, the House took it up, amended it, and passed it on June 16, only 2 days before the Congress was to adjourn. Yet, when it was finally put to a vote, it passed almost unanimously. I called for a division vote, and the Record shows the House voted 180 to 2 in support of the bill.

But passage at this late date required some pretty fast footwork to get final clearance and get the bill to the White House before the Congress adjourned, as otherwise the legislation would have died with that Congress. The amended bill was, however, brought to the attention of the Senate on the same day; and the Senate passed it as amended. During the next 2 days we worked until the late hours of the night to make sure that the redtape was cleared away, that the Speaker of the House and the Vice President signed the bill, and that it was transmitted to the White House before Congress adjourned on the night of the 18th. There was never any doubt that President Roosevelt would approve it and sign it. In all this activity, I can assure you, Roy Bergengren performed some extremely fast footwork.

It is always pleasant to look back and describe victories that have been hard won, and to recount setbacks that have been narrowly averted. But there is considerable danger in too much looking backward, particularly when there are great new challenges to be met.

The question is, where are you going tomorrow and the day after?

If I might suggest my personal view, it would be this: The credit union movement has made only a beginning. The importance and the excitement in this movement lies ahead, not in the past. This is no time to rest on your past accomplishments. And the time has not come to dig trenches and merely try to hold onto your past gains. If 10,000 local credit unions are good for the country today, then twice that number should be good for the country 5 years hence. If 10 to 12 million people are better off today by reason of their membership in credit unions, then at least twice that number should enjoy this privilege 5 years hence. If the credit unions have proved a successful way of helping people meet their credit needs in their personal and family affairs, then it should also prove successful in meeting the credit needs of people who operate small businesses.

The Federal law authorizes loans for any provident or productive purpose. Provident purposes have been well served in the field of consumer finance, but much more needs to be done for productive purposes. One of the great challenges ahead, it seems to me, is to explore more fully the possibility of bringing small business into the credit unions.

Most small businesses have no place to go. And what a pity. We have in this country a great capitalistic system—a system which is based on credit. Even our money is based on credit. No debt, no money. Yet many of our most efficient and productive free enterprises are being squeezed out for lack of credit.

Here then is a new challenge and one worthy, I think of the credit unions' great heritage.

The question is whether to push on to new frontiers.

There is a tendency, we know, for great movements to become tired and conservative. There is a temptation to forego new adventures and new advances because of fears that what has been won may be lost. The time for new crusades seems unpropitious; the climate of opinion seems to turn threatening if not hostile; and the potential opposition seems to grow more powerful and more menacing. The voices of caution in all of us counsel against rising to new challenges; they advise that it is safer to let new growth proceed within the confines of the niche that has already been carved out.

Well, it has seemed to me that when the credit-union movement stops making new advances, it is as good as dead. No crusade can last bivouacked behind a fixed wall.

Of course there are powerful and selfish forces who see in the credit unions a potential threat to their self-interest. There are groups who would use the legislative halls to roll back, confine, and hamstring this movement. But these groups would outlaw all self-help on the part of the masses of the people.

There are groups who would try to find ways to tax the credit unions out of existence. But these groups would tax the churches and the fraternal organizations.

And I think you will find that these selfish forces of reaction are with us at all times. They may seem more menacing today than in the past, but I doubt if they are. They only seem so because new conflicts and new tests of courage always seem more fearsome than those past.

If you push into new areas there will, of course, be opposition. If you carry on the crusade as you have in the past, there will be fights. But the fights will be no harder than

in the past. And certainly the new advances to be made are no less important than those which have been made over the past 25 years.

New legislation is needed to improve and modernize the Federal law—that we all know. Present your legislative needs to Congress clearly and on their own merits, and you may be sure that Congress will give them careful and sympathetic consideration.

Certainly you can count on your staunch friends in the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The two legislative giants of that committee, Chairman BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, and the Honorable PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, are still battling for the public interest, just as vigorously as when they gave their able support to the Federal Credit Union bill 25 years ago.

The Federal credit-union bill which was introduced last summer by Congressman LEROY ANDERSON, of Montana, will, I think, receive most sympathetic attention in Congress. And I know that if General ANDERSON continues to carry the leadership for this bill, many Members of the House will be willing to support it and to work to make its provisions and their merits understood. Under those circumstances, it would be my prediction that this Congress will pass such a bill.

You will always have many champions in Congress so long as your cause is good, and I can see little chance that your cause can ever be anything but good.

General MacArthur at 79

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe Democrat on January 26, 1959, the birthday of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It is another fine and deserved tribute to our illustrious general.

The editorial follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR AT 79

Today General of the Army Douglas MacArthur celebrates his 79th birthday.

As this noble patriot and greatest military genius of our age enters his 80th year, a grateful Nation might well pause to reflect not only on his incomparable service over half a century but the lessons which it holds for America.

General MacArthur's every word and deed has been dedicated to strength, both military and moral. He preached unceasingly that only the strong could remain free, and that only the prepared could be strong. He coupled military strength with the fully equal concomitant of the moral fiber of the people.

To its sorrow, America has not always listened to Douglas MacArthur. After World War I we created a vacuum of power when we decimated our Army and sank our fleet. Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo arose to take their place.

In World War II at an age when most soldiers are completing their military careers, General MacArthur assumed command of our scant military forces in the southwest Pacific and in a series of campaigns which will live forever in military history, he led his forces back from Australia, through New Guinea and the Philippines, to final triumph on the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay.

But again the forces of weakness and compromise and pacifism prevailed, with an inevitable Korea as a result, and a third time the United States paid the penalty of weakness by having a fight a long and costly and inconclusive war.

If Douglas MacArthur's advice had been heard and heeded, Korea might easily have been transformed into a victory which might have stemmed the tide of Communist aggression perhaps forever, in the Far East. The Nation at some future day may to its sorrow have to pay for the neglect of General MacArthur's repeated warnings.

In peace and in war, Douglas MacArthur has preached the need for strength. When his advice has been heeded, America has been victorious. When his warnings have been disregarded and we have listened to counsels of despair, our cost in men and wealth has been overwhelming, and is not yet fully reckoned.

Only when we learn the lessons of a lifetime of dedicated service—that only the strong are free—that only the strong can prevent future and even more disastrous wars—will Douglas MacArthur's enormous stature in world history be fully comprehended.

Showdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, editorials are appearing in numerous newspapers, big and small, throughout the country urging Congress to live within the President's \$77 billion budget to the end that the budget will be balanced and the danger of runaway inflation overcome.

Many of the editors laud the President's indicated intention of vetoing bills that exceed his budget recommendations.

The following is an editorial from the Chicago Tribune on the need for a balanced budget:

SHOWDOWN

The Democrats who control both Houses of Congress have set out to wreck President Eisenhower's precariously balanced \$77 billion budget. The outlook for preserving the value of the dollar thus is bleak, at least until the 1960 election when the voters will have another chance to say whether they want their pensions and savings destroyed by further inflation.

The Senate almost contemptuously passed a bill authorizing a \$2.6 billion expansion of the slum clearance and public housing programs. The amount is approximately twice as large as the administration had requested. The Senate also lost no time in approving a \$465 million airport improvement program, disregarding the administration's recommendation that only \$200 million be appropriated for this purpose. The House voted overwhelmingly to set up a new \$300 million loan fund for veterans' housing.

The President has indicated that he intends to veto all spending measures that go beyond his budget and he will explain his reasons in television and radio appeals to the people. He has challenged the Democrats in Congress to raise taxes to match all their reckless spending programs.

It's too bad Mr. Eisenhower didn't start earlier to fight for sanity in public expenditures. His failure to do so deprived his party of the inflation issue in the last congressional election and permitted the Democratic Party to pose as the champions of all the groups that want handouts from the Federal Government.

He would be in a better posture also for his fight against the squander maniacs if his current budget did not call for continued waste of tax funds on foreign aid and on a continuation of military conscription. The spending involved in both is as inflationary as any other spending. It is hard to answer arguments for housing and slum clearance programs under these circumstances.

Yet the President should hold to his determination to keep the Nation's spending within its income. Sometime there must be a showdown, and the sooner the better.

Disagreement on America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, St. Mary's College, nestled in the Moraga Hills in Contra Costa County, Calif., sometime ago initiated an annual Business and Industrial Executives Symposium where outstanding leaders in government, business, education, and science are brought together to discuss the current affairs of the country in the quiet atmosphere of the campus.

The keynote speaker in this year's seminar was Gen. Lucius D. Clay, board chairman, Continental Can Co., and one of America's outstanding soldiers.

This year's symposium was marked by a clash in the views of General Clay and Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, director of the Institute of Philosophical Research.

Herewith is a report of the symposium taken from the San Francisco Monitor, the official publication of the Catholic archdiocese for San Francisco, dated February 6:

AT ST. MARY'S—DISAGREEMENT ON AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Jim Kelly)

St. Mary's College last Thursday sent 100 business and industrial leaders back to their desks and factories with:

An executive's cheerful prediction that an exciting atmosphere of change heralds continued economic growth for America.

A philosophers' gloomy warning that our system and Russia's are converging toward a meeting point on their side of the line.

Better understanding of, if not immediate solutions to, mutual problems.

Conferees left St. Mary's second annual business and industrial executives' symposium with handshakes all around after a stimulating 2-day tussle with the topic "What's in store for tomorrow's executive, and what can he do about it?"

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, board chairman, Continental Can Co., and Mortimer J. Adler, director of the Institute of Philosophical Research here, were the men on opposite sides of the oratorical fence in viewing this country's economic future.

REFUSE TO FEAR

Declared keynoter Clay: "I refuse to fear that inflation will get out of hand to limit our economic growth before the common-sense of the American people brings it to a stop.

"With new products and scientific developments stimulating consumer interest, with the consuming desire of the American people for an even better standard of living, with a better educated people contributing more to productivity, there appears ahead an economic climate favorable to continued and even more rapid growth in as far as conditions at home are concerned."

"If anything threatens this country's capacity for growth," Gen. Clay said: "It is the possibility of international turmoil so far staved off by NATO and our own defensive strength."

He told conferees their part in winning the cold war lies in assisting the have-not areas of the world where nationalism has become the raging passion.

"It cannot be done with large grants of money," he said. "It requires technical information, industrial know-how, and to the fullest extent possible the expansion of American business enterprise into these areas."

General Clay cautioned the businessmen to think less of sending export goods, more of sending capital and management to build and operate plants and factories which provide employment and contribute to the industrial development of the have not country.

Philosopher Adler, critiquing the Clay thesis, disagreed with the general that the cold war solution lies in peoples' choosing between communism's control by the state and the type of government of the people represented by the United States.

"So-called capitalist democracy and so-called Communist democracy are tending to be more and more alike," he said. "They are converging rather than diverging—and, worst of all, the meeting point does not seem to be in the middle, but well over on their side of the line."

The U.S. economy has been progressively socialized, Adler charged. He noted that less than 10 percent of American families own equities, that what they are getting, from government and giant unions and corporations, is the economic equivalent of property—a high living standard, good working conditions, access to the pleasures of sense (recreation) and the goods of the mind (education).

People in Communist countries are provided with the same economic equivalents through the state alone, Adler said.

He saw the United States heading for complete socialization unless it finds a way to diffuse private property in the means of production, instead of its economic equivalents.

Good speakers, good food, and a relaxing campus atmosphere stimulated the off-the-cuff seminar discussions that formed the heart of the 2-day meet. Sitting in as consultants, and guiding the conversation, were Christian brothers and lay professors of the St. Mary's staff, plus experts from other bay area college faculties.

One group burnished up these facets of America's troubles in overseas areas:

"It's a fine thing we're doing, helping the underdeveloped countries. But what happens when they reach the point of producing enough to export to us? Do we let them invade our markets? Can we keep our own level of technical achievements always in advance of theirs?"

"That's where it becomes important to American business to have topflight men in our Foreign Service. That will be a problem for them to handle. And right now we aren't

luring that caliber of man into consular posts.

"What we need are young men to enter Government service abroad with the same sense of dedication that others enter West Point and Annapolis.

"How about offering tax and insurance benefits as an inducement? The problem now is, our Foreign Service career men spend a lifetime in a tough job and retire with very little to show for it financially. Let's make it lucrative enough to attract able, talented men who'd otherwise go into business."

On the 20-hour week:

"That will mean fewer hours on the job for the rank-and-file, but think what it'll mean for executives—more work than ever.

"In that case, it's going to set up one specific problem: Less time that executives can devote to civic and community affairs. Dealing with Government agencies, pressure groups, and labor already is eating into time that we used to be able to give to charity drives and the like."

"Why not delegate more of the civic-responsibility jobs to a wider number of men in our firms? Spread the load, give the junior execs a chance to function in public service, and I think that our communities will reap more service from business and industry than they get now."

On lack of manpower for industry's mechanical jobs:

"Youngsters these days seem to think it's a sin to get ink or paint or grease on their hands. They all want to go to college and become executives. We're getting too many would-be generals, not enough privates to keep the wheels turning.

"That's for sure. And after a lad has gone to college it's usually too late to train him for mechanical production work after he's found out his chances are small of reaching the executive level of business.

"By that time he has a car to keep up, maybe a family started, and can't afford to go back to the wages an apprentice makes.

"The crux of this thing is to interest more high school graduates in filling the gaps at the level where industry needs manpower. That means selling them on the idea that working with the hands is a respectable way to make a living, and quite often an extremely well-paying way.

"If we can do it, we might accomplish this, too. We'd take some of the pressure off the colleges. They'd be getting the kind of material they want—serious students who will go all the way."

May 22, 23, and 24 Selected as Dates for 1959 Congressional Tour of New York City for Members of Congress and Their Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, plans are being perfected for the 1959 annual congressional tour of New York City for Members of Congress and their families.

The weekend of May 22, 23, and 24 has been selected for the tour which provides for three fun-packed days in New York at a cost of \$39.50 each for adults and \$34.50 each for children between the ages of 5 and 12 years. This year's trip will include a reception at New York City

Hall, a visit to the United Nations, a reception aboard a transatlantic liner, a boat trip of New York's harbor, a visit to the Empire State Building, together with receptions, and so forth, at various hotels and clubs. Opportunities for attending New York theaters are included in the schedule.

Since this is not a congressional election year, the weekend of May 22, 23, and 24 should now be reserved by all Members who desire to make this enjoyable visit to New York City. Those wishing to obtain further information may call Miss Patricia Bryan in my office, telephone extension 4576.

A Reporter Bares a Story About Fidel Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an interesting story concerning the Cuban revolutionary movement headed by Fidel Castro. The article was written by Mr. Tony Canty, a reporter on the Sunday Journal, published at East St. Louis, Ill. The article is from the February 8 issue.

Tony Canty, a personal acquaintance of mine, is an experienced and reliable newsmen. He has been on the Evening & Sunday Journal staff 13 years, his career with the newspaper beginning after his separation from military service following World War II.

Canty followed two hobbies: the collection of guns and vacation trips to Mexico. The experience which prompted his story stems from these hobbies.

Mr. Canty's story follows:

REPORTER BARES A STORY ABOUT FIDEL CASTRO
(By Tony Canty)

With the overthrow of the Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista by rebel leader Fidel Castro, some of the now it can be told stories of the bitter revolution are emerging.

One such story may be of interest to those who plan to visit East St. Louis Police Headquarters during open house next Tuesday. It concerns three pistols, one of which will be on display during "open house" and two companions to it which we hope helped just a little in assuring Batista's downfall.

We long have taken a deep interest in Latin American countries. For many years we have had strong ties in Mexico, which we have visited often. For some time we have had a personal interest in Cuba. Of great interest to us have been the ground swellings of revolution in some of the Latin Americas, directed against dictatorships as cruel, as undemocratic as that which very nearly enabled Hitler to conquer all of Europe. It has been of great concern to us that while our Nation preached and encouraged democracy for peoples far separated from the United States by oceans and continents, it did little to support and hearten those at our very doorsteps when at times they found the leadership and inspiration to attempt to bring their countries under more democratic processes.

After leading an initial but ineffective uprising in 1953 and serving a prison term, Castro was exiled to Mexico in 1955. Mainly because the young and honest intellectual brought them to believe in his cause, not only fellow exiles but Mexicans and others were drawn to him. He soon was training what was reported as an army. In reality it was merely a small group of deadly serious, fiercely determined men.

Although the people of the United States were told little of him, bit by bit, we learned more of this man, of his motives. We placed our bets on him and right up until his forces took over all of Cuba last month, no one could convince us that he would do other than win out in the end.

CLOSE TO HOME

In December of 1956, Castro with 80-odd freedom fighters returned to Cuba from Mexico and landed in Oriente Province, his home and the home of some of our in-laws. That first day all but a handful of them were killed. Batista reported Castro dead and did his best to publicize him to death.

We went to New Orleans that month on a short trip. New Orleans was a hotbed of Latin American exiles. Cuba was but a step away by plane. We learned, that as with Mark Twain, the reports of Castro's death were exaggerated. We also learned that his followers were ever increasing from the handful which had survived his landing in Cuba. These followers were willing to trade their lives for an end to the hated Batista. It was then and there that Castro, his followers and his motives became very live to us, not merely words in print.

Besides arms and ammunition, the rebels sought other supplies, and very wisely, sought the understanding of the people of this country. We were able to help in a minute way but not nearly as much as we would have liked.

During the next few months, Castro started slowly on the road to victory with his hit-and-run guerrilla tactics, coming out of the mountain to attack and wreak havoc, and backtrailing into the mountains to avoid destruction. It was a familiar picture to us. We were with guerrilla fighters in German-occupied Yugoslavia in 1944. In Cuba as there, the powers controlling the cities and the government could do little but hold on as time after time, the occupiers were slashed to pieces in night attack by fighters who held the mountains. In Cuba as well as Yugoslavia, old men, youngsters, and young women fought side by side. In both countries arms and ammunition was the chief problem.

Much has been said about the larger shipments of arms which were seized by the United States on their way to Castro. Little has been reported on the small individual contributions, at times a single gun or a handful of cartridges, which were donated by Castro supporters in this and other countries. It is estimated that at least 50 percent of the guns meant for the rebel forces slipped past United States and Cuban officials and reached the hands of the guerrillas.

One of the techniques of guerrilla fighting, when ammunition is at a premium, is to depend on guns which can handle the caliber of ammunition used by the enemy. Batista was using arms and ammunition furnished by the United States and a supply in such calibers was available if it could be captured or taken from a dead soldier.

Of great importance were pistols which rebels could tuck away on their person while infiltrating lines or mingling in towns. It was important that the hand guns take .45 caliber automatic ammunition such as used by Batista's army and police. This ammunition is for the .45 caliber automatic pistol.

Following one of our hobbies, that of collecting weapons, late in 1957 we came across a type of revolver converted to handle

the ammunition of the .45 automatic pistol, at a price even within our limited means. We thought a couple of them could be put to good use in Cuba.

The pistol is the English-made Webley Mark V service revolver with a break-top design which allows it to be emptied and loaded even while on the run. In its original form it handles the British .455 caliber cartridge. However, carloads of them were brought into the United States as surplus by dealers and in some instances were being converted to handle our .45 caliber automatic ammunition. Two three-shot, half-moon clips are used to load the six-shot cylinder of the gun.

TWO FIND THEIR WAY

We purchased one of the pistols for our collection, the pistol which can be seen Tuesday. We found it to be a rugged, dependable piece of workmanship and acquired two more in perfect, like-new condition.

The U.S. Government had pointed out that aid to Castro was a violation of the Neutrality Act. There is no law against making a gift to nonbelligerent friends. In December of 1957 we were in Mexico. A few weeks after we returned we heard that the two Webleys were being put to good use in Cuba but received no further details.

We hope some day to trace one of the guns. If we find it we gladly will trade the Webley we have or a better gun for it, yes and something to boot, if we find it has been put to proper use. Then we would like to retire it permanently to our collection.

We think that it will deserve that retirement.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities Has Done a Good Job and Should Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, petitions bearing the signatures of more than 350 church member citizens of Clark County, Wash., lauding the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its investigation of subversion and expressing opposition to any efforts to discontinue that committee have been received by me.

The headings on the petitions read as follows:

Whereas it is an established fact that our concept of Government, based on the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States, is under attack by an opposing ideology, despotic and godless in nature; and

Whereas the perpetrators of this ideology have ceaselessly proclaimed to the nations of the world their plans for subjugation of said nations; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has been designated as a major objective of the aforementioned subjugation; and

Whereas one of the approved techniques of appropriation is the infiltration of the subversive element into policymaking levels of Government, and into strategic defense positions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the undersigned do petition the Congress of these United States for the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee, the past achievements of which

have been of inestimable value to our national security.

I am in complete agreement with these citizens. In my opinion the Un-American Activities Committee is one of the most valuable in the House. It should be continued and granted adequate funds for the thoroughgoing investigations it has been making.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of February 7, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, February 7, 1959)

The veterans' direct housing loan bill provided \$300 million more for direct Treasury loans and increased the maximum interest rate from the present 4½ percent to 5½ percent. Arguments for: (1) Additional veteran home purchases may result; (2) more private investment money may become available to veterans through the increased interest; (3) the President is not forced to spend this money, it is only made available. Arguments against: (1) There is \$192 million still on hand for such loans; (2) Congress, control of expenditures is bypassed by this direct Treasury payout; (3) this is \$300 million beyond the budget. The bill was passed 310 to 89 (35 not voting). I opposed the bill. As I see it, the merits of the bill were completely eclipsed by the unconscionable expenditure of \$300 million we don't have, to that extent unbalancing the budget.

The "battle of the budget" is on, the opening gun being the vote on this loan bill. Not a single Democrat voted to keep the budget balanced (all 89 were Republican). Several Democrats spoke vehemently against the bill. Some, like myself, consider the bill clearly unconstitutional, since such appropriations bypass the expressed provisions of the Constitution for appropriating money. This backdoor to the Treasury, or House appropriation procedures bypass, accounted for \$4½ billion of the 85th Congress' expenditures. Why this unconstitutional procedure? Why does not even one Democrat vote against it, including all alleged southern conservatives? Why? Could it be politics, pure and simple—the attempt to discredit and embarrass the President who is now trying to hold the line, trying to cut spending, trying to tailor spending to income—as all responsible fiscal practice demands—even household operation?

In the Senate Democrats are pushing a \$2½ billion housing bill (creating the inflation which wrecks the income of the very people who politicians claim need housing); then there's the Armed Forces budget struggle with the "defense at any cost" cliché (our defense is based on a sound economy and can be wrecked by inflation); or how about agriculture with the Democrat plan now for direct subsidy payments to farmers. Well, where's the money coming from? The Federal Government hasn't any—it's broke and in debt. Do people want their taxes raised? The President reminded the spenders—"include the taxes in each of these pro-

grams to pay for them." Politicians vote for every appropriation and against every tax. If ever conservatives of both parties had the courage of their convictions, now is the time to support the President's balanced budget for the sake of our Nation. Surely, not even rabid partisans can oppose economy moves just because it's the President, a Republican, asking it. A prevalent distortion now presented by Democrat leadership is "the Democrat Congress clipped \$5.6 billion off the budgets for 1958 and 1959." What a transparent distortion, even to the untutored, when it is remembered that the Democrat-led Congress piled up a deficit of \$12.7 billion during this period. As Knebel, columnist, says of the budget battle: "Ike challenges Democrats to raise taxes to cover their spending. That's pay-as-you-go, but Democrats have their own slogan: 'Ple now—pay later.'" For myself, I dislike thinking the labor leaders, the ADA, and/or liberal Democrat leaders can so influence the traditionally conservative southern Democrats.

The draft bill extension passed handily 381 to 20 (32 not voting) extending for 4 years compulsory military service. Many Congressmen dislike a draft in our freedom and peace-loving country, but this cannot blind us to the reality of the dangers confronting us. We don't seem to be able to maintain the necessary manpower by voluntary methods.

The mountain of debt in this country now totals a staggering \$788.8 billion, that's \$4,650 for every man, woman, and child, a total debt more than that of all the rest of the world. The breakdown: Federal, \$283 billion; State, \$14.7 billion; farm, corporate, and family, \$449.6 billion. Isn't it time we held the line on spending, taxing, and borrowing, and lived within our Federal income? The Alger thumbnail legislative program might be said in one sentence—cut Government spending, cut Federal taxes, make social security a sound pay-as-we-go system, free farmers from regulations and subsidies, evaluate all existing law, and stop the socialistic labor trend of government.

Voice in the Washington Wilderness Department: Last year, when a something-for-everybody boost in railroad workers unemployment compensation was being whistled through the Interstate Commerce Committee, only senior Republican Member Joe O'HARA and I protested in a separate report that under current conditions the unemployment insurance fund might well drop dangerously from \$170 million to less than \$100 million "within a year's time" O'HARA blocked the bill during the closing days of the session. Now this proposal is up again, backed by the committee chairman. Meanwhile in 8 months the compensation fund has plummeted to \$80 million and the retirement board head requests authority to borrow around \$100 million—coupled with a move to increase benefits.

Medal of Valor Awarded to Oakland Policeman Robert Ross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the East Bay Police and Fire Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, has awarded the Medal of Valor to Oakland policeman, Robert Ross, 32, 14317 Bradley Street, San Leandro, Calif., for the

performance of duties above and beyond the call of his official duty.

Last March Patrolman Ross went inside a tanker that was moored at the foot of Oakland's embarcadero to rescue three men who were inside the tanker, overcome by leaking gas fumes.

The citation given Ross reads in part:

A man's quick thinking and immediate action saved the lives of three workmen.

Ross and Charlie Kitchen, 30, a shipyard worker also from San Leandro, lowered themselves 40 feet into the tank of an oil barge where the three men were overcome by fumes. They secured lines about the men and a crane pulled them to safety as Ross and Kitchen guided the cables.

Ross is married and has two children, Karen, 9, and Robert, 6.

Judge Homer Buckley, Oakland Municipal Court, presented the medal and citation at a meeting held in the Veterans Memorial Building.

The Medal of Valor is given annually to an outstanding East Bay fireman and policeman. This year the medal was given only to Ross, since no firemen were nominated by the judging committee for the honor.

Can We Afford Not To Pay Off the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have been asking myself two questions which have a definite tie-in with the arguments over Federal spending policies and balanced budgets.

One question is this. Why do investors have a growing apathy toward the purchase of Government securities?

The second question is related to the first. It has to do with the obvious present difficulty of the Secretary of the Treasury. I would like to know whether or not the problem of debt management, the continual refinancing of U.S. note and bond issues, could develop into as serious a situation as it seems to me might easily occur?

There is certainly no lack of public savings. The total savings accounts in the banks and on deposit in financial institutions keep growing and growing. Yet, the regular public drives to encourage purchase of U.S. savings bonds do not seem to be very successful. Corporate investors lack enthusiasm too.

Some economists say we are in an expanding economy with no immediate threat of inflation or decline in the buying power of the dollar due to increasing Government spending.

Other economists do not agree and are fearful of more deficit Federal spending.

The investors seem to agree with the latter, or at least appear to lack confidence in long-term Government securities.

The national debt now stands at \$283 billion. Interest on this is estimated during the next fiscal year at \$8.1 billion. If the average rate increases to 3.5 percent as some people believe it will, the annual cost to the taxpayers will climb to \$9.9 billion. In other words, assuming the debt remains constant, in less than 30 years at this rate we will pay as much as the debt is today but we will still owe all of it.

Meanwhile, it occurs to me, as I said at the start, that lack of enthusiasm for Government securities could be serious. Our increasing debt, it seems to me, could bring on a buyers' strike. I wonder what will be the consequences if Congress, year after year, creates deficits. I wonder as to the consequences of spending enormous and necessary sums for defense, and at the same time paying out ever-increasing subsidies for foreign aid and domestic programs of all kinds beyond the Government's income.

I wonder as to the advisability of the new Federal proposals which call for State matching funds. Many States at the moment face very serious budget dilemmas. Are we not causing them to overspend along with the Federal Government toward more debt and more taxes?

Socialists do not worry about a possible crisis in Government finances. Why should they? It means higher taxes and a possible capital levy. When a business pays a 52-percent income tax, it is more than half socialized. Let us not overlook that. Are we headed for more socialism?

Dictators can rise out of uncontrolled inflation, too. Adolf Hitler did.

As for the Communists, inflation is the means they plan to use to take over. Inflation gave communism its chance in Russia. That is how it started. And so it was with Red China.

Of course, Uncle Sam is not broke and there is no reason to panic, certainly not as long as the Government lives within its means. Not if we exercise self-discipline. Not if we plan and govern ourselves properly.

In this connection, a concurrent resolution was introduced in the Congress earlier this week which points the way. It called for a systematic program of national debt reduction. Its author showed how embarking on such a plan or retiring the \$283 billion debt in 100 years, with payments of \$2.8 billion annually, would actually save future taxpayers \$485 billion as against continuing to pay the interest each year on the present debt.

Mr. Speaker, a policy of balanced budgets, together with regular yearly payments on the debt, could restore confidence in Government securities and the interest rates on Treasury borrowing would decline almost enough to offset the amount of yearly debt reduction.

If the volume of Treasury securities offered for sale declined each year, the demand would stiffen. Suppose as a result of this that the average interest rate declined 1 percent. That would save 1 percent of about \$280 billion the first year or the amount of annual reduction under the resolution which I

referred to previously. In other words, public confidence and more demand could be the solution of our Treasury problems, but only if we abandon the philosophy of spending ourselves rich. Only if we abandon that kind of quack fiscal remedy.

Mr. Speaker, let us adopt a policy of systematic retiring the Federal debt and set our financial house in order.

That is the road to victory in our economic competition with the Soviet Union.

Unless we hold the line on Government spending, I fear the consequences.

Massachusetts Loses, United States Gains, Guardian of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the bulldozer is the great leveler of our times. It opens the way for highways, shopping centers, and spreading "suburbia."

But it must not be permitted to destroy all those natural resources which, apart from their beauty that recreates the spirit of man, serve him in ways that are necessary to his life on earth.

For many years a few wise men have sensed the danger implicit in this encroachment by the machine on the sanctuary of nature.

They have fought against it with imagination and skill and with protective programs that future generations will truly appreciate.

In Massachusetts we have a young man who has served with distinction as commissioner of the department of natural resources.

Almost singlehandedly he fought for and won the battle to save the natural features of our State from the onslaught of the bulldozer.

Francis W. Sargent has been recognized as one of our leading conservationists.

He has been summoned to serve as Executive Director of the new Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission in Washington.

Massachusetts is sorry to lose a man of his foresight and his inspiring devotion to the public interest. But we know that his talents deserve a larger field of opportunity for the Nation's good.

In his honor, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the February 6 issue of the Boston Herald:

WE LOSE A LANDGRABBER

The resignation of Francis W. Sargent as commissioner of the department of natural resources is sad news for Massachusetts; good news for the Nation. He is leaving us to serve as Executive Director of the Federal Government's new Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission in Washington.

As top staff man for this agency, Mr. Sargent will play a key part in its forthcoming

survey of the natural resources of the United States and its Territories, and in the formulation of a long-term plan for conserving these steadily diminishing resources. Mr. Sargent is admirably suited for this work. Indeed, his conservation accomplishments in Massachusetts may well have led to the Federal appointment, which was unsolicited.

Largely in response to Mr. Sargent's insistent and eloquent prodding, the legislature last year approved the first step in his 20-year, \$100 million program for the acquisition and development of State parks and other outdoor recreation areas. It is a program that should some day be recognized as one of the wisest adopted in the Bay State in the 20th century. It is a public-spirit land grab initiated by a man who is delighted to be called a landgrabber.

The board of natural resources will not find it easy to obtain a topflight replacement for Mr. Sargent. The commissioner's post pays a paltry \$10,000 a year. (There is a bill in the legislature increasing the salary to \$15,000. It should be passed.) But the five distinguished men who comprise this board should not rest until they have found the best man available.

Massachusetts needs another indefatigable landgrabber to replace the one it is losing. Otherwise the ambitious conservation program launched by Mr. Sargent may falter. And if this happens, the Commonwealth in another generation will present an aspect of physical devastation and spiritual poverty.

Federal Assistance to Education

SPEECH

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce one of two bills carrying out the administration program to strengthen American education. These bills properly recognize a national concern for our educational system by providing Federal assistance in meeting two of the most critical problems confronting our schools and colleges.

The first bill, introduced by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, would remedy the plight of needy school districts which do not have the financial resources to overcome their classroom shortages on their own. It would enable such communities to construct up to \$3 billion worth of new classrooms in the next 5 years.

Over the same period, my bill would help colleges and universities accelerate \$2 billion worth of construction of additional academic and housing facilities which will be needed to accommodate the ever-increasing numbers of able boys and girls who will reach college age in the next few years.

Many colleges and universities, both public and private, are presently unable to finance the construction of additional classrooms, laboratories, and dormitories which must be built now to provide facilities for the tremendous enrollment increases expected in the decade ahead. It is a matter of national interest to assure that the opportunity for higher education will remain available to all able young men and women who seek it in the years to come.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a part of my remarks in observance of the Lithuanian Independence Day at the Lithuanian Citizens Club in Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 8, 1959.

The matter follows:

On Lithuanian Independence Day it is pleasant to note that Lithuania is as old as most of the other European nations, with a language, with a culture, and with political institutions that are definitely her own. In fact she was an independent state 900 years ago.

In spite of centuries of struggle to defend herself against envious neighbors, the Lithuanians have succeeded in preserving their language, which is proof of their national spirit and their pride.

It is a strange fact of history that when the savage Tartar tribes swept out of the Orient they easily conquered Russia but were defeated in battle by the Lithuanian princes.

Some of that cruel Tartar character has survived and still manifests itself in the rule by terror that is practiced by the Communists of today.

Even the famous author of Polish descent, Joseph Conrad, has said that in the second half of the 18th century there were two centers of progressive ideas on the Continent of Europe: one was France; the other, Poland and Lithuania. The educated classes of Poland and Lithuania were permeated with the humanitarian ideas of French and English literature. There was a Diet and an elective monarchy; the universities of Vilnius and Warsaw were important centers of culture. The liberal complexion of Polish and Lithuanian institutions was naturally distasteful to Russia, Prussia, and Austria, who decided to eliminate the outposts of liberal and democratic ideas by partitioning the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth among themselves.

Lithuania's subjection to Russia lasted 120 years.

In all that long time, however, the spirit of the people never weakened. They never lost hope of regaining their freedom and independence.

The oppressive rule of the czars prevented economic and cultural development. The only way out for many was by emigration to the New World. Happily for us, there are now over a million Lithuanians in the United States.

The people in Lithuania know that you will speak for them in the free world, so that the free world will not forget its obligations toward those who live under the hated domination of the Communists.

Meanwhile, consoled and strengthened by their Catholic faith, Lithuanians in the homeland endure the Soviet tyranny. From their history they know that they can outlast Stalin and Khrushchev and others who, being mortal, must die. But faith is eternal.

Soviet troops and puppet officials seem to have the country under their control.

But there is a resistance movement that is doing its work in preparation for the day of liberation. The main purposes of this movement are: (1) To obstruct the attainment of all Bolshevik political aims; (2) to keep the local inhabitants informed of the true state of affairs; and (3) to document everything that has been done by the Soviets in Lithuania since 1944 and is still being

done. And it can only be left to the free world to hope that the hour is not far distant when the authors of these outrages against humanity will be brought to account and made to pay the just penalty for their crimes.

And what about the Russian people who were the first slaves of communism? They are quiet because they know that the secret police are everywhere watching and listening. But the Russian people must be thinking of the day when they, too, can reach for freedom.

The Soviets would like everybody to forget Lithuanian Independence Day.

This is impossible.

Every year as February 16 approaches the Soviets squirm.

They hear of the proclamations issued by State Governors and mayors of the cities, giving official recognition to Republic of Lithuania Day.

United States Senators and Representatives pay tribute to Lithuania's splendid record of progress during her years of freedom, and to the admirable personal qualities of her sons and daughters in the New World.

This is not a tribute that is voiced on 1 day of each year and forgotten until the next anniversary rolls around.

It involves our own character and our own responsibilities as a democratic people.

For the principle at stake concerns the sanctity of human rights and of elementary justice and decency.

On Lithuanian Independence Day we serve notice on the Soviet Union that we shall never relax in our efforts until Lithuania becomes once again a free and equal member of the family of nations.

February 16: Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 Lithuanians and the citizens of Lithuania descend throughout the Nation will commemorate the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Freedom loving Americans all admire the fight the Lithuanian people are making today to be released from the yoke of Communist tyranny.

Forty-one years ago, we all thought that Lithuania would be given the opportunity to build a free and independent government and establish a nation under the leadership of statesmen from their own ranks to again demonstrate to the people of the world their ability to build a nation in competition with the other great nations of the world. This dream was not to be realized because of the infiltration, duplicity, and aggression of its powerful Communist neighbor the Soviet Union. Lithuanians for over a century and a half had formerly received a dark experience of enslavement under the Russian czars.

The temporary rule of the Russian Communists will some day capitulate and collapse. The United States and all free nations should aid Lithuania in accomplishing this victory. It will require great sacrifice, and as long as Lithuania is enslaved and other neigh-

boring nations are captives of communism, liberty is threatened throughout the world including our own free country.

On February 16 commemoration programs will be held throughout the United States in honor of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. In Gary, Ind., Lithuanians from the Calumet district and their friends will assemble in a gathering and banquet commemorating this event and again reaffirm their determination to continue Lithuania's fight for independence.

I am hereby submitting a proclamation issued this week by Gov. Harold W. Handley, of Indiana, and Mayor George Chacharis, of Gary, Ind., setting aside this date, February 16, 1959, as Lithuanian Independence Day:

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR OF GARY, IND.

Whereas on February 16 of this year, the people of Lithuania and Lithuanians throughout the world, will commemorate the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence for Lithuania, the city of Gary is fortunate to have as its citizens, a great number of people of Lithuanian descent who came to our shores to enjoy the liberties and freedoms of our great Republic; and

Whereas the great progress of our city, county, State, and Nation has been attained by stalwart immigrants and their descendants from nations across the water who have diligently worked and sacrificed to build a community and Nation wherein their children and their children's children will enjoy the life of freedom; and

Whereas the great majority of the people of Lithuania and citizens of Lithuanian descent living in our city and our State and our Nation, have consistently fought and opposed tyranny of all kinds back through the centuries and are continuing the fight for liberty until their mother nation is freed from the Soviet Communist tyranny; and

Whereas Americans of all nationalities and extractions join the people of Lithuania in this noble observance of their freedom anniversary;

Now, therefore, I, George Chacharis, mayor of the city of Gary, hereby proclaim February 16, 1959, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the city and hope that all of our citizens will join in this anniversary day. It is the hope of all of us that the day is not too far distant when self-government and freedom will again triumph in Lithuania and all satellite nations under Communist enslavement.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the city of Gary, State of Indiana, this 10th day of February 1959.

GEORGE CHACHARIS,
Mayor, City of Gary, Ind.

PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF INDIANA

Whereas the 16th day of February 1959, will mark the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas on that day the citizens of the State of Indiana who are of Lithuanian origin or descent will convene in various communities throughout the State to commemorate that occasion and to join their countrymen in the grief of a liberty-loving nation caused by the aggression and the acts of injustice of the Soviet Union which took over Lithuania by force of arms, usurped the sovereign and inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people and proceeded with the extermination of them by mass deportation, imprisonment, and execution; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign occupation and oppression, and are determined to restore their

freedom and sovereignty which has been always recognized by the Government of the United States of America; and

Whereas because of their unmistakable attitude toward the Communists, struggling for world domination, the Lithuanian people together with a million Americans of Lithuanian descent represent an important force in the present fight of free nations against the Communist aggression; and

Whereas the residents of the State of Indiana feel deep sympathy for the gallant people of Lithuania and of other countries, presently enslaved by the Kremlin imperialism;

Now, therefore, I, Harold W. Handley, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim Monday, February 16, 1959, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the State of Indiana, and commend all interested groups, organizations, and individuals to appropriately observe the occasion, encouraging the Lithuanian people and wishing that they soon attain their goal of freedom and independence which they so ardently desire and cherish, and to which they have every right.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the Capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 15th day of January 1959.

[SEAL] HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
Governor of Indiana.

By the Governor:

JOHN R. WALSH,
Secretary of State.

Dogfish Bounty

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service would do well to study the results of a Canadian program to reduce dogfish.

Last year proposed legislation to pay a bounty on dogfish to fishermen on the Pacific coast, including my own bill, were not reported out of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Instead, a bill providing for research as to possible commercial uses of the dogfish was passed.

Frankly, I think stopgap legislation is needed. Scientific research may develop an answer to the problem of this predator that preys on valuable types of fish and sea life, but meanwhile we must reduce the menace which causes such economic loss to our fishermen. And our Canadian neighbors may prove that a bounty system is an effective means of doing this.

The following news article from the New York Times gives a graphic picture of what is happening in British Columbia waters:

DOG FISH YIELDS BONANZA—CANADIAN FISHERMEN GET 10 CENTS A POUND FOR THEIR LIVERS

VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA.—When hordes of dogfish were drawn toward Saanich Inlet by swarms of herring, the fishermen began reaping a bonanza through the subsidy of 10 cents a pound for dogfish livers.

"Ten trawlers are getting about 1,600 pounds of liver apiece, daily," said Will Egeland, a fisherman. "The average is about 200 pounds of liver to a ton of fish."

The fishermen are eagerly in favor of killing the destructive little sharks.

"Every dogfish caught has six or eight herring in its stomach," Mr. Egeland explained. "It is impossible to guess the number of tons of herring lost every day. When a dogfish school goes through, nothing is left—not even shrimps."

Likewise, this Marine Digest article describes the Canadian program:

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERMEN GIVEN SPECIAL DOGFISH BOUNTY

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA.—Many British Columbia fishermen got underway recently on a clean-up of predatory dogfish, as a direct result of a special bounty of \$130,000 provided by the Canadian government.

Dogfish have been increasing greatly in recent years, with heavy loss of food fish, and much damage done to fishermen's nets.

Fishermen will receive a bounty of 10 cents a pound for dogfish livers, delivered to processing plants at Vancouver or at Prince Rupert.

It is expected Vancouver fishermen will concentrate in the Gulf of Georgia and Vancouver Island, while Prince Rupert fishermen will work in Hecate Strait.

The fisheries department has chartered five trawlers to help combat the dogfish menace. In addition to the charter money, an incentive bonus of \$6 a ton for the first 300 tons and \$15 per ton for quantities in excess of 300 tons, was being paid for the first 4 weeks.

Italian Politics

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following article by Mr. Vanni B. Montana, which appeared in the *Giustizia*, official organ of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

Mr. Montana is a great American. I have known him a long time. During World War II he held a very sensitive position with the United States and contributed greatly in the liberation of Italy and later in furthering the strong ties which presently exist between the United States and that country. Mr. Montana is a trade unionist and knows the labor movement in Italy almost as well as he does here. In addition thereto, he has studied the political parties of Italy and is au courant with all of them.

The association which he makes in this article between the Italian Socialist Party led by Pietro Nenni and that of the Communist Party led by Palmiro Togliatti is most interesting and I am sure my colleagues will find it so:

WHAT DOES NENNI REALLY WANT?

(By Vanni B. Montana)

Do the results of the Naples Congress of the Partito Socialista Italiano (PSI) mean a positive step by its leader Pietro Nenni toward

broadening the basis of Italian democracy?

As far as appearance goes, it could be yes. Were appearance to count more than substance, it might also be said that Communists are for democracy, since they often speak very loudly about constitutional rights and freedom and never fail to parade behind the names of such great democratic figures as Lincoln and Jefferson in America, Garibaldi in Italy, or Bolivar in South America. But, if we look beneath the surface of the Naples Congress of the PSI, it will be seen that Nenni and his friends actually did not make a forward but a backward step. The autonomy proclaimed by the PSI in Naples from the Communist Party is not a new development. Its congress, held in Venice, a couple of years before, did practically the same thing.

Prior to the Venice Congress, Nenni and Giuseppe Saragat, leader of the Italian Social Democratic Party (PSDI) had met in a summer resort town, Prolognan, to arrange for the merging of the two parties, on a democratic basis, free from all subordination to the Communists.

At the Naples Congress, Nenni disdainfully rejected any idea of dealing with the PSDI which—despite its numerical weakness, lack of strong organization and meager financial means—has contributed the decisive margin which Italian democracy needed to safeguard its newly gained free institutions against Communist and Fascist attacks, and to maintain Italy's bonds with the free nations organized in NATO.

Not only did Nenni reject at Naples any idea of merging with the PSDI, but he directed the main fire of his colorful oratory against the PSDI, the Christian Democrats and the other genuine democratic groups rather than against the Communists.

The important test is whether or not a party or any other organization helps Moscow's policies which are flexible in form to meet special local situations, but which are rigid and firm in their purpose—the weakening of the free world, the destruction of democracy and its replacement by worldwide Soviet despotism. It is not so much the kind of utterances one hears from the spokesmen of the PSI that counts as the practical work it does.

The fundamental points of Communist policy in Italy are:

1. Unity within the Confederazione Italiana Generale del Lavoro (C.G.I.L.) which is the central labor body completely dominated by the Communists.

2. Unity in the Cooperative Alliance, a central body controlling thousands of co-operatives, and tightly dominated by the Communist Party.

3. Unity and cooperation between Communists and the P.S.I. in the thousands of municipal and provincial governments, as well as strengthening the unprincipled united fronts in the regional government of Sicily between Communists, P.S.I., Fascists, Monarchists, and insurgent Christian Democrats.

4. United fronts in all other mass organizations—Women's League, sports, etc., etc.

5. One of the main aims of the Moscow-led Italian Communist Party is to dominate southern Italy and the great islands of Sicily and Sardinia, whose strategic importance in the Mediterranean, a sea connecting three continents—Europe, Africa, and Asia—is very clear. Those parts of Italy are largely depressed areas. The Communist Party has built a special united front organization "Comitato del Mezzogiorno," whose task is to win political domination of southern Italy and its islands. The Naples Congress of Nenni's P.S.I. strongly endorsed this committee.

Theoretically, Nenni again proclaimed the autonomy, the independence, of the P.S.I. from the Communist Party. But, in practice, he cemented once again the unity of action

and common aims with the Communist Party in all these vitally important fields.

This is not all. In regard to foreign policy, Nenni's formula adopted at the Naples convention calls upon Italy to be outside the two blocs. It is said that this is neutralism of the Nasser kind. But the position of Italy is very different from that of Egypt. Italy is not in Africa. Italy is part of Western Europe and the shield of Western Europe including Italy, is the Atlantic Alliance. Deprived of this shield, Italy would become an easy prey to Communist maneuvers which are moving definitely in the direction of deals with the Fascists and some greedy industrialists who want to do business with Russia and its satellites.

In the new crisis created by the P.S.I. Naples congress, Giuseppe Saragat has been showing determination and courage in resisting the latest tricky and sinister Nenni maneuvers. Should disloyalty develop in his party, he would be fully justified in speedily taking the firmest measures to protect the democratic Socialist Party organization and future.

It is the opinion of this writer that the leaders of the Italian Liberal Party (P.L.I.) are also responsible for the dangerous situation now in the making. Their rigid opposition to the urgently needed reforms has led some sectors of the Christian Democratic Party, of the P.S.D.I., of the Republican Party, to look to the left. And it is in this so-called left where Palmiro Togliatti, head of the Italian Communist Party, has never stopped fishing with several rods and lines, with different hooks and baits, to lure the different fish he wants to catch.

What is greatly needed is not only a common denominator for liberty, but also a common denominator for social justice. To help the P.S.I., to serenade Nenni and his type of leaders, to approve, applaud or even excuse its policies can only result in destroying the free Italian trade unions, fatally weakening NATO, and ultimately preparing the crucifying and burial of Italian democracy without any further hope of resurrection. That is the ultimate goal and inevitable outcome of the new Nenni course. No critical Communist phrases and no hypocritical Nenni claims to the contrary can deter or defeat this logic of events.

TV Grows Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, television has become an effective medium for communication in politics and is a growing medium for educational purposes. The broadcasting companies recognize the growing importance of TV and are streamlining their programs to better educate the listening and viewing public and to make the citizenry more informed.

Donald H. McGannon, president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., has announced a new concept in programing of forum programs which streamlines existing programs and brings the matters of public affairs to the local people as well as to a national audience.

A press release from Mr. McGannon sets forth the concept and the scope of

the new plan and will be of interest to the televiewers and listening audiences:

WBC TO TELECAST "YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW" AND "AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR"

NEW YORK, February 5, 1959.—A new concept in programing of forum programs which will bring two of the Nation's outstanding public affairs programs to local television stations was announced by Donald H. McGannon, president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. The programs which will be aired in February are the award-winning "Youth Wants To Know" and "The American Forum of the Air," produced by WBC in cooperation with the broadcasting industry's pioneer in forum programs, Theodore Granik.

WBC will schedule the two programs on its five television stations, each once a month as local specials in prime evening time. The TV programs will be syndicated to other television stations possessing tape equipment.

WBC will also produce with Mr. Granik "The American Forum of the Air" for WBC's six radio stations, a half-hour each week. These will be syndicated to radio stations from coast to coast. The radio and television programs have been made available for commercial sponsorship.

The WBC programs will originate in the studios of WITG, Washington, D.C. and both WTTG and WNEW-TV, New York, owned by the Metropolitan Broadcasting Co., who will be broadcasting both shows. The WBC television stations which will carry these programs are: KDKA-TV, Pittsburgh; KYW-TV, Cleveland; KPIX, San Francisco; WJZ-TV, Baltimore; WBZ-TV, Boston.

The WBC radio stations carrying "American Forum of the Air" are: KDKA, Pittsburgh; KYW, Cleveland; WBZ, Boston; WOWO, Fort Wayne; KEX, Portland, Oreg.; WIND, Chicago.

"We are undertaking more than the production of a program and the investment of money in this effort," said Donald H. McGannon in making the announcement. He further stated, "We are testing a conviction that the appetite of the American public for information and background in the crucial issues that face the United States and the world today has grown dramatically and demanding; there is a strong proof they are eager to be better informed in these areas and the opportunity to have our audience see and hear great men of our times face the hard realities and complexities of the nuclear world must be grasped by us as a broadcaster now and under conditions that will permit maximum family exposure. This experiment in the fields of public information and debate, like our prior efforts in the field of education, etc., carries with it our highest hopes. It is believed that the adoption of program vehicles such as 'Youth Wants to Know' and 'American Forum of the Air' which are bywords in the American household, will do a great deal to assure the ultimate success of our undertaking. We also anticipate the ability to fill a need on the part of other local radio and TV stations for service programing of national dimension on this basis that will achieve a service beyond the present extraordinary accomplishments of the networks and broadcasters to the moment."

In the more than quarter of a century of "The American Forum of the Air," Mr. Granik has brought to listeners virtually every major Washington name of those decades including such luminaries as ex-Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. "Youth Wants to Know" in its 9th year, has faced the controversial national and international issues and personalities who have been subjected to the sharp and incisive questions of bright and knowledgeable youngsters. As recently as last summer Mr. Granik went to Russia and filmed a "Youth

Wants to Know" interview with Mikoyan, the first such interview with the Deputy Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., which achieved international acclaim.

"Both 'Youth Wants to Know' and 'American Forum of the Air' which have received worldwide acclaim and continual attention throughout their program careers, will be reshaped to add further excitement and new dimensions to stimulate audience appeal. WBC and Ted Granik intend to deliver to the public newsmaking guests and important and exciting subject matter," said Richard M. Pack, vice president, programming, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.

Six Points To Watch in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Dale Francis, in an article in *Our Sunday Visitor*, a Catholic weekly, for February 15, 1959, has analyzed the possibility of a turn to the left in the new Government of Cuba. He comes up with six points to watch for in making judgments on which direction the new Cuba is taking. I think this is an interesting guideline for use as the months go on. Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the Appendix of the Record:

"Batista is America's best friend in Cuba and the strongest bulwark against the flood tide of communism." These are words published since the end of the Batista regime in an anti-Communist publication called *American Opinion*.

If the people of Latin America could really be convinced these words were true then the revulsion against the United States would be unanimous and the victory of communism in Latin America would be assured.

Yet a supposedly anti-Communist publication in the United States republished these words after the fall of Batista. They were words that had been spoken by Spruille Braden, a man who once served as assistant secretary of state for Latin America. His words demonstrate the myopic shallowness of men who lived and worked in Latin America for years and yet remained insensitive to the sufferings of the people.

American Opinion is also a publication that has called Fidel Castro a Communist. So let us examine the truth of this statement.

Fidel Castro is a graduate of Belen College, a Jesuit school in Havana. He has since that time been in contact almost continuously with priests of that school. They have talked with him often, going into the mountains to consult with him.

One of his closest friends is Father Amando Llorente, head of the *Agrupacion Catolica Universitaria* and a man who has appeared frequently in these stories on Cuba. Father Llorente knew Fidel Castro as a boy and knows him as a man. Castro in a letter to Father Llorente that Father showed me said, "I have kept unchanged the special feeling I always had for you because you were able to understand and encourage me."

Does Father Llorente understand Fidel Castro? He thinks he does. He has had every opportunity to know him well. Father Llorente says Fidel Castro is not a Communist, could never be a Communist.

Yet Robert Welch, editor of *American Opinion*, calls Castro a Communist. J. B.

Matthews, writing in *American Opinion*, doesn't go so far as to call Castro a Communist, but suggests he cooperated and worked with Communists.

Who knows the most about Fidel Castro? Father Amando Llorente, who has known the man since he was a boy, talked with him many times in recent days, had a close contact with him, or the editor of an American magazine who probably has never met him, knows only by hearsay and does not give his sources for his statement?

I have talked with Castro, watched him in action. I found him a flamboyant man, a man of big gestures, extravagant language, a man who talks almost incessantly.

He struck me as a young man, more immature than his 32 years. Certainly he is not a prudent man when you consider that he is now a man of important stature in the world and yet a man who talks on and on. I told a close friend of his that he is certain to regret his talkativeness. A man who talks an hour may say something foolish; a man who talks 2 hours will probably say something foolish, but a man who talks for 3 hours is certain to say something foolish. Fidel Castro gives public addresses that last 3 and 4 hours.

He talks poetically. He seems incapable of expressing things simply. He dramatizes situations, and it is this flair for the dramatic that gives him much of his appeal.

But I know of no one who has heard him talk who thought him a demagogue. I know of no one who knows the man who is not impressed by his apparent sincerity.

Yet his personality is not entirely pleasing. He seems a bit more enamored of himself than even a man of such prestige should be.

But a Communist? Nothing he has said or done confirms that he is. And much he has said and done indicates he is not. There has been absolutely no indoctrination of the troops. Anyone who has talked with soldiers or heard them talk—and literally thousands were interviewed over television in Havana soon after the end of the war—could see there was no Communist indoctrination of these men. There wasn't even any anti-American indoctrination—one soldier ran after me down the street, when we finished talking, to tell me how much he liked Americans. This is not, of course, a certain indication, but it would seem that a Communist would have indoctrinated his troops at least a little.

The cabinet Fidel Castro formed is not a cabinet that leans to the left. It would have been difficult to have found a cabinet that stayed more to the middle. What is more, the men who were chosen were men well known to the public as genuine believers in democracy.

All the evidence seems to indicate Castro is not a Communist. But, of course, there are Communists in Cuba, and there are Communists who have served the rebellion.

While there is no proof he is a Communist, I have severe misgivings about Raul Castro, Fidel's younger brother. Like Fidel, he was Jesuit educated. Unlike Fidel—who still claims to be a Catholic although he does not seem to be a practical one—Raul takes pride in calling himself an atheist.

Several times in the past year I have called attention to the fact that the rebels received a part of their training from Alberto Bayo Girouard. Bayo is a veteran of the Spanish Civil War, where he fought on the side of the so-called Loyalists. He is quite possibly a Communist, and he did help train the rebel units in Mexico. He stayed in Mexico during the rebellion—he is an old man—and while he came to Cuba to join in the celebration, there is no indication he will be invited to join in any way in the Government.

Another man of possible Red background is one I've mentioned several times before—Ernesto Guevarra. He is known to Cubans

as "Che" and his handsome face is one of the most photographed. He was director of La Cabana, the military prison, when I went to see him.

A young man, he is nevertheless a medical doctor and a man who also participated in fighting in Guatemala on a side that was supported by Communists.

He is an Argentinian by birth and those who know his family there said his background was that of a boy from comfortable circumstances. A friend of mine, high in the Guatemalan Government and an anti-Communist, says he does not believe "Che" Guevarra is a Communist.

But Guevarra says that he is neutral in the disputes between the United States and Russia and that very neutralism tells a great deal about him. His early public statements indicated certainly a strong leftist leaning and this is a man I would judge bears close watching.

There is also a strong potential Communist influence in the labor movement. As this is written, this Communist influence has gained power in only a few places, but you can be certain it will keep trying and be ready to take over completely if the opportunity offers itself.

Because Communists are wise in the way of politics, because Communists recognize the importance of Cuba, it is certain that they will bear close watching.

Every action that creates more anti-Americanism paves the way for the Communists to move. The political illiterates who favor tyrants may think they are being anti-Communist, but they are the best friends the Communists have.

My own fear is not so much that Castro and his rebels might turn to communism as that in his own immaturity, Castro may destroy his own government by too much talking and too little responsibility and so create new chaos in Cuba.

I also have some fear about the welfare of Castro. He walks among the people and appears among them on speaking platforms absolutely without real protection. I think it inevitable that among the barbudos there would be some Batista plants. The murder of Castro, President Urrutia and a couple of more key figures would create chaos in Cuba.

The provisional President is essentially a middle-of-the-road man who heads an equally responsible Cabinet. When, in 1952, Batista took the Government by force, the party that seemed most likely to win the election was a new party called the *Autentico*. Many of the members of that party are represented in the new Cabinet, among them Roberto Agramonte, who would have been named President in a free election in 1952, and Raul Chibas, whose brother was the leader of the party.

Castro is not a member of this Cabinet. He says he does not want to be in the Government since his desire was only to free Cuba. But this ignores the political reality that he is the leading figure in Cuba. And it ignores the fact that he continues to speak on governmental matters, therefore usurping the Government without taking any responsibility for his actions.

There are a few key things that I think the average person can watch to know how the Government of Cuba is progressing.

1. The preservation of right of asylum: Castro seems to want to override the ancient provisions of asylum. Why he wants to do this is understandable—there are some real criminals who have taken asylum in embassies in Havana. But to override this would be to override a very necessary protection for freedom since not all those who seek asylum are criminals and overriding it now would set a precedent that could be used by tyrants in the future.

2. The fate of General Cantillo: The end of the war was precipitated by General Can-

tillo's negotiations with Castro. Batista learned of this and hurriedly left Cuba. Since Batista's police had planned a heavy drive early in January, his early leaving saved the lives of many persons. Castro, however, was angered because General Cantillo had promised to turn over Batista for justice. So General Cantillo is held for trial. It would be rank injustice to condemn General Cantillo to death, and if the Castro government does this you can mark down a most serious blot against it. I do not believe Castro will allow this mistake to be made, but this is one of the signs to look for to know what is happening in Cuba.

3. Castro in the cabinet or silent: If Castro wishes to continue to speak publicly on all matters of government then he should be in the government. If he does not choose to join the cabinet or take an active part, then he should become relatively silent. If he continues speaking but taking no responsibility, he may well make the work of the new government almost impossible and precipitate the resignations of mature men who are greatly needed.

4. The Communist Party in Cuba: After being banned for years—but still active—the Communists are allowed to come out into the open in Havana. You can observe their success by the positions they take in the labor movement. The name of the party in Cuba is the Popular Socialist Party, so if you see reports of government appointments of men of this party you'll know the Communists are gaining in power. As this is written, they have not yet attained power.

5. Recognition of Russia: If Roberto Agramonte and the Provisional President have their way there will be no recognition of Russia. You can know the solid men are being overridden if Cuba does give recognition to the Reds.

6. Continuation of executions: The justice of the executions of real criminals is something about which those who understand the Cuban situation have had no doubt. The manner of the trials and executions was bad. If the executions were to continue, if new arrests continue to be made, there will be real fear. There is an unfortunate failure on the part of some persons to distinguish between murder and death in battle. A news dispatch says three policemen have been arrested for the March 1957 murder of a Havana university student. If they are speaking of the death of Jose Antonio Echevarria, it really isn't proper to call it murder. He is a martyr for a noble cause, but he died in an attempt at revolt, armed and ready for death—his mother told a friend of ours that on the morning of the attack on the palace he told her he had gone to confession and holy communion and that if he died she should understand he was prepared. The soldiers who killed him may have been fighting against those who were right and for a tyrant, but it was surely not murder in a real sense.

The murder the next day of Pelayo Cuervo Navarro, a highly respected political leader who was taken from his home and shot, was murder in a real sense and these murderers could be punished. If executions continue in Cuba I fear a further lack of discrimination and eventual injustice.

These are six points to watch. If you keep up with them in your daily papers you will be as well informed as anyone in the country.

But don't be misled by some other things. The new government's insistence that all contracts with foreign companies be examined doesn't mean the government is going to go Communist. There was so much graft, kickbacks were so common, it is absolutely necessary to study all contracts made by Batista's government.

Summing up, Cuba has just rid herself of a corrupt and tyrannical government. This doesn't automatically mean the new govern-

ment will be all we would wish it to be. Persons who know these leaders best are convinced, however, that they do believe in democratic freedom, and there is indication this is true.

We in the United States should offer understanding and support for the Cuban people, showing them a friendship on a fraternal and not paternal basis. We should aid the new government in the establishment of freedom, and regain whatever friendship we lost because of our support of the tyrant—Batista—who caused so much suffering in Cuba.

If we do not we are likely to drive the Cubans away from us into the waiting arms of the Communists.

In Mr. Dulles' Absence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very well written and timely editorial which appeared in the Washington Post today, February 11.

In my opinion this emphasizes the desire of all Americans, regardless of party or political affiliations, to support those in our governmental service, who are devoting their lives, energies, and abilities to work unceasingly to preserve the peace.

I am sure that we all join together, as suggested by the President, to pray for the good health and speedy recovery of this outstanding American and Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles:

IN MR. DULLES' ABSENCE

President Eisenhower spoke for the entire Nation yesterday in expressing profound regret about Secretary Dulles' new illness. Past disagreements are cast aside in recognition of how much the President and indeed the whole Western alliance have come to depend upon this one forceful man. His combination of firmness on Berlin and resilience on Germany has won the admiration of many here and abroad who have been critical of him on other occasions.

Mr. Dulles' absence is the more unfortunate because of the necessity for perseverance in establishing detailed Allied agreement on access to Berlin. Under Secretary Dillon, and Under Secretary Herter when he returns from vacation this weekend, may be counted on to do their utmost to maintain continuity. But these officials inevitably will be under some handicap because of Mr. Dulles' intensely personal approach to large diplomatic problems.

One could wish in other circumstances that the Secretary would place more reliance upon the initiative of subordinates and would permit more independent advance planning. As it is, there is no disguising the fact that his illness will leave a big hole not only in the State Department, but also in the Cabinet and the Government generally. Mr. Dulles indubitably is the strongman of this Administration, and his devotion merits an accolade.

Fortunately, the doctors report no recurrence of malignancy, although General Heaton and Walter Reed Hospital observe that Mr. Dulles is worn out and will need

a considerable period of rest to recuperate from his prospective hernia operation. It would be altogether surprising if a man of nearly 71 did not show the strains of 6 years in office; the truly remarkable thing is that Mr. Dulles has stood up so well to the burdens he has had to bear for the administration and to the almost inhuman schedule he has set for himself.

It is important to have Mr. Dulles back, especially if there are to be negotiations with the Soviet Union. For that reason we hope that he really will rest and will encourage others to make necessary decisions while he is recuperating without attempting himself to carry the weight of policymaking. That will be the most effective way, incidentally, of showing the world that American policy is stronger than a single personality.

An Alternate Murdock Plan for Furnishing Water to the Western Portion of the Navajo Indian Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD the first of three articles by the Honorable John R. Murdock, of Arizona, a former Member of the House for 16 years and a former chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Murdock's articles set forth his proposal for the comprehensive development of the Little Colorado River so that its waters may be put to beneficial use on the western portion of the vast Navajo Indian Reservation and on the Hopi Reservation in Arizona. The Murdock plan also contemplates a supply of municipal water for Arizona's rapidly expanding city of Phoenix.

Mr. Murdock's plan to use Arizona's allotment of water under the upper Colorado River Basin compact of 1948 as a pump primer to develop additional water in the Little Colorado is based on his long years of service as a Member of the House, plus years of private study since he left the House in 1952.

The first installment of Mr. Murdock's plan follows:

AN ALTERNATE MURDOCK PLAN FOR FURNISHING WATER TO THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION

A recent enactment by Congress contemplates as one of its details furnishing water to the eastern portion of the Navajo Reservation in New Mexico and Arizona. However, the most elaborate plans in the recent legislation referred to cannot possibly provide the necessary water for the western portion of that vast area. On the other hand, it is the opinion of those who know the situation well that thousands of Indians, Navajos and Hopis, will either have to be moved off the reservation or perish. It therefore becomes highly important that something more be done for these Indians.

Up until recent years when oil and gas and uranium were found on this arid and desolate plateau, the Navajo Indians have been regarded as the poorest as well as the largest Indian tribe in America. Friends of

the Indians and especially thousands of church people of every Christian denomination have long urged that better and proper treatment be given this group of American citizens. Many of the proposals already tried have cost large sums of money and some may not have been too successful, but after many years of study I can report that relatively small but important progress has been made.

CONGRESS HAS ACTED

In defense of Congress I must contend that the Government at Washington has not been as niggardly in furnishing appropriations for these Indians as many are led to believe. Whether the money appropriated has been used most effectively is another matter. I want to call attention to some Navajo Indian legislation 8 years ago which has had bipartisan congressional support and I shall name only a few Members on both sides of the aisle who have taken the lead in this matter. In the 80th Congress—a Republican Congress—the Honorable Richard J. Welsh, Republican of California, as chairman of the House committee dealing with Indian matters introduced legislation entitled "Rehabilitation of the Navajo Indians." I, being on the committee, asked the chairman to broaden the legislation and include the Hopi Indians, because the 5,000 Hopis are on a reservation within the Navajo Reservation and entirely surrounded by the 65,000 Navajos, and their circumstances are equally critical. This bill was amended and made to include the Hopi Indians.

Only a beginning was thus made at that time in the Republican Congress but in the 81st Congress—which was a Democratic Congress—Congressman Toby Morris, of Oklahoma, took the lead in enacting the legislation which Chairman Welsh had introduced. I am happy to say the authorizing legislation was passed and became law. Therefore, I want to give due credit to Judge Morris, of Oklahoma, for his effective work on the bill and also to Wesley D'Ewart, who was at that time Republican Congressman from Montana. Congresswoman Bosone, of Utah, gave it her very best support. Of course I as a Democratic Member of Congress representing the State of Arizona am giving myself some credit for this enactment. In recent months I have traveled over hundreds of miles of these reservations and have seen the physical construction made possible and resulting from this legislation.

GETTING MORE WATER ONE WEIGHTY PROBLEM

The chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council told me that the western end of his reservation is by all odds the driest portion, and in spite of the success in putting down deep wells—with which program I have also helped—they have been unable to get sufficient water for the vast portion of that reservation area lying next to the Colorado River and north of the Little Colorado River. There is a lot of water in the main Colorado River flowing by and some of it undoubtedly belongs to those Indians but, gloomily, it might seem as well to be on the planet Mars as to be so far below where they live.

An easy answer to this problem is to say, "Let's move the Navajo and Hopi Indians off that high and arid plateau." My question is, "where will we move them? The Hopi Indians living on the mountain tops like eagles on a rock do not want to remove from the sky cities which they have occupied centuries before Columbus came to America. My belief is that without too great an expenditure of money it would be quite possible to furnish sufficient water to enable them to continue and expand their life right where they have lived for more than 2,000 years. My studies show this should be done by utilizing the natural resources which are in the region. The following is perhaps the germ of a unique idea.

MURDOCK'S LITTLE COLORADO RIVER PLAN

My own view of the "law of the Colorado River" assigns to Arizona in perpetuity a firm block of 50,000 acre-feet of water annually out of the Colorado River system to be used where Arizona can get maximum benefit. This water need not all come out of the depth of the Colorado River if an "exchange of water" will improve the situation. By proper engineering it could be supplied in part by the Little Colorado tributary below any point at which white men or Indians might feasibly divert water from that stream except as herein proposed. Although the Little Colorado River at its junction with the main Colorado is in a very deep gorge—where the two great airliners collided June 30, 1956, with a loss of 128 lives—a large part of its waters come from the high plateau and could be captured before they reach the bed of the main stream. Many springs, like the famous Blue Spring in the Little Colorado, furnish much water which is not measured under the "law of the river" and is not used any place in the State of Arizona. My contention is that there is undoubtedly sufficient of such water to furnish those Navajo and Hopi Indians more than 50,000 acre-feet annually when and if the other and varying supply is stabilized or regulated by some such work as Murdock's Little Colorado River plan.

What expensive engineering would be required in this proposed Little Colorado River plan? Nothing like the expense which is contemplated by the recently enacted legislation for the Navajo Dam on the San Juan River. I do estimate that four sizable dams and one smaller dam would need to be built. The smallest of these, in the nature of a diversion dam, should be on the mainstream of the Colorado River just below the mouth of the Little Colorado. This would not be the most expensive dam and not nearly as expensive as the great project now provided for on the San Juan River by the recent enactment. This diversion dam on the main Colorado need not exceed 150 feet in height for purposes of my Little Colorado River development. I have studied four dam sites upstream on the Little Colorado where large dams could be built, but none of them exceeding 400 feet in height above the stream bed. These dams would each provide a catchment basin backing the water up to the foot of the dam above it and each have a unique powerplant for pumping water to the final level of Tuba City in the surrounding areas where Indians now are cultivating a little land with their limited supply of water.

TERMS EXPLAINED

Murdock's Little Colorado River plan: This is not a little plan, but a big plan on the Little Colorado River in northern Arizona, to develop its waters fully.

Diversion dam: In this water plan it means an obstruction across the main Colorado River, where the Little Colorado enters, high enough above stream bed to force a small part of the flow up the channel of the Little Colorado River a few miles to a point on the Navajo Indian Reservation and outside the Grand Canyon National Park.

Unique power plants on the high dams: With most reclamation dams we build hydroelectric power plants to produce electric power from falling water. My Little Colorado River plan is quite different. I want to catch all the water draining from its watershed (also sand, silt, etc.) behind these high dams so that none of the flow of the Little Colorado, water or rock, gets to the main Colorado. On each dam in the Little Colorado I want a Percy Thomas wind-driven power plant to lift the water from the foot of the dam to its top, thus reversing the river's flow. Also from the V-shaped lake at the junction of the two rivers I would count on the same, a wind-powered pumping plant, to lift about 140 acre-feet of water

daily over the top of the highest dam near the main Colorado. The 140 acre-feet of water daily, more or less, would total the 50,000 acre-feet to be taken out of the main stream, to be mingled with waters coming down and to be used both on the Indian reservations and to be diverted southward for Greater Phoenix and central Arizona.

Exchange of water: Intermingling of the waters of the two rivers in this series of man-made lakes and dividing them according to a legal formula. A portion of the mingled waters is to be diverted to the Verde River for Greater Phoenix.

This, very briefly, too briefly, is my first alternate plan for a system of dams and unique power plants to furnish a constant and dependable water supply for the western Navajo area which would cost less than that contemplated for the eastern Navajo area in New Mexico. It would, in my opinion, be the sanest solution for this part of the Navajo problem. Since the foregoing is but a very brief outline of one phase of my proposed water development in northern Arizona, perhaps a further statement should follow and explain these suggestions.

Another reason calling for explanation and clarification is that terms and expressions have been used in this statement having different meanings, and capable of different interpretations. Further, some of the phases of this proposal are controversial and will need to be justified in the public mind because of the likely objections to be raised. Therefore, I want to follow this with a statement which will offer further explanation, elaboration, and justification.

In Honor of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, during the week of February 7 to February 13, the attention of the Nation is centered on the Boy Scouts of America.

The Scouts are proud of their organization; of its happy, wholesome program of activities; and its contributions to the making of a finer America.

As we, their elders, are proud of them.

Men and women devote their lives to their work, their homes, and their children.

But the greatest satisfaction they derive from all this effort is to see their youngsters become worthy of the advantages and the opportunities provided for them.

In our youth we knew little about the Boy Scouts. There were no troops available for us to join; and no one to direct us toward this organization that offers such fulfillment for the energy, the enthusiasm, and the natural idealism of youth.

If we had our lives to live over again, we would make certain to engage in those activities that we missed, and high among these would be membership in the Boy Scouts of America.

For there is no movement in this country that does more to make a boy self-sufficient, courteous, and inspired by the right thinking and the right doing than

develops a good man and a good citizen than the Boy Scouts.

I am humbly grateful for this emblem you have presented to me, and I shall be happy to wear it in celebration of the week that is set aside to honor your fine organization.

But do not ask me to go camping just yet. You will have to teach me the ropes before I can qualify for life in the great outdoors.

Even though boyhood days are far behind me, I admire your spirit, your healthy adventures, and your consideration for other people, that you are learning as members of your local troop.

Congratulations to the Boy Scouts of America.

Montana Eagle Scout Praises National Program of Youth Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the President's Council on Youth Fitness is doing an admirable job of focusing the attention of the Nation on the conservation of its most important asset, its youth. The council, made up of the Secretaries and Administrators of Federal departments, with Secretary of Interior Fred A. Seaton, Chairman, is catalytic by nature and design. It achieves its ends by stimulating the multiplicity of youth-serving organizations and resources and the homes that support them. Prominent among these agencies is the Boy Scouts of America. At the recent 49th anniversary breakfast of the Boy Scouts of America, a gifted Montana youth, one of 12 carefully selected Explorer Scouts, made a statement on the relationship of scouting and fitness, which Shane MacCarthy, Executive Director of the President's Council, proclaimed a most enlightened and eloquent interpretation. I commend the exposition to my colleagues. It follows:

PRESENTATION BY EXPLORER DON A. LaBAR, BILLINGS, MONT., OF REGION X, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The fitness of youth is an important subject which is getting much attention these days. My part on this program is to tell you about scouting and fitness. As everyone knows, the Scout program has been one that developed fitness ever since it started. All through the years the main emphasis has been on the outdoor activities of rugged camping and hiking, and on the Scout oath which says, "... physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight." It has been an all-round fitness program teaching boys to take care of themselves, be of service to others, and to develop functional and emotion, as well as physical, aspects of fitness.

President Eisenhower has called on all organizations and individuals to "take further action to improve the fitness of American youth." This will be a major emphasis in the Boy Scouts of America program during 1959 and 1960. Personal fitness will become a more important part of activi-

ties in units all across America. In other words, we're going to give more attention to something we've already been doing most of the time.

In this way we'll help youth become more fit. Through our adult leaders we hope to help parents understand their responsibility for fitness and how important it is for young people to be fit and stay fit.

It's going to take a great deal of planning and effort to do this job. Through our various committees and adult leaders, and with the help of experts in the various fields of all-round fitness, I know we'll do it and do it well for the personal fitness of the boys of our country.

Yorkville Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, New York has a glorious and eventful history. Unless the spirit of the passing times is captured and preserved by some one incorporating it into literature that spirit vanishes with the passing years. While I represent the 18th Congressional District and feel that I understand the people, the times, and the pulse, I feel that there are so many events which have escaped my attention. A few people have written about the glorious history of East Harlem and Yorkville. One of my constituents, Gertrude McManamon, of 325 East 69th Street, forwarded me a letter in which she portrayed a picture of Yorkville as it was in yesterday and is today. This story depicts the area and describes the people who populated it, were supplanted by new groups, and moved on to other climes. It tells the story of the people of my district, the Italians, the Germans, the Irish, the Bohemians, and other ethnic groups who came, lived, and departed.

I find it a great pleasure to incorporate this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that a history of the segment of my district shall be preserved for posterity.

The letter follows:

YORKVILLE TODAY

As we walk along the streets how many of us ever think of the way these streets looked some 50 years ago or even 25 years ago.

The climalent and the appearance of Yorkville today would impress any visitor or even those who had moved some years past and made a visit therein.

Jones Woods, empty lots, and coalyards are now a thing of the past. Likewise the old families who for generations had made Yorkville what it was are all a memory.

Yorkville in the beginning of the century belonged to the Italian heritage. When one would pass through or experience an apartment hunt, the majority living therein were Italian families. After the 1908 depression many of these families lost their little apartments and had to double up because of lack of work and money.

After a year of complete poverty throughout the section there were many apartments available but no money to rent them. At that time Yorkville ceased to be Italian. There were many young Irish boys and girls

who had migrated here from Ireland. With salaries at their lowest many of these boys and girls found their new home in America in the homes of others as domestics. Those who could afford servants as they were called lived on Fifth Avenue. Avenue A, First Avenue, Second and Third Avenues were a novelty to these employees when time permitted them to be free. Free time was very little. Lunch was served at 12 and they had to be sure to report by 4 to draw the blinds. They were permitted one evening a week free and every other Sunday. To them it was wonderful. They had a good home and enough to eat with a salary of \$6 to \$8 a month. With these few free hours they could find time to discover the other side of town or as they would say it—across the tracks.

As time passes boy meets girl and it was the Irish who took over the middle sixties of Yorkville. Then we eventually find the Bohemian people finding their way therein. The eighties found the German immigrants making Yorkville their land.

The year of 1914 saw difficulties which in most sections could have been bloodshed but in Yorkville the neighbors and inhabitants were one. Italian—German—Irish the problem was in their fatherland but they had found home in Yorkville where all worked and lived together.

The flu of 1918 did not spare anyone. The neighbor being struck down was as great a blow as one of the family, as Yorkville was all one big family.

The men who had loved Yorkville were corpses in their fatherland or the fatherland of their neighbors. Their sacrifice was to make Yorkville a home safe for their wives—and sons and daughters and in time for their grandsons and granddaughters.

The First World War was over; some did return to the home they loved more dearly than the home of their childhood. Many never did return, but they had left little boys and little girls to carry on their love.

The gaiety of the twenties was felt to the utmost in Yorkville for they were fun-loving people. The dances and block parties more numerous in this section of the city than anywhere else. Most of the inhabitants were poor, some very poor but in love and kindness they were rich.

The first sorrow reached Yorkville when announcement was made of the abolition of Jones Woods now the site of Rockefeller Institute. Yes, a hospital was to arise to help not the poor of Yorkville but the unknown diseases of the whole world.

Then to the dismay of many, Burns Coal Co. must leave Yorkville. Many of the inhabitants had been employees since their immigration to America. To find new employment was not easy but to find new homes was harder. All the employees were forced to leave their homes, another new hospital was being sought out for this section of town. New York Hospital from West 16th Street was now to be among the beauties of Yorkville.

With new surroundings, furnished rooms would be a thing of the past. Sixty-eighth Street between First and Second Avenues was the first experiment sought out. Among the furnished-room houses was the home of the Dominican Sisters of Sparkill Community, 227 the number. A new home for the convent. This was not easy; it was not to be determined quickly. The Sisters returned to their motherhouse for the summer months and in September a house was secured at 228 East 69th Street.

With the advent of the winter months the buildings were slow arising. The boom of money which seemed to entwine the twenties was dwindling off into the past and by 1930 the new buildings completed but who had the wherewith to rent them. By 1931 work got scarcer the boys and girls of the boys and girls of the war years were now approaching their working years.

New York Hospital employed many from the neighborhood but many also from other neighborhoods therefore there were many unemployed in Yorkville. The Democratic Club was never lonely for visitors and the members thereof in many instances took the opportunity to benefit themselves many jobs would be filled if a remuneration was given.

Through the years national churches had been added to the vicinity—now the church of St. Catherine which was the upper level of the school had outlived its usefulness. The parishioners who arrived in their teens now had grown to old age. The stairs was a hardship and many found that they could not attend the services because of the stairs. Another edifice to be added to Yorkville, St. Catherine of Siena Church, on 69th Street. Now the depression in its highest the boys and the girls walked the streets day and night. Work was something everyone talked of but few had the joy of having a weekly pay envelope. Checks in those days were not thought of.

Soon the boys were again to disappear now not to their fatherland but to try to keep the homes for their parents, wives, or families. The CCC was founded. Many of the Yorkville boys were responsible for the roads and improvements which was attained by the CCC. Then to some the luck of the WPA saved them from leaving their homes. They were fortunate enough to stay at home and received the dole of the city to keep their little homes together. Few ever thought of the idea of leaving Yorkville.

Improvements were made in the suburbs and new edifices erected but the neighbors of Yorkville just married and waited for the God-given blessing of securing an apartment in Yorkville.

With the sorrow of the depression put aside and another decade added to time more and more looked for homes but this joy was not long to be experienced. New York Hospital continued to expand and the true natives of Yorkville had to take leave there were no homes left for them. Many homes because of lack of money had been neglected and were now beyond repair. These were just boarded up others were passed on to new owners and redecorated not for the Yorkville family of three or four but for the transient of one who would rent it out to two nurses on different shifts and get an exorbitant fee for the rental. This was at first in the minority.

Pearl Harbor again brought back to many the sorrow of 1914. Once again the neighborhood was heavily robbed of its male youth yet too many of Yorkville females faced the safety of their country. The draft was heavy because of the many hospitals and city buildings and schools within the area. No one was safe. One with glasses from his baby years appeared in a uniform and some were among those who never returned to Yorkville but lay in the fatherland of their fathers or mothers.

Divorce or separation in Yorkville was seldom heard of. There was sickness and poverty but there was always a way. There was neighborly love and there was family devotion. To stay near to help the old folks to help the young ones with their little families was not a burden but a duty.

The war ended all looked to the return of the youth who in turn looked for a long happy life in Yorkville. This was soon to end their home and hopes. Now with homes at an impossibility of securing each month hundreds of families are forced out of the only home they have known or wanted to know Yorkville.

Lenox Hill settlement that withstood the depression and wars cannot withstand the inflation. It is not one house but blocks of houses turned into parking lots, office buildings, or apartment houses far beyond the reach of the working class.

As the hospital center moved in to help the people of Yorkville, it has helped the people of all over the world and left the lifelong inhabitants of Yorkville homeless.

Those who come to take the place of the immigrants that built and preserved and loved this spot in no way feel the home love it deserves. It is an address, or a place to work, but family life is not part of the dwelling. These tenants live for the day they will return to Pennsylvania, North Carolina, California, or any one of the other 49 States, but those who are being relocated are never to return to the home of their love and their childhood—Yorkville.

As history repeats itself, there is no room in the hearts of the political leaders to direct or preserve Yorkville from its fall. Home is not new beautiful buildings; home is where the family is raised and taught to be good citizens—good fathers and mothers—and in turn their children will do likewise. There will be no children to grow up in Yorkville to preserve its future or to pass on to their families the love they have inherited through the generations from their parents and grandparents.

Yorkville has helped make some of your dreams come true; surely it is in your reach to produce some possible assistance to save Yorkville.

Program of Inauguration of Hon. Pat Brown as Governor of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of the program occurring at Sacramento, the capital city of my native State of California, on January 15, when the distinguished California citizen, Pat Brown, was inaugurated as Governor of my State.

Heretofore, the distinguished U.S. Senator from California, Hon. CLAIR ENGLE, inserted in the Appendix of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 14, 1959, beginning at page A140 thereof the text of the inaugural address by Gov. Pat Brown. It is now my pleasure to supplement for the information of all who read this the inaugural day program on that same historical occasion:

PROGRAM

Call to order of the joint session of the Legislature of the State of California. President pro tempore of the senate and speaker of the assembly presiding.

"Star-Spangled Banner": Organist, Assemblyman Frank Lanterman.

Invocation: Chaplain of the assembly.

Lieutenant Governor escorted into chamber and seated.

Governor escorted into chamber.

Introduction of Gov. Goodwin J. Knight by the speaker of the assembly.

Remarks.

Administration of oath of office to Hon. Edmund G. Brown, Governor, by Hon. Phil S. Gibson, chief justice of the supreme court. "America."

Administration of oath of office to Hon. Glenn M. Anderson, Lieutenant Governor, by Hon. Phil S. Gibson, chief justice of the supreme court.

Introduction of Gov. Edmund G. Brown by the president pro tempore of the senate. Inaugural address: Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

Introduction of Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson by the speaker of the assembly.

Address: Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson.

Benediction: Chaplain of the senate.

"I Love You California."

INAUGURAL DAY PROGRAM, STATE CAPITOL, WEST ENTRANCE, MONDAY, JANUARY 5, 1959, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

1:30 P.M.

Band concert, San Francisco Boys' Club Band, Roland Terry, director.

2 P.M.

Proceedings from the assembly chambers.

3 P.M.

Call to order.

Presentation of colors.

Pledge of allegiance.

Invocation.

Administration of oath of office to Stanley Mosk, attorney general; Alan Cranston, controller; Bert A. Betts, State treasurer, by Hon. Phil S. Gibson, chief justice of the supreme court.

Presentation of Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson and Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

Benediction.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Businessman in Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the address I am about to ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD was made yesterday by a man who is peculiarly qualified to make it. It is on the subject "The Businessman in Public Affairs," and was made to the Weirton, W.Va., Chamber of Commerce. The speaker was the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. He began his activities as a working newspaperman. Then he became, successively, a newspaper editor, a magazine editor, a college professor, and a business executive.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH served with distinction for seven terms in the House of Representatives. In the course of that service, I was privileged to have him, with other Members of a House committee, visit us in Alaska, where his interest in its problems was reflected in subsequent legislation.

After his seven terms in the House, JENNINGS RANDOLPH became a business executive again in an industry which is greatly affected with the public interest, namely, the aviation industry. He is now, I am happy to say, our colleague in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that his thoughtful and timely address, "The Businessman in Public Affairs," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUSINESSMAN IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Weirton Chamber of Commerce, and guests, it is a pleasure to be with you and to discuss the role of the businessman in public affairs. This is a question which has long been of interest and personal concern to me—since I have considered myself a businessman as well as one professionally interested in public affairs—and I note that it is a subject which is becoming of increasing regard to your own organization.

During the campaign last fall an incident occurred which I think highlights one aspect of our discussion tonight. As I was walking along the street in my home community of Eklins, talking with the voters and discussing the issues, I was stopped by a citizen who drew me into a doorway to discuss the campaign. After finishing our conversation I asked him why he had drawn me off the street and into the privacy of a doorway. Whereupon he replied: "You know I am in business and I must be very careful of what I do and say."

Though this man may have dramatized his fears somewhat, ladies and gentlemen, he does not represent an isolated state of mind.

For, the rule of prudence—the precautionary attitude against speaking one's mind on controversial issues—has taken seed among too many of us. It is a measure of the failure of the democratic process—a failure in the belief in the great dialogue of democracy—when anyone, business man, professional man, or teacher, fears to participate in the political process.

Therefore, I am much heartened by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce program of the Aircade and local political workshops to encourage the political activity and participation of businessmen.

However, I would offer a word of caution. For there is some indication that this action is stimulated by the concern within the thinking of some members of the chamber for what is seen as the growing power and political effectiveness of organized labor.

I hope that this view will not dominate the political actions of businessmen. I hope that they will see their role in larger terms—and not merely in opposition to labor. For any action which is cast in terms of protagonist and antagonist limits the freedom of the actors—by limiting the scope of their imagination and perception.

I would digress a moment to illustrate this principle in reference to our own national attitudes toward the Soviet Union. Russia has at one and the same time become our national demon and the gage by which we measure our own progress. We are too frequently confronted with such questions as "Are American schools as advanced as those of Russia?" "Do we offer enough support for basic research in science and technology compared with that of Russia?" "Are race relations in the United States strengthening the position of Russia in world opinion?"

Thus, in recent years, we have too frequently approached our problems not in terms of finding the best possible solutions, but in terms of the cold war with Russia. And to that extent we have fallen increasingly under the dominance of the Kremlin. For the solution to any problem is determined, in large measure, by the questions which one addresses to the problem.

I devoutly hope, therefore, that the political actions of businessmen will not be thus restricted—that they will ask questions not in terms of whether a particular policy will circumscribe the power of labor, but rather whether it is in the best national interests as well as their own legitimate self interests.

This is only instance, however, of the need to avoid the general tendency of interpreting public problems in terms of opposite solutions. Our political discourse, and hence the solution to political questions, is too often restricted by the use of polar or opposite terms—liberal and conservative, radical and reactionary, labor and management, farmer and consumer, socialist and capitalist, et cetera. The list could be extended. And we are all familiar with the old platitude, "There are two sides to every question."

Such a polarizing of public problems, however, falsifies the realities of political life. For there are, in fact, as many sides to every question as there are parties or interests involved. And the great genius of the democratic process is that it offers a wider variety of solutions than can be encompassed by mere opposites.

Politics in a democracy is the art of the possible—the art of compromise and conciliation. Webster defines "compromise" as "a settlement by arbitration or by consent

reached by mutual concessions." This definition offers us a clue as to how the businessman can make one of his chief contributions in the arena of public affairs. For the life of business and commerce is in large measure a life of offering mutual concessions, of arriving at a compromise of interests whereby each party gains some satisfaction.

It was popular at one time in some quarters to state that America needed a sound business Government. Without commenting on the recent record of some businessmen in Government, I suggest that this statement offers an oversimplification of both business and Government. For it assumes that business can be defined solely in terms of dollars and cents and cost accounting. And that the justification of governmental policies should be decided in the same terms. I have called this an oversimplification, first, because it fails to acknowledge the complexity of government in a modern democratic society; and second, because it fails to perceive the cultural significance of business and commerce.

The modern businessman must be more than a mere cost accountant. Wise decisions in business require not only a knowledge of how to conduct a commercial transaction, but knowledge of personal relations, of community relations, and of the whole process of communication. From this point of view, therefore, the businessman, the modern businessman, is peculiarly well gifted to contribute to public affairs.

In this connection, it is appropriate to mention that one of the distinguished guests with us tonight, President Thomas E. Millsop, of National Steel Corp., is not only a man of management, but one who has associated himself with public affairs and has made real contributions to the advancement of community, State, and national interests.

The National Management Association, an organization of 73,000 members in 340 affiliated clubs representing 1,200 companies in 34 States, honored Mr. Millsop by awarding to him its 1958 Management Man of the Year distinction. I am sure that this award was not bestowed upon Tom Millsop simply because of his technical proficiency in the management field; rather, it was recognition, too, of his broad understanding of and contributions to public affairs in relationship to the free-enterprise system.

I say in passing, however, that we should not limit the term "public affairs" to the application of government alone. Public affairs, and the role of the businessman therein, imply the whole range of public life and all of our cultural institutions as well as those of the States. This means that the businessman should interest himself not only in politics in the more limited sense, but also in the advancement of our schools, our hospitals, and our institutions of the fine arts, as well as those matters which more immediately affect his own interests, such as tax revisions, fair-trade practices, and the reciprocal trade agreements.

Participation in such affairs can be justified in more than just humanitarian terms as well. It can be justified in terms acceptable to the most hardheaded businessman. For example, we are all well aware of the need to attract a more diversified industry to West Virginia. While we are fortunate in having such basic industries as coal and steel and chemicals, we also need light in-

dustries which involve a lower capitalization per man in order to revive our sagging economy and offer jobs to workers who have been displaced by technological developments. And it has been the experience of other States which have sought to attract new industry that modern enlightened management is becoming increasingly concerned with the general cultural conditions in the area in which they seek to locate. While such factors as the tax climate, transportation facilities, and natural resources are perhaps the dominant factors in attracting industry, present day management is aware that its industrial and personnel relations are strongly affected by the surrounding conditions in schools, hospitals, recreational facilities, et cetera. Thus, from a long range point of view, it is equally to the interest of the businessman to engage himself in the development of the general cultural facilities of his area.

This suggests another respect in which the business community can make a genuine contribution to public affairs. Ours is a civilization dominated in large measure by a business ethos—by the values and attitudes of the business world. This condition affords the businessman considerable influence in the molding of public opinion—in the conditioning of cultural attitudes. I would like to see him use this influence on public opinion in raising the cultural status of the expert—the person of achieved excellence.

The American businessman has the reputation of being tough-minded. He is from Missouri. He is hospitable to facts and to the person who is expert in dealing with them. I should like to see him use his influence and his arts of communication to extend this hospitality to the expert throughout the range of public affairs; I should like to see such efforts emerge in a revitalization of the American regard for the expert, for the person who has achieved excellence in whatever field—in the arts, in business, in science, in scholarship, in government administration, as well as in the individual conduct of life in our daily affairs.

We are today, and we have been for some years, faced with what might be called a growing lack of accountability. In an evermore complex society in which individual responsibility becomes lost in the mesh of social relationships, it is too easy to avoid responsibility—too simple to avoid being held accountable for the quality of one's performance. This is what I mean by the lack of accountability.

Thus we have given rise to the glorification of mediocrity and the neglect of excellence. To dispel such a popular attitude and reawaken a public regard for quality performance may well be one of the greatest contributions the businessman could make to public affairs.

Now after this somewhat philosophical foray, let me turn, in closing, to more concrete matters, to matters which I am confident have occupied a considerable amount of your interest.

I refer to two items of legislation which will soon be presented to the 86th Congress. First, Senate bill 505, introduced by Senator KENNEDY with myself as one of the cosponsors. This is the labor-management reform bill—a revised version of the Kennedy-Ives proposal which passed the Senate in the last session by a vote of 88 to 1. During my campaign I stated that I would support such legislation as that offered by Senators KENNEDY and Ives. As a member of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have offered myself as cosponsor of the present measure.

I am well aware of the criticism that has been leveled from some quarters. Without taking these criticisms up in detail, and without impugning the motives of any who have criticized the bill, I would like to state briefly its purpose and its provisions. But

first I would like to quote from a letter which Senator KENNEDY recently received from former Senator Ives.

Senator Ives wrote, "This bill represents many months of careful study in committee, the collective judgment of the U.S. Senate as expressed in 5 days and nights of debating and voting, and many, many years of collective experience of labor-management legislation.

"Furthermore, it is designed to meet the objectives set forth in the report of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. It is my firm conviction that this bill not only meets those objectives but does so in a fashion that makes it corrective rather than punitive legislation, a measure which will correct abuses without undermining the rights of working men and women."

First, as Senator KENNEDY has said, it is "a bipartisan measure on a nonpartisan subject." Second, it is stronger and clearer in its terms than was the original Kennedy-Ives bill. It has been revised to make it quite clear that the section on employer reporting does not interfere with normal personnel relations or communications, and that the section on bribes cannot possibly be interpreted to include wage or other normal payments.

And third, it is, as Senator KENNEDY stated, "primarily a labor-management reform bill, dealing with the problems of dishonest racketeering—it is not a bill on industrial relations, dealing with the problems of collective bargaining and economic power." The broad issues of labor-management relations are not involved in this legislation and were not so intended. For these are quite properly divorced from the issues of corruption and racketeering in labor.

I would, therefore, urge each of you to consult the bill yourself and in your own judgment determine if this is not for the best interests for labor and management alike, as well as in the larger national interests.

A question of equal importance to all of you is that of forthcoming legislation on small business. I am pleased that I am also a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business, and will be actively engaged in legislation in this field.

In preface to my remarks on this topic let me state that I am not one to whom big business per se is an evil; there is nothing inherent in the size of any economic structure, nor for that matter in any political or social structure, which makes it either good or evil. It is the uses to which such organizations are placed and the degree of responsibility exercised by those in management which determine their ultimate benefit to society. In recognizing this we must acknowledge also that bigness has become a permanent and fundamental characteristic of American economic and political institutions—big government, big labor, and big business are here to stay. The problems of capitalizing modern industry and exploring the new frontiers of technology require large units of production. But with this, we must develop and maintain the means and techniques to prevent the individual man and woman from being lost in the shuffle and to insure the continued vitality of small businesses.

The 85th Congress moved significantly in this direction in establishing the Small Business Administration as a permanent agency, in passing the Small Business Investment Act, and in broadening the lending authority of the Small Business Administration. But much remains to be done.

There are approximately 5 million small businessmen in the United States, roughly the same number as there are farm families. These two groups comprise much of the reservoir of talent and initiative that have

brought our Nation to its present greatness. We must see that this reservoir is not drained off by neglect, by inequitable tax laws, and by administrative regulations.

Let me emphasize once again the potential power the businessman has for exerting his influence far beyond the range of the activities of buying and selling and of producing and distributing goods. For the men of commerce and industry are the ones who control the material resources of our society; morally speaking, these resources are held not in fee simple but in stewardship—a stewardship which carries with it the responsibility to see that these material resources are used to assure the widest possible benefit, both materially and spiritually, for a free society. It is within your power if you but will it.

These are times of extreme tension—sometimes of deep doubts about our tomorrows.

I close on this positive approach:

There is no room for gloom in the long-term future. Fact and faith must combine in the promise of a further unprecedented era of expansion, creation of new industry, and a more sustained prosperity.

The American people are resourceful. They will realistically meet the challenge of changing world and domestic conditions.

We must see to it that business continues its dynamic development and that our co-operative capitalism, which embraces both employee and employer, be cushioned by reasonable Government regulation and reputable practices within the framework of our private enterprise system.

Ours is a growth country. It is a fallacy to short-sell its future.

Deseret News Discusses Neuberger Bill on Alcohol and Tobacco Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding newspapers in America is the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City. In its weekly supplements for January 17, 1959, and January 24, 1959, the Deseret News has published two comprehensive interviews with me about my legislative proposal to have Federal matching funds used to encourage courses in our public schools in educating children with respect to the impact on their health of both tobacco and alcohol.

These interviews were written by Mr. George L. Scott, veteran newspaperman, who is correspondent in the Pacific Northwest for the Deseret News.

I ask unanimous consent that these interviews from the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News, Jan. 17, 1959]

OREGON U.S. SENATOR OPPOSES TOBACCO, LIQUOR ADVERTISING

PORTLAND, OREG.—"Glamour advertising of cigarettes and liquor over TV and radio, in magazines and newspapers is aimed at the young—older people are already hooked."

So declared U.S. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, as he prepared to reopen his senatorial effort to educate the youth of the Nation on their gamble with health if they use either product.

The Senator said he would reintroduce the bill he placed before the Senate on May 21, 1958. This bill, which did not reach the Senate floor before adjournment, provided Federal grants-in-aid for educational programs to teach schoolchildren about the dangers to health from cigarettes and liquor. He said there would be no substantial change in the measure.

Senator NEUBERGER emphasized that he was not advocating a prohibition in the use of either tobacco or liquor.

"My purpose is to give the States of this Nation a chance to advise their young people on important matters concerning their health," he said.

"Most of the advertising on tobacco and liquor is beamed at young people.

"They are entitled to know what the facts are. After that, if they want to smoke, it's up to them. Their own reasoning rather than the pressure of glamorized advertising should prompt them," he declared.

LAUDS HEALTH EDUCATION

Senator NEUBERGER, who does not smoke nor drink, said his determination to push for health education was intensified following his return from Washington after the last session of Congress.

He underwent surgery for a malignant growth and is still under treatment.

"My own experience," the Senator said, "has intensified my interest in anything dealing with health."

He pointed to the Nation's \$6.8 billion expenditure for research, most of it dealing with nuclear science, while only \$211 million, or 4 percent, was spent on medical research of all diseases.

"Cobalt radiation, now used in the treatment of cancer, is a result of research," Senator NEUBERGER said. "If my trouble had developed a few years ago my chances would have been much less."

"Look at the children in the past who died of polio, diphtheria and other diseases before medical research made recovery almost certain."

CHILDREN SHOULD BE INFORMED

"I feel every child is entitled to the right to be informed of dangers ahead. The best place to do this is in school—backed by research and not advertising glamor," he said.

"In contrast to the questionable advertising which prompts young people to take up smoking at an early age, when they frequently are told to associate this habit with the success of some great baseball star or motion picture queen, is the warning by the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Leroy E. Burney, who said:

"Many independent studies thus have confirmed beyond reasonable doubt that there is a high degree of statistical association between lung cancer and prolonged cigarette smoking . . . while there are naturally differences of opinion in interpreting the data on lung cancer and cigarette smoking, the Public Health Service feels the weight of the evidence is increasingly pointing in one direction—that excessive smoking is one of the causative factors in lung cancer," the Senator quoted.

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News, Jan. 24, 1959]

PUBLIC INDIFFERENCE DELAYS HEALTH BILL

PORTLAND, OREG.—Public indifference, advertising power and sectional economy will be major hurdles to clear before the public can be educated on the health hazards surrounding the use of liquor and tobacco.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, encountered all of these obstacles

after he first introduced his bill for Federal aid to States desiring to give their schoolchildren the facts of research concerning the use of cigarettes and alcohol.

He is hopeful there will be an upsurge of support from Senators and the public when he reintroduces his bill sometime in March.

"Any bill that has strong support from public bodies in the States will be brought out of committee for congressional action," the Senator said.

REACTION TO MEASURE

In dividing first reaction to his measure, Senator NEUBERGER listed the following:

Public: Indifferent, little immediate support in general.

Educators: Some support but far under expectations.

Churches: Good reaction from religious groups, particularly the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Seventh-day Adventists, and Methodists.

Advertising agencies: Hostile reaction from advertising magazines and publications. Much of their revenues come from tobacco and liquor.

"Only a few Senators gave promise of support," Senator NEUBERGER said.

"Southern Senators are swayed away from support by the importance of the tobacco crop to the South although they favored education on liquor.

"I realize that it takes time to build up a program but with the aid of such organizations as the American Cancer Society, other health groups, educators, and churches it can be done.

"If the public gives its support you have a chance to pass legislation.

"If indifferent, little chance because of the great amount of legislation facing Congress."

CHURCH MEMBERS LEND SUPPORT

Senator NEUBERGER said he received many letters from Mormon Church officials and members in Utah, Idaho, and California backing his program.

"The power of liquor and tobacco advertisers is the main hurdle facing the grant-in-aid education program," Senator NEUBERGER said.

"We leave the field entirely to the liquor and tobacco people who have unlimited capital to support their products."

The Senator insisted that education is the great hope for everything. He pointed out that the grant-in-aid plan he backs for giving the facts on cigarettes and alcohol respects State's rights. No State, he said, is required to give such education unless it so desires.

"I don't believe in prohibition," he declared, "but I do believe in giving relative facts. If advertisers misdirect the Nation's youth, the Government should at least give the fair facts."

U.S. AGENCIES INCONSISTENT

"If ever there was a situation where the left hand knoweth not what the right hand doeth, it is in the policy of the U.S. Government with respect to tobacco and cigarettes. While one agency of Government warns that cigarettes may be a factor in causing cancer, the most terrible disease afflicting the human race, another governmental agency subsidizes and encourages the growth of the product from which cigarettes are made."

Senator NEUBERGER inquired:

"What would be the reaction here in America if we learned that the government of Red China was subsidizing the production of poppies, from which opium is distilled? Would we not raise our voices in righteous scorn and indignation? Then what must the rest of the world think of the fact that in the United States eggs and meat and vegetables are not supported as basic farm crops, but tobacco is?"

The Senator conceded that "a bill is simply a piece of printed paper that can be indefinitely postponed."

"Other things," he said, "cannot be postponed so readily—cancer of the lung, for instance. The doctors and scientists will continue their studies. They will report, and some men in journalism and politics will disseminate the reports. People will smoke cigarettes, and human tissue and protoplasm will react accordingly. Such events as President Eisenhower's account of how he himself overcame the smoking habit are sure to have a mighty effect. Americans will learn the facts about cigarettes and various diseases, and then they will wonder why their Government considers tobacco a basic crop but not the Thanksgiving turkey or baby's milk or the morning baked apple or glass of orange juice.

"When enough Americans wonder about this, my bill will pass," Senator NEUBERGER concluded.

Who Will Control?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Edgefield Advertiser, in Edgefield, S.C., on February 4. The editor of this weekly paper points to the real danger of the continuing centralization of control by the Federal Government of the individual citizens of our country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO WILL CONTROL?

Among all the controversial issues or mild subjects that ferment in legislative bodies, in departments of state, in the press, and elsewhere, there is one—the most important among them all—that gets little or no attention.

It is: Who will control?

Each year, the individual has less control over what he earns.

Each year, he has less control over the who and the what and the how of the education of his children.

Each year, he has less control over his way of life.

Each year, he has less control over his Government.

It is a simple deduction, that, with less control over what he earns, and this control going to the state; with less control over education of his children, this control going to the state; with less control over his way of life, this control going to the state; and with less control over the state itself, the very meaning of freedom has been renounced.

It is not surprising that the ideals of American history are being subverted in many public school textbooks in the United States.

The words of Patrick Henry, for example, which were presented stirring to schoolchildren for generations, "Give me liberty or give me death," are now in a position of ridicule, or are twisted to serve a new purpose.

The sordid substitute now is: "Gimme; I'm afraid of insecurity; and who wants to die for anything?"

To interpret the political trend in any other way is serving untruth. It is dishonest, and it is also a reason for more than impatience.

It is getting late to brand the enemies of freedom; for there are so many of them.

They parade with the mantle of welfarism, and speak with the sweetness of saints. From time immemorial it is the type which people of love and zeal have had to oppose with ceaseless vigilance and determination.

There is far too little hostility against these perpetrators of public evils and these abettors of communistic subversion in the United States.

No Communist missiles carrying hydrogen bombs will ever destroy freedom.

But freedom is on the way out because of these forces working from within.

Right-to-Work Legislation Held Harmful to U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 3, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], had printed in the RECORD an editorial from one of the leading papers in my great home State of Utah, the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City. The editorial dealt with the so-called right-to-work issue, and detailed the views of that newspaper on this important subject.

In the State of Utah, the Deseret News has a well-deserved reputation for precisely and forthrightly stating its point of view. It also has a reputation for fairness, and it regularly opens its columns to its readers whose views differ from those of the newspaper. This is, to my mind, a sound and fine example of true belief in freedom of the press and in freedom of speech.

The editorial which Senator GOLDWATER inserted into the RECORD on February 3, was published in the Deseret News on January 17. On January 30, however, that newspaper published a letter, from Mr. LaMar D. Gulbransen, chairman of the United Labor Committee of Utah, and president of the Utah State AFL-CIO, taking vigorous issue with points cited in the News editorial.

The Deseret News thus presented both sides of a controversial issue. I am sure that my distinguished colleague, Senator GOLDWATER, would want the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to present equally both sides of this issue; and, probably, when he offered the editorial he did not realize that the other side had already been presented in the same newspaper.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter to the editor of a great newspaper, the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News, Jan. 30, 1959]

RIGHT-TO-WORK LEGISLATION HELD HARMFUL TO U.S. ECONOMY

Our American democracy is based upon the collective bargaining process guaranteed under the present rule of the majority.

So-called right-to-work legislation is a fundamental attack on these basic principles; an attempt by a comparative few to make the expression "Union Busting" more realistic. It is a system devised to weaken and eventually destroy the fundamental and basic concepts of the collective bargaining process.

The right to work is not new; in the early 1900's it was formulated in an attempt to stop organization of working men and women into unions of their choice. This type of propaganda has been used by the National Association of Manufacturers and other employer groups in an effort to slow, weaken, and destroy labor throughout the entire first 60 years of the 20th century. Clarence Darrow stated in a legal brief drawn in 1900: "Right to work is a bit of bird lime to sway the unthinking mass."

It still is:

Proponents of right to work profess to be worried about the fate of the individual workers. They seek to give the right to a single employee to contact management for negotiation purposes—all by himself—for pay increases and/or better working conditions. In other words, right-to-work supporters seek to restore the ancient liberties of the working man and woman—the right to suffer, starve and work long hours under sweatshop conditions.

Responsible unionism is the result of secure unionism. The Taft-Hartley Act recognizes this. Under the Taft-Hartley Act a union may bargain for a union shop only if a majority of the workers so affected vote for a union shop. Originally, the Taft-Hartley Act provided for such employee votes to be supervised by the Federal Government. After 4 years, 92 percent of all such elections resulted in 95 percent of all affected workers voting for the union shop and Senator Taft, himself, asked that the provision of the Federal law calling for such elections be dropped as a waste of money.

Defenders of the right-to-work law use figures indiscriminately to try to prove that this type of legislation helps the economy. In reality, the right-to-work States rank at the bottom of the list of States in personal income according to the U.S. Department of Commerce. Utah's per capita income in 1957 was \$333—16 percent—below the national average. Utah is 30th in the list of States in this category.

Right-to-work States with the low income are States where reactionary and selfish employers seek to manufacture goods on a 1920 pay scale and sell elsewhere on a 1959 scale. This is harmful to the economy of the United States. When our national economy is hurt; when the economy of States is harmed; it means that each of us is hurt as well.

To keep in step with progress—to regain her position in the march of States toward a better and more prosperous life, we need to restore the rule of sane and safe legislation and repeal the present unsound and harmful right-to-work law.

LaMAR D. GULBRANSEN,
Chairman, United Labor Committee of
Utah, and President of the Utah
State AFL-CIO.

Legality of Supreme Court Decision in Doubt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial

entitled "Legality in Doubt," which was published in the Greenville News in Greenville, S.C., on February 10, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGALITY IN DOUBT

It almost certainly is unintentional, but both the Republican administration and a group of Democratic and Republican liberals headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, are betraying doubt that the antisegregation decision of the U.S. Supreme Court really is the law of the land.

They have been saying all along that it is, and have either used force or proposed the use of further force to compel segregated communities to admit Negroes to their white schools.

Now, however, in separate bills, the administration and the Douglas group are asking Congress to adopt a resolution declaring the decision of 1954 to be the supreme law of the land and demanding that the States must take immediate steps to end segregation.

We have never believed that the decision is truly constitutional and legal, but if the integrationists are right in their contention that it is, why do they feel the need of an act of Congress to declare it so?

Blows Against Protestant Christianity by the Peiping Communist Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, last November, the press of the Nation gave much attention to a proposal made by the Fifth World Order Study Conference of the National Council of Churches' Department of International Affairs, in Cleveland, Ohio. This proposal urged that Red China be granted diplomatic recognition by the United States and also be admitted to the United Nations. Opponents of the proposal quickly pointed out that the pronouncement did not constitute an official policy of the council.

A news story recently carried by the Religious News Service tells of a questionnaire sent to Protestant pastors and of the overwhelming disapproval of the study conference's proposal.

At the same time, the District of Columbia Baptist Convention weekly newspaper printed a compilation of reports from the National Council of Churches depicting the crippling blows which have been dealt to Protestant Christianity by the Peiping Communist Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD these two news stories, which indicate the views of many Protestant ministers and the terrible circumstances under which the Protestant churches in Red China exist.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEY DISCLOSES 7,437 PROTESTANT MINISTERS OPPOSE RECOGNIZING PEKING

NEW YORK.—In a nationwide survey 7,437 Protestant ministers recently opposed United States recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations.

Questionnaires were sent out to some 45,000 pastors of major Protestant denominations in this country. Of 8,572 replies, 963 approved China's recognition and United Nations entry, 172 expressed no opinion, and the remainder were opposed.

The clergy group, which originated the survey, said it was designed to counteract a proposal made by the Fifth World Order Study Conference last November in Cleveland that Red China be granted diplomatic recognition by the United States and admitted to the United Nations.

Sponsoring the conference was the National Council of Churches' Department of International Affairs but its pronouncements did not constitute an official policy of the council.

GOVERNMENT CRIPPLES CHURCH IN CHINA

(The following is a compilation of reports from the National Council of Churches. The sources are: Dr. Wallace C. Merwin, executive secretary of the China Committee, Division of Foreign Missions; Dr. Frank W. Price, director of the Missionary Research Library. Their sources included personal letters, the New China News Agency and China's only nationally distributed Protestant biweekly, Tien-Feng.)

A series of crippling blows has been dealt to Protestant Christianity in Communist China. Under pressure from the Peking Government, all denominations are being merged into a single church body, and a preponderance of local churches are being forced to close.

Involved are 16 principal denominations long established in the country, with a membership of nearly 1 million. Typical of local church closings was the recent shutdown of all but 12 of the 200 Protestant churches in Shanghai, while in Peking itself 61 out of 65 churches have been closed. These closed churches are being turned over to the Government as patriotic gifts, the reports indicate.

The measures are being carried out by the Three-Self Patriotic Movement Committee of Chinese church leaders, the only Protestant agency in the country officially recognized by the Peking Government.

"By leaving the churches little choice except to join the Three-Self Patriotic Movement Committee," Dr. Merwin declared, "the Chinese authorities are succeeding in maintaining closer controls over the churches and their members. They have already acquired Protestant schools, hospitals and other institutions as 'patriotic gifts.' As a result, it is not so much a persecuted church as it is a captive church."

During the first 6 months of 1958, church workers underwent an intensive course in education for socialism as a part of a general thought-rectification campaign. Many rightists in the churches were exposed and a considerable number arrested. Among the many who refused to cooperate, Dr. Merwin cited a woman, the former president of a Christian college in South China, who is now scrubbing floors in that institution.

Congregations are constantly urged to carry out self-reform and to take an active part in China's giant leap forward. In inland towns, denominations have already merged into a single organization and church leaders everywhere are reportedly pledging wholehearted obedience to the Government and the Three-Self Committee. By holding joint services in a single building, the funds of the other churches are dedicated to socialist construction.

Under special attack now are freelance preachers, revivalists, and the steadily in-

creasing religious gatherings in private homes, which are considered subversive.

In 1950, the year of the last count, Protestants numbered 903,805 active church members, perhaps 1,500,000 in the total community. The largest group was the Church of Christ in China, about 177,000. The Methodists reported 102,693, a few thousand less than the True Jesus Church, the second largest group. Lutherans and the China Baptist Convention numbered 65,000 each, the Seventh Day Adventists 21,117, and North China Congregationalists 18,235. Roman Catholic membership was estimated at between 2 and 3 million, including family members of all ages.

"Today," said Dr. Merwin, "Chinese Protestants are told that church divisions and denominational names are 'vestiges of western colonialism aimed to divide and rule.' To be truly independent and patriotic, they are advised, the churches must unify their forms of worship, methods of support and doctrinal creeds. This counsel is bringing such incompatible religious factions together that more and more church members are staying away from church. These latest actions are the first attempt to break denominational authority and bring all churches into a controlled ecclesiastical system. 'It is also the first time,' he concluded, 'that Protestant congregations have had to surrender their properties and funds on such a large scale.'"

Two letters report the drastic changes taking place in Chinese Protestant churches.

"The first group of pastors and church workers have now finished their meetings after about 5 months," says the first writer. "There are many decisions, many restrictions. No one may teach or preach except those registered with the Three-Self Movement Committee and no services, prayers or Bible teaching may be carried out except in regular church buildings. Attendance has much fallen off, partly because so many work on Sunday—one of the latest resolutions is that services on Sunday must not be allowed to interfere with work."

"Many pastors and church workers are being taken into factories, the younger ones go out to farms. They are all having what they call the 'leap forward,' and everyone must work more, faster, better, and more economically. It is amazing what they have accomplished, working very hard often with only about 5 hours left for sleep."

A second letter:

"Mother does not always go to church on Sunday as the churches have now been joined together. The pastors who are not needed in the combined church are sent to work in factories or in the fields. And the church is not open much besides Sundays as the pastors have to attend political study meetings. The tension and fear of doing or saying something wrong is enough to wear you out."

A Star for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, sometimes a very few words depict the essence of a problem so clearly that comment upon the content is superfluous. Such is the very brief and to-the-point editorial urging Hawaiian statehood which appeared in the Idaho Falls (Idaho) Post-Register of February 5, 1959. I ask

unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A STAR FOR HAWAII

Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn. Statehood for the islands, a pretty sturdy perennial before Congress, is about to enter the bill-drafting stage for the umpteenth time.

This year the odds run more strongly for it, though opposition still exists. Alaska has broken the ice and changed the flag.

Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned, and that argument has faded in consequence.

With Alaska we abandoned the notion that only territory directly attached to the continental United States could be brought within the fold of States. Once we did that, then what difference whether the spread is 1,500 miles or 2,600?

By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds.

Recognition Is Given to Worldwide Travel Show at Bluefield, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, next Tuesday, February 17, the Bluefield, W. Va., Automobile Club will open its Worldwide Travel Show in the Bluefield Municipal Auditorium.

Mine has been a lively interest in the beneficial effects of travel, and I was privileged to issue a statement in connection with the forthcoming Bluefield Automobile Club travel show venture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record my statement to the sponsoring club.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I extend my congratulations to the Bluefield Automobile Club and its director of travel, James H. Cowan, for initiating the first Worldwide Travel Show in West Virginia. I am confident of the success of this venture. The Bluefield Automobile Club deserves the gratitude of the citizens of the Mountaineer State for taking this step to attract the attention of American travelers to the charms and beauties of our fair State.

The tourist industry offers one of the chief sources of potential economic development in the State of West Virginia, and the automobile clubs are to be commended for the part they are playing in stimulating its development.

But it is worth noting that the Bluefield Automobile Club Show is not limited by merely State or sectional interests. This exhibition is an appropriate expression of the growing interest of Americans in world travel itself, and it offers another link between us and our neighbors in other lands.

We Americans are a mobile people, and the urge to be somewhere else will hold a continued fascination for innumerable millions of folk during this next record travel year.

The once-popular song words, "I was born to wander, I was born to roam," continue to be lived by vacationers and tourists who are lured "to the far-away places with the strange-sounding names."

We Americans who live and work at such a rapid pace can find in travel refreshment for the body and renewal of the lagging spirit. We may be mindful as well of the inspirational and spiritual values that flow from travel and the act of occasionally drawing away from our daily preoccupations. For it was the Master of all mankind, who, when the pressures from expectant people tapped too deeply His earthly resources, whispered to His disciples: "Come apart, and rest a while."

Travel, however, fulfills more than the needs of the individual alone. For the American traveler has become his country's main diplomat abroad. And as a nation we are in large measure judged by our neighbors in other lands on the basis of the behavior of the American tourist. Thus, the modern conveniences of travel—the jet airliner and the luxury ocean liner—will not alone bring about a world community of neighbors. There must be global-minded people traveling, men and women disposed to appreciate and understand the customs, cultures, and the philosophies of the countries they visit.

The late Irish poet, George Russell, predicted in the 1920's that the United States would have an historic role to play, because "Americans have been the first people to adopt a planetary viewpoint." Though Russell's statement was contested by those who worried about America's apparent drift to extreme isolation, he insisted that he could detect signs that we were preparing to assume planetary responsibilities. He said, "You Americans have a vision about this planet that no other nation has ever had."

We need to understand that our 177 million citizens, comprising only 10 percent of the non-Soviet world, control over half of the world's production of goods. Therefore, our policies and our actions affect not only our own national destiny, but that of the world at large. We are challenged to thinking in world terms. We have now reached the point where we must assume the same kind of responsibility in world affairs as we are accustomed to assume in our individual affairs. If we falter, the free world falters. If we are firm, the free world is firm.

A Children's Birthday Party With Emphasis on Giving Instead of Getting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, particularly for youngsters, receiving gifts is more than half the fun of a birthday party.

However, when the birthdays of two young ladies in Fort Worth, Tex., came this year, they gave a gift instead of taking for themselves.

There is some concern these days over the rise of juvenile delinquency and many have commented on the lack of civic spirit of today's young Americans.

I have always maintained that the vast majority of young people in the United States not only stay out of major trouble and are therefore never mentioned in news reports, but they are actively working to be good citizens now and training to be better ones later. Seldom do we hear of the young people who do volunteer work with churches and hospitals, work with worthy charity solicitations and perform other unselfish acts that display good citizenship. I believe the spirit of giving in asking that, instead of birthday gifts for them, the money be given to a fund to buy milk for needy children, of Misses Sheryl and Brenda Palmer is a fine example of the spirit of today's young people.

Mr. President, in recognition of these two young ladies' unselfish action and as a salute to the other fine work being done quietly by today's young people, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Catherine Gunn which was published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram for Sunday, February 8, 1959, under the heading "Party Given by Sisters Helps Fund."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTY GIVEN BY SISTERS HELPS FUND

(By Catherine Gunn)

Fort Worth children in need of milk were remembered when two sisters recently celebrated their birthdays.

Sheryl and Brenda Palmer, daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Max S. Palmer, of 2908 Cedar Park, asked their friends to help other children instead of bringing presents to their joint birthday party.

Contributing \$6.55, which went to the Star-Telegram milk and ice fund, were Cathy Leggett, Janice Morgan, Paula Daniels, Debbie Thomas, Delane Mauldin, Linda Ard, Layon Walker, Marilyn Walker, and Carol Rogers.

Sheryl's ninth birthday was January 31. Brenda was 7 on January 30.

Business Forecast by C. B. Stephenson, President, First National Bank of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 5, 1959, Mr. C. B. Stephenson, president of the First National Bank of Portland, in my home city, made his annual report to the Portland Chamber of Commerce on business conditions.

Mr. Stephenson is particularly afraid of mounting and continuing inflation, a fear which I share. Inflation is especially cruel to retired men and women on fixed incomes, such as social security and annuities.

While I do not agree with all the conclusions advocated by Mr. Stephenson, he has presented an important and significant point of view which merits in-

clusion in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that Members of the Senate and the House may be familiar with his recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues for that purpose, and I trust it will be granted.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW FAR CAN WE GO?

(Annual business forecast presented by Mr. C. B. Stephenson, president of the First National Bank of Oregon, to the Portland Chamber of Commerce, January 5, 1959)

The year 1958 turned out pretty much as predicted. If forecasts were wrong, they were wrong in the areas of timing and the depth of our recent recession. Only a few prognosticators saw the beginning of the upturn in the spring of the year. Most took the more cautious approach and predicted mid-year as the turning point.

Once under way, the rebound was sharper than experienced in previous recession periods; and as we begin the new year it would appear that this momentum will continue. There is some historical pattern for this. The record shows that these upward swings carry on long enough to include a span of the 12 months that lie ahead.

Most everyone is aboard the good-business-outlook bandwagon although there are many economists who could not be classified as highly enthusiastic. Those less optimistic put normal-size question marks after housing and automobiles and smaller-size question marks after inventories and plant expansion.

Reasons for optimism are numerous. It is rather clear there will be a continuation of consumer spending. How much of the consumers' dollar will go into consumption items and how much into durables remains to be seen. Both areas of spending should be up. The same holds true of expenditures for services.

The automobile business should do better. It certainly has had a bad time. Just when it started to get off the ground it was plagued with strikes.

Government spending can be expected to keep up its steady march. A hundred speeches of this kind could be devoted to that subject.

Inventory liquidation continued in 1958 and chances are there will be restocking before the year is out.

Estimates on the gross national product vary from \$460 billion to \$480 billion for the year ahead. This will compare with about \$435 billion for 1958.

These estimates all confirm the somewhat monotonous predictions of good business ahead. Perhaps some of you will say that you won't mind that kind of monotony. It doesn't take any seer to read these signs; and with the strong note with which many segments of business ended 1958, one is on pretty safe ground to forecast a continuation of the recovery.

There continue at work many major forces, however, that give one concern when he looks beyond the immediate future.

I think on this occasion I will devote most of my time to some observations on long-range problems. Before doing so, however, I will speak specifically of one or two significant events of 1958 and perhaps observe more particularly regarding some of the situations within Oregon that would have meaning to you on a more individual and day-to-day basis.

What has sustained our economy here in the State in the last half year has been improvement in lumber prices, which firmed up again in December after a dip between then and early fall. The lumber business, as you know, is closely tied to housing, and housing is closely tied to credit. Credit

opened up as money eased but is still the No. 1 problem in housing. I think credit will be forthcoming, but at somewhat higher prices. I believe one of the first things to which the Federal Congress will apply itself is legislation in the area of housing. So housing starts should be greater in number in 1959, which is particularly meaningful to us Oregonians, although there appears to be no unanimity of opinion on that subject.

Construction, of course, played a strong part, and projects presently under way and those on the drawing boards will maintain a high level of employment in that industry for 1959.

A high level of farming income also helped last year. Crops were good. Prices were up only moderately.

Our centennial celebration will attract thousands of tourists. And that industry—our third biggest—should have a banner year.

We start the year with a new Federal Congress and a new State legislature. While there are carryovers in both bodies, the number of new faces likely will be greater than at any time in history.

So, again, when one takes a look at the longer-range economic picture, the first place to start is with the legislators, both State and national. What they do in coping with some of the basic problems that confront us will determine very much the long-range economic well-being of us all.

Locally the voters indicated their attitude by turning down everything that had to do with spending money. Even measures on the ballot such as for an increase in veterans' loans by the State were rejected. The State legislature will confront that declared attitude of the people and also have before it a very good report prepared by Dr. Sly and his associates on the tax situation in Oregon.

The National Congress will confront various demands that will add up in increased spending. The President has presented a budget that balances at the figure of \$77 billion. Increases in the gasoline tax and in postal rates were recommended by him. It is obvious to everyone that we can't have another \$12 billion deficit. And it is equally obvious that over a period of time we cannot permit the forces of inflation to keep up their persistent inroads on the purchasing power of the dollar.

Inflation is something about which everyone talks but does little. Some economists say it isn't all bad. And some go further to say any chance to curb it is remote. However, it is hard to accept the latter philosophy. Inflation is an insidious thing. In small doses it is pleasant but in large doses it is fatal.

We have just witnessed the further devaluation of the franc by the De Gaulle government. Things had gotten pretty well out of hand in France, as everyone knows. How well the people of that country will accept an austerity program remains to be seen.

Along with that devaluation came an adjustment in other currencies of the European group. This could have limiting effects on our foreign trade. Already the industrial development of many countries has begun to have its impact in world trade. An example of that is in the automobile business. Almost overnight our automobile industry has shifted from a net exports to a net imports basis. Imports now outnumber exports three to one.

Beyond that there has been some shift in general international trade against us, all at a time when the forces of inflation are still proceeding. This has some Europeans using the term "soft" dollar. The term "flight from the dollar" has appeared here and there.

Certain it is that markets we used to consider secure are threatened not only with competition from countries within the West-

ern bloc who have learned a good deal of our know-how, but with the continuing threat of Russian competition at prices we cannot meet.

While an increase in the price of gold is not likely, I remind you that there was movement of gold out of the country during the past year and that we are being looked at very closely by our overseas friends regarding what action we may take to retard further decline in the value of the dollar.

Perhaps while we have roughly 4 million unemployed and some idle plant capacity, these influences will tend to stabilize prices.

However, the matter of inflation cannot be dismissed that easily. Somehow we have to get over the idea that we can get more out of our economy than we put into it. Responsibility for controlling inflation, it seems to me, rests squarely with the Congress. The executive branch of the Government cannot spend anything the Congress does not authorize and appropriate.

A significant remark was made a few months ago by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, when he told his colleagues, "When you go home at the close of this session and your people complain about the high cost of living, do not pass the buck. Tell them the facts. Tell them the national debt is higher because you voted to make it higher. Tell them the dollar has gone down and the cost of groceries has gone up because you voted to depreciate the dollar and voted to raise prices."

Unfortunately there do not appear to be many Congressmen as candid and forthright as Representative CANNON. I took his remarks from a speech made recently by James P. Oates, Jr., president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Mr. Oates went on to say that the statements of Representative CANNON "place responsibility squarely where it belongs—with the Congress of the United States. It is high time that we stop fencing with windmills and concentrate our attention on the political scene where the malignancy of inflation originates . . . It is high time for those of us in the business and financial community to attack the problem of inflation at its source, first by making certain that all Congressmen understand fully the inflationary implications of their day-to-day legislative activities and, second, by offering them vigorous support for strong public policies to preserve the integrity of the dollar."

That is forceful language. How can Mr. Oates, or I who quote him, produce not only the depth of interest but action as well on the part of us all? Many are inclined to shrug off the possibilities of doing anything with the Federal Congress.

Some say that since 60 to 70 percent of our budget goes for defense there isn't very much left to work on. But I say to you, as a businessman, that if we were to take that attitude to our respective businesses we would soon be in financial trouble. All of us have an area of fixed expense that we cannot avoid. It is in the area of controllable expenses where we have to make savings in order to produce a profit—and without profits our economy would be in a sad state indeed.

What can be done? It is not the kind of issue that prompts a march on Washington. Housewives will not parade the streets with banners reading "Stop Inflation."

One simple way, some say, would be to provide the President of the United States with stand-by controls which could be invoked if matters got out of hand. If labor unions set about for a hefty increase in wages, a control could be imposed. The same could be done with regard to a business that proposed a hefty price increase.

But would that be the way to do? If we were ever to establish price controls by leg-

islative action and executive decree, would we ever take them away again? Maybe. True, we did have controls during wartime in the field of installment credit. But as a fixed instrument of national policy, would controls be in the democratic tradition? I don't think so. What then can be done?

One suggestion I have to make to you, unpalatable as it may be, is that no increase in spending be undertaken without a comparable increase in taxes.

Another suggestion is that the new Congress revise the Employment Act of 1946 so as to include as an objective reasonable stability in the value of the dollar. The act now makes it a policy for the Federal Government to promote maximum employment and production, and foster free competitive enterprise and the general welfare. This law is supposed to reflect and guide Congress' general economic philosophy. As it stands, it encourages the idea of maximum employment at any cost. It does not carry the implication that inflation is bad, as is unemployment. As you probably remember, the Employment Act was passed at a time when the greatest fear was of a serious postwar recession. Little consideration was given to what actually has happened—a postwar boom and inflation.

William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, on returning from a recent world tour said he ran into this question: Since America is the richest country in the world, it can afford whatever amounts are needed for the national defense of the United States and for social benefits the American public demands as well. Since Americans can clearly afford these expenditures, why don't they pay for them? That is, why don't they pay in taxes or reduce other programs instead of giving I O U's and simply printing more paper dollars?

He stated further that he was amazed to see how closely our budgetary developments were being followed in such remote areas as Thailand and Hong Kong, and how many people there knew our precise budget figures better than most Americans. He said their interest is stimulated by personal experience. They remember the stern lectures America has given foreign countries about their need to have the moral fiber to put their finances in order. He continued, it is only natural that foreign countries should be wondering if we have that same moral fiber to take the medicine we have so freely prescribed for others.

When the British, a year ago, faced a crisis of sorts, they took the bull by the horns. They applied a real stiff dose of old-fashioned monetary medicine. The discount rate was raised to 7 percent and restrictions on imports imposed. They had courage and it paid off.

America needs to pause and take a look at itself. We have had a long period of prosperity, interrupted of course by some short-lived recessions. During that period of boom the Federal Government was barely able to make both ends meet during the best of years and even with the highest tax rates in peacetime history.

We have accepted the theory of enormous Government spending as not only an essential element of modern life but as the very lifeblood of our prosperity. Business, the farmer, and the individual have all sought to lean on the special crutch of Federal aid. Even defense spending, which absorbs some 60 percent of all Federal outlays, is treated as a prop to prosperity rather than, as it really is, a necessary but horrible burden on the economy.

And so, if America is at an economic crossroads, we as voters, as well as the Congress, are to blame. More inflation will only put us on an endless merry-go-round which will some day burst under internal stresses. This is our clear danger.

So, as I conclude these remarks, I urge upon each and every one of you the very great importance of developing a dedicated interest in national affairs with particular emphasis on the vital matter of inflation. It could be the most important New Year's resolution you have ever made.

Flexibility in Approach to West Berlin Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann's column in the Washington Post of February 10 emphasizes the importance of flexibility in our approach to the problem of West Berlin. Mr. Lippmann's thoughts, it seems to me, are of value to us and I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON FLEXIBILITY

(By Walter Lippmann)

The new word in western diplomacy is flexibility. It has become fashionable because just under the surface of the official formulas there is going on in Washington, in London, and in Bonn a reappraisal of the German problem. It is a wholly false picture of what is going on to suppose that the issue in this reappraisal is between surrendering and standing firm, between appeasement and principle, between being soft and being strong.

The real issue, to which the reappraisal is addressed, is whether to stand pat on positions that have become untenable or to move to new positions from which the Western Allies can recover the political initiative.

Let us take Berlin for a concrete example, remembering, of course, that it is only the focal point of the whole larger German problem. At present there are two streams of traffic between West Berlin and West Germany. One, which is much the larger, is civilian traffic. This traffic is regulated by an agreement between the West German Government and the East German Government and it is by this traffic that the civilian population of West Berlin lives and does its business. The other traffic is military. It is between the British, French and American forces in West Germany and their garrisons in West Berlin. This traffic is regulated by allied agreement with the Soviet Union.

Moscow has now said that if there is no other negotiation about the status of Berlin, it will on May 27 turn over to the East German Government its authority over the military traffic. If this is done, it will mean that at the checkpoints on the highways and railroads and canals Allied military traffic will be met by East German rather than by Soviet officials.

The immediate and specific questions about Berlin are: (1) What will we do when we meet these East German officials; and (2) what will the East German officials do about our military traffic?

This is where the difference between an inflexible and a flexible policy shows itself. The inflexibles say that we do not recognize the East German Government, and that we

cannot, therefore, allow them to have anything to do with our traffic to Berlin. The flexibles reply that as long as no one interferes with our traffic to Berlin, it does not make any difference whether the official who stamps the papers wears an East German or a Soviet uniform. They add that if Dr. Adenauer can allow East German officials to stamp his papers for the civilian traffic, he is in no position to insist that President Eisenhower be more inflexible than he is himself.

In speculating about the use of force to keep open access to Berlin, the first question to be decided is whether we ought to be ready to go to war if we meet an East German official at the checkpoints on the highway. Do we fight because the official who wants to see the papers carried by the truck wears an East German uniform, or do we fight if he closes the highway? The flexibles say that a blockade of West Berlin is a fighting matter but that whether the official is East German or Soviet is not a fighting matter.

The flexibles say, moreover, that to announce you will fight about the official at the checkpoint is not a strong policy but a foolish one, and because it is foolish, it is weak. It is weak because the people of the Western World cannot conceivably be united to fight a world war on such an idiotic issue.

As we know, the mayor of West Berlin, the highly esteemed Willy Brandt, can be counted among the flexibles. He has suggested that the East German officials might be recognized as agents of the Soviet Union. An easier, and as good a way, to accomplish the same result would be to ask a Soviet guarantee of access to West Berlin until a new status can be arranged by negotiations covering the two Germanys and the two Berlins. What we want is that West Berlin should not be blockaded and strangled and that Berlin should become again the capital of a reunited Germany.

This flexible position is a strong one. We stand firm on the substance, which is that West Berlin is not to be blockaded. We are indifferent to the formalities which do not matter as long as access to West Berlin is open. We keep alive our real objective, which is not to maintain West Berlin as an island within East Germany but to restore its status as the capital city to which all parts of Germany must have equal access.

It may well be that the Soviet Union will refuse to guarantee access during the period, which would have to be a long one, when the whole German problem is being negotiated. If that is what happens, the Soviet Union will find itself in a dangerous position. It will have given the East Germans a free hand to impose a blockade, which would be an act of war, and it will be committed to come to the defense of the East Germans if they provoke a war.

This is a much bigger gamble than Moscow has ever taken before, and we need not jump to the conclusion that it will take the gamble now.

"Abraham Lincoln," Poem by Herbert L. Oberer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an original poem, by Mr. Herbert L. Oberer, of Youngstown, Ohio, which is extremely

appropriate on this day, in recognition of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln—in prose and in rhyme
His praises will echo through unending time
And the things that he did and the things
that he said,

Throughout all the world, have been heard
and been read.

When chosen to pilot our land's ship of
state

The perils he faced were both many and
great:

A nation divided by cruel civil war
Was restored, through his efforts, to union
once more.

Abraham Lincoln—with sorrows beset;
With wisdom and patience his trials he met.
Though heavy the load he was called on to
bear,

He never gave way to the gloom of despair.
In the hearts of all mankind secure is his
place

For he loosened the shackles that bound a
whole race.

In his life's darkest moments he never lost
sight

Of the power of mercy to kindle a light.

Abraham Lincoln—his well-earned renown
Was further exalted by martyrdom's crown.

Derided by many political foes,
Unafraid and undaunted, in stature he rose,

And those who had snubbed him ac-
knowledged his worth

When his great, benign soul winged its way
from this earth;

Abraham Lincoln—how solid his fame!
Abraham Lincoln—how hallowed his name!

—Herbert L. Oberer.

"I Will Support and Defend the Constitution"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the September 1958 issue of Navy. This article was written by an outstanding legal scholar and successful practicing attorney and an experienced naval officer, Comdr. Robert W. Collins, USNR, of Yazoo City, Miss.

This article, entitled "I Will Support and Defend the Constitution," is exceedingly well written; and I call it to the special attention of all those who are interested in a brief, but detailed, discussion and study of this most precious document, the Constitution of the United States.

As Commander Collins points out in this article, the Constitution is the guiding rudder of our Nation.

Our Nation should heed the suggestions of outstanding men like Commander Collins endeavoring to preserve and foster respect for our Constitution. I commend Commander Collins for his excellent presentation and recommend it

to be worthy of the special study and attention of all Members of Congress as well as all other citizens of our great Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I WILL SUPPORT AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION"

(By Comdr. Robert W. Collins, USNR)

When I accepted this invitation to give a message on appreciation of the United States Constitution from the viewpoint of a Naval Reserve legal-specialist officer, I did so in serious thoughts and reflections on that day so many years ago when I was first commissioned in the U.S. Naval Reserve and swore "that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

In celebrating the 171st anniversary of the adoption of the United States Constitution, we are paying just tribute to the very foundation of our Government, that is, the Constitution itself.

On the 17th of September 1787, a convention of delegates of the people of the United States, selected from the original 13 States, adopted and made public that document, which consisted of a preamble and seven articles expressed in the language of the common law.

When accepted and ratified by those States on behalf of the people of these United States, our charter of Government came into being.

It should be remembered that the Constitution at that stage in American history was much clearer in its definition of responsibility and its imposition of obligation on its citizens and member States than at a short-ly later date in our history.

Four years later there came into force and effect the first ten amendments, commonly called then and at all times since, including the present moment in history, the Bill of Rights. These early amendments did not alter in any manner the form of our constitutional government. However, they did write into the charter itself certain rights, largely of the individual, guaranteed to them by their Government in this basic compact of their own creation.

Perhaps the Constitution was better understood in its terms and in its meaning at the time of its adoption than it is presently understood, although thoughtful Americans have at all times recognized that the obligations of citizenship are implicit and inherent in the Constitution. To support and defend the Constitution is part of the oath required in all services, but it is a definite obligation on all citizens with or without a formal oath. The struggle to maintain the Constitution of the United States is an unending one, and we would do well to remember the old adage that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

As we take time from our ordinary pursuits to honor such an event as the adoption of our Constitution, it is well for us to consider whether or not the American people had the same appreciation then as we now have of this basic instrument of our lives and Government.

The people did understand the document, but the degree of appreciation and support was far from what we now have. History teaches us that only 55 of the 65 delegates of the Constitutional Convention attended that Convention. Only 12 of the 13 Original States were represented in the deliberations. Of the delegates in attendance participating in the drafting of the Constitution, 16 failed or refused to sign the document at the time of its adoption. When the secrecy was broken and the proposed plan was published, a tempest of debate over its merits began to blow. Critics fell upon it.

Scarcely a single sentence or line of the Constitution escaped attack. While this public debate over the plan was in full course, conventions duly elected in the States assembled to pass upon it.

Within 3 months three States ratified it, Delaware and New Jersey and Pennsylvania, after a hot contest. Early in 1788, Georgia and Connecticut added their approval. By a close vote Massachusetts accepted it in February. Maryland and South Carolina soon followed. The New Hampshire convention, at first opposed or hesitant, decided favorably before the end of June. Nine States, the number necessary to make the Constitution effective and binding between the States so ratifying same, had now made their fateful decision. Two large States wavered. In New York and Virginia the result was long in doubt, and it was not until the late summer of 1788 that New York and Virginia ratified on the same day. Two States still remained aloof. North Carolina withheld its approval until November 1789, and Rhode Island, which had sent no delegates to the Convention, would have nothing to do with the new Constitution until the spring of 1790, when it added its own ratification. Upon that event the full acceptance of the charter was accomplished. It had stood the test of scrutiny and searching criticism and survived. Its great ideal, its great body of principles, its great hope for the human race then became the basic charter of the United States, binding and effective at the same time on all of the people in all of the States of our great Nation.

If proof be needed that the Constitution was clear and explicit, permit me to show briefly how that document provided the basic authority for the existence of that department of the Government in which we of the Navy League have particular interest. The Department of the Navy exists due to the following items:

Article I, section 8 provides:

"The Congress shall have power—

- "(13) to provide and maintain a navy;
- "(14) to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;
- "(18) to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

The only other reference to the Department of the Navy in the Constitution is contained in article II, section 2(1), which provides: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

It may be interesting to note that during its first years the Navy operated without the benefit of being a separate department. It was a great soldier-statesman who urged the creation of a permanent Navy and the founding of the Department of the Navy which was accomplished April 30, 1798. Washington's recommendation hereon contained the following language which we cherish: "To secure respect of a neutral flag requires a naval force, organized and ready to vindicate it from insults and aggression. This may even prevent the necessity of going to war by discouraging belligerent powers from committing such violations of the rights of the neutral party as may, first or last, leave no other option." The prime mission of the Navy Department was then, as it is now, to assist the people of the United States to provide for their common defense and this is one of the people's prime obligations under the Constitution.

When the Constitution was adopted our Nation was living in a period described at that time as "These are the times that try men's souls." There have been various times during our history when the expression would have been appropriate and it is par-

ticularly appropriate today. We are fortunate that the framers of the Constitution were moralists. They were to a man moralists to the degree that they held that every right has its corresponding responsibility. They knew that benefits and rights flow from the fulfillment of just and honorable obligations.

The Constitution as framed by the great convention and reluctantly and somewhat grudgingly ratified by the American States was at the same time the wisest and the noblest assertion of constitutional morality in the annals of statecraft. If the Founding Fathers were dubious of the future of that Constitution, it was not they questioned its wisdom so much as they doubted the willingness of successive generations of American citizens to accept its wise restraints and fulfill its implied and inherent obligations. Washington himself was very reserved as to the merits of the Constitution, but as months passed he came to feel that the result had been wiser than he had anticipated. After stating that the powers of Government had been wisely distributed so as to prevent any undue concentration of power in any one man or body of men, he stated that the new Government would not be other than good, "so long as there shall remain any virtue in the body of the people."

It is recorded in our history that the great delegate from Pennsylvania, Benjamin Franklin, with tears in his eyes implored his fellow delegates to sign the compact. He said in an answer to those who saw fatal objections in the Constitution: "There is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered for a course of years, and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

In these statements, Washington and Franklin were giving similar advice and warning of an earlier statesman of our colonial era. It was William Penn who expressed the same principle in this simple analogy. He said: "Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined, too. Therefore, governments depend upon men rather than men upon governments."

Our Constitution, as a scheme of Government, is a Government under law, and not under men. Nevertheless, our Government depends upon its citizens to fulfill their individual responsibilities in the manner set forth in the precepts handed to us by those great early Americans we have mentioned. The Constitution is the organic expression of our national unity and has brought unbounded blessings to the millions of Americans that have come and gone.

The great English historian, Macauley, nearly 70 years after the adoption of the Constitution, made this studied criticism: "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor." The terms of that critique stimulate my interest. What that great writer probably had in mind was the suggestion that no written document could wholly restrain the excesses of democracy. His underlying suggestion is not incorrect, but possibly it would be more accurate to state that the Constitution has proved to be more of a rudder than an anchor. No state of human society is wholly static; there was no occasion for the Constitution to be an anchor. Its purpose was, and is, to guide rather than to hold.

Another great and disinterested witness of American institutions rendered his opinion on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the American Constitution. Gladstone, the English statesman, wrote the committee in charge of that celebration: "I have always regarded that Constitution as the most re-

markable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke, so to speak, in its application to political affairs." We have reason to consider that he believed most strongly that opinion, for earlier the same Gladstone had written the following: "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

We Americans and generations which follow us will do well on occasions such as this if we will remember the advice of the ancient proverb in our actions in relation to the Constitution of the United States: "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

The Multitude of Government Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, unquestionably many of my colleagues have been receiving much correspondence from small businessmen complaining of high taxes, Government waste, and unnecessary expenditures. Admittedly, until the budget is balanced and the huge multibillion-dollar deficit is reduced, there can be no marked degree of tax relief. Congress and the agencies of the Federal Government however can, right now, provide some relief for these businessmen and at the same time reduce Government spending by calling a halt to the ever mounting volume of paper work imposed upon business.

Mr. President, I present the views of the editor of the Rittman (Ohio) Press on this subject, so ably stated in the editorial which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT: THERE ARE A LOT OF MAD AMERICANS

Mr. PRESIDENT: There are a lot of Americans who are just plain mad at the multitude of Government reports that have to be made out. It seems that every year they are getting more burdensome than the year before. Just ask the average businessman. He'll tell you how he feels. He is just loaded down with work in getting reports out for this department and that department.

The Government bureaucrats have learned the art of the crackdown and threats. Every report carries a deadline and a threat of a fine plus interest.

Many small businessmen have been holding up their hands in disgust. They have their wits scared out of them when a Government agent darkens their doorway.

These departments have been able to raise their budgets so they hire more agents to harass business firms.

So you lean back in your chair and say, "Why doesn't the businessman comply?" He does or else. But this working for the Government takes a lot of time and adds to the cost of doing business.

Besides business firms have to collect sales taxes for the State and they just about get their heads knocked off if they innocently make a mistake in forgetting to charge a tax on one out of thousands of sales. Or the

Federal agents swoop down on the little guy who doesn't withhold money for income taxes from an employee.

Why it's getting to be criminal the way the little man is being pushed around and made to collect money from his employees and customers, which a self-respecting merchant never would do.

But the little businessman doesn't talk out loud because he's afraid of two things: Either he is afraid that these Government agents will pull further reprisals on him, or he is afraid inwardly that to protest might seem to be unpatriotic. So, he goes along and submits meekly like a Russian slave.

If he gets a heavy fine for being late with a Government report, he meekly pays it and keeps his mouth shut. He's learned that there is not much use in writing to Congressmen or Senators, because they don't get anything done to lighten up on the load or they are too busy serving on national committees drafting laws to spend more of our tax money.

Mr. President, we need relief from this type of badgering and harassment which in the past we have associated only with dictatorships.

Attacking Segregation in the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, no one can make the assertion that we have true equality for all races in the North. However, I am pleased to state that we are attacking the problem with a view to its solution. I hope that before long we will be able to say that true equality exists.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Naomi Levine, program director of the American Jewish Congress. Miss Levine's article appeared in the January 19, 1959, issue of Congress Bi-Weekly:

ATTACKING SEGREGATION IN THE NORTH

(By Naomi Levine)

On December 15, 1958, Justice Justice Wise Poller issued a decision in the domestic relations court of New York City in a case involving de facto segregation in the New York public schools, that is destined to become a major contribution in the struggle to achieve genuine equality in education for all children, in the North as well as in the South.

In a sense this case began 2 years ago with the adoption by the New York City Board of Education of six reports submitted by its commission on integration, which conducted a series of studies to investigate the charges of the Public Education Association that the schools in New York City were in fact segregated. The reports established the fact that public schools in the North were indeed segregated, notwithstanding the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public schools. These segregated schools were, moreover providing inadequate and unequal educational facilities. Thus the reports sustained the charge made by the Public Education Association that the schools in New York City were not only separate but unequal.

The reports also contained detailed suggestions for eliminating segregation and for improving the curriculum, facilities, and staff of the segregated schools. While recognizing that segregated schools in the North are

largely a consequence of residential segregation, the reports pointed to techniques that can be used to integrate these schools despite this factor. For example, the zoning report, while recognizing the problem of schools built in the heart of segregated residential districts, suggested techniques of rezoning, permissive transfers, bus transportation, new site selection, etc., to promote integration despite the segregated housing patterns.

The other reports were concerned largely with equalizing educational facilities for the segregated schools. The board of education and the organizations that supported the integration reports held "that improved zoning procedures, however effective in achieving more racially balanced schools, will fall short of the board's stated objective regarding integration unless equal concern and direction is given to teacher assignment, improved facilities, curriculum, proper guidance, and educational stimulation."

One of the major problems in implementing these reports concerned teacher assignments. The teacher assignment report stated simply that the needs of the children must be given preference over the needs of the teachers. As soon as this principle was announced teachers voiced loud opposition. They made it clear that teaching in the difficult schools was an unpleasant and trying experience, and they insisted on their right to choose the schools in which they wanted to teach. These vehement protests had their effect. The board of education refused to implement or even interpret any part of the teacher assignment report in a way that might suggest compulsory assignment. Instead, it concentrated its efforts on recruiting volunteers for these difficult schools. To date, the program of volunteer recruitment has been a dismal failure.

In fact, it is no exaggeration to state that the implementation of all the six reports has been profoundly disappointing. The board of education has refused to take any major step to put into effect the basic recommendations of these reports. No effort has been made to develop a comprehensive zoning plan aimed at the eventual elimination of de facto segregation. Only a meager effort has been made to improve the physical plants of the segregated schools. No real guidance program and educational motivation program has been developed to raise the academic level in the segregated schools. And no real effort has been made to improve the quality of the teaching staff in these schools.

It is no wonder that organizations and individuals which praised the board of education when it adopted the integration reports have become sharply critical. More important is the impatience of those parents whose children are attending the segregated schools and are receiving inadequate and unequal education. Several of these parents during the past year have picketed the segregated schools; others have refused outright to send their children to these schools. Several brought suits against the board of education charging discrimination and inequality; and still others have been brought into court by the board of education on charges that they willfully have kept their children out of schools. It was such a case that was presented to Justice Poller.

The facts in the case are simple. Two sets of parents, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Skipwith and Mr. and Mrs. Charles Rector, refused to send their children to Junior High Schools Nos. 136 and 139 on the ground that these two schools offered inferior educational opportunities as compared with those offered in the schools whose pupil population was largely white. They asserted that this inferiority of educational facilities was caused by two conditions: de facto racial segregation and discriminatory teacher staffing. Finally, they contended that as a consequence of the situation in the two schools

the children attending them were being denied equal educational opportunities in violation of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment of the Constitution.

The board of education argued that these constitutional objectives were not properly before the court and must be addressed to the commissioner of education. The court held, however, that it had jurisdiction to consider the constitutional issues involved in the case, stating: "The board of education contends that one arm of the State—this court—must blindly enforce the unconstitutional denial of constitutional rights of another arm of the State—the board of education. Such a proposition is abhorrent to the American doctrine of supremacy of the law"

The court found that de facto racial segregation exists in the junior high schools of New York City. The 2 schools involved in the case had a student population of 100 percent Negro and Puerto Rican. There are 7 additional junior high schools in New York City in which the student population is 95 percent Negro and Puerto Rican. In 40 junior high schools the student population is 95 percent white. Among the 127 junior high schools in New York City there are 16 schools with more than 85 percent Negro children and 52 schools with more than 85 percent white children. School segregation, the court observed, decreases the motivation of minority children and impairs their ability to learn. The court cited Dr. Kenneth Clark, distinguished psychologist and social scientist, who said:

"It is my considered judgment and opinion as a consequence of extensive study of segregation in schools, both in those regions of the country where segregated schools were maintained previously by law and in regions of the country where segregation in schools exists as a consequence of residential segregation or mores, that the segregated schools and the general characteristics usually found associated with the segregated schools depress the ability of children to learn, as reflected in low achievement scores, in low IQ scores, to the extent that these IQ scores are the result of what the child has or has not been taught."

The court found, too, that discrimination in the staffing of the segregated school does exist, that schools attended by Negro and Puerto Rican children are taught by less qualified teachers, and that such children, as a consequence, suffer educational disadvantages. The court noted that as of September 11, 1958, the schools with 85 percent Negro and Puerto Rican children had an average percentage of vacancies of 49.5 percent, while the percentage of vacancies in schools with 85 percent white children was only 29.6 percent. Moreover, a far greater percentage of positions in the segregated schools were filled by substitute teachers—not qualified licensed teachers.

Responding to an observation made by a school official that the board of education had no power to transfer licensed teachers, the court pointed out that the report of the commission on integration, adopted by the board of education in 1957, stated unequivocally that teacher assignment should be based on the needs of the schools rather than the preferences of the teacher. The board has no right to permit teachers to choose the schools in which they want to teach. The assignment of teachers is a governmental function and cannot be delegated to the teachers themselves. The court stated:

The board of education can no more plead not guilty than could the police commissioner if he allowed patrolmen to choose not to accept dangerous or unpleasant assignments.

Finally, the court held that the board of education has the constitutional duty to

provide equal educational facilities for all the children of this city. Obviously it is not the duty of the court to decide how the board of education should achieve this; these are educational problems which the board must deal with. But they are no more difficult than the problems faced by cities like Washington, D.C., Baltimore, and Louisville, which have changed from segregated to desegregated school systems:

"Here, as there, determination, resourcefulness, and leadership can bring the situation in the New York City school system into line with the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the laws. Until then, the board of education has no moral or legal right to ask that this court shall punish parents, or deprive them of custody of their children, for refusal to accept an unconstitutional condition which exists in the schools to which the board has assigned their children."

"I hold the defense on grounds of inferior educational opportunities in those schools by reason of racial discrimination to be established and to bar an adjudication of neglect."

"These parents have the constitutionally guaranteed right to elect no education for their children rather than to subject them to discriminatorily inferior education."

The implications of Judge Poller's decision are plain and should help to clear the confused atmosphere surrounding the problem of segregated schools. First, she makes it clear that the board of education in New York City cannot delegate to the teachers the right to decide what school they will teach in. No city can surrender its obligation of providing capable teachers for all of its schools. Second, the decision gives judicial cognizance to the existence of widespread de facto segregation in the northern schools and recognizes the evils that flow from the perpetuation of this system. It states: "The record in this case fully sustains the contention that the separation of children by race, whether it be the result of governmental action, or of private housing segregation, creates factors inimical to the full and equal educational opportunities."

Implicit in this statement is a recognition that school boards must not only seek to eliminate overt acts of segregation but must also take affirmative action to achieve genuine integration. They must view educational integration not merely as a social problem but as an integral part of their responsibilities in administering public education. In brief, they must recognize that one of the primary goals of public education in a democracy "is to promote ethnic and racial integration as a positive educational experience of which no child should be deprived."

The decision of Judge Poller goes a long way in giving the stamp of judicial acceptance to these far-reaching educational ideas. Its acceptance as the law of the land is an essential step if we are to achieve real integration in education for all children.

Forestry Conservation in Republic of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, mankind has devastated forests all during his occupancy of earth. One of the first great stands of timber to pay the toll

for our recklessness was the mighty Cedars of Lebanon, of Biblical fame.

Yet, in the Middle East, where these rich groves once were destroyed, efforts are being made at conservation and restoration. This is especially true in the Republic of Israel, where a strong sense of social consciousness moves the people and their leaders in government. We in Oregon have a special interest in this situation because Oregon, with some 433 billion board feet of standing timber, is the No. 1 lumber-producing State in this Nation.

Therefore, Israel's achievements in the realm of forestry fascinated Roy J. Beadle, editor of the editorial page of the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland, when he recently toured that burgeoning new land. In an article published in the Journal of February 2 Mr. Beadle has noted succinctly Israel's program to become, once more, a forested land—to recover from the devastation of past centuries, long before the creation of the Republic of Israel.

Because conservation of trees and forests is a major obligation of the Congress and our Government as a whole, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Beadle's article, entitled "More and More Trees Vision of New Israel," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREES AND MORE TREES VISION OF NEW ISRAEL (By Roy Beadle)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—In ancient times Israel had many forested areas.

Well preserved woodlands were reported to have existed through the eras of the Roman and Byzantine occupations and up to the time of the Moslem conquest.

Then came the increase of the goat, called the curse of the Middle East. The Bedouin invasion, the Moslem civil war and the Crusades brought in their wake the cutting down of trees. During the time of the Ottoman Empire, taxes were levied on trees and on the planting of new ones.

Despite this, as recently as a century ago, what is now northern Israel had many trees, but goat-grazing, neglect, forest fires and heavy use of the ax in two world wars made heavy inroads.

Toward the end of the Turkish rule, Jewish settlers began planting eucalyptus forests, and in the period of the British mandate large areas were set aside for forest plantations.

Since establishment of the state of Israel, a stepped-up program of reforestation has been carried on.

No one from Oregon can be impressed by the trees he now sees in Israel, although the roadsides everywhere are lined with eucalyptus, part of the reforestation program.

But the Government is bent on making Israel once more a forested land. It wants trees for timber production, roadside beautification, protection against soil erosion, sand dune fixation and control of water flow.

Dr. Rene Karschon, forestry official at the Government's forestry department headquarters at Nathanya, north of Tel Aviv, told me Israel now must import 90 percent of its timber. He foresees the day when it will be able to produce 30 percent of its requirements.

What commercial tree harvest Israel now has, largely from the fast-growing eucalyptus, goes into fence posts, agricultural

stakes, telephone poles and packing cases for agricultural products.

The Government's program ahead is to plant 10 million trees a year for the next 10 years.

The forestry headquarters station at Nathanya is also a central nursery, where 2,000,000 saplings are being grown. It has a wood utilization plant and forestry research institute.

Here I met R. D. Carpenter of New York, in Israel with the U.S. overseas mission to advise the Israelis on wood utilization. He is helping them improve their methods of preserving wood. Carpenter, who had been with the U.S. Forest Service for 15 years, is acquainted with C. Herbert Stone, our regional forester. I had hoped to meet Ahmed Goor, Israel's chief forester, with whom Stone had gone to school at Yale, but Goor is out of the country.

Israel has 8 forestry districts and another 10 or 12 tree nurseries. Trees grow faster here than in Oregon, and only 1 year is required to grow saplings big enough to plant.

Israel has a program to interest its children in trees and observes an annual Arbor Day in the latter part of January, when the youngsters do ceremonial planting.

Emergency Resolution of Cleveland City Council for Program of Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, notwithstanding recent indication, in several phases of our economy, that a widespread upturn in business and employment could be expected, obviously there remain many soft spots where conditions are critical and may become worse. This is set forth in an emergency resolution, recently adopted by the Cleveland City Council, and which I call to the attention of the Senate; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION 248-59

An emergency resolution memorializing the Senate and the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to institute a program of public works so as to provide employment for those persons who are suffering economic hardships resulting from the present recession

Whereas, due to the present economic recession, unemployment, not only within the city of Cleveland but throughout the entire country, has risen to numbers reminiscent of the depression of 3 decades ago; and

Whereas means of sustenance could be provided to the unemployed and their families by creating employment through the inauguration of a public works program which shall be of benefit not only to the unemployed but also to all citizens throughout the Nation; and

Whereas this resolution constitutes an emergency measure providing for the usual daily operation of a municipal department; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Cleveland:

SECTION 1. That the Senate and the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized to take immediate steps to institute a program of public works so as to provide employment for those persons who are suffering economic hardships resulting from the present recession.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of council be and he hereby is requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Ohio.

SEC. 3. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and provided it receives the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to council, it shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its adoption and approval by the mayor; otherwise it shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Adopted February 2, 1959.

JACK P. RUSSELL,
President of Council.
THAD FUSCO,
Clerk of Council.

Approved by:

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Mayor.

FEBRUARY 4, 1959.

Effective February 4, 1959.

America's Respect for Old Soldiers Seems To Be Fading Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, to paraphrase a much-used Army proverb: "America's respect for old soldiers never dies, it just fades away."

Right now, Americans are breaking a promise which we made to the men and women of our Armed Forces. It was a mutual trust and they kept their bargain. They worked for the safety of our homes and families as a deterrent force and, when necessary, we called on them to go into battle and they did so. They kept their part of the agreement, but by not paying equal pay to some 99,000 retired members of the armed services, we seem to be letting our respect for these people fade away. In addition, our respect for ourselves must be fading too in that we failed to keep our word, failed to keep faith with these people who believed in us when we outlined an Armed Forces retirement program.

Under the military pay bill, passed by the 85th Congress in 1958, members of the Armed Forces who retire after May 31, 1958, receive pensions based upon a percentage of the current pay for persons on active duty, which is higher than the percentage granted those already retired. A straight 6 percent increase was granted those who retired prior to that time.

Thus, two persons who were in the same service—perhaps faced identical dangers—and retired at the same rank can be paid on different scales. This

goes against the old tradition of pay according to a percentage of the pay for persons on active duty.

I have joined in cosponsoring a bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the armed services. This bill carries out the recommendation of the Cordiner Report that retirement pay scales be refigured each time laws pertaining to them are changed. It has been endorsed by a number of military and veterans' organizations. It will help keep the retirement program abreast of economic conditions of the future.

When the call to face death to defend our country came, these military personnel did not fade away. And we now should not fade away when we have a chance to demonstrate our respect and gratitude for them, and what they did.

Mr. President, in support of my statements, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article which was published in the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal for Saturday, February 7, 1959, under the heading "Pending Pay Legislation Would Cut Losses to 99,000 Retired Prior to 1 June 1958," and a comparison table which accompanies the article under the heading "Here's What Retired Pay Injustice Costs," with the letter of transmittal to me from the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, dated February 6, 1959.

There being no objection, the letter, article, and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE JOURNAL,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1959.

The Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Recently your office inquired if the Journal had ever published statistical tables comparing the difference in pay for members of the Armed Forces retired prior to June 1, 1958, and those retired after that date.

We were able to furnish you with comparative statistics in the more senior grades, but discovered that we had never published a table such as you had in mind. The idea, however, appeared to be an excellent one and we have now compiled statistical information showing the differences in pay. These tables and an article pointing up the disparity between pay for the two categories of retired military personnel will be published in our February 7 issue.

I am enclosing tear sheets for your information, and with the thought that you may desire to insert the article and tables in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a ready reference for other Senators who are interested.

Sincerely,

LOU STOCKSTILL,
Legislative Editor.

[From the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, February 1959]

PENDING PAY LEGISLATION WOULD CUT LOSSES TO 99,000 RETIRED PRIOR TO JUNE 1, 1958

Approximately 29,000 officers, 10,000 warrant officers, and 60,000 senior sergeants retired prior to June 1, 1958, will win pay increases if Congress approves legislation authorizing recomputation of retired pay on the basis of the 1958 Military Pay Act scales.

The cost of the plan has been estimated in the Senate at about \$30 million. If this figure proves correct, approximately one-third of the total will go to Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps colonels and Navy captains.

At the time of the pay hearings last year, there were 7,117 colonels/captains on the

retired list with 30 years' service and another 3,283 with 20 to 29 years' service. Those with more than 30 years would receive an increase of \$93.85 per month if the proposed retired pay plan is enacted; those with 20 years' service would receive an increase of \$49.67 per month.

Together, the yearly cost for both groups would be in the neighborhood of at least \$10 million.

The biggest single increase, \$391.51 per month would go to Adm. Arthur W. Radford, U.S. Navy (retired) and to four-star officers who served as Chief of their service.

The second biggest increases would go to other full generals and admirals (\$260.26), lieutenant generals and vice admirals (\$188.76), major generals and rear admirals of the upper half (\$156.76), and one-star officers (\$112.33) with 30 years' service.

For those retired with 20 years' service, the increase would amount to \$123.51 per month for four-star officers, \$76.71 per month for three-star officers, \$108.45 per month for two-star officers, and \$136.69 per month for one-star officers.

Officers in pay grades O-1, O-2, and O-3 (except for those with 4 years' enlisted service) would receive no increase as a result of the legislation. A savings clause contained in the 1958 Military Pay Act would, however, prevent them from taking a reduction.

Among those with 4 years' enlisted service, who retired after 20, the increase would be nominal, ranging from \$1.57 per month to \$5.90. Those with 4 years' enlisted service who retired in pay grades O-1 and O-2, after 30 years' service, would receive monthly pay increases of \$2.35 and \$8.85, respectively.

All warrant officers in the 20-year-service category would receive increases ranging from \$7.69 to \$20.03 per month. However, only W-4's and W-3's in the 30-year-service group would benefit. W-4's would receive \$14.58 per month and W-3's \$14.44.

No increases would go to enlisted men retired prior to June 1, 1958, with 30 years' service and only those in pay grades E-7 and E-6 would benefit in the 20-year-service category. In the latter group, E-7's would win an additional \$13.77 per month and E-6's would receive a 31-cent monthly increase.

Majors and lieutenant commanders retired with 30 years' service, before the effective date of the new pay law, would benefit only slightly from the legislation. Officers in this group now receive \$471.28 per month if retired before June 1, 1958. Those retired after June 1 receive \$472.50. Thus, the former group would receive an increase of only \$1.22 per month.

Here's what retired pay injustice costs 30 YEARS' SERVICE

	Before June 1	After June 1	Difference
Chief of Staff.....	\$1,014.74	\$1,406.25	\$391.51
O-10.....	1,014.74	1,275.00	260.26
O-9.....	1,090.24	1,275.00	184.76
O-8.....	855.74	1,012.50	156.76
O-7.....	708.92	861.25	152.33
O-6.....	644.90	798.75	153.85
O-5.....	535.29	681.25	145.96
O-4.....	471.28	472.50	1.22
O-3.....	409.27	303.75	-105.52
O-2.....	328.65	285.00	-43.65
O-1.....	297.65	235.50	-62.15
Commissioned officers with over 4 years' active enlisted service:			
O-3.....	469.27	401.25	-68.02
O-2.....	328.65	337.50	8.85
O-1.....	297.65	300.00	2.35
Warrant:			
W-4.....	431.67	446.25	14.58
W-3.....	365.06	379.50	14.44
W-2.....	334.06	330.00	-4.06
W-1.....	292.72	292.50	-.22

Footnote at end of table.

Here's what retired pay injustice costs—Con.

20 YEARS' SERVICE

	Before June 1	After June 1	Difference
O-10.....	\$576.49	\$800.00	\$223.51
O-9.....	623.29	700.00	76.71
O-8.....	541.55	650.00	108.45
O-7.....	450.61	587.50	136.89
O-6.....	380.33	430.00	49.67
O-5.....	322.45	372.50	50.05
O-4.....	297.65	315.00	17.35
O-3.....	264.58	262.50	-2.08
O-2.....	219.10	190.00	-29.10
O-1.....	198.43	152.00	-46.43
Commissioned officers with over 4 years' active enlisted service:			
O-3.....	264.58	267.50	2.92
O-2.....	219.10	225.00	5.90
O-1.....	198.43	200.00	1.57
Warrant:			
W-4.....	256.31	264.00	7.69
W-3.....	214.97	235.00	20.03
W-2.....	197.90	208.50	10.60
W-1.....	178.61	195.00	16.39

¹ These officers were authorized by the 1958 Pay Act to recompute their pay on active duty base pay of \$1,276.40 for 4-star officers and \$1,176.40 for 3-star officers, plus 6 percent.

Our Government Must Live Within Its Income—A Letter From Martin Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from our recent colleague, the Honorable Martin Dies, which is addressed to the Texas delegation in Congress, but which I feel deserves and demands the attention of every Member of the House and Senate.

It states economic facts which cannot be controverted. I respectfully request that the letter be incorporated in the daily Record.

The letter follows:

OUR GOVERNMENT MUST LIVE WITHIN ITS INCOME

To the Texas Delegation in Congress:

DEAR FORMER COLLEAGUES: One of the most serious, if not the most serious, issue which faces our Nation is inflation. Whether we can survive the economic, military, and subversive aggressions of communism will depend to a large degree upon our willingness as a nation to stop inflation. Inflation has already robbed our dollar, savings, pensions, annuities, insurance policies, social security, etc., of more than one-half of their purchasing power and real value. It has increased the cost of Government more than 100 percent, thereby raising taxes more than 100 percent. As the dollar buys less and less each year, the cost of national defense rises more and more, thereby seriously crippling this country and the free world in their life-and-death struggle for survival against the disciplined forces of communism.

One of the chief causes of inflation is the Government spending more money in appropriations than it receives in taxation. This policy is responsible for our national debt of 280 billions. The more money a government owes the less its obligations are

worth. One of our Government's obligations is its paper money, which is a promissory note to pay the bearer gold, or, in the case of silver certificates, silver at some time in the future. These notes are by law made the medium of exchange which gives some advantage over ordinary notes. However, just as the value of notes of individuals and corporations are determined by their solvency and financial condition so is the value of the currency notes of the Federal Government determined by the solvency and financial condition of the Government.

Since our Government has gone in debt more than all the other governments in the world and since Congress continues to spend more money than it takes in, thereby piling up more debt for our children, the money obligations of our Government have been falling in value year by year for a long time. If this keeps up for a few more years our money will be worthless and the savings of our people for old age, sickness, and for their children will be wiped out. This is more than a possibility. It is a certainty if Congress continues its spending spree. If there is any doubt about this, read the history of nations in ancient and modern times. The handwriting is on the wall for all to read but the blind.

This is a period in the early stages of inflation when the owners of equities such as stocks, land, commodities, etc., appear to either hold their own or profit from inflation. This doesn't last long. As history shows, the owners of such equities are finally wiped out. Under inflation stocks earn less and less dividends and ultimately their value is based upon dividends. Taxes on real property mount ever higher because of inflation until it makes ownership of real property unprofitable. In France and Germany, where inflation was unchecked, the people vainly sought refuge through every type of investment. They all came to the same end—bankruptcy.

The truth is that no one profits in the end from inflation except communism, and everyone is finally destroyed.

Because of these fundamental but, unfortunately, little understood truths, it is evident that your greatest duty to the people of Texas is to insist by speeches and votes that our Government live within its income and that deficit spending during these times of peace and prosperity must stop.

Is it asking too much of Congress to do what we as citizens are compelled to do?

For the sake of our country and our children we ask you to vote and speak against deficit spending.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN DIES.

Kosciusko: Polish-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today, February 12, is the birthday of a great Polish-American patriot. Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of those unique European statesmen whose thinking was far beyond his contemporary lifetime.

Above all, Kosciuszko was a Democrat in the tradition of Jefferson and Lafayette.

ette. He implicitly believed in man's desire and ability to grow, develop, and become strong under the democratic form of government. Throughout his long life—February 12, 1746, to April 2, 1817—Kosciuszko devoted his entire energy and talent to furthering this belief in practical form.

Aside from Kosciuszko's leadership in Poland as well as in all of Central Europe in the cause of national and individual freedom, this great man played one of the most significant roles of any individual in America's fight for independence. He came to the United States in 1776 as a young man and distinguished himself as a brilliant military strategist, especially in New York and at the battle of Yorktown. As recognition of his services, General Washington promoted Kosciuszko to the rank of Colonel of Artillery and made him his Adjutant. In 1783, after American independence was firmly established, Kosciuszko was rewarded for his services to the cause of U.S. independence with the thanks of Congress, the privilege of American citizenship, a considerable annual pension with landed estates, and the rank of brigadier general. A year later he returned to his native Poland for many years he led the struggling Polish people in their unending battle for independence. In 1796 he came to the United States for a second visit and lived in Philadelphia until May 1798. Gaining new insights into the democratic process, he returned to Europe and made one last, but fruitless attempt to restore the sovereignty of his homeland at the Congress of Vienna. At length he retired to his estates. His last act before his death on April 2, 1817, was typical of a lifetime devoted to the freedom of the individual and belief in the dignity of man. He freed all the serfs in his care, insisting only on the maintenance of schools on the liberated estates.

Today, with a world so torn with fear and ideological conflict it is well that we in the United States pause to pay tribute to a great military leader, a great statesman, and a great American. His energy, his insight and his unfailing belief in man as a rational political being provide a contemporary lesson for us all. Poland still fights in the name of Kosciuszko. America remembers.

The Cadillac for Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently I received a very pointed letter from Mr. E. H. Heinbaugh of Canton, Ohio, in which he expresses his complaint over incidents of free handed spending by Congress.

The letter is typical of others I have received on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and the newspaper article referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANTON, OHIO,
January 17, 1959.

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Attached you will find a clipping from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 17, 1959.

This kind of thing makes me sick. In order to pay my income taxes, I have to drive a 1956 auto. Is it possible that his highness Mr. MARTIN can't ride in an automobile that isn't air conditioned, could he not ride in a Buick or even a "Chevy?"

If they must have a "Caddy," would not a regular model be nice enough?

Someday the legislators of this great country of ours are going to go too far with their foolish spending. It seems the more you make available to them, the more silly things they can think up to spend it for.

I pay taxes for schools, hospitals, care of aged, preparedness, etc., cheerfully, but I don't like this kind of thing and there are many that feel as I do.

From one who has voted for you many times.

E. H. HEINBAUGH.

MARTIN RECEIVES \$11,000 CADILLAC

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Ousted Republican Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., ended up better off today than all the congressional leaders at least in one respect: He had the newest chauffeur-driven Cadillac limousine.

The shiny, new air-conditioned, fully equipped limousine complete with whitewall tires and extras purged up to the Capitol today. Congressional sources said it cost the taxpayers \$11,000.

The House decided last Monday that MARTIN should continue to be provided with a chauffeur-driven car at taxpayers expense, even though Republicans had ousted him as their floor leader.

Some lawmakers had assumed that MARTIN would keep his 1956 limousine and that a new one would be ordered for the new Republican leader, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana.

As it turned out, HALLECK and MARTIN both were ordered new Cadillac limousines. HALLECK's has not yet arrived.

Anniversary of the Birth of Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marks the 213th anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who contributed greatly to the battle for freedom both in his native Poland and in America.

Born in Poland in 1746 and educated in the military schools of Poland and France, Kosciuszko came to our shores during the dark days of the Revolution and unselfishly devoted his great ability

to the establishment of freedom and independence in America.

To the cause of the struggling colonies Kosciuszko brought three things: Scientific knowledge, strength of character, and unwavering enthusiasm for the cause of liberty. His contribution to the struggle for American independence was rivaled only by his fight for the freedom of his native Poland.

Today all the people of America join with Americans of Polish descent in paying tribute to this great Polish patriot. His name will live always in the hearts of all people who believe in justice, freedom, and self-government.

Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have cast my vote against H.R. 2260, the resolution which proposes to extend the present draft law for a period of 4 years and which was overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives. Only 20 Members of the House voted against the bill, although you and I know that there were many more who did not, deep in their hearts, favor the extension of a national conscription. This fact in itself may be indicative of the inordinate amount of influence that the past 20 years of military presence has imposed on our thinking. True, this military presence has been a most necessary one, but one nevertheless that should be continuously reevaluated in the light of these rapidly changing times.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, that there is no longer a need for military forces. I think that we all recognize such a need is self-evident. The question is, what kind of military forces do we need? We are constantly told that the Armed Forces need highly professional, highly trained, highly skilled, highly technical, and highly motivated personnel in this age in which we live. Are those the words that describe the draftee? I think we all realize that they are not. Furthermore, I think we all realize that the average draftee never receives the incentives that will convert him into the type of person fitted by these descriptive words. The so-called incentive pay bill of the last Congress was badly misnamed. The only incentive that can be read into this bill is based on the assumption that everyone who enters the Armed Forces is convinced he will become an admiral or a general. We know that such an assumption would be entirely erroneous. Since the flag positions, which were really the only ones to substantially benefit from the incentive pay bill, are usually available only to graduates of the service academies who, presumably, are already provided with necessary incentives, there actually re-

mains little or nothing for the conscriptee or volunteer to entice him to become a career military man.

Mr. Speaker, the draft has been with us for almost 20 years now, far too long. We all know it is not being fairly and impartially administered and is far from universal in its effect. Only one of the three armed services is actually using it to any extent. So the true purpose of the draft is to act as a club to force young men to enter the Armed Forces. Those who volunteer for the Navy and the Air Force are only indicating their desire, not to faithfully serve those particular arms, but rather to avoid the rigors of Army life. Those who wait for the draft are simply saying, in effect, that they want to take the quickest way out. In either instance, the psychological approach of these young men to military service is the exact opposite of what it should be, and what I think it can be. Without the draft, the armed services would be forced to make a military career the attractive thing that it must become in order to get the type of individual they proclaim to be so necessary in this technical era. They would have to look elsewhere for the cooks, sweepers, chauffeurs, and assorted coolie labor for which today's conscripts are being used.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in youth work for a number of years, and I also have two teenage sons. I think we can all recall from our own lives and experiences, as well as those we have observed, the fact that there is a naturally occurring amount of uncertainty and indecision during the years approaching adulthood. Our draft law is simply aggravating this uncertainty and is, in fact, a substantial contributing factor to our national problem of juvenile delinquency. Our destiny and survival may very well rest in the heads and hands of the youth which are today subject to the draft. If the pitched battle for survival comes, it must surely come, it seems, within the next 30 years, or even sooner. From every quarter, voices cry out that we need scientists, educators, philosophers, artists, and political leaders to revivify the essences and guts of Americanism, and to meet the challenge of communism all over the world. But what do we do to the very number from which these people are to come? We cast over them the dark cloud of frustration and uncertainty in the form of the draft. We discourage, delay, and, in some cases, deny the steps that will lead them to lives of leadership and service in their chosen field and on a high level. Our youth can not help but wonder why we have huge armies that train and retrain, while Asian, Middle Eastern, and South American nations continue to fall under the influence, if not the domination, of communism. These youth have a vague feeling of uneasiness, to which they are probably unable to give expression in most cases, that perhaps we have here an enemy who must be fought in other ways. They are told that we are engaged in an ideological conflict for men's minds. Yet many of our youth who are sufficiently endowed to prepare themselves for this conflict are conscripted for a period of years, in which they perform

menial tasks, and they either lose the impetus or the opportunity to sufficiently prepare themselves for the defense of democracy. A further perplexing factor to our youth is the fact that our Nation's leaders, whom they feel certainly must be wise men, fail to furnish them the opportunities and inspiration, even the example, as to how this enemy should be fought. Could it be that the vistas of our leadership are too limited and too interwoven with the traditional ideas of what constitutes national power to see that we are immolating much of the potential of our youth on the altar of national conscription.

Let us liberate our youth, during that period of unique vitality, to follow whatever constructive paths they may choose. Let one of these choices be a career in an attractive Military Establishment where only the dedicated and proficient volunteer can exist.

It is my sincere hope that we can eliminate these shackles and hindrances which are so repugnant to the basic American concept of individual freedom and initiative, which has always been the keystone of our greatness.

Krebiozen Showdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Krebiozen controversy remains at the "do nothing yet" dead center stage; its test committee conferences never seem to reach a true solution as to the selection of an honest method to be used to scientifically test the drug in its reaction on the cancer patient.

Meanwhile, thousands die of the malady and other thousands suffer the poisoning agonies of the putrefaction of live body tissues of the victim approaching death. No one seems to care. Certainly, no one in the million dollar fund-raising cancer clinics are excited over the almost miraculous 9-year record of the Krebiozen Research Foundation's medical records; and reports of the 500 doctors who used Krebiozen in the treatment of cancer patients, all terminal cases. Yes, other doctors told loved ones, "It is hopeless, the patient will die shortly, nothing can be done. It's only a matter of time."

But there are real God-fearing men in the medical profession who love humanity and live by the sacred oath of Hippocrates.

They used Krebiozen, some secretly, in order to escape the vicious opposition of their fellows, and these kept a steady vigil over the sick, registering every change in the patient. These records are the undeniable testimonials to the scientific value of Krebiozen in cancer study:

First, Krebiozen relieved pain when sedatives failed.

Second, Krebiozen reduced the size of the carcinoma in certain types of cancer cases.

Third, Krebiozen stimulated the appetite of the patient to partake of food, thus gaining natural strength.

Fourth, it caused bed patients, 8 months abed, to leave their beds and become ambulatory.

Fifth, Krebiozen is biologically active.

Sixth, Krebiozen is the key to the arrestment and control of cancer.

Seventh, Krebiozen is one of the answers to a study of new scientific areas and methods in the fight on cancer which will ultimately result in a cure for cancer.

FEBRUARY 1, 1959.

Dr. J. R. HELLER,
Director, National Cancer Institute, U.S.
Public Health Service, Bethesda, Md.

DEAR DR. HELLER: First, I should reiterate that the proposal for giving Krebiozen a fair test in the cancer patient made by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS on the floor of the U.S. Senate in August 1958 was immediately accepted by the Krebiozen Research Foundation and by me (A. C. Ivy) the research adviser of the foundation.

The proposal was accepted by me without hesitation because it is based on the principles we have advocated since 1952. First, it provides for the appointment of a three-person arbitration type of committee, consisting of (1) an appointee of the U.S. Public Health Service, (2) an appointee of the Krebiozen Research Foundation who would be myself, and (3) a biostatistician who would be selected by the U.S. Public Health Service and me. Second, it provides that the committee would design a study which would give me the opportunity of demonstrating unequivocally whether Krebiozen is sufficiently beneficial in certain types of cancer patients, so that I, by judging from changes in the cancer patients, could distinguish the patients who received the contents of ampules containing Krebiozen from those patients which received the contents of ampules containing no Krebiozen. Third, the proposal provided that I would serve with physicians appointed by the committee or U.S. Public Health Service in the selection and treatment of the patients, but neither I nor anyone connected with the study would know the identity of the ampules. Fourth, the proposal provided that after completion of the study I, on the basis of a report of the observations on patients, would state which set of ampules contained Krebiozen. Fifth, the proposal provided for the publication of the observations.

Senator DOUGLAS concluded his speech with the statement that he believed his proposal was fair. We also believe that his proposal is scientific and fair.

The USPHS has not accepted Senator DOUGLAS' proposal, but has made a new proposal of its own. Without committing myself to accept the proposal of the USPHS, I agreed to explore it because I believe it was made in good faith.

The USPHS proposal contains three basic provisions. First, it provides for the appointment of an "independent committee" of five members, of which I am not a member. Second, I shall be appointed a consultant to the committee. Third, a double-blind type of controlled study of Krebiozen shall be made, the detailed methods to be designed by the committee.

The proposal of the USPHS has been explored with the following progress to date. First, a committee of five has been tentatively selected for consideration. I have agreed that the five men tentatively selected are good scientists and that they are individually honest men. I know three of them quite well. But I know only one of the

three well enough to know that he would stand for the right regardless of pressure. By this I do not imply that the others would not stand for the right regardless of pressure. Second, I have agreed to state the conditions under which I would serve as a consultant to the committee should the Krebiozen Research Foundation and I agree to accept the proposal made by the USPHS.

I have formulated and attach my conditions. They are in accordance with the principles I have been proposing since 1952 for settling the Krebiozen controversy.

The conditions in brief provide that I would take part in the design of the study which would be of the "blind type," and would take part in the selection and treatment of the patients. The attending physician and I, who would treat and observe the patients and make the records, would be given two or more lots of ampules labeled "A," "B," "C," and so forth, for administration to the patients, the key to the code being sealed and held by Senator Douglas. At the end of the study, I would write a report at the end of which I would conclude which lot of ampules contains Krebiozen on the basis of the observed improvement of the patients. This conclusion would be checked with the key of the code held and sealed by Senator Douglas. The report of the findings would then be published in a medical journal.

The conditions which I have formulated are based on the fact that I am the individual who has had the most extensive experience with the administration of Krebiozen to cancer patients of many types and stages and at the same time have devoted the most study to the observations made and reported by numerous physicians to the Krebiozen Research Foundation. To turn over any test to one or more individuals who are not thoroughly qualified by specific experience with a new therapy would not be a test. It would be only another experiment carried on by novices with the new therapy.

If my conditions are acceptable, the only remaining question would be the desirability and necessity of a three-man arbitration type of committee with me on it, as proposed by Senator Douglas, or of a five-man committee without me on it, as proposed by the Public Health Service.

I should say that the alternative proposal made by the Public Health Service has not been considered by me to be a rejection of Senator Douglas' proposal. I believe the counterproposal was made in good faith because the officials of the Public Health Service actually thought that a committee without me on it would be more acceptable to a majority of the scientific community. In other words, unless the double-blind test is done under direction of a so-called independent committee, the results would not be accepted by a majority of the professional guild. But, it may be asked: Who is going to guarantee the absolute independence or lack of prejudice of each of the members of a so-called independent committee?

What does the suggested need for an independent committee to insure the acceptance of the results by a majority of the professional guild, imply? Does it imply that the majority of the professional guild is biased or prejudiced? Does it mean that they would not accept results obtained by a double-blind test performed under conditions which are devoid of, and which cannot be suspected of, permitting the operation of conscious or unconscious prejudice? Should it be our desire to satisfy the majority of a guild, or should it be to satisfy the interests of truth, science, and humanity as soon as possible?

Obviously, it is implied that my presence on the committee would make the results suspect by the majority of the scientific community. Would my presence on an arbitration type of committee deprive the com-

mittee of its independence? Would not the results obtained by an arbitration type of committee using an experimental method in which prejudice cannot operate speak for themselves when published?

Suspicion seems to exist on both sides of this matter. One side does not want to agree to a test performed by a committee with me on the committee, and the other side does not want to agree to a test performed by a committee without me on the committee.

To neutralize such suspicion it became necessary for me to propose the performance of a double-blind test by an arbitration type of committee. I have made such a proposal repeatedly since 1952. Senator Douglas also detected the suspicion on both sides and proposed an arbitration type of committee. He has proposed and has served on such committees throughout his career.

Why should anyone object to the appointment of a committee with both sides represented on it?

Someone has said "sides" should not exist in science. But the fact is that they do exist and the history of science shows that progress is made only on the basis of scientific controversy. But the controversy and skepticism should be constructive and not barren or destructive. Unfortunately, and too frequently, too much of the skepticism has been destructive in nature. In the case of Krebiozen there has been an impasse since 1952. An inexcusable, unfortunate, unscientific, inhumane impasse.

The Krebiozen side will accept the results of a test conducted by an arbitration type of committee but not the results of a so-called independent committee. The anti-Krebiozen side will accept the results of a so-called independent committee but not those of an arbitration type of committee.

This situation has been permitted to continue by responsible scientific and professional organizations and governmental groups, presumably interested in scientific and human welfare. It has continued to exist regardless of the fact that the results of a test conducted by an arbitration type of committee using the double-blind type of test cannot be rationally suspected. Furthermore, the Krebiozen side of this controversy has been clamoring for such a test since 1952.

The test has been denied because of various excuses, false rumors and fallacious analogies. For example, it has been said that I should not be on the so-called independent committee because one cannot be a party litigant and at the same time a judge. That is obviously a fallacious analogy offered in ignorance or with the intent to mislead. To use such an analogy, without the intent to mislead, is to manifest a lack of understanding of the meaning of an arbitration type of committee and a "double-blind test" in which the person who knows the most about the therapy is allowed to take part. I desire only to demonstrate, by the use of an unequivocal method, that Krebiozen has merit in the treatment of cancer.

The basic question, as I analyze the situation is: Can Dr. A. C. Ivy, working under strictly controlled conditions where an honest bias or prejudice cannot operate, demonstrate that Krebiozen has merit? I ask only the opportunity to demonstrate that I can.

Suspicion can only be dissolved by the appointment of an arbitration type of committee which will prescribe fair conditions for a fair test in which bias or prejudice cannot operate. No other way is known or has ever been tried in such a situation.

Therefore, I am forced to agree with the Krebiozen Research Foundation that for a test of Krebiozen to be fair I should be a member of an arbitration type of committee and be a party to the administration of the therapy and the interpretation of the re-

sults under conditions where bias cannot operate.

This group reiterates its acceptance of the principles outlined in the proposal of Senator Douglas and is anxious to explore his proposal with you and to place it into action as soon as possible.

With best wishes I am,

Yours sincerely,

A. C. Ivy,

Ph.D., M.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.A.C.P.

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH I WOULD SERVE AS THE CONSULTANT TO THE COMMITTEE PROPOSED BY THE USPHS SHOULD THE PROPOSAL BE ACCEPTED BY THE KREBIOZEN RESEARCH FOUNDATION AND BY ME

METHOD FOR THE PRESERVATION ON THE ANONYMITY OF THE DIFFERENT SETS OF AMPULES

Two or more sets of identically appearing ampules, one set containing Krebiozen and the other set or sets containing No. 9 light mineral oil (Standard Oil Co. of Indiana) would be given to Senator Douglas. The Senator would arrange for the two or more sets of ampules to be marked with letters of the alphabet, such as A for one set, B for a second set, etc. He would be the only person to possess the key to the code. His signed statement as to the key to the code, or their designation by letters of the alphabet would be placed in a well-sealed envelope in a safe to which he or an alternate in case of his disability shall have access.

Each ampule in the A lot or A set would be labeled "A," and each ampule in the B lot would be labeled "B," etc. The ampule in each lot would be placed in identical appearing cardboard containers. In order to avoid errors in labeling, the lot of ampules containing Krebiozen would be sent to Senator Douglas for labeling with the code letter of his selection on one date, and the ampules containing only mineral oil would be sent to him later, after he has labeled the lot containing Krebiozen.

The sets of ampules would be placed in a safety deposit vault of a bank or trust company, requiring two keys for its opening. One key would be kept by a representative of the committee of the USPHS, and the other by me (A. C. Ivy) so that the ampules may be removed jointly as required for use in the treatment of patients.

After a report of the study on patients had been prepared by the committee and by me (vide infra) and I had concluded which set of ampules contain Krebiozen, Senator Douglas would reveal the key to his code.

MY RELATION TO THE DESIGN, CONDUCT, AND PUBLICATION OF THE STUDY

1. A study of the sort under consideration cannot be properly designed and conducted unless the objectives are clearly defined and accepted.

It is understood that the true objective of this study is to determine by the most probative method possible, whether Krebiozen is of any value in the treatment of cancer, or whether the favorable changes observed after the administration of Krebiozen to numerous cancer patients, are due to delayed effects of prior therapy or to spontaneous natural causes, resulting from variations in the natural resistance of the host to cancer.

It is understood that the objective is not to determine whether Krebiozen is a cure for cancer, or whether it is better than other forms of treatment now being used. I make this negative statement because such "straw men" or false assumptions have been proposed for the purpose of destructively criticizing past efforts.

It is understood that the most probative method for testing a new treatment of a disease (a) utilizes the experience and understanding of the person or persons who know the most about the new treatment and (b) an experimental design in which the

honest bias of enthusiasm and conviction, or the prejudice of barren or destructive skepticism, or the prejudice of face saving cannot operate.

The objective of this study is not to determine whether persons, without experience and understanding of a new therapy, can obtain favorable results. That is a secondary objective. I make this negative statement because it has been used recently as an argument against the proposal of an arbitration type of committee and a double-blind test. For example, it has been said that the test proposed by me (also that of Senator Douglas) would not yield results which would demonstrate that other physicians could obtain the same results. That is a reasonable objective, but it is not the purpose of the proposed test. We now have plenty of evidence showing that many physicians obtain favorable results with Krebiozen, a matter to be considered in due season. Furthermore, who has taken a vote to determine whether a majority of the scientific community would not accept the results obtained by an arbitration committee (with me on it) using a double-blind type of study devoid of the operation of prejudice. I agree that it would be desirable to obtain results by the ordinary methods used by a majority of a scientific community. But when prejudice prevails, such methods may not be probative; then unusual probative methods must be used. In the case of Krebiozen it is known that malignant prejudice exists. (See app. I).

These objectives are important for two reasons: One reason is to test therapeutically an important scientific theory or hypothesis (see app. II); the other reason is humanitarian, namely, to establish as soon as possible whether the product called Krebiozen has any therapeutic merits in the treatment of cancer in man, and, if so, to develop the product and make it available to the physicians of cancer patients.

2. It is understood that I would be notified and expected to attend all meetings of the committee.

3. It is understood that I should have the right to approve or disapprove the type of controlled study or experimental design, in regard to whether it is devoid of the operation of prejudice and is designed to attain the objective set forth above. It is understood that I shall provide a list of signs and symptoms which would represent a minimum list to be observed by measures and subjective reports.

4. It is understood that only one type of tumor patient would be selected for study. The type much preferred by me and the Krebiozen Research Foundation, would be proven cases of primary brain tumor; cases which have been written-off by the neurosurgeon or neurologist. Such patients are preferred because they most consistently show a favorable response a few weeks after the initiation of Krebiozen therapy. The second preferred type of tumor would be cases of breast tumor with metastases to the bone but without extensive metastases to the lung. The patients should have proven refractory to the therapies usually tried in cancer therapy.

5. It is understood that the type of tumor and patient selected for treatment would be subject to my approval because I know the approximate percentages of those types of tumors and patients who respond favorably to Krebiozen as it is now available for use.

6. It is understood that the patient would be a patient of the attending physician designated or appointed by the committee.

7. It is understood that the contents of the ampules, would be administered by me or in my presence, as a consultant to the attending physician designated by the committee. It is understood that I could designate some physician to administer the drug,

as a substitute consultant for me, should I become incapacitated. This is to make certain that no error is made in the lot and number of ampules the patient had been designated to receive and to avoid lapses in therapy due to unavoidable absence.

8. It is understood that I would determine the dosage rate each patient is to receive at the start of the treatment and the increases or decreases to be made after the start of the treatment. (Krebiozen is not given according to a rule-of-thumb method.) The reason for the increase or decrease would be recorded on the patient's chart by me or some physician designated by me in the presence of the attending physician designated by the committee.

It is understood that, if after 2 or 3 months there is no improvement in the condition of the patient, I shall in the presence of and with the consultation of the attending physician designated by the committee, determine whether the lettered ampule the patient has received should be changed to a letter ampule of a different lot, or whether the patient's tenure in the study be ended.

It is understood that the continuance or introduction of new adjunctive therapy, such as analgetics, sedatives and physical therapy, should be determined by the attending physician designated by the committee in consultation with me.

9. It is understood that all therapy and recommendations of therapy and all observations including my own or those of my substitute would be recorded in the patient's official record.

In addition, it is understood that I should have the right to make notes on the diagnosis, complications, past therapy, and progress of the patient, after the start of the proposed new therapy, from the official record of the patient. I desire to possess such notes for the purpose of study relative to making changes in the dosage rate of the contents of the ampules. A copy of these notes would be given to the committee.

10. It is understood that it would be preferable to have all the patients treated in one clinic in one city and certainly not more than two cities.

11. It is understood that at the conclusion of the study, as determined by the design of the experiment, I would prepare a report of my observations and would conclude, on the basis of the observations, which set of ampules contain Krebiozen. My conclusion then would be checked with the code prepared and placed previously in a safe by Senator Douglas, and favorable or unfavorable it would be understood to be the criterion of the activity of Krebiozen.

12. The results would be announced jointly by Senator Douglas, the National Cancer Institute, and the committee, and within 6 months thereafter published as a scientific report in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute or some other appropriate publication.

A. C. IVY.

APPENDIX I

I painfully regret the necessity of calling attention to the following proven facts or facts which can still be proven and indicate the extent of malignant prejudice regarding Krebiozen. It is necessary because many persons are not acquainted with these facts and it is only because of the existence of these facts that it became necessary to propose an arbitration type of committee to give Krebiozen a test under conditions devoid of the possibility or suspicion of the operation of bias or prejudice. These facts are the cause of the controversy and of the need of an unusual test method to end the controversy.

1. A dishonest (in part) and superficial (in toto) report on Krebiozen was published in the J.A.M.A., October 1951. These

charges were established under oath and never denied under oath at the hearings of a commission of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

2. I (A. C. Ivy) was suspended from the Chicago Medical Society under false charges, an action later admitted by the president of the society to have been a mistake.

3. It was rumored throughout the medical world in the United States that "Dr. Ivy was off his rocker," "had suffered a minor stroke." The truth is that during the period of my alleged affliction I was the author or coauthor of approximately 65 scientific articles printed in medical journals on subjects other than Krebiozen; I have spoken on subjects other than Krebiozen at numerous medical scientific meetings, and have been on six lecture tours in Europe and three round the world including Australia. Incidentally I also took part in raising \$45 million worth of medical buildings for the West Side Medical Center in Chicago.

4. A committee appointed to study the observations collected by the Krebiozen Research Foundation did not consider or evaluate the reports of the observations of three physicians, two of whom are associated with university tumor clinics, the other being the pathologist of a hospital in Chicago.

5. One cancer specialist working in a university tumor clinic treated 40 patients with proven cancer with Krebiozen. He has been prevented by his chief from publishing his observations. Even up to as recently as December 1958, he has asked permission to publish them.

6. I had three articles on Krebiozen accepted for publication by a medical journal and they were sent to the printer to set into type. Later they were rejected because the publisher did not wish to experience difficulties due to pressure from certain AMA officials.

7. I was invited by the editor of a lay magazine with a large circulation to write a brief of the story of Krebiozen. I prepared the article and it was accepted for publication by the editor with much praise. It was sent to the printer, but then returned because of pressure exerted by two AMA officials.

8. Physicians working in a large cancer clinic have written that they had tested Krebiozen and found it to be inactive; whereas they had never had any Krebiozen to test. Numerous similar stories have been told about Krebiozen.

9. One well-known physician was removed from a hospital staff because he used Krebiozen; later because he was a friend of a local newspaper publisher who came to his assistance, he was reinstated and permitted to use Krebiozen.

Other physicians have been threatened, if they should use Krebiozen.

10. The therapeutic trial of Krebiozen has been banned by numerous hospitals, though it is distributed to physicians for clinical trial according to the regulations of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

11. At two hospitals, part of the records of two of our "7-year cures" have been lost. At another hospital the surgeon has refused to provide to a physician a copy of the surgical and pathological report of a "6-year cure." And, these were honorable men.

12. An associate professor of medicine at a medical school under pressure gave up his study of Krebiozen and renounced the observations he had reported to the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

13. Recently I was invited to report our observations to a well-known cancer society. I accepted the invitation and was thanked for accepting. Later the program committee under pressure withdrew the invitation.

14. Former Surg. Gen. Leonard Scheele (USPHS) agreed with me, Dr. Ivy, several years ago to the effect that the situation regarding Krebiozen was so prejudiced

that it would be practically impossible to obtain an unprejudiced report by an independent committee of medical or cancer specialists. I believe hidden and open pressure would be brought to bear on the members of such a committee. I have been told orally and in writing that the pressures against me would cease if I wrote and published a report to the effect that Krebiozen had no significant value.

15. Numerous other incidents revealing almost incredible prejudice in unexpected places could be cited. For example, certain AMA officials lodged charges against Judge and Dr. Durovic with the Immigration Office to prevent them from becoming citizens of the United States of America. And, on the occasion of their taking the oath of citizenship an Immigration official read publicly these charges and reported that after extensive investigation they were found to be entirely false.

APPENDIX II THEORY

I believe that the existence of natural defenses in the mammalian body against cancer has been firmly established, and that these defenses may be affected favorably or unfavorably. One type of defense mechanism is illustrated by the role which autacoids, or hormones, or the glands of internal secretion play in the excitation or inhibition of the growth and spread of certain types of cancer cells before they lose their physiological property of responding to such growth controlling chemicals. Another type or group of autacoids is more primitive. They may be referred to as "local autacoids" which are resident in all the cells of the body, particularly in the reticuloendothelial cells, and are locally concerned (a) in regulating the normal repair of extracellular or intracellular injury, (b) in the prevention of the development of benign and malignant tumors, (c) in the inhibition of the local "invasion" of the cells of malignant tumors into adjacent normal tissues, and (d) in the inhibition of the growth of the malignant cells which enter the blood and lymph streams and lodge in the capillaries of distant organs.

The former type of autacoids has been exploited therapeutically in cancer for some 15 or 20 years. The latter type has not been developed and exploited therapeutically except in the case of Krebiozen. Only very recently has it been studied therapeutically in mice in the laboratory.

Krebiozen was produced on the basis of the hypothesis that it represents a product of the reticuloendothelial cells which is concerned with one of the primitive types of body defense against abnormal growth. The experimental use of products purporting to be "immunological agents" and of Krebiozen in animals and patients with cancer represent the therapeutic exploitation of the second type of body defense against cancer. The development of the Krebiozen hypothesis will undoubtedly lead to very fruitful therapeutic knowledge; Krebiozen as we understand it today is probably only an opening wedge.

Mr. Jack Mabley, the Chicago Daily News feature columnist, in a recent highly informative article, treated the Krebiozen question fairly.

[From the Chicago Daily News, January 31, 1959]

KREBIOZEN SHOWDOWN—IS IT A FAKE OR A MIRACLE?

(By Jack Mabley)

Scores of people in this country—dozens here in Chicago—who were in the agonizing final stages of cancer, are leading healthful, useful lives today. They are free of cancer. They have been, or are being treated with Krebiozen.

Krebiozen is given to cancer patients only after doctors have termed the cases terminal, when there is no hope.

In 70 percent of these cases Krebiozen is effective. Sometimes it only relieves the unbearable pain, lets the patient live his final weeks in relative peace.

Sometimes it brings total recovery.

HE'S CRUSADING FOR KREBIOZEN

These statements were made to me by John M. Davis, president of one of the Nation's major construction companies.

Davis is devoting virtually all of his time to crusading for Krebiozen. He is president of the Committee for a Fair Test of Krebiozen, 343 South Dearborn.

He has impressive evidence. He can produce a parade of recovered victims. More than 300 doctors in this country are administering Krebiozen to cancer victims.

A careful record is kept of each treatment and the 70-percent effectiveness is documented.

The names of most of the doctors who administer this drug are kept secret because they fear retribution from the American Medical Association.

This association has declared that Krebiozen is worthless.

The American Cancer Society sides with the AMA. It has refused to conduct a test of the drug and has gotten into a bitter brawl with the committee for a fair test.

EFFECTIVE, SAYS DR. IVY

The most prominent backer of Krebiozen is Dr. Andrew Ivy, professor of physiology and head of the Department of Clinical Science at the University of Illinois.

Dr. Ivy has never wavered in his belief that Krebiozen is an effective weapon against cancer.

He is not only one of the most distinguished medical scientists in this Nation; he is one of the scrappiest men in Chicago.

He now is fighting for a fair test of the drug. If the test confirms his beliefs, the Government would be able to approve general use.

Dr. Ivy believes that literally hundreds of thousands of cancer victims would be spared the horror of the disease.

Powerful forces are fighting the test.

If Krebiozen is proved effective, the AMA and the Cancer Society will suffer irreparable damage.

CONSPIRACY IS CHARGED

Charges have been made that businessmen who sought control of Krebiozen, and failed, have conspired with the AMA to discredit the drug.

The charges, if not true, are extremely libelous. Those who made the charges keep repeating them, in print and orally, and they have not been sued for libel.

The controversy over Krebiozen has been simmering for several years and is about to erupt. A showdown must come.

Someone is terribly wrong. Either the drug is a fraud or one of the worst scandals in the history of the American medical profession is about to explode.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this is Boy Scout Week when we look back over the 49 years that scouting has existed in America. Twenty-six million people

have been touched by it; nearly 5 million lads have joined up—Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Explorers, and so forth, learning what it means to be God-fearing citizens of a free land.

This is what a Scout subscribes to when he joins up:

On my honor—

I will do my best to serve God and my country.

To help other people at all times.

To keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

Strong meat, perhaps—but it builds strong youth and fine men.

Nor are we the only country in which scouting flourishes. There are 7,589,183 Scouts and leaders in 67 countries of the world and there is a constant interchange among them. Could there be a better road to understanding? Could there be a better way to tie us all together under God?

Edgar Guest has painted a very descriptive picture entitled "The Boy," which I include as follows:

A possible man of affairs,

A possible leader of men,

Back of the grin that he wears

There may be the courage of ten;

Lawyer or merchant or priest,

Artist or singer of joy,

This, when his strength is increased,

Is what may become of the boy.

Headless and mischievous now,

Spending his boyhood in play,

Yet glory may rest on his brow

And fame may exalt him some day;

A skill that the world shall admire,

Strength that the world shall employ,

And faith that shall burn as a fire,

Are what may be found in the boy.

He with the freckles and tan,

He with that fun-loving grin,

May rise to great heights as a man,

And many a battle may win;

Back of the slang of the streets,

And back of the love of a toy,

It may be a Great Spirit beats;

Lincoln once played as a boy.

Trace them all back to their youth,

All the great heroes we sing,

Seeking and serving the truth,

President, poet, and king,

Washington, Caesar, and Paul,

Homer who sang about Troy,

Jesus the greatest of all,

Each in his time was a boy.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate day to recall a statement by Abraham Lincoln which represents one of the guiding principles in his private life and a basic tenet of his approach to government.

In 1843, Mr. Lincoln said:

As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so it must be with a government.

Certainly no one can dispute the effect of continued borrowing on the finances of an individual. No one can hope to live forever by borrowing, for he will in truth be eaten up by interest.

It is likewise true that governments cannot continue to live by borrowing. We are in our third decade of the era of deficit spending. Since 1930 there have been only 6 years in which the Federal Government has lived within its income. Yet in the recent years this country has recorded unparalleled growth and prosperity, and in such times of record-breaking income, both individuals and governments must seize the opportunity to retire debts.

We are faced this year with a precariously balanced budget. It is doubtful that the budget will remain balanced in view of the action by Congress on the first few spending bills which have been brought before the two Houses. Many responsible persons in and out of Congress feel that unless there is bold action to balance the budget this year and in the immediate future, there will never again be a balanced budget.

I share the view that we are reaching a financial crisis, that if we are to remain a nation with strong economic policies and a sound dollar—or perhaps I should say a sound 50-cent dollar in view of past inflationary spirals—we must act boldly and strongly.

Accordingly, I am introducing a resolution on this anniversary of Lincoln's birth which would set the wheels in motion for a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget except in war or other grave emergency.

I do not feel a sense-of-Congress resolution or any other act of Congress can do the job, for it is agreed that an act of one Congress does not necessarily bind succeeding Congresses. We must put this resolve—if the people express their desire for it—in such a way that it cannot be circumvented in future years.

My mail shows a growing concern by persons throughout the country about inflation and deficit spending. I know other Members who also report the same trend. People realize you cannot live forever on borrowed money and they know that Uncle Sam cannot either.

I urge my colleagues to let the people decide through their State legislatures whether they want to continue deficit spending and inflation or whether we will live within our income. Let the people decide and then we will do their bidding.

An Address by Hon. M. A. MacIntyre,
Under Secretary of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a very interesting and informative address delivered by Hon. M. A. MacIntyre, Under

Secretary of the Air Force, before the Yale Law School Alumni Association, at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, on January 30, 1959.

The address follows:

Gentlemen: You are a part of a privileged group—the people of the United States. This group to which you belong has the highest material standards of living in the world. It has, within the past 50 years, absorbed and harnessed, to a degree which no others have, the automobile, the radio, and the airplane. It is now somewhat indigestibly absorbing TV, air conditioning, and advanced electronics. But it has yet to put in perspective, real or imaginative, the rockets and missiles of the space age which is upon us.

Like all other breakthroughs in human knowledge and reasons, we know they are usable for good or for evil, for peace or for war. To such alternate ends has the automobile been directed—and the airplane.

On the vistas opened by the space age to peaceful purposes I will not dwell. They are, however, legion in imagination and had we time we could dream together.

But it is the more immediate military significance of this age that I should like to discuss with you. I say immediate because trips to the moon, while perhaps essential to assure a knowledge of outer space and an ability to deny to others its uses for other than peaceful purposes, are still somewhat ahead of us in time. But the rocketry which creates the capability for orbiting satellites and probes to the moon and beyond is here right now. And it has present convertibility to the launching of intercontinental ballistic missiles with atomic warheads.

It is, therefore, appropriate and exceedingly timely that we be realistic about these weapons; their effects upon our other weapons; our military capabilities, and the policies which such capabilities can and must support.

First of all as to the characteristics of the missile itself. In range it will suffice to span the distance from the United States to Russia, East or West, and vice versa. It will travel such distances in approximately 30 minutes. The shorter range, the so-called IRBM, or intermediate range ballistic missile, will travel its 200-to-1,500-mile range in 10 to 12 minutes. While initial warheads will not be as large as those carried by long-range bombers they will be many times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb. Their accuracy, dependent on radio or all-inertial guidance, is a matter of experience but can be well within the destructive range of their warheads. Their overall reliability—that is, the chances of a successful launch, flight, and impact in an expected circle of probable error in one continuous operation—is, as you might expect, dependent likewise on experience, but could be very high. However, high probability of accuracy is more important than reliability of launch. Two or three missiles can take care of one target if the accuracy is sufficient.

These are formidable dimensions of speed of attack, warhead power, accuracy, and reliability. Clearly, the warhead size, degree of accuracy, and degree of reliability will become more refined and we must, in our own self-defense, seek the utmost refinements with the greatest intensity. The sputniks and lunik alone reveal the power and guidance which others have already successfully achieved.

Clearly, any of us can conclude, from our own test shots of Atlas, our first ICBM, and the sputniks, Explorers, and lunik, that operational intercontinental ballistic missiles are around the corner. Unlike the initial atom bombs, we will not be the only possessor. How many we or they will have or could have and by what dates I do not pro-

pose to discuss. Such matters involve not only intelligence but alternative considerations of operational concept and assumptions as to accuracies. They affect numbers but are immaterial to other important general implications which are being drawn, some erroneously, which I will discuss.

These implications must, in particular, be measured against our expressed national policy of depending upon an ability to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing. It would be wrong to assume, however, that this means we must take the first blow on the continental United States. The President himself has stated that he sees no reason for saying we necessarily have to accept a major nuclear attack on the continental United States before we can act.

It is conceivable the first blow at us might not involve the continental United States as it could be a blow at the forces of an ally. We are, in short, under all circumstances undertaking to have a capability to exercise retaliation at our discretion. This is the heart and soul of what is spoken of as the deterrent. And militarily the basic ingredient is the capability to destroy, or substantially so, those major forces which could destroy us—not just some forces, or the peripheral forces. All our forces—land, sea, and air—contribute in varying degree to this deterrent. The force which today contributes in the greatest degree is the Strategic Air Command and its bombers. This alone today can reach to and destroy the inner core bomber forces and military targets that represent the only forces which militarily might prevail over us.

It is only natural that, in the transition of thought from these present day bombers to missiles having the characteristics I have described, some might draw the implication that our deterrent can rest solely on the possession of forces which, after initial attack upon us, could survive to assure retaliation by general devastation. This I believe would be a diluted deterrent. And I come to this conclusion by reason of the intensive nature of the concept, whether or not it be assumed that bombers give way to missiles, under sea or underground, as the backbone of such survival forces. For the danger of the concept is this: The survival forces that could indeed effect general devastation are so relatively small that they might not be capable of the substantial destruction of the major military forces of intercontinental bombers and missiles available to devastate us. Even though we are firm in our principle to strike only in retaliation for injury inflicted upon us, we must have this capability of destroying our enemy's ability to destroy us, or our deterrent can never be exercised except at the expense of our own destruction and our opponent would know this.

As Henry Kissinger and others have pointed out, an effective deterrent only exists if there are the forces to carry it out, the will to do so, and the belief of the opponent that both the forces and the will exist. But will an opponent believe that we would unleash our forces if our military capability is known by him to be limited to devastation capability and is not sufficient to prevent him from devastating us in return? And even if he did believe us, would we be as firm in the face of peripheral prods at the Berlins and Formosas or at the bargaining table?

It would, therefore, seem that we cannot allow the missile age to deflect us from attempting, within the confines of that age, to maintain the capability of neutralizing the bomber and missile forces that could devastate us. This will be difficult and many different weapons and means must be considered—including the airplane, the submarine, and the missile. The composition of such a force is, of course, on a quite different premise and many of its elements may indeed

be vulnerable or unsuitable for a pure survival force, expected only to exact a toll of devastation in retaliation for a nuclear blow struck at us.

The role of the airplane, which may more and more itself become a missile platform, is quite flexible for an infinite variety of attacks, particularly upon targets whose locations are not accurately known. It provides the means to bring human perception and judgment closest to the target. It is susceptible in quantity, of 15-minute alert and in lesser quantity of airborne alert. Whether, and the extent to which such measures plus dispersal now well under way, improve the bomber posture depend to great degree on the equally timely receipt of warning. The ballistic missile early warning we are building in the far north and other measures are designed to achieve this objective. The anti-ICBM missile on which ARPA and the Army are working and which is a problem of great difficulty could further add protective coverage. These considerations serve to highlight other less obvious but very important as well as correct implications of the missile age.

Until the advent of the missile, forces which could survive an attempted direct attack on them, generally speaking, were of the same character as those which would be usable prior to any direct surprise attack. But the compression of time and distance brought by the missile involves a closer and separate look at the before forces and the after forces.

It has been suggested that the missile age involves a further withdrawal to fortress America rendering overseas bases and installations useless. The emphasis, of course, is upon the compression of time for attack at shorter ranges than in the case of the continental United States. There seems to be also the countersuggestion that since the missile age may bring an assured retaliatory stalemate of devastation there is more need than ever for bases from which to be prepared for local aggression.

It is, of course, conceivable that it might become impossible for any one power to prevent retaliatory devastation by another. This is another way of stating that one cannot substantially neutralize the military forces of an enemy, which I do not now concede. But in any event, it is difficult to see how this increases the likelihood or scope of what are loosely called limited wars. Limited wars, there may certainly be, where the capability of one participant is limited as to the nature or number of weapons possessed. These, however, seem extremely limited and outside of the outright Communist bloc where the limitations are solely imposed by the discretionary will of the dominant partner, now and in the future. There is, of course, the exception of Communist China as a present and continually growing special case. Possible, if we were to assume a stalemate in capability of devastation among the major powers, encouragement of satellites or the growing independence of Communist China could precipitate more intense indirect aggression and local conflicts. Certainly our experiences when in possession of a strong deterrent cannot lead us to believe that we will need any less bases under a stalemate.

Part of the very reason I do not make the concession of a possible stalemate is the existence of those overseas bases and forces. Our allies and our forces among them, scattered throughout the world, represent a necessary target for our potential enemy that is a far more complex job successfully to attack by surprise than would be the continental United States alone.

Let me now, if I may, briefly summarize what I think is good defense thinking in the missile age.

First, our national policy does not require, nor does any intrinsic military deficiency,

that if an aggressor makes an attack upon us or our allies overseas, we must grant him the advantage of an attack on the continental United States before launching our nuclear missile retaliation.

Second, were we to accept a military posture that limited our forces only to those which, after a surprise missile attack on the continental United States, would be sufficient to enable us to effect general devastation, we would then possess a deterrent, but a less believable one than when the capability to neutralize his major military forces of intercontinental bombers and missiles is possessed.

Thirdly, the missile age requires forces measured separately for capability to neutralize substantially the military forces of a potential enemy and for assurance of general devastation after surprise attack upon us.

Fourthly, whether or not the before attack missile age forces can be created and whether or not, therefore, a stalemate is created, limited conflicts controlled by limited capacities or limited willingness of indirect aggressors will require allies and bases throughout the world either to meet the prods under a stalemate or to complicate the surprise attack burden of a common potential enemy.

Abraham Lincoln—Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, we have gathered here today in the Halls of the Congress to observe the 150th birthday anniversary of the 16th President and one of the greatest sons of our country, Abraham Lincoln. On this day, also, we commemorate the birthday of a famous adopted son of our country, and a hero of the Revolutionary War, Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

In their backgrounds, Lincoln and Kosciuszko were far apart. Lincoln was born in a log cabin in Kentucky, received little formal education, and advanced from his humble origins to the highest office in our land.

Kosciuszko, in contrast, was born in Poland, of a well-to-do family, and received excellent education. He was a graduate of the Military Academy in Warsaw and the Military School of Artillery in Paris. Unlike Lincoln, he was principally a soldier.

But in spite of their divergent backgrounds, Lincoln and Kosciuszko were alike in their love and liberty and justice, and in their belief in the dignity and basic equality of men.

It is these convictions which they shared, and for which they lived and died, that have earned them our love, gratitude, and honor.

The lives of these two men, and their achievements, are well known to all of us. I shall not endeavor to repeat them. I would, however, like to bring out one point which seems very significant, and very pertinent to the problems which our Nation, and the rest of the free world, face today.

Both Lincoln and Kosciuszko were involved directly in tremendous struggles

to assure the freedom, and the unity, of our Nation. And they both clearly realized, and so indicated in their speeches and writings, that those wars were not fought solely for the sake of the then-living generations. Those wars were fought so that generations to come could enjoy liberty, justice, and progress in a free, democratic, and united nation.

We, too, are involved in a great and terrible conflict: the conflict between the free world and communism. The outcome of this conflict may well determine the survival of our Western Civilization, and the survival of the priceless heritage which came to us through the efforts and sacrifices of men like Lincoln and Kosciuszko.

We must realize and remember, therefore, as they did so clearly, that what is at stake in this conflict is not only our own future, but also the future of our children and of our children's children for many generations to come. Our actions today will determine the framework of the society in which they will live for decades and even centuries to come.

With God's help, and a firm stand and willingness to sacrifice on our part, we may preserve our heritage and pass it on to our children, so that they too will be able to enjoy liberty and justice.

This is our responsibility. God give us strength that, inspired by the example of Lincoln and Kosciuszko, our Nation today and in the days to come may live up to that responsibility.

Treasury Bows to Market—Avoids Long-Term Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been urging that the Treasury Department increase the interest payable on U.S. savings bonds—E bonds—at the same time waiving the payment of income taxes on such bonds provided that the bonds are not redeemed for at least 10 years after their maturity.

On January 7, 1959, I again introduced bills which would accomplish the foregoing. They are H.R. 596 and H.R. 597, respectively.

The following article by Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American, points up the necessity for enactment of these measures. The article appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 30, 1959:

TREASURY BOWS TO MARKET—AVOIDS LONG-TERM ISSUES

(By Leslie Gould)

The U.S. Treasury in its newest financing—\$15 billions—faced realities and passed up for the time being any further switch of the debt into long-term securities.

The two previous long-term offerings—last spring and earlier this month—missed the market.

DEBACLE IN BONDS

Last year's long term issue resulted in a demoralized market, from which it has yet to recover. The crackup last spring and summer was one of the worst debacles in bond market history.

The long term bonds sold earlier this month are selling below the offering price even after a 2-day rally in governments.

The Treasury could hardly take another crack on the head or a kick elsewhere on the anatomy.

NEXT FINANCING APRIL

The new financing is all in short term securities—3-year 4 percent notes and 1-year 3½ percent certificates. This is a "roll-over." The new securities will be issued only in exchange for maturing issues. There will be no cash subscriptions.

Outside the regular short term bill offerings—none of which will be for cash under the new Treasury policy—there will be no more Treasury financing until April. The Treasury, to meet payrolls and other cash needs will have to come into the market then.

EIGHTY AND ONE-HALF BILLION DOLLARS DEBT DUE

The Treasury in the year ahead has more than \$80½ billion in securities maturing, including the issues to be swapped for the new offering. This \$80½ billion also includes nearly \$2 billion in E-bonds, and \$1½ billion in savings F and G bonds.

The Treasury is on the spot, largely as a result of its failure 5 and 6 years ago to refinance more of its debt into long term issues. Then it could have financed at around 2½ percent. Now it has trouble getting money at 4 percent.

The Federal Reserve has had a role in this, putting up money rates.

LITTLE GUY GETS ONLY 3½ PERCENT

What the Treasury and the Federal do sets the pattern for the money market. The public fails to realize this, and when investors see Government bonds dumped because of the changing interest pattern they put part of the blame on a flight from the dollar. If there ever is a real flight from the dollar, the Treasury will be in trouble. So, will everyone else.

One thing the Treasury can never explain is why a little E savings bond investor can get only 3½ percent for his money—and then only after holding his bonds more than 8 years—while large bonds nearly 9 years—while large institutional investors now can get 4 percent.

Unemployment Still No. 1 Domestic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, this year I have received many letters asserting that inflation is the great No. 1 domestic problem. The President in his budget message proceeds on the assumption that inflation is our greatest danger. By legerdemain or juggling, he has apparently submitted a balanced budget. Other people contend that international communism is our greatest problem. I know that the fear of inflation and the fear of international communism are disturbing a great many people. However, in my area, the problem of unem-

ployment is a serious one. The problem of unemployment appears to me to be the major domestic problem in my congressional district. My opinion is fortified by the results of a questionnaire which I forwarded to the voters of my district during the early part of January. In response to one of the questions, I received a very alarming answer. I asked the following question:

In connection with your standards of living, are you employed full time, employed part time, unemployed, or retired? I have tabulated the answers and I find this alarming situation. Sixty-four percent of the people declared they are employed full time, 8 percent indicated that they are employed part time, 8 percent are unemployed, and 12 percent stated that they are retired.

It appears, therefore, that the domestic problem of unemployment is still a major problem in my area. This is in the great city of New York where the country feels prosperity abounds. The percentage above, if projected, indicates that my area is suffering from lack of employment, either fully or partly. Sixteen percent of those who responded to my questionnaire declared that they are not employed full time. An additional 12 percent are on fixed incomes inasmuch as they are retired.

The problems of my district apparently are problems throughout the United States. We must not relax in our efforts to expand our economy and to provide measures for the relief of the unemployed. Throughout the United States reports are heard that unemployment is still the No. 1 domestic problem.

In the February issue of the magazine, *The Laborer*, there was this illuminating editorial. I set it forth for the reading of all those who wish to know what is going on. After reading it, they will be better informed as to what they should do:

Unemployment, someone once said, is like an iceberg. The chunk that rises above the surface—the actual unemployed—is only a small part of the story. Resting quietly beneath the jobless waters are the bewildered, hungry faces of millions of children and dependents of the unemployed worker.

As the year 1958 rang down, the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Statistics issued its last report for the old year on the number of unemployed—4,100,000, or 6.1 percent, of the labor force.

Coinciding with the release of unemployment figures, President Eisenhower issued his seventh state of the Union message to Congress. The theme running through the entire message was the need to balance the budget. During the reading of his message the President was applauded some 27 times, but the only unanimity of applause in the heavily Democratic Congress occurred when the President stated that there would be no retreat on Berlin.

HOPE OFFERED

When the President had finished his message the consensus was that Congress had a major task ahead on the economic front.

One hope for restoring jobs to the unemployed came soon after Congress convened last month when Representative ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, introduced an omnibus housing bill.

If passed, the bill would provide \$500 million a year for 3 years for slum clearance and urban renewal, with a clause providing an additional \$100 million accelerator fund to

be added at any time. This compares with the administration's proposal last year for a \$250 million annual program, with the Federal share declining in later years. The bill would also remove some restrictions on the public housing program; provide \$500 million for the Federal National Mortgage Association's special assistance program for purchase of some housing mortgages; set up a new loan program for housing for the elderly, and provide \$500 million for the college housing loan program.

Another area where the unemployed can hope to find employment is in airport construction (see January 1959 *Laborer*). The Democrats in the Senate have already listed Federal aid to airports as a top priority on their 1959 calendar. Also, the Democratic leadership has promised dollars and cents aid to depressed areas of our country.

A recent edition of a leading business magazine has predicted a half billion dollar economy by early 1960.

Early in its story, the magazine announced that the economy is "moving up again, somewhat anxiously and hesitantly, but in a healthy and broad-based way." Near the end of the article, there was a section on unemployment. One of the reasons given for the rise in unemployment during the postwar years was technological advances. It was noted that technological unemployment, not a serious threat to wage earners yet, can expect to be felt more and more in 1959.

AUTOMATION BLAMED

One of the industries hardest hit by technological advances has been the auto industry.

A Michigan State University professor, reporting on the large number of layoffs in this industry, says that he has firsthand knowledge of "auto workers with 12 years' seniority who haven't been called back to work yet. The feeling is that only those with 10 years or more seniority will go back to work this year." Others evidence of the inroads automation has made on this industry is the fact that auto makers are turning out cars with only 75 percent as many machine tools as it used in 1953.

The hardships presented by automation should be a joint labor-management problem and should look to a solution from these two groups.

Relief for the displaced worker could be sought through a program to help the worker find new employment elsewhere or to retrain him, if he is capable, in the new technology. Those who cannot be retrained and are not young enough to look elsewhere for work should be retired at an earlier age.

Studies conducted by the Department of Labor in industries where automation has made the biggest inroads, e.g., the baking and chemical industries, have brought out one salient fact—the necessity to give workers sufficient notice of an impending automated program. Many workers then have a chance to make up their minds whether they will train for new jobs, take downgraded jobs at the same pay, or find other employment opportunities.

The year 1959 offers a clear cut challenge to all members of organized labor to see that the unemployed worker does not remain a mere cipher lost in an impersonal maze of statistics.

For the record, we will here cite the December 1958 report of the Department of Labor on unemployment and then next year perhaps we can return to these figures to check for any signs of improvement.

The increase in unemployment was the largest since June 1958 when 500,000 workers were added to the jobless rolls.

WORKWEEK INCREASED

Manufacturing employment dipped by 50,000 to 15.7 million mostly because of seasonal declines in canning and food processing.

The factory workweek increased three-tenths of an hour to 40.2 hours, bringing average weekly factory earnings to \$88.04, a new high.

Insured unemployment for the week ending December 27 was 2,811,467.

Estimates indicate that about 200,000 persons exhausted their regular jobless benefits in December, compared to 180,000 in November.

As this issue of the Laborer was going to press, the President submitted his budget to Congress. In the \$77 billion balanced budget the President called for:

A breathing spell in starting new public works projects. Federal expenditures for public works in fiscal 1960 would be the highest in history, but the President said "no additional funds are proposed in 1960 for starting new water-resources projects, general office buildings, and veterans' hospitals."

A glowing picture was painted of the employment of our people and resources at high levels, but no mention was made of the unemployment problems facing our country. The budget message further proposed an end to the emergency spending to extend jobless benefits and stimulate homebuilding. The President said a new plan for loans and grants to depressed areas will be submitted to Congress shortly.

An increase in interest rate on GI home loans from 4 1/4 to 5 1/4 percent.

Federal aid for school construction was not mentioned in the budget message and it is assumed that there will be no Government funds for this purpose. However, Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said "the issue is not foreclosed."

Estimated receipts in the budget were placed at \$77.1 billion and expenditures at \$77.03 billion, for a surplus of \$70 million. If realized, it would be the third Eisenhower budget in balance. Four have shown a deficit.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to implement the seven recommendations made by the President in his civil rights message of February 5, 1959.

This proposed Civil Rights Act of 1959 constitutes a moderate, practical, sound, and, I believe, generally acceptable step forward.

First. Title I would make it a criminal offense to interfere with the exercise of rights or the performance of duties under orders of U.S. courts in school desegregation cases.

Second. Title II of the bill would make it a Federal offense to cross State lines to avoid prosecution or confinement for destroying or attempting to destroy by fire or explosive any structure used for educational or religious purposes. This legislation will clarify the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to assist local enforcement authorities to track down the perpetrators of such offenses.

Third. The President has said that the right to vote is the keystone of demo-

cratic self-government. Title III of my bill will require election officers to retain and preserve for 3 years all records and papers which come into their possession relating to elections involving candidates for Federal office. The measure will also authorize the Attorney General to demand their production for examination and copying with recourse to the courts in the event of noncompliance.

Fourth. In establishing the Commission on Civil Rights, the 85th Congress provided that the Commission shall terminate its existence not later than 2 years and 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Civil Rights Act. This would mean that in the absence of an extension the Civil Rights Commission would, at the latest, cease to exist early in November of this year. The President has recommended, and title IV of this bill will accomplish, a 2-year extension in order that the Commission may adequately perform the job for which it was created. The bill also provides for the President and the Congress to be advised in an interim report to be submitted not later than September 1, 1959, as to Commission activities as of that date.

Fifth. Title V will give legislative stature and independent existence to a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts. The 15 member Presidential Commission would be authorized to continue and to expand the work which has been done in recent years to promote equal job opportunity in the performance of Government contracts without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

Sixth. Title VI of the bill would appropriately amend Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress, which authorize Federal payments to school districts which provide free public education to children whose parents reside or work on Federal property not subject to State or local taxation to include children of members of the Armed Forces whether they reside on Federal property or not. This title will also authorize the acquisition of certain school buildings as rental property, to be used for providing for children of military personnel education necessitated by the closing of the public schools.

Seventh. The final substantive title, title VII, will authorize the Federal Government to provide technical assistance to States which prior to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954—Brown against Board of Education—maintained segregated schools and which seek to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court. It would accomplish this purpose by making Federal grants available to the States. Also, at the request of the States or local agencies, the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to provide technical assistance and information in the development of desegregation programs and upon request of such officials will initiate or participate in conferences dealing with the educational aspects of problems arising from desegregation of public schools.

As indicated at the outset of this statement, I am convinced that this bill is a sensible, middle course which the Con-

gress should look upon with favor. I sincerely hope it will receive consideration at an early date.

The 20th Anniversary of Marian Anderson's Concert on the Steps of the Lincoln Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today Members of Congress have joined in tribute to the man whom many Americans regard as the greatest figure in the history of our country, Abraham Lincoln.

We have heard a distinguished American, Carl Sandburg, speak on the 150th anniversary of the birth of a man who has been described by Walt Whitman as "the grandest figure on the crowded canvas of the drama of the 19th century."

Mr. Sandburg declared just a few days ago that Abraham Lincoln took the word "liberty" as precious, saying in 1858:

Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, is 1959 the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. It is also just 20 years ago that Lincoln's memory was honored in a concert on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, a concert given by one of the grandest figures on the crowded canvas of the drama of our century, Miss Marian Anderson.

It seemed to me most fitting that Miss Anderson, one of the world's greatest musicians and one of America's finest citizens, should be invited to sing at the joint session of Congress today when we commemorate the birth of Abraham Lincoln. For this reason, last month I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Arrangements on the Joint Session urging that Miss Anderson be invited. I am pleased to say that I understand the committee did extend to this great lady an invitation and that only the pressures of the late hour prevented her being with us today.

I wish to insert in the Record at this point my letter to the chairman of the committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1959.
The Honorable FRED SCHWENGLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHWENGLER: I am writing to you in your capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements on the Joint Session of Congress for the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

It is my understanding that your committee has invited former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman to take part in the ceremonies of February 12, 1959, and that your committee has also arranged for participation in the ceremonies of the distinguished American poet, Mr. Carl Sandburg,

and the distinguished American actor, Mr. Frederick March.

I wish to congratulate you and your colleagues on your plans for honoring the memory of this towering figure in our country's history.

I should like to suggest, however, that you invite another distinguished American to take part in the activities of February 12—Miss Marion Anderson, one of the world's greatest musicians and one of America's finest citizens.

I was among those who on May 26, 1957, watched Marion Anderson receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from the President of Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana. The degree citation read in part:

"Arturo Toscanini said of Marian Anderson that a voice like hers happens once in a hundred years. The distinguished composer Sibellus protested that the roof of his house was too low for her voice. * * * Chiefs of State representing their people have celebrated her public triumphs. At the invitation of our own Government, Marian Anderson has sung to honor the visit of royalty, the return of a hero from a war and the inauguration of a President."

Miss Anderson has indeed served our country nobly and in many capacities, most recently as an Alternate Delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. She won much friendship for the United States by her 1956 and 1957 concert tours in Europe and the Far and Near East.

Her accomplishments are many and could be multiplied and, as the President of Saint Mary's College said in 1957, "All these achievements Miss Anderson has accomplished in a spirit of profound Christian faith."

It was just 20 years ago, in 1939, that Marian Anderson gave her now legendary Easter concert before 75,000 persons in Washington, D.C. She sang from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

I believe it would be most fitting for your committee to invite Miss Anderson once again to sing in the shadow of Lincoln's memory as the Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States join to pay tribute to the man who is the symbol of America's dedication to freedom.

I hope, sir, that you and your colleagues on the committee will invite Miss Anderson to take part in the ceremonies of February 12, 1959, before the joint session of Congress.

With highest regard and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN BRADENAS,
Member of Congress.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marks a very special day for all of us who cherish freedom in our hearts. I am proud to join in commemorating the birthday anniversary of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, who fought for freedom on two continents.

Kosciuszko was born in Poland on February 12, 1746. Benefiting from an education in Poland and in France, the 30-year-old captain of artillery joined with the American patriots of 1776 in support of the great moral and political principles

set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

A skilled military leader and a tireless fighter for human liberty, he served with distinction at Saratoga, Yorktown, and Charleston. Through his talents he became a brigadier general in the Continental Army.

When it seemed that there was hope for the cause of freedom in his native Poland he returned to join the struggle. Although the small but inspired Polish army fought gallantly against the Russian hordes, defeat was inevitable. After an imprisonment of 2 years in Russia, he returned to America in 1797 for a brief visit. He formed a close friendship with Thomas Jefferson who wrote of him:

I see Kosciuszko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known.

The next year he returned to Europe to champion once more the cause of Polish independence. He died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

To Kosciuszko, the gallant fighter for the cause of human freedom, we offer this tribute to perpetuate his memory and our gratitude.

Birthday of a Great Patriot, Leader, and Revolutionary War Hero: Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, today, February 12, we commemorate in this country not only the anniversary of one of our great national leaders, the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, but also we commemorate the anniversary of a great American Revolutionary War hero and patriot, who came from his native land to help us with the liberty for which we are today so grateful, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

It is indeed significant that the fight for freedom and democracy which brought about the independence of this country caught fire across the seas and rallied to American standards outstanding men from other countries who shared our sentiments. One of the greatest of these was Kosciuszko, an outstanding military engineer, whose efforts contributed toward the military fortifications at West Point in 1778, and who played a prominent part in the decisive Saratoga and Carolina campaigns of the American Revolution. In recognition of his great service to American independence, Kosciuszko was made a brigadier general in the American Army by Congress on October 13, 1783.

After he returned to Poland, Kosciuszko, with the same spirit of freedom, became one of the great champions of Polish independence, leading his countrymen in uprisings against their Russian and Prussian oppressors.

But the brave Polish fight for independence faced heavy odds from totalitarian aggressors, and General Kosciuszko was driven out of his homeland and died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

On this anniversary of his birth let us pause today, Mr. Speaker, to pay honor to the memory of a great and gallant Polish officer who left home, friends, and fortunes to serve the cause of freedom in this country. May his memory remind us that the cause of freedom is indivisible, and that when the freedom of any country is menaced the freedom of all men is menaced.

Just as Kosciuszko left home to fight for American freedom, may we in days to come dedicate our energies and resources to the end of restoring freedom from Communist oppressors to the Polish homeland which he loved so well and served so faithfully.

Restoration of the Historic Relationship Between Pay of Active Officers and Pensions of Retired Officers of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the following editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Washington Post, Washington, D.C. This editorial sets forth effective and convincing arguments as to the need for restoring the historic relationship between the pay of active officers and the pensions of retired officers of the armed services. I have introduced H.R. 703 to accomplish this objective. Many other Members have introduced similar bills. I hope that this legislation can be given an early hearing by the Armed Services Committee.

MILITARY PAY AND PENSIONS

Thirty-one Senators and 25 Representatives have opened a campaign to remedy a serious defect in the military pay bill passed by Congress last year. Their objective is an amendment to the legislation that would restore the relationship between pay of active officers and military pensions. The law ought to be changed in fairness to officers already retired and in consideration of the importance attached to retirement benefits by men pursuing military careers.

Congress modified a 100-year-old military tradition that retirement benefits should be related to active duty pay when it provided 6-percent increases in benefits for officers who had retired before June 1, 1958, and continued the pay-benefit relationship only for persons retired after last June 1. The Cordier Committee report on military pay noted that "military retirement and its firm tie-in with active duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system."

It would cost \$30 million this year to restore this relationship, and the cost would decline in succeeding years as death de-

creased the number of retired officers affected. This is not too high a cost when it is measured in terms of a strengthened career military service and the moral obligation to officers who retired in years past.

Agricultural Production Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a very courteous letter from the president of the Ellis County Farm Bureau in Texas. Attached to this letter was a pamphlet attacking the direct or compensatory payment approach as a basis for a farm program.

Since there is obviously much misunderstanding as to this program as well as to the alternatives that are available and especially since I have introduced a direct payment plan for cotton, I have felt that I should attempt, as best I can, to explain the proposal and to point out some of the answers which will suggest themselves to the charges in the pamphlet.

I have written a rather comprehensive letter on this subject to Mr. Joe B. Shirley. The letter, which is self-explanatory, follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 11, 1959.

Mr. JOE B. SHIRLEY,

President, Ellis County Farm Bureau,
Waxahachie, Tex.

DEAR MR. SHIRLEY: Your letter of the 6th, together with the attached statement or circular condemning production payments as "a long step toward socializing agriculture" was just received. I deeply appreciate the fine, fair attitude which you and the other members of your local bureau expressed. I recognize that the production payment approach, like all other agricultural programs with which I am acquainted, has imperfections and weaknesses, but for a good many years I have been trying to compare the strength and weakness of various programs and I think that it must be on a comparative basis that we must make our decisions. If I am right on this, we must then answer these questions: (1) What programs are available? and (2) Which program offers us the most?

Basically there are but three approaches to the farm problem:

First, there is the philosophy of *laissez-faire*—no controls and no supports. This is what the President and Mr. Benson both strive to achieve, although they would not reach their goal immediately. This means that we would abandon all controls over agriculture and all efforts to support agricultural prices and farm income. It has a very strong appeal for most people and I think that I would support such a course were the farmer not the only element in our economy who is called upon to operate without any stabilization of his income.

If it were possible for the farmer to buy in a completely free market, uninfluenced by governmental regulations, minimum wages, price floors, Government profit assuring contracts, etc., then I think that I would be compelled to agree that the farmer should

have no more protection than is accorded to labor, industry, and commerce, but we do not live in that kind of a dream world. The farmer buys in a market of administered prices—that is, prices that are determined in a large degree by governmental actions. Certainly the minimum wage laws directly affect the price of what a farmer pays for a tractor. Certainly the policy of guaranteeing remunerative contracts to the producers of missiles, atomic weapons, etc., adds to the farmer's taxes. Certainly the Railroad Retirement System adds to the freight bill on everything that the farmer buys, as well as everything that he sells, and he pays the freight both ways. The average income of people on farms is today only \$1,027, while the average income of people not living on the farms is \$2,040. In other words, the average person on the farm is making just one-half as much as the person not on the farm and one-third of all of the income of people on the farms comes from nonfarm sources.

To deliberately adopt a policy that would still further decrease this pitifully small farm income, while holding nonfarm income to its present levels, is so contrary to my feeling of right and wrong that I cannot seriously consider going back to the freedoms of 1932.

The second basic approach to the farm problem is that of the Agricultural Adjustment and Soil Conservation Act of 1937 (fundamentally the present system). It consists basically of an attempt to balance supplies with demand; first, by controlling the acres of crops produced, and, second, by removing any remaining surplus into Government warehouses through a nonrecourse loan. In the case of cotton and wheat the loan establishes the market price. This is our present system. It has, of course, undergone a great many changes as to the exact degree of controls and the level of Government assistance (the loan). Its distinguishing mark, however, remains the same—the use of a nonrecourse loan to secure for the grower the desired level of support.

Mr. Benson, the President, and Mr. Shuman have all urged that this supplemental governmental support should be reduced, and it has been reduced very materially during the present Eisenhower administration. The amounts paid farmers for their cotton, corn, and wheat is far less than it was. The reduction in the rate of Government loan has not, however, achieved any of the promised savings to the taxpayers.

It has not reduced Government costs. Prior to January 1, 1953, the loan support program of our six basic commodities had cost the U.S. Government nothing for the entire 20 years previous. On the contrary, the Commodity Credit Corporation had accumulated a small profit of \$13 million as a result of its support of these commodities. Since 1952, and through 1958, the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation have amounted to approximately \$2,500 million in its support operations involving the six basic commodities.

This reduction in the support prices has not reduced surpluses as it was claimed that it would. On the day Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture the stocks and commodity loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation amounted to \$2,452 million. On January 1 of this year the stocks and loans of Commodity Credit Corporation totaled \$8,710 million and the President's message to Congress said that by July 1 they will exceed \$9 billion. In other words, flexible supports, always flexing downward, have not only aggravated the farmers' problems; they have been terribly expensive to the taxpayer.

I am well aware of the fact that the American Farm Bureau Federation has urged that we cut our supports entirely loose from the parity concept and, instead, let them drop year by year to a point 10

percent below the level of prices for the preceding 3 years. For any commodity, the price of which is actually supported, this means progressive reduction until we reach a point as low or lower than the support price itself. It could only require a few years to make every support price which fixes the market price totally ineffective. In his message to Congress the President supports this approach but asks that it be speeded up.

He asks authority to lower supports 25 percent below the market price "in recent years." In the case of every basic commodity this would mean that in 1 year he would eliminate all effective supports and would drop the support price to a figure below the present market price. We don't have much need for support prices when we can get more on the market.

Obviously, if it were possible to bring the supply of farm commodities to a sufficiently low level, it would be possible in most cases of commodities, except cotton, to raise the price to almost any desired figure, but as a practical matter farmers do not have the resources to accept the drastic cuts that would be necessary. With its far greater resources the oil industry has used this device very successfully. It is called "proration" in our oil laws.

I stated that at this time it would not be practical to reduce the production of cotton to a point where we could force the price to a remunerative level, because to do so would result in a greatly increased use of synthetic fibers. Our mills would simply use less cotton. This, of course, is not true in the case of wheat, where the public is not going to turn to corn meal, even though the price of wheat were doubled. It is for this reason that I have felt that we stood in special need of a better system of maintaining cotton income, but I think it is clear that our present method of maintaining all farm prices is ineffectual. On this point I agree with the President and with Mr. Benson, although I think that their active sabotage of the program has come a long way toward proving the case that they wanted to prove.

Third. We now come to what seems to me to be the only alternative—that is, direct compensatory payments to adjust the difference between farm income obtained in the open competitive market and the level of income which has been predetermined to be the nearest attainable approach to a fair income.

This is not, as Mr. Benson and Mr. Shuman have tried to indicate, some new plan, nor was the inclusion of such proposal in the plan suggested by former Secretary Brannan anything new or unique. At that time this method had been used in the case of sugar for something like 15 years before Mr. Brannan suggested that it be expanded, and it was only about 5 years after Mr. Brannan made this suggestion that the present Secretary of Agriculture proposed that this method should be used to support the price of wool. It is doubtless a pure coincidence that wool and sugar are major crops in the State of Utah—but I am sure that Secretary Benson would not knowingly advocate a program which he considered to be either wicked or ineffective for the farmers of his home State.

The sugar program, which has been in effect for 22 years, uses production quotas to prevent the overall quantity of sugar from becoming too great and direct Government payments to make up the difference between the world price and 98 percent of parity. It has resulted in a very stable market for sugar, very acceptable returns to the producers, and reasonable prices to consumers. The wool program, the extension of which our own Texas sheep and goat people vigorously supported this year after having opposed the original bill, does not involve any production controls because there is no foreseeable danger of growing more wool than we want, but

It has resulted in returns to wool growers in excess of 100 percent of parity and has enabled woolen fibers to sell at price levels competitive with foreign wool and with synthetic substitutes. It was presented to the Congress by the present Secretary of Agriculture, who seems to feel that it would be quite wicked to use a similar program for cotton.

I recognize that there are a great many difficult details involved in working out a comprehensive program for all crops. I think that anyone can point out defects and difficulties in the administration of any such program. I have not tried, or at least I have not been successful in producing, an overall payment program that I want to present as worthy of public support, but I have worked out the details of a compensatory payment program for cotton which I am happy to defend. I have proposed that we go ahead with cotton because it cannot use some of the other programs as effectively as can the other commodities. This is because of the competitive situation to which I have already made reference.

That there may be no misunderstanding, the bill I have introduced on cotton, H.R. 3684, does not undertake to increase the amount of money that we are now authorized to spend. I would like to see every commodity bring the farmer a full 100 percent of parity. Until we can do that, I don't think we have met our full obligation, but I also recognize that it is important to protect our taxpayers. This bill only proposes to support the price of cotton at 82 percent of parity—approximately the support level of the past year. The best calculations I can make, this can be achieved without any increase whatever in our expenditures, but it would mean that all of the money spent in the way of subsidies would go directly to the producer—the American producer—the farmer.

As it is now, we are paying out vast sums in direct subsidies—more than one-half billion dollars during the first year of the present cotton support program, but that one-half billion dollars did not go to the farmers. Most of it went to pay storage and carrying charges. I don't know why our taxpayers should be burdened with this storage. The President says that the present program is going to result in storage charges of more than a billion dollars a year and undoubtedly if we continue the existing program, those costs will increase and not decrease. The direct payment program would eliminate all storage charges except on commodities that we have already accumulated. That would be a tremendous saving to start with.

Another matter of importance is that these vast expenditures are not providing competitively priced cotton for American mills. Our cotton is not competitive with synthetics in the mills of Carolina, but we are subsidizing cheap cotton into the mills of Italy, Germany, and Japan. What is there about a subsidy to these foreign mills that makes it sound and just, while a subsidy paid directly to American farmers is, in the opinion of the writer of the sheet you enclosed wicked and immoral?

I am not going to undertake to discuss the whole problem of supports for all agricultural commodities, but I do want to attempt to discuss the criticisms contained in the sheet you sent me as they relate to the cotton program which I have proposed in H.R. 3684 and which I am sponsoring.

The crux of the support provided by this bill is found in the provisions requiring the Secretary to make equalization payments to the first buyer of cotton from a "cooperator." This means the first purchaser of cotton from the farmer, and the payment required is the difference between the average market price for the preceding calendar week and 82 percent of parity. The bill contains provisions to protect the Government from payments to any buyer who has not passed the payment on to the producer and provides a

limitation of \$5,000 on the payments made to any one producer in any 1 year. This means that the largest producer will still receive payments on about 200 bales of cotton and that everyone who produces less than that amount would receive payments on all of his cotton.

The bill provides that we will maintain a minimum national acreage allotment of 16 million acres, which will be increased if the demand for cotton increases. So long as the present existing surplus exists, the allotment will be decreased by the equivalent of 1 million bales, this for the purpose of eliminating the surplus Mr. Benson has built up. As a matter of protection against losing anything good that we have, the bill will retain an emergency loan provision at not more than 3 percent less than the estimated average world price. Obviously, no one would take advantage of such a loan except as a means of financing holding operations. The bill does make provision for continuing the existing loan level if for any reason funds are not made available for carrying out the provisions of the act. I believe you will immediately see that many of the objections raised in the circular are not applicable to this bill.

The first of the so-called basic objections raised by the author of the circular is that direct payments "would stimulate production, depress market prices, and make farmers dependent on congressional appropriations for all their net income." This bill does not encourage excessive production—in fact it retains all of the production limitations that we have at the present time and in spite of repeated statements by Mr. Benson, Mr. Shuman, and others to the contrary, the assurance of a high price for cotton has never resulted in overproduction. On the contrary, our largest crops have been grown when prices were low and when it was known in advance that they were going to be low. The largest cotton crop this Nation has ever had was produced in 1937, with a support price of 52 percent of parity. According to the logic of this circular, we should have imported cotton in 1937. There have been many years since that time when there have been much higher prices and when there was no control on the production of cotton, but we have never approached the production of those low price years. The reason is that when a farmer who is growing cotton or any other cash crop in a one-crop country (and that is where most of our basics are grown) finds that he is faced with a lower price, he tries to make up in volume what he expects to lose in price. I believe that wheat farmers, tobacco farmers, peanut farmers, and others will react exactly like cotton farmers react and will try to maintain their family's living standards through increased production when they see lower prices coming. In my opinion, this assumption that a fair price for farm products will automatically result in overproduction is the fatal defect in the Bensonian philosophy. If Mr. Benson and Mr. Shuman are correct in this assumption, how do we account for the tremendous increase in surpluses that have been produced by our farmers in the last 6 years, during which time farm prices have been constantly declining? Of course, the reference to depressed market prices is entirely dependent upon the assumption that supports would result in overproduction.

The complaint that it would make farmers depend upon congressional appropriations has no more validity when applied to a direct payment program than it has to the present program. Our present loan support program is entirely dependent upon congressional appropriations. So is any other program that depends upon the Government. A direct payment program, costing the same amount of money as the loan program, is no more dependent upon congressional appropriations than the existing pro-

gram. In either case, Congress must appropriate money to keep the program going, and it is an insult to the intelligence of the American farmers to suggest that they do not know that the present program is dependent upon congressional appropriations. How do we get the money to pay our present export subsidies; how do we get the money to pay the losses of Commodity Credit Corporation, if it is not from congressional appropriations; and what would happen to the present program if congressional appropriations stopped?

Point 2 in the circular criticizes the Talmadge plan because it is limited to the six basic commodities, but point 3 condemns the expansion of a program to cover all commodities as being tremendously expensive. I have not introduced a compensatory payment bill for anything except cotton, but I think that some of the figures that are used to condemn a general compensatory program are quite misleading. Of course, the cost depends upon the level of support one achieves, but I think we might get some idea about what the cost will be by considering the fact that the total gross farmers received from marketing of all farm products in 1958, including livestock and milk, amounted to somewhere between \$25 billion and \$32 billion (there is a difference in the figures of the Department and the Census Bureau). Let us take the larger estimate. The average price of all farm products was approximately 82 percent of parity. If we guaranteed the average of all farm income at 82 percent of parity, as provided in my bill, for cotton, this should have involved no cost at all in 1958 except to bring up some of the lowest priced items. This, of course, is a far cry from the \$8 billion to \$16 billion suggested by the circular. As a matter of fact, \$16 billion is just about exactly one-half of the total gross value of all farm products. Since it would only take an increase of 20 percent from the value of all farm products to bring the average to 100 percent of parity, it seems to me that somebody has been figuring with a very dull pencil. Of course, I know that last year's price level is not stable. Mr. Benson says it will go up, but I rather expect it to go down, and on the six basic commodities the shift from our present loan-supported prices would naturally tend to reduce the world price and make the spread somewhat greater, but I think you can readily see that these figures seem to be for propaganda purposes only.

The fourth objection is that this program would result in cheap food. As far as I can see, cheap food is highly desired. It seems to me that if we are going to spend tax money on an agricultural program that it makes more sense to let that tax money result in lower prices to the consumers rather than using their money to force up the very prices those same citizens must pay. I don't think that we can long expect to have the support of the consumers of the big cities for a farm program that is based upon and must inevitably result in forcing their prices to higher levels. While I am firmly convinced that our consumers are buying the greatest bargain of history in the food they consume, I think that Secretary Benson has done a magnificent job of convincing them that they are being robbed, and, as I see it, the chances of losing congressional support for a farm program are far greater if we continue to rely on forcing up consumer prices than if we offer our consumers a program in which they will at least feel that they have some selfish interest.

Of course, the last statement on page 3, "Because it would encourage inefficiency, its ultimate effect would be high priced food to consumers," is a gratuitous and unsubstantiated conclusion that nobody will attempt to establish on the basis of fact. Have the wool and the sugar programs re-

sulted in a decrease in the efficiency of Utah farmers?

Point 5 is the one that is discussed at greatest length by the author of the pamphlet and is doubtless the basis of much of the real opposition to this proposal. The author of the pamphlet states that "Production payments would lead to a ceiling on opportunity in agriculture and a leveling of producer income." He bases this conclusion on the assumption that any direct payment bill would have a limit on the size of the payments, and he assumes that any such limit would be bad. I think he is correct in assuming that Congress is going to place a limit on the size of payments whether they are made through direct payments or whether they are made through a continuation of the present program. I think the American people are about fed up with seeing one wheat grower draw \$330,268 and one cotton farmer draw \$1,167,502, and this is particularly true when these large producers are so frequently heard to proclaim that if the Government would leave them alone they could produce and sell cotton for 20 cents and wheat for \$1. I think it is true that some of these large producers, Mr. Benson's "efficient farmers," can produce and sell commodities substantially lower than the average sized farmer can. Therefore, it seems to me to be logical that we should extend our help to those who need the help rather than to those who say they do not need it. But in the final analysis a limitation on the amount of payments is no essential part of a direct payment program and should stand or fall on its own merits.

The sixth objection, "Any temporary advantages that might accrue to individual farmers as a result of a payment program would be short lived," seems to be open to the same criticism that applies to the last part of the first point—that is, exactly the same suggestions can be made in regard to the present program. Certainly our present cotton allotments have value to the extent that they result in increasing the income of the holder of the allotment. These advantages can be transferred by sale of the land under the present law just as truly as under a direct payment. As a matter of fact, they have been incorporated into the capitalization of farm values. This is particularly true of tobacco allotments. I can see no way where it can be fairly argued that direct payments would change this threat unless it is admitted that the direct payments would be more advantageous to the farmer and therefore more valuable. If that is true—and I think it is—it seems to me to be a good argument for using the direct payments.

The seventh and last criticism of course relates only to those programs that involve payments on the domestic portion of production. The bill I have introduced applies to all cotton grown regardless of where it is sold. I don't think it makes a great deal of difference to the producer where his cotton finally goes. What he wants to know is what he is going to get for it. I might, however, point out that spokesmen for the American Farm Bureau Federation have repeatedly urged the payment of a direct subsidy on all cotton that is exported. Certainly this involves a much more serious basis for criticism as dumping then would the payment of subsidies at home, and it does not put the money where I think it should go—that is, into the pockets of the farmers.

I have gone into a considerable amount of detail, discussing the effect of this program and the objections that the pamphlet you enclosed has made because I know that you are seriously and sincerely interested as cotton producers, and I believe that you should hear both sides of this argument. I may have overlooked some important points. If I have, I will be glad for you to suggest

them to me. On the other hand, if I have been able to answer any of the points raised by the opponents of this bill, I hope that the Ellis County Farm Bureau will avail itself of the much advertised democracy of the Farm Bureau system and express your local views in favor of the program that will be of the greatest benefit to Ellis County cotton producers. If you don't agree that that is a direct payment program, ask yourself what system will better serve your needs. If you find a better program, support it and let me know what it is. I want to support it too. And finally, carefully note that the unsigned author of the pamphlet did not suggest anything better. It, therefore, seems to me that as far as this article is concerned, all you have to choose from is the production payment plan, or a continuation of the present program with low supports, reducing farm income, high prices, and consequently noncompetitive, cotton, reducing the market for cotton at home and a direct subsidy system for the benefit of foreign purchasers.

Thanking you, and with best wishes, I am,
Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman.

National Advertising Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, this being National Advertising Week, I think it is most appropriate to bring to the attention of the Members a letter I received from Robert Kearns, sales manager, WIBW radio and WIBW-TV, Stauffer Publications, Topeka, Kans. While Mr. Kearns topic is mainly advertising taxes, he does clearly state the role advertising plays in the growth of our economy. I strongly urge that each Member take the time to read Mr. Kearns' comments.

The letter follows:

WIBW, WIBW-TV,
Topeka, Kans., February 2, 1959.

Hon. WM. H. AVERY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Recently, I had occasion to write to your attention in regard to a subject of advertising taxes. We have known each other for many a year and as you know, this profession provides my income as well as the income of many thousands of Americans. Undoubtedly, this subject will rear its head throughout this session of Congress or some session of Congress in the next several years.

Recently, I was reading a book entitled, "The Story of Advertising," written by James Wood and in this volume I ran across some interesting things in regard to the subject. I will quote from page 112:

"The dual taxation of newspapers through most of the 18th century and the first half of the 19th century acted restrictively on advertising in the English press. The taxes first levied in 1714 were increased at various times so that by the year 1804 the newspaper tax was 3 pence, and the tax on every advertisement inserted in a newspaper was 3 shillings and sixpence. The principal effect of these taxes on knowledge was to keep the news from the many and to keep the prod-

ucts of British manufacturers, multiplying under the stimulus of the industrial revolution which overtook England between 1760 and 1800, from reaching wide domestic markets."

It has been written as you know, BILL, by some great men in this field that advertising is information and from the paragraph quoted about the trials and tribulations of advertising taxes which, by the way, in the year 1836 was reduced. I believe that certainly in our lifetime could put a curb on industrial expansion and growth. Advertising has a prime duty and responsibility of keeping America's economy on a growing cycle and letting more and more people know about new products and urging them to buy these products so that prosperity continues to grow in this very wonderful land.

I thought I would pass along these few thoughts so that in the event you had the opportunity to speak on behalf of the advertising profession that you would have a source of information.

Thank you very much for past courtesies and lots of good luck in 1959.

Sincerely,

BOB KEARNS,
Sales Manager.

Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a housing bill which should be of substantial assistance in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and in increasing rental housing and related special health facilities for elderly families. My bill is directed toward the accomplishment of two objectives:

First, Assistance in obtaining more liberal FHA financing for the construction of rental and sales housing, especially designed in whole or in part for our senior citizens; and

Second, Provision of adequate health and medical facilities as an integral part of such elderly family housing projects.

This bill makes a substantial amendment to the existing FHA program for Section 213 cooperative housing, and in addition, provides for an entirely new FHA insured-loan program for elderly family rental housing and for nursing homes. The program for improving the financing of elderly family rental housing is set forth in a new section proposed for inclusion under Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended.

This new section, 229, would increase the dollar limits on insured loans for elderly family rental units and provide for insurance of a loan up to the full replacement cost of a project as estimated by FHA. A significant change from existing law is that this bill provides for FHA insurance of loans for both profit corporations and nonprofit organizations. Present law is limited to nonprofit operations.

In my bill, the maximum interest rate would be 4½ percent and a priority of occupancy is assured for elderly persons or families—60 years of age or over. At

least 50 percent of the units in such a project would have to be especially designed for occupancy by elderly persons.

By special definition, the mortgage on an elderly family rental project would be able to cover structures and facilities designed for assisting the elderly occupants in the care of their health. These special facilities would be such structures as infirmaries, inpatient or outpatient health facilities, therapeutic facilities or such other facilities as the Commissioner of FHA might approve and deem adequate to serve the elderly occupants of the project.

In addition, my bill amends the existing law on cooperative housing to provide than an FHA section 213 cooperative housing mortgage, for either sale or rental housing, can cover the cost of special facilities which are of the type I have just described. In this way, a cooperative housing project which, in many areas of the country, is an ideal vehicle for the supply of low-cost, liberally financed housing suitable for our senior citizens, will be even more able to serve their needs. Existing law already permits cooperative rental projects to cover needed commercial and community facilities. It makes sense, therefore, to add this further provision and thus make possible in its most beneficial way, the availability of cooperative housing for our elderly families.

In one further way, this bill should prove of real assistance for elderly family housing projects. I have included provisions in this bill which have already received the approval of the other body, covering a new program for the insurance of a loan for the construction of a nursing home especially directed toward the care of elderly persons. In my bill, I have included in addition, however, a provision directing the FHA to encourage the construction of such nursing homes at or near the site of elderly family housing projects. In particular, I am anxious for the facilities made available by these FHA programs to result in coordinated and integrated projects of most benefit and economical use for our elderly families. Wherever possible, I feel, that projects of housing designed for our senior citizens should be set up so as to become a fully equipped community for their better enjoyment of life.

I would hope in the future that a program can be devised, using private financing and private construction but with the insurance provided under the FHA programs, so that our large, single family housing projects under the basic section 203 of FHA, can be developed as planned communities including the facilities and services, with FHA financing aid, if needed, that seem best suited to the majority of the occupants for which the project is built.

Let me note that the amendments to existing law which are contained in this bill and the provisions of a proposed new program for FHA rental housing, are no burden upon current budget proposals in any manner whatsoever. At the most, in the long distance future, there is, of course, a contingent liability as now exists on all FHA insured loans. Experience has demonstrated conclusively, however, that the security of the con-

struction, coupled with the debenture system of FHA, are more than adequate, together with its very substantial financial reserves, to protect the Government's interest, without drain, in any way, upon taxpayers.

Railroad Workers' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a committee of this distinguished House is currently considering a measure vital to the interests of the railroad workers of America. It concerns increased retirement and unemployment benefits to bring them to an equality with retired career civil service employees and those under the social security system who have attained the age of retirement or have suffered economic setbacks through the loss of jobs.

It is my sincere hope—actually my expectation—that this important bill will soon be reported favorably and that the Congress will discharge its responsibility imposed by the Railroad Retirement Act to remove the injustice currently prevalent respecting the railroad workers. I know that this disadvantage was not premeditated. It was merely an oversight on the part of the Senate and House, which in increasing retirement and unemployment benefits to other classes of workers, neglected those railroad employees who are so necessary to a healthy national economy and a strong national defense. It is axiomatic that too often the wheels of justice grind slowly.

My purpose is not to be repetitious. It is rather to impress on this distinguished body the necessity of correcting at this session of the Congress the omission we have made with respect to the railroaders. With that thought in mind and with the permission of the House I shall here include my remarks made before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during hearings of a number of bills, including one which I introduced, designed to bring these workers to a par with other workers enjoying additional benefits under the civil service and social security systems.

My testimony before that committee follows:

This distinguished committee has before it today important proposals affecting hundreds of retired workers of the Nation's railroads. Across the Potomac, in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, is located one of the largest railroad yards in the world. I personally know many men and women employed in Potomac yards. I know their problems and I know these problems are shared by their fellow workers in all parts of the United States.

Today there are wagging the cow's tail. Discharging our responsibilities respecting Federal and social security employees we have increased their benefits to bring them more into line with the cost of living. But to date we have neglected the railroad workers, who are also our responsibility. We

have assumed this responsibility through the enactment of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Without action by the Congress, retired and unemployed railroad employees must continue to drag behind those in the Government service and those covered under the Social Security System.

The railroad workers are not fat cats. They are people who are in an income bracket comparable to many other groups who devote most of the fruits of their labor to current expenses. They are dependent on adequate retirement and unemployment insurance to meet these situations. If there are savings, they are indeed meager. Little opportunity is offered to set aside funds for old age and emergencies.

Now, I am appreciative of the economic difficulties of the eastern railroads. Competition has reduced their earning power. They have been compelled to curtail certain types of services. But such difficulties are inherent in our system of free enterprise. Business has its ups and downs. That is to be expected.

In my own business—the building industry—we are sometimes faced with the necessity of reducing original prices to sell homes. But that is not the fault of our construction workers and we certainly do not make them the victims of our failure to properly evaluate the housing market. It is my hope that the economic plight of the eastern railroads will improve and that if necessary the Federal Government will lend some sort of helping hand. Rail transportation is essential to our national welfare. We must do what we can to make it economically healthy.

The necessity of liberalization of the congressional acts affecting our railroad workers is further emphasized by the long-range actuarial deficit now existing in these programs. We must restore to a sound actuarial footing.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to follow your footsteps in presenting a companion bill to yours in order to accomplish the aforementioned purposes. The same measure was the subject of a number of bills introduced in the 85th Congress. It was passed by the Senate last August, but was not called up for floor action in this House in time to receive proper consideration before adjournment.

The bill contains a number of benefit improvements under both the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. But, to my mind, the primary purpose which will be accomplished under the bill will be to put both of these systems on firmer financial bases.

The railroad retirement system has been operating at a deficit for the past several years. This situation must be corrected without delay if we are to maintain a retirement system in which the railroad workers of this Nation can place their confidence. Under the bill, it is proposed to increase the tax rate and raise the maximum wage base sufficiently to finance the benefit increases contained in the bill, as well as to help liquidate the present actuarial deficiency in the railroad retirement fund.

Taxes would be increased from a current rate of 6¼ percent on railroad employers and employees to 6½ percent beginning with the current year and to 7¼ percent commencing in 1962. Thereafter the tax rate increases would match those taking place under the social security old-age and survivors insurance program.

The wage base maximum would be increased from \$350 to \$400 a month. This would put the railroad retirement system on a par with the social security system, which, under amendments enacted last year, covers earnings up to \$4,800 a year.

The financial basis of the railroad unemployment insurance system would be strengthened to provide funds for the additional benefits proposed in the bill and to take care of the current deficiency which

exists also in this fund. This would be accomplished by increasing the tax base from \$350 to \$400 a month and changing the tax rate to provide for a range from a minimum of 1½ percent to a maximum of 3½ percent, depending upon the current balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account. Minimum annual earnings needed to qualify for unemployment benefits would be raised from \$400 to \$500 a year.

The benefit increases proposed under the Railroad Retirement Act include a general 10-percent increase in monthly pension and retirement payments. When the 85th Congress came to a close it had granted pay or retirement increases for practically every group whose rates of compensation are established by law, with one major exception—the retired railroad worker. Civil service retirees were granted a 10-percent increase, those under social security 7 percent. It is no more than simple justice that the retired railroad worker, who has borne the brunt of increased living costs to the same degree as his retired neighbors, be given equal treatment.

Other major changes proposed in the Railroad Retirement Act are:

1. Lowering the retirement age for women employees with 10 to 30 years' service and wives of retirees to age 62 with a reduction in annuities. This would allow the same privilege of receiving a reduced annuity now available to women under social security. The same privilege would be offered to male workers at age 62 with 30 years of service.
2. Raising the maximum compensation used in computing benefits from \$350 to \$400 a month for services rendered after this year.

3. Allowing those retired on account of disability to earn up to \$1,200 a year in casual or intermittent employment without loss of benefits.

4. Allowing survivors living in foreign countries to earn up to \$1,200 a year, the same as survivors in this country. Under present law survivors living outside the United States, principally in Canada, are allowed no benefits for any month in which they work 6 days.

Under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act benefits increases would range from 50 cents to \$1.70 a day depending upon rates. The maximum benefit would be \$10.20 a day as compared to the present \$8.50.

The bill would also extend the benefit year, or the periods during which unemployment benefits may be paid to an employee. These extensions apply principally to workers with considerable railroad service. Those with over 15 years would be extended another 130 days of benefits, those with 10 to 15 years another 65 days.

I sincerely hope that this measure will receive the thorough consideration of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at its earliest convenience. I am sure that after having done so, the committee will issue a favorable report upon it, so that the urgent necessities for strengthening the finances of both of these systems and bringing their benefits in line with present living costs will be met.

Chaplain Nash P. Geany Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of January 30, the Reserve Of-

ficers Association of the United States gave its Chaplain of the Year Award to an outstanding man of God who has rendered outstanding service to the Armed Forces of this Nation, Chaplain Nash P. Geany, deputy staff chaplain, Eastern Transport Air Force—MATS—McQuire Air Force Base, N.J.

This award has some significance to this body which has a great responsibility for the men and women in the military services. The ROA is due some recognition, and appreciation, for thus encouraging the oft-forgotten chaplain in his work.

I include herewith ROA's statement relative to the presentation of the Chaplain of the Year Award:

Chaplain Geany has been selected for the Reserve Officers Association's Chaplain of the Year award for his outstanding contributions to the religious and moral welfare of military personnel and their dependents as well as his charitable activities in civilian communities.

During the 38 months he served at Rhine-Main he evidenced a dynamic ministry and pursued his salutary works with a persevering industry in proportion to his many gifts.

His impressive physical stature commands attention. His outstanding speaking ability emphasizes the leadership qualities inherent in a dedicated servant of God.

It is a colloquialism to state that Chaplain Geany has a heart as big as he is yet this has never been more true of any chaplain.

His charitable concern embraces all ranks and all faiths. His solicitude for the welfare of children in local orphanages and the aged in old folks homes made a valuable contribution to the improvement of German-American relations.

Chaplain Geany has been termed a "chaplain's chaplain." This complimentary title has been earned by his practice of caring for the needs of chaplains arriving or leaving the European theater via his installation.

No matter how late the hour, Chaplain Geany at all times generously extended hospitality and accommodations to chaplains en route to their assignments.

The association presents its 1959 Chaplain of the Year Award to this outstanding representative of the chaplain apostolate.

Profit-Sharing Fund Pays \$289,000 to Retiring Truckdriver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON. L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a lot of lipservice has been given to various profit-sharing plans in the past, but in industry as a whole these plans do not appear to have obtained the attention they deserve. As an illustration of this, I would like to include with my remarks an Associated Press story from Chicago pertaining to the big dividends a Sears-Roebuck profit-sharing fund is now paying to retiring workers.

The article follows:

EMPLOYEE GETS \$289,000 ON \$5,928 PROFIT SHARE

CHICAGO, February 11.—A profit-sharing fund started by Sears, Roebuck & Co. 43

years ago is paying big dividends to retiring workers.

James M. Barker, chairman of the board of trustees of Sears profit-sharing fund, said today a study of the fund's operations showed these returns to workers who participated in the program and retired during 1958:

Employees who retired after more than 40 years' service and who had contributed \$6,321 to the fund withdrew an average of \$154,767. Among these was a truck driver with 44 years of service, who amassed \$289,000 on a total of \$5,928 invested in the profit-sharing pool.

The average withdrawal of workers with 35 to 40 years of service was \$123,054 for a \$6,092 investment; \$93,019 for 30- to 35-year workers who invested \$5,791; \$67,089 for 25- to 30-year workers with a total investment of \$4,899; \$36,695 for workers who contributed \$3,593 during 20 to 25 years' employment.

Employee members of the fund contribute a straight 5 percent of their wages and salaries up to a maximum of \$500 a year. The company contributes up to 10 percent of its net income before taxes.

Resolution Adopted by the Illinois General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from the members of the Illinois General Assembly enclosing a copy of the house resolution 23, as adopted in the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative to an amendment to Public Law 85-316, which would provide for the entry of members of many families whose petitions have piled up and created a backlog within the fourth preference quota and would facilitate the reuniting of such families.

I am in full accord with this resolution, which follows herewith.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,

Springfield, February 10, 1959.

HON. ROLAND VICTOR LIBONATI,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As authorized, I am enclosing herewith a copy of House Resolution 23 as adopted in the 71st General Assembly of this State.

Sincerely,

CHARLES CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 23

Whereas there are many Americans who have filed petitions with the immigration authorities of the United States for the entry of their sons, daughters, brothers and sisters, which petitions are classified in the fourth preference quota of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

Whereas of the four preference quotas established by the Federal Immigration and Nationality Act, the first, second and third quotas are allotted 100 percent of the total annual entry quota; and

Whereas as a result, those persons who fall within the fourth preference section must depend for entry into this country upon deficiencies in the first three quotas; and

Whereas there is frustration and despair resulting from the law that gives hope to Americans by permitting them to file petitions, getting them approved, and then compelling them to wait for their kin who may never come; and

Whereas thousands of discontented people abroad, whose hopes are first raised and then dashed, certainly cannot believe in the good will we try to engender through our foreign policy, and thus become easy prey to the propaganda of unfriendly nations; and

Whereas Congress has recognized and alleviated a similar problem through Public Law 85-316, which includes a provision for reuniting spouses and minor children of aliens legally residing in this country whose petitions were approved prior to July 1, 1957; Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That this house respectfully request the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to amend the provisions of Public Law 85-316 to include cases which fall within the fourth preference quota, in order to provide for entry of the many thousands, petitions for whom have piled up in a backlog in prior years; that in order not to create another problem of separated families, those applicants who are married and have families be permitted to bring them; and that a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be sent by the secretary of state to each Congressman and United States Senator from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, February 3, 1959.

PAUL POWELL,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

CLARENCE BOYLE,

Clerk, House of Representatives.

Wanted: Four Million Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is time that some notice be taken of the state of unemployment in New England. Although the recession has eased in other parts of the Nation, economic recovery in the New England States is lagging behind.

It is my belief that this economic problem has remained unnoticed long enough, and that it is time something be done. The economy of New England, and especially of Maine, can best be helped by stimulating, through badly needed Federal programs, the gross national product.

Automation has had its part in addition to the contraction of the textile industry, in increasing the unemployment ratio, and now some steps must be taken to create new jobs for those who find themselves out of work. Certainly, I do not agree that unemployment should become a permanent fixture in our economy. I feel that the long-range program of renewing the economic vitality of our country should take precedence over the present concern in some quarters with balancing the budget at all costs.

Following is an editorial taken from the Boston Daily Globe on February 9

which brings the problem of unemployment in New England into clear focus:

WANTED: FOUR MILLION JOBS

It was Disraeli who first heaped abuse on statistics, and Mark Twain was happy to quote him. Statistics can be a long word for a lie. But in the 20th century we live by such figures. They are the instrument to tap the pulse of our economy so that we may smile and turn away from the patient's bedside, or purse our lips and frown and rummage in our store of specifics. Here the patient is employment, and he isn't doing too well. His temperature is way up and his pulse is way down, particularly in New England, while the doctors have stood by admiring somebody else's chart.

This region was hard hit in the 1957-58 recession. It still drags its heels behind the recovery wagon, chiefly because the durable goods industry suffered so badly. New England lost 200,000 jobs between December 1956 and May 1958 and has recovered only 52,000 of them. If the slack is going to be taken in, it will require imaginative leadership and joint action of private industry and the States.

The fact is that the national employment picture is not bright, and it is against this background that New England must appraise her own bleaker picture. The national seasonally adjusted unemployment rate, which stood at 5.0 in December 1957 was at 6.1 in December 1958. That was after 8 months of so-called recovery. Recovery it was, but not sufficient. Because of our developing technology, which makes for job displacement, a more rapid rate of recovery from such setbacks is required than has previously been the case.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics consistently declines to make any predictions. Certain of its figures speak for themselves in that they indicate the magnitude of the task before the American economy. If the present rate of productivity increase is to be maintained, the economy must provide at least 2,750,000 new jobs each year. Of these, 750,000 are for new entrants to the labor field, such as high-school or college graduates. The 2 million is the figure demanded by the annual increase in our productivity rate, an estimated 3 percent.

But above the 2.5 million so-called hard core of unemployed, there are at present 1,250,000 jobless who, statistics say, want to work and should be working. This means that to bring the economy into ideal balance for 1959, 4 million new jobs must be found this year. This in turn means that we must increase the national product by an estimated \$40 billion this year. There the Bureau of Labor Statistics stops, but the next step is not too difficult. The national product is not increasing at that rate.

The U.S. economy has two new major forces pressing on it. One is automation and the other is international leadership. The first promises that consistently fewer man-hours will be needed for an increasing national product, which in turn must be sold; and the second necessitates our strengthening allies who become competitors for the markets where we must sell that product. For the first time in history the dollar volume of our automobile imports has exceeded our exports.

The problem of reducing existing unemployment, of finding jobs for the newcomers each year brings to the labor force, and of creating new and adequate jobs for those persons displaced by automation is not going to yield to a purely fiscal solution. New England has the national problem superimposed on her own. Regional consideration of both cannot begin here too soon.

Realism on REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the morning Post and Times Herald reports a stirring defense of REA on the part of certain political leaders, who urge the convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to fight with beer bottles, if necessary, to keep the advantages they now have under the law. They were urged to fight for the right to borrow Federal funds at 2 percent, though the Government has to pay 4 percent for that same money.

It is interesting to note that some of these very cooperatives who are borrowing money at 2 percent, rather than let it lie idle in the bank until used, put it into Federal securities at 4 percent, thereby making money off their loans from the Government.

No one denies the magnificent achievement of the REA in the past, but a very able editorial in the same Post and Times Herald the day before, clearly points out that the time for this racketeering could and should be terminated.

I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 9, 1952]

REALISM ON REA

The convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which begins today in the National Guard Armory will generate much criticism of the administration's power policies. President Eisenhower's private power predilection is not above criticism, of course, but the reexamination of the REA program which the administration is seeking surely is needed. The program has fulfilled its original goals of 1935 and there is a real question whether the Government should continue its present REA role.

At a relatively small cost to the Federal Government the REA loan program not only has brought the benefits of electricity to rural America, but it has also greatly expanded the market for electrical appliances and other equipment. Hundreds of thousands of Americans who may have never been on a farm have been indirect beneficiaries of this far-sighted program.

But should the Government continue to provide extremely low-cost loans to REA co-ops that are going concerns and in many cases have become highly successful electric utilities? Once an REA co-op is established ought it not to seek its capital in the open market as other utilities do?

When Congress set up the REA loan program in 1935 to bring electricity to farmers only 11 percent of the persons who lived in rural areas had electric lights and power. Today 95 percent of them enjoy such service. Now the REA loans, which still bear an interest rate of only 2 percent, are being used to expand and improve existing co-ops. President Eisenhower has recommended that REA financing be gradually shifted to non-Government sources.

Perhaps the Government should not completely withdraw from REA financing. There may be some situations where direct Gov-

ernment loans are still needed, but it would seem reasonable for the Government to limit its participation generally to the insurance of loans or some other indirect device which would let the REA co-ops build on their own strong foundations with a minimum of Federal aid. The not inconsiderable resources of the NRECA and the very size of its convention, which will be attended by more than 7,000 delegates, indicate the strength of the REA co-ops.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, February is the month of heroes. To Americans the greatness of Washington and Lincoln is called to mind. To Lithuanians there are joyful recollections of independence, heroically won, only to be bitterly lost in the tragic recent past, but still celebrated in this month of honor. And to Polish people all over the world there is no date in memory more notable than February 12, the birthday of the great Polish statesman, military engineer extraordinary, democrat and patriot of two continents: Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Never was there a man more inclined to dream of the impossible, yet at the same time so capable of fulfilling his dreams. Born into the mid-Eighteenth Century world, at a time when Poland was plagued by foreign armies, Kosciuszko grew up burning with the desire to drive the foreigners, once and for all, from Polish soil. Was this a practical dream? Was it practical to expect the people of a nation with no natural boundaries and little in the way of political unity to expel and hold at bay the arms of Europe's mightiest nations? Perhaps not, but Kosciuszko nonetheless conceived this dream and clung to it as long as he lived.

Kosciuszko's role in the American Revolution is legend. No sooner had he entered upon the military scene than his talents at fortification construction earned him wide renown. The defenses erected at Ticonderoga early in the war were his work, and his removal from that post and a revision of the defenses there brought forth an anguished cry from a superior officer, who prophesied disaster unless Kosciuszko returned. The protest was prophetic for, in Kosciuszko's absence, Ticonderoga fell to British assault.

Not wanting to commit the same blunder a second time, the American Army authorities now turned over their main defensive operations to Kosciuszko. At Saratoga he laid out defenses that enabled the Americans to overwhelm the British attack. This victory, in turn, won for America her alliance with France and her recognition as an independent nation by Louis XVI.

Now fully cognizant of the abilities of this engineering genius, the Army appointed Kosciuszko to oversee the de-

fense of the Hudson River, with headquarters at West Point, the so-called Gibraltar of the Hudson. Kosciuszko's work at West Point was the longest and most important of his undertakings in the United States and is inseparably connected in the American mind with his name. Little is now left of his fortifications, but the monument raised in his honor by the American youth, with the inscription: "To the hero of two worlds," remains a grateful tribute to his memory.

That the military students of the United States can look back to West Point as their alma mater is in great measure Kosciuszko's doing. When it was first resolved to found a training school in arms for the young men of the States, Kosciuszko urged that it should be placed at West Point, and suggested the spot where it now stands.

When he sailed from American shores in 1785, Kosciuszko left behind an enviable record. Living up to his constant dream of democratic achievement in the face of heavy odds, he had assisted in the liberation of a colonial people from the yoke of the most powerful military nation in the world. His remuneration had been slight, but that was no matter—a dream had been fulfilled.

Kosciuszko now returned to Poland in the hopes of serving the Polish people as he had served the Americans, and on the occasion of the reorganization of the Polish Army in 1789 he was appointed major general. The stage was now set for the closing drama of his career and his final contribution to the world's awkward struggle for perfection.

The democratic tidal wave generated by the American Revolution was now rushing upon Europe and compelling members of every class and creed to line up, either on the side of the revolutionary doctrine of the rights of man, or in defense of ancient European laissez-faire traditions. When this tidal wave struck Poland in May of 1791, Kosciuszko immediately announced himself as a democrat, calling upon the people to establish constitutional government. He was with the forces that carried the day.

A constitutional and hereditary government was established; burghers were granted equal civic rights with the nobility, and the condition of the peasants was ameliorated. At long last it appeared that political unity had come to Poland; that finally there existed the basis for the growth and success of a Polish state supported by the people. But such a development would deal a death blow to the designs of conquest of those who had fed so long on Polish weakness, including the neighboring state of Russia.

In consequence of this, Russia invaded Poland in May of 1792 and Kosciuszko, for the second time in his career, found himself engaged in the forefront of the world's battle for democracy. But on this occasion the odds were impossible. Notwithstanding Kosciuszko's brilliant generalship, the Polish Army was overwhelmed after two months of some of the most gallant fighting in military history.

When Poland was partitioned following the war, Kosciuszko withdrew from

the army and retired to Leipzig. But the next year he was back again, leading an insurrectionary army against the Russians with astonishing success until, once again overcome by the heavy odds, he was defeated for the final time.

What had Kosciuszko's military performance achieved for Poland? The cynical might observe that nothing was accomplished. But life is not so simple as to be governed solely by skirmishes won and lost on a battlefield. Kosciuszko's brilliant, courageous, and idealistic attempt to drive the foreign invader from Polish soil, in the name of democracy, created a tradition, which persists to this day; a tradition that will never be eradicated.

In his zeal for democratic government, Kosciuszko was following in the footsteps of the United States. But that was not always the order of things. In April 1817, 6 months before he died, he issued a letter of emancipation to the serfs on his estate in Poland. It was to be almost half a century before the United States was able to emulate this departing gesture of one of Europe's truly great democrats, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the "hero of two worlds."

A Plea for U.S. Diplomatic Relations With the Vatican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most forceful and compelling forces in the struggle against communism and one of the strongest influences for peace in the world today is the Vatican. We are living in a most difficult age, a challenging age which calls for wise leadership and effective action if freedom is to survive. We must leave no stone unturned in meeting this challenge. By our refusal to establish diplomatic relations with the Vatican, however, we are ignoring a very important center of information and intelligence. In so doing, we are harming ourselves and the cause of freedom to a very considerable extent.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt realized the importance of maintaining diplomatic relations with the Vatican when he sent Ambassador Myron Taylor there as his emissary. The results of Mr. Taylor's mission were highly satisfactory to the interests of our Government and our people, because it enabled us to obtain certain political and economic intelligence which we would not have had otherwise.

Today the free world is in a life-and-death struggle with the evil forces of communism. If communism should emerge triumphant, it will make little difference whether we are Catholics, Protestants, or Jews—all believers, regardless of creed, will be doomed. Under such circumstances, it stands to reason that we should all be united in our

efforts against those who seek to destroy us. In that case, it is unthinkable that any reasonable man would raise objection to the United States being represented by a diplomatic mission at the Vatican.

It is a very strange situation to me when I see full-fledged U.S. diplomatic missions in the Soviet Union and in the satellite countries of Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria, but no such representation at the Holy See. At the time of the Hungarian revolt in 1956 we condemned the Communist regime of that country and we protested against the brutalities of the Soviet troops in Hungary, but we did not withdraw our diplomatic missions from Budapest or from Moscow. When people in this country asked why this was not done, we were told by responsible Government officials that we would lose important listening posts behind the Iron Curtain.

While that is very true, we are ignoring an important listening post at the Vatican which could be no less valuable to us. There our mission could obtain vital information from all parts of the world, including from countries behind the Iron Curtain, which flows daily into the Vatican in large volume. My experience as an intelligence officer with OSS during World War II had taught me that the Holy See is au courant with everything that is going on in the world, and sometimes was even more informed than we were.

Such antiquated reasons that having a U.S. envoy at the Vatican would be showing special favoritism toward one particular religion or that the Pope would rule the White House are too ridiculous for our day and age. We are interested in preserving the security of our Nation and of the free world; we are interested in maintaining peace in the world and genuine understanding among the nations. It is, therefore, most logical to stand together in a common cause with all those forces who think as we do, who seek the same goals, who are fighting the same enemy. In other words, as I see it, it would constitute a step in the direction of greater unity of the free world which believes in the supremacy of the Almighty God as against godless communism which seeks the enslavement of the whole world.

About 3 years ago, at Christmas, 1955, the late Pope Pius XII held audiences with members of the diplomatic corps assigned to the Vatican. He discussed with them the possibility of reaching an accord between the East and the West on nuclear disarmament, but he noted at the time that it was impossible for the Vatican to undertake international mediation "when two of the greatest powers are not represented at the Holy See." The Pontiff was referring to the United States and Soviet Russia, neither of whom maintain diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the unenviable position of being classified with Communist Russia as the two great powers in the world today lacking diplomatic representation at the Vatican. What a strange position for us to be in at a

crucial time such as this, when we claim to be the moral leader of the free world. It is a fact that the Vatican maintains diplomatic relations with some 50 countries throughout the world. Among them are such Protestant countries as Great Britain, the Netherlands, West Germany, and others, who find it advantageous to have official representatives attached to the Holy See.

Our failure to be represented at the Vatican leaves us in the same category with Soviet Russia—as well as with Communist China, which has no representation there—which is not only a paradoxical and embarrassing situation for us, but it also creates considerable doubt in the minds of our friends and allies who are inclined to regard our attitude as immature action unbecoming a great nation.

This is a situation which needs to be corrected. In the past, the maintenance for separation of church and state was advanced as a major argument against recognition of the Vatican. Such an indictment in connection with Vatican representation is wholly fantastic. All of us are deeply aware of the constitutional and historic role of religion in American life. I dare say that the American people would not brook a distortion of that role any more than it would approve religious bigotry and intolerance. Consequently, the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Vatican would be entirely in accord with our Constitution, our history and our traditions. It is motivated solely by the desire for the promotion of world peace and understanding.

Fortunately, the successor to Pope Pius XII, the present Pontiff, Pope John XXIII, is pursuing the same attitude toward the attainment of world peace, and the same desires for achieving understanding among the nations of the world. At a time when from many corners of the earth we hear the voices of doom and destruction, the voice of Pope John is one of calmness and comfort. We must help strengthen it, so that it does not remain a voice crying in the wilderness.

Whether we like it or not, we are at war with Communist Russia on all fronts. They are bent on destroying the free world, and particularly the faith of the free world in a Supreme Being. I regard this as a most propitious time to establish relations with the Holy See, in view of Pope John's elevation to the Papal Throne and his strong appeal for unity in the ranks of Christendom.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am particularly concerned about the challenge being made to the invincible powers of God. I would think that religious men of all faiths would want to work together to prevent the atheists not only from destroying our bodies, but also our souls. It so happens that the Vatican is today the only existing world religious center having diplomatic relations with other nations—the only nations not represented are the United States, Soviet Russia, and Red China. If other faiths had a similar world organization, I would be the first to advocate diplomatic representation in such a body.

For these reasons, I am now introducing a resolution which calls for the immediate establishment of diplomatic relations with the Vatican through the appointment of an envoy as a gesture of our friendship and our desire to help promote world peace and greater understanding. In sending a diplomatic mission to the Vatican, the United States would demonstrate to the world that it has the highest esteem for the Catholic Church and the broad principles of religious freedom for which it stands. The Vatican is most certainly in a position to serve as a force for unity and strength of the free world. Let us seek its wise counsel, its moral strength, its worldwide support.

Of What Use Is Scouting?—What Does It Really Do for Boys?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, many people this week are asking, Of what use is scouting? What does it really do for boys? No story I have ever seen tells so much as this story of two mothers—reprinted by the Los Angeles Examiner from the American Weekly of February 6, 1955—which, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks:

MURDER—AND TWO MOTHERS (By Will Oursler)

In the bright morning sun, two boys rolled in the dust, locked in combat, while a handful of bystanders watched and cheered. One boy was Mexican, the other Negro. Suddenly a knife flashed in the hand of the Mexican lad, glittering an instant and plunging down. The Negro boy gave a cry and twisted away and lay still. The onlookers were frightened. Someone cried out that the boy was dead and the police were coming and they had better run.

For some months this area of Los Angeles—the adjoining districts of Aliso Village and Pico Gardens—had been a trouble spot, with its mounting postwar population, its overcrowding, its poverty and filth and crime and interracial conflicts.

Police officials, social agencies, church groups, and special project workers of the Boy Scouts had waged an intensive drive to improve conditions. But the drive had made slow progress in the face of indifference. In the past 6 months there had been 57 arrests of youth in the area for crimes that included armed robbery, burglary, rape, assault with deadly weapons. Now it was murder.

Word of the stabbing raced through the area. Both boys had been members of rival gangs. Both gangs held secret conclaves, one to map plans for vengeance, the other tactics of defense. Nor was the threat of trouble limited to the gangs. Groups of adults began gathering in small meetings, behind closed doors and drawn shades. A tense, wordless terror closed in. Some of the noisier troublemakers were calling an indignation meeting—to decide how to strike back.

The peril was immediate, and a young man named Andy Sals, who had fought derision and indifference for months as a Boy Scout worker trying to launch Scout troops in the

area, decided on a daring countermeasure against this impending riot.

The Negro boy had been in one of the troops Sals had been trying to start. The Mexican boy had been one Sals had hoped to interest in scouting. Sals paid a visit—to the Mexican boy's mother.

He found her alone in the house, sobbing hysterically, repeating over and over, "What can I do? He killed him. What can I do now?"

Sals told her gently, "I want you to come with me—to meet that boy's mother."

Together the Scout worker and the Mexican woman walked the ominously quiet streets to the home of the slain Negro boy. The mothers, one grieving for the loss of her boy, the other for what her boy had done, met and talked. They agreed that there should be no more violence.

Word of the meeting of the two mothers swept through the troubled neighborhood. They had met and wept together, people said. There was no hate between them.

The indignation meeting was still on. But Sals called together—as a second step—his own "gang," all the Scouts he had been organizing into troops over the past months. He talked to these boys—some of them also members of the rival gangs—about the Scout law of friendliness to all people and all creeds and all races.

The mass meeting was held as scheduled. But there was no threat of violence. The story of the meeting of those mothers—and the conclave of the Scouts—had cleared the air. With the men and women at this unusual town meeting were some of their own youngsters—boys of various factions within the district, seated side by side, as Scouts. Sals talked and men and women began to stand up and talk about what they could do to make it a better place, this district, for their children to grow up.

Steps were begun with authorities to launch, not the punishment, but the rehabilitation of the boy whose tragic deed had upset the community. Church groups and social agencies pitched in to aid this lad and others, and in the months that followed a completely new era dawned in the area where hoodlumism and crime had flourished.

Half a dozen Scout troops were fully organized under Sals, and performed literally hundreds of neighborhood good turns—boys of all creeds and races working together, cleaning out alleys and fire hazards and school yards, repairing and painting school buildings and churches, collecting clothes and food for needy families.

There were many in the city who found it hard to understand how such a miracle could sweep over a neighborhood of trouble—particularly after the slaying of a boy. But a Scout worker and two mothers understand.

his kind were few and far between, and very much in demand.

I speak of course of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the great Polish-American hero of the Revolutionary War. Both his exceptional service as a military commander in the Saratoga and Carolina campaigns of the Revolutionary War and his engineering feats as the man who built the fortifications at West Point mark his for greatness.

Today, it is imperative that we recall the great example set by General Kosciuszko for yet another reason. After the Revolution this popular hero returned to his native Poland to champion his own people's fight for independence. This is a fight that is not yet over, a fight that could well benefit from the likes of another Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of gratitude and admiration that I join in this salute to General Kosciuszko on the anniversary of his birth 213 years ago.

The Nebraska Farmer Magazine Has Reported History of State From Lincoln's Day Until Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD F. MCGINLEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most memorable and lovable characteristics of Abraham Lincoln was his sedate, but sharp sense of humor. There is a story behind the naming of Nebraska's capital city—Lincoln—which I think would have amused Mr. Lincoln, had he been living at the time.

The Platte River, in its east to west course cuts the State of Nebraska into approximate halves, north and south. Early territorial politics—1854–67—were colored with a sectional rivalry over location of the territorial capital site. The first acting Governor, Thomas B. Cuming, chose Omaha, north of the Platte, as the territorial capital rather than another historic Missouri River town, Bellevue, south of the Platte.

The location controversy continued and became hotter as Nebraska became a State on March 1, 1867. One of the acts of the first State legislature in 1867 was to make a final capital site determination.

The South Platte members, many of whom were Democrats, were in the majority in the first State legislature and were determined to relocate the capital city. They had chosen the small inland village of Lancaster on Salt Creek, because of the expected wealth of the salt reserves in that area.

Forced to strategy, the North Platte group, who hoped to retain the capital of Omaha, offered an amendment to rename the village of Lancaster as "Lincoln." By this maneuver, the northern members hoped to make the relocation measure distasteful to the South Platte

Democratic members and thus break up the political strength of the South Platte majority.

However, the South Platte members accepted the amendment and on July 29, 1867, the little village of Lancaster, on Salt Creek, was officially designated as the State capital and renamed as the city of Lincoln.

Thus did the controversy over this minor issue cease, as it were, by accident, and symbolized the later acceptance of Abraham Lincoln by all parts of the Nation as a good and great man who saved the Union of the United States of America.

It is then, Mr. Speaker, further proof that men of vision make history both by their direct efforts and by the force of their being.

On this anniversary of the birth of a man of principle and foresight, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues another birthday. This birthday is of an institution born in the mind of man of many Lincoln-like attributes.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the Nebraska Farmer, a farm magazine that reported the history of the State from Lincoln's day until now.

Its founder was Robert W. Furnas. He was a farmer, fruitgrower, horticulturist, soldier, politician, and newspaperman.

When that first edition was published, the Territory was vast in size, with most of the people living along the eastern boundary of the Territory. There were 24 counties represented in the Sixth Territorial legislature in 1859. Nebraska City was the largest town, with a population of 1,922. Omaha's population was 1,883.

Furnas continued to publish the magazine until going to war in 1862. He returned to his publication and was elected the second Governor of the State in 1872.

This was the heritage of the Nebraska Farmer and it reflected as almost a creed: ruggedness, adaptability, honesty.

Its pages were dedicated to the farmer of Nebraska. It was interested in his economic welfare, his opportunity for education, his right and privilege of good government.

And the Nebraska Farmer has never lost that personality.

Another man was to rise over the horizon of Nebraska history and shine with the strength and brightness of a Nebraska summer day upon the people and the land. He was Sam McKelvie, born on a homestead in the State he loved.

He guided the Nebraska Farmer for half a century, was to become Governor of the State at the age of 37 and bring into focus the greatness of agriculture and to especially enshrine the sandhills of Nebraska as the greatest cattle land in America.

As the farmers of Nebraska struggled against adversity so did this publication. The anniversary issue relates an era in the history of the Nebraska Farmer which could have spelled its doom or—as was the outcome—nurtured the publication on the sparse diet of adversity and the strengthening qualities of austerity.

February 12, 1959, a Day of Homage for Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, at a time in our history when the emphasis on military and defense requirements is so constant as to be commonplace, it is especially fitting that we pay more than ordinary homage to a great soldier who rendered extraordinary military service to this country at a time when men of

A period of depression hit business in Nebraska in 1921. In 1923, Sam McKelvie was broke. It was a despondent Sam who boarded a train for Omaha to try to tap one of the fading hopes of obtaining the \$50,000 needed to keep the business going.

Walter Head, president of the Omaha National Bank, listened to this man's plea and heard the publisher expound his belief that the Nebraska Farmer could come back.

The banker and friend of Sam wrote out the check and said:

Sam, Nebraska needs a good farm paper. Let's keep the Nebraska Farmer going.

Sam's name was the only security ever offered to protect that loan.

There are many more stories of the growth of the Nebraska Farmer under the guidance of Sam McKelvie. Too many to relate here.

The Nebraska Farmer is like a jewel of many facets. Its organization is a family in a real sense. The employees own stock in the company and its almost negligible turnover in employees is testimony of the loyalty and devotion of its people. Sam's will provided for the employees to own the business.

Like Sam McKelvie, its present president and publisher, Glenn Buck, came up from the ranks. He started over 30 years ago as an advertising salesman.

The Nebraska Farmer story is in the finest traditions of Americana. It was and is interested in progress but not plunging; government but not political power; education but not preachments.

It is the true chronicle of Nebraska history.

The Press and Its Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the kind of government, the amount of tax paid by the citizen, the service he gets, depend to a large extent upon the press, upon what the editors and the columnists, influenced as the latter all too often are by pressure groups, print.

The lobbyists and the pressure groups, through their paid representatives, wield a tremendous influence here in Washington—while the average citizen must depend upon his chosen representative, often with little time of his own to give to the study of proposed legislation.

It is unfortunate that the Congress and Washington do not have in the District a daily publication which represents the thinking of the country as a whole.

The situation here is somewhat similar to that which existed when the United States of America sought, through the press, to give people abroad a view of American thinking.

What did the then administration do to convey American thought to, for example, London?

It purchased and distributed copies of the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. Certainly, both are influential publications—but represent not at all the thinking of the people west of New York.

Apparently, those wanting to convey American ideals to the people of other lands do not have the slightest conception of the needs, the desires, the ideals of the people outside of the great State of New York, which, it might be said, is dominated by people from other lands.

Fortunate indeed are we that we have throughout the country not only thousands of weekly publications whose editors represent their communities, but we have dailies, many in towns of less than 100,000 people, which speak for millions of Americans.

There are seven such publications in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

— Typical of the group is the News-Palladium of Benton Harbor, Mich., a daily which, by actual comparison, carries as great a volume of real news as do many of the publications in cities of 200,000 population.

An editorial from the News-Palladium of February 10 gives that publication's conception of a newspaper's duty. It reads:

THE NEWSPAPERS' DUTY

Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of two newspapers in Indianapolis, Ind., and two in Phoenix, Ariz., uttered some pretty definite political observations in a recent speech before the California-Nevada Associated Press Association, meeting in San Francisco.

The essence of Mr. Pulliam's remarks was that if the Republican Party is to be saved from political suicide, it must cease trying to exist as an echo of Democratic theories and practices.

Urging newspapermen to remember that their most important responsibility is the preservation of the Republic and individual freedom, the Hoosier publisher complained that this country has been drifting toward a one-party system for the last 5 or 6 years. The drift, he added, has been due to Washington bureaucrats.

Pulliam asserted that both parties have the same elements, that neither stands for anything definite and unequivocal. "There is no difference between the Republican and Democratic parties as far as their governmental objectives are concerned," the Associated Press executives were told. "No wonder the Republican Party got dumped in the ash can last fall. It is no longer a national party with definite principles. It has abandoned the very people who gave it power and position in this country for the first time in 20 years. . . ."

The net result, Pulliam stated, has been a steady drift toward a welfare state and "now both parties are dedicated to some type of it."

To a great degree, the publisher went on, it is up to the newspapers to teach the people that in 5,000 years of history it has been proved that socialism has failed miserably in every country where it has been adopted. This is true today in Soviet Russia.

The press will not always win popular support by upholding the principles of initiative, capitalism and genuine freedom not tied to paternalism, but neither will the press earn or deserve influence or confidence if it evades its duty in speaking out for its convictions.

In the field within which it operates, this newspaper has not intentionally or deliberately ever ducked what was deemed to be an issue requiring a stand, local, State, or National. We have no doubt made enemies, but we think we have made more friends, as our circulation figures show.

We believe this country must again have two strong parties representing divergence of opinion. If this does not come about more and more confused voters will feel that the choice they have is insignificant.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, Hero of the American Revolution (1746-1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the success of the American Revolution was assured by the unrelenting efforts and untold sacrifices made by the people here struggling for their independence. Other peoples, not native to this country, but equally great fighters for the cause of liberty, also contributed significantly to the successful culmination of that historic and glorious event. Tadeusz Kosciuszko of Poland, that intrepid, gallant and gifted soldier of freedom, was one of those whose personal participation in the American Revolution marks him as one of the great heroes of his day.

This great man was born into an impoverished family on February 12, 1746. At the age of 13 he lost his father, but his yearning for education led him to the Royal School at Warsaw in 1765. He was graduated with the rank of captain in 1769, and was awarded a scholarship to France where he studied at the famous military school at Mezieres, specializing in artillery and engineering. In 1776 he was in Paris when he heard of the American Revolution. That stirred his imagination; he saw his chance for action in a good cause, and with borrowed money he sailed for America. He arrived in Philadelphia in August and immediately applied for military service. He was admitted, and charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware River. The immediate success of this work earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

In the spring of the following year he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga. Later the fortifications he erected at Saratoga contributed greatly to the brilliant victory of our forces there. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently he took part in the Battle of Charleston, and was among the first of the Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British. On October 13, 1783, in recognition of his outstanding services, Congress made him a brigadier general.

Having served this country and its noble cause successfully and brilliantly, in July of 1784 he returned to Poland, hoping to carry on the fight for the freedom of his countrymen there. For more than 20 years he continued his brave but unfortunately futile efforts for Poland's freedom and was fated to die in exile in Switzerland on October 15, 1817.

Today, on the anniversary of his birth, we solemnly honor his memory. We do this not only because he fought for our independence, but also because he was a gallant and unwavering champion of the universal cause of human freedom.

The Real Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an ironic rule of history at work when it comes to dealing with great men.

It might almost be said that the greater the man and the farther removed in time he is from our own generation, the more freely he is quoted and the more loosely he is interpreted.

Thus, few people in our Nation's history have been more vigorously embraced by representatives of more diverse points of view than has Abraham Lincoln.

In a very real sense, this is a tribute to Lincoln's greatness. He was a unifier, a builder, a man who loved his fellow men regardless of political differences.

In another sense, however, this is unfortunate. For it obscures what Lincoln really believed and sometimes what he really said and meant.

And worst of all, it tends to hide the real Lincoln—a man from whom other men in all ages have much to learn.

It behooves us, then, to see him now as he really was. In this, our purpose may be better served by examining the characteristics of the man Lincoln, rather the words and the policies by means of which the public figure Lincoln dealt with the concrete political realities of his particular time.

Granted the importance and the wisdom of what he said and what he did, we must do Lincoln the justice of dealing with him in the perspective of his time. And this means restraining ourselves from using his words to serve our own ends.

The irony in this should be apparent. For Lincoln was addicted to the truth. It has been said of him that he was morbidly preoccupied with truth—morbid, perhaps, because to few of his contemporaries, as too few of ours, gave evidence of valuing it as highly.

Lincoln was a man with a passion to be understood. He abhorred indirection, despised glittering generalities, shrank from evasion and ambiguity.

His respect for man's mind led him to rely on demonstration, rather than on

emotional appeal, to convince those with whom he dealt.

His outward style—his manner, his taste and his writing—reflected the inner Lincoln: self-contained, direct, clear, sometimes terse, precise, simple, and undecorated.

He was a realist, about himself and about others. He lacked sentimentality of any kind. And he would, it is certain, have scorned those who, however sincerely, have sentimentalized him. For he recognized that sentimentality destroys a man's integrity, fuzzies up the truth about him, and makes him a pliable instrument for the service of others' interests.

Lincoln was no storybook hero, no romantic fool. He was a difficult, complex human being, the material of true greatness.

He valued excellence. He recognized it in others. He understood the painstaking, laborious price of achieving it, and willingly paid that price. And, afterward, he appreciated honestly what he knew to be his own great worth.

This self-control, this mastery of himself—no easy accomplishment for this giant of many moods and passions and ambitions—was the source of his strength and his mastery of others.

Was Lincoln really modest and humble? Not in the conventional sense of false self-effacement or self-righteousness, but genuinely so, as one who knew and understood himself as he really was.

He was a great man—a man for our age and every age.

The Significance of Lincoln's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following excerpt from "The Faith of America," by Mordecai Kaplan, J. Paul Williams, and Eugene Kohn:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

This day is gratefully dedicated to the remembrance of Abraham Lincoln, who led the United States through 4 years of civil strife to keep the Nation one, and who used the power of his office to free the Negroes from slavery. His memory is both an inspiration and a challenge. It inspires us to dedicate our lives as he did his, to freeing the bound. It challenges us to make of our country a land in which all men are accepted by their fellow men for what they are and for what they can make of themselves.

We are wont in family life to accept our brother; we assume his right to be himself, to seek him own welfare in his own way; we ask of him only that he share with us a common devotion to the family. So let us in our public life accept our fellow man in brotherhood. Let us acknowledge his right to his own interests, his own beliefs, his own loyalties. Let us ask of him only that he share with us a common devotion to the cause of all humanity.

Ours is a nation built by men of different races, different faiths, different cultural traditions. To recognize all of them as our brothers is to show respect for their right to be different from us. It is to learn to value the special contribution which each can bring to the common cause. It is to welcome his cooperation in the building of a common civilization. That civilization should be great enough to embrace all the diversities among us. Let us make America safe for differences and liberate all those who today are oppressed by unbrotherly prejudice and rancor. Thus and then only can we honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln and bring victory to the cause for which he lived and died.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, from the time of Catherine the Great to 1917, Ukraine, like Poland and Georgia, was submerged as a nation in the czarist Russian Empire. During this period, autocratic czardom suppressed and attempted to eradicate the culture and the national identity of the Ukrainian people. It attempted to demolish what we in the West esteem as praiseworthy, Ukrainian traits and qualities, notably their invincible desire to establish the natural rights of man and to exercise these rights in a self-determined and independent Ukrainian state.

Toward the end of World War I, the glorious opportunity for the expression of these God-given rights and for the full exercise of the Wilsonian principle of national self-determination presented itself with the collapse of the Russian Empire. On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed and a new day was ushered in for the second largest Slavic nation in Europe. That memorable day is a landmark in Ukrainian history and it will always remain a bright spot in their entire history. It is celebrated annually as a national holiday and although the Republic did not last more than 2 years when it was overrun by Soviet Russia—R.S.F.S.R.—that short period has left its indelible impression of freedom on all Ukrainians. All of them would like to observe this historic anniversary but not all Ukrainians are permitted and privileged to do so. To 40 million Ukrainians who have suffered under the Soviet regime since 1920, that supreme privilege is denied in their homeland. But in the free world we gladly join in this celebration of Americans of Ukrainian origin, on this 41st anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

The following editorial from the Washington Star and the news story from the Washington Post and Times Herald are worthy tributes:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 23, 1959]

UKRAINIAN DREAM

At this time 41 years ago, after having been held captive for centuries by the Rus-

sian Czardom, the ancient and highly civilized Ukrainian people—who now number about 40 million—reestablished themselves as an independent nation. But their new status, their new freedom, was short-lived. For the imperialistic Bolshevik revolutionists soon moved into their land and subjugated them all over again. Even so, throughout the four decades that have since passed they have maintained their own language and separate identity within the Soviet Union, and great numbers of them still yearn and strive for complete self-rule. In fact, although it has mercilessly repressed them, the Kremlin itself has recognized their special position in many ways, including the arrangement under which their make-believe "autonomous republic" is fictitiously represented in the United Nations by a delegation of its own.

As things stand today, of course, it may seem almost quixotic that any of these people should still harbor hopes for real autonomy. But the same used to be said of other independence-seeking nationalities—such as the Irish—and what needs to be remembered in matters of this sort is that the world is always changing. Tyrannies, after all, not only rise, but also fall, and so it is not utterly inconceivable that the Ukrainians will once again attain—permanently—the liberty they enjoyed for just a little while in 1918. In any event, as one of their spokesmen has written, large segments of them can be counted upon to keep alive their "undying movement" to restore their country to full self-mastery "as a vital and indispensable element in a free Europe and in a free world."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 23, 1959]

HOUSE MARKS BIRTHDAY OF UKRAINIAN REPUBLIC

The 41st anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian Republic was commemorated yesterday in brief remarks and ceremonies in the House of Representatives.

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts, House majority leader, and Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, Pennsylvania, led House Members in praise of the Republic, which was gobbled up by the Soviet Union shortly after its independence was declared.

They were joined in their remarks by Representatives FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, and Representative MARQUETTE STITT CHURCH, Republican, Illinois. A resolution has been submitted in the Senate by Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, Connecticut, to have the President proclaim each January 22, a day to honor the republic's independence.

Earlier yesterday, FLOOD was host to Lev Dobriansky, Georgetown University professor and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, at picture-taking ceremonies. Also attending were MCCORMACK and Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, Ohio, and BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, Illinois.

Address on 100th Anniversary of Lincoln's Birth by Booker T. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all of us were proud and pleased with the program today celebrating the 150th anniversary

of the birth of our great President, Abraham Lincoln. At this time, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the words of another great American who had words of praise for President Lincoln. These remarks were made 50 years ago to this day by Booker T. Washington, born a slave but who became a great, free American who has served as an inspiration to all of us. The Booker T. Washington Goodwill Building Commission at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama has asked my help in inserting his remarks in the Record, which I am most happy to do at this point:

AN ADDRESS ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN DELIVERED BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 12, 1909, BY BOOKER T. WASHINGTON ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN'S BIRTH

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, you ask that which he found a piece of property and turned into a free American citizen to speak to you tonight on Abraham Lincoln. I am not fitted by ancestry or training to be your teacher tonight for, as I have stated, I was born a slave.

My first knowledge of Abraham Lincoln came in this way: I was awakened early one morning before the dawn of day, as I lay wrapped in a bundle of rags on the dirt floor of our slave cabin, by the prayers of my mother, just before leaving for her day's work, as she was kneeling over my body earnestly praying that Abraham Lincoln might succeed, and that one day she and her boy might be free. You give me the opportunity here this evening to celebrate with you and the Nation the answer to that prayer.

Says the Greek Book somewhere, "Though a man die, yet shall he live." If this is true of the ordinary man, how much more true is it of the hero of the hour and the hero of the century—Abraham Lincoln. One hundred years of the life and influence of Lincoln is the story of the struggles, the trials, ambitions, and triumphs of the people of our complex American civilization. Interwoven into the warp and woof of this human complexity is the moving story of men and women of nearly every race and color in progress from slavery to freedom, from poverty to wealth, from weakness to power, from ignorance to intelligence. Knit into the life of Abraham Lincoln is the story and success of the Nation in the blending of all tongues, religions, colors, races into one composite Nation, leaving each group and race free to live its own separate social life, and yet all a part of the great whole.

If a man die, shall he live? Answering this question as applied to our martyred President, perhaps you expect me to confine my words of appreciation to the great boon which, through him, was conferred upon my race. My undying gratitude and that of 10 millions of my race for this and yet more. To have been the instrument used by Providence through which 4 millions of slaves, now grown into 10 millions of free citizens, were made free would bring eternal fame within itself, but this is not the only claim that Lincoln has upon our sense of gratitude and appreciation.

By the side of Armstrong and Garrison, Lincoln lives today. In the very highest sense he lives in the present more potentially than 100 years ago; for that which is seen is temporal, that which is unseen is eternal. He lives in the 32,000 young men and women of the Negro race learning trades and useful occupations; in the 200,000 farms acquired by those he freed; in the more than 400,000 homes built; in the 46 banks established and 10,000 stores owned; in the \$550 million worth of taxable property in hand; in the 28,000 public schools existing, with 30,000 teachers; in the 170 industrial schools

and colleges; in the 23,000 ministers and 26,000 churches.

But, above all this, he lives in the steady and unalterable determination of 10 millions of black citizens to continue to climb year by year the ladder of the highest usefulness and to perfect themselves in strong, robust character. For making all this possible, Lincoln lives.

But, again, for a higher reason he lives tonight in every corner of the Republic. To set the physical man free is much. To set the spiritual man free is more. So often the keeper is on the inside of the prison bars and the prisoner on the outside.

As an individual, grateful as I am to Lincoln for freedom of body, my gratitude is still greater for freedom of soul—the liberty which permits one to live up in that atmosphere where he refuses to permit sectional or racial hatred to drag down, to warp and narrow his soul.

The signing of the Emancipation Proclamation was a great event, and yet it was but the symbol of another, still greater and more momentous. We who celebrate this anniversary should not forget that the same pen that gave freedom to 4 millions of African slaves at the same time struck the shackles from the souls of 27 millions of Americans of another color.

In any country, regardless of what its laws say, wherever people act upon the idea that the disadvantage of one man is the good of another, there slavery exists. Wherever in any country the whole people feel that the happiness of all is dependent upon the happiness of the weakest, there freedom exists.

In abolishing slavery, Lincoln proclaimed the principle that, even in the case of the humblest and weakest of mankind, the welfare of each is still the good of all. In reestablishing in this country the principle that, at bottom, the interests of humanity and of the individual are one, he freed men's souls from spiritual bondage; he freed them to mutual helpfulness. Henceforth no man of any race, either in the North or in the South, need feel constrained to fear or hate his brother.

By the same token that Lincoln made America free, he pushed back the boundaries of freedom everywhere, gave the spirit of liberty a wider influence throughout the world, and reestablished the dignity of man as man.

By the same act that freed my race, he said to the civilized and uncivilized world that man everywhere must be free, and that man everywhere must be enlightened, and the Lincoln spirit of freedom and fair play will never cease to spread and grow in power till throughout the world all men shall know the truth, and the truth shall make them free.

Lincoln in his day was wise enough to recognize that which is true in the present and for all time: that in a state of slavery and ignorance man renders the lowest and most costly form of service to his fellows. In a state of freedom and enlightenment he renders the highest and most helpful form of service.

The world is fast learning that of all forms of slavery there is none that is so harmful and degrading as that form of slavery which tempts one human being to hate another by reason of his race or color. One man cannot hold another man down in the ditch without remaining down in the ditch with him. One who goes through life with his eyes closed against all that is good in another race is weakened and circumscribed, as one who fights in a battle with one hand tied behind him. Lincoln was in the truest sense great because he unfettered himself. He climbed up out of the valley, where his vision was narrowed and weakened by the fog and miasma, onto the mountain top, where in a pure and unclouded atmosphere he could see the

truth which enabled him to rate all men at their true worth. Growing out of this anniversary season and atmosphere, may there crystallize a resolve throughout the Nation that on such a mountain the American people will strive to live.

We owe, then, to Lincoln physical freedom, moral freedom, and yet this is not all. There is a debt of gratitude which we as individuals, no matter of what race or Nation, must recognize as due Abraham Lincoln—not for what he did as Chief Executive of the Nation, but for what he did as a man. In his rise from the most abject poverty and ignorance to a position of high usefulness and power, he taught the world one of the greatest of all lessons. In fighting his own battle up from obscurity and squalor, he fought the battle of every other individual and race that is down, and so helped to pull up every other human who was down. People so often forget that by every inch that the lowest man crawls up he makes it easier for every other man to get up. Today, throughout the world, because Lincoln lived, struggled, and triumphed, every boy who is ignorant, is in poverty, is despised or discouraged, holds his head a little higher. His heart beats a little faster, his ambition to do something and be something is a little stronger, because Lincoln blazed the way.

To my race, the life of Abraham Lincoln has its special lesson at this point in our career. Insofar as his life emphasizes patience, long suffering, sincerity, naturalness, dogged determination, and courage—courage to avoid the superficial, courage to persistently seek the substance instead of the shadow—it points the road for my people to travel.

As a race we are learning, I believe, in an increasing degree that the best way for us to honor the memory of our emancipator is by seeking to imitate him. Like Lincoln, the Negro race should seek to be simple, without bigotry and without ostentation. There is great power in simplicity. We as a race should, like Lincoln, have moral courage to be what we are, and not pretend to be what we are not. We should keep in mind that no one can degrade us except ourselves; that if we are worthy, no influence can defeat us. Like other races, the Negro will often meet obstacles, often be sorely tried and tempted; but we must keep in mind that freedom, in the broadest and highest sense, has never been a bequest; it has been a conquest.

In the final test, the success of our race will be in proportion to the service that it renders to the world. In the long run, the badge of service is the badge of sovereignty.

With all his other elements of strength, Abraham Lincoln possessed in the highest degree patience and, as I have said, courage. The highest form of courage is not always that exhibited on the battlefield in the midst of the blare of trumpets and the waving of banners. The highest courage is of the Lincoln kind. It is the same kind of courage, made possible by the new life and the new possibilities furnished by Lincoln's proclamation, displayed by thousands of men and women of my race every year who are going out from Tuskegee and other Negro institutions in the South to lift up their fellows. When they go, often into lonely and secluded districts, with little thought of salary, with little thought of personal welfare, no drums beat, no banners fly, no friends stand by to cheer them on; but these brave young souls who are erecting schoolhouses, creating school systems, prolonging school terms, teaching the people to buy homes, build houses, and live decent lives by fighting the battles of this country just as truly and bravely as any persons who go forth to fight battles against a foreign foe.

In paying my tribute of respect to the great emancipator of my race, I desire to say a word here and now in behalf of an element of brave and true white men of the South

who, though they saw in Lincoln's policy the ruin of all they believed in and hoped for, have loyally accepted the results of the Civil War, and are today working with a courage few people in the North can understand to uplift the Negro in the South and complete the emancipation that Lincoln began. I am tempted to say that it certainly required as high a degree of courage for men of the type of Robert E. Lee and John D. Gordon to accept the results of the war in the manner and spirit in which they did, as that which Grant and Sherman displayed in fighting the physical battles that saved the Union.

Lincoln also was a southern man by birth, but he was one of those white men, of whom there is a large and growing class, who represented the idea that in order to assert and maintain the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race it was necessary that another group of humanity should be kept in ignorance.

Lincoln was not afraid or ashamed to come into contact with the lowly of all races. His reputation and social position were not of such a transitory and transparent kind that he was afraid that he would lose them by being just and kind, even to a man of dark skin. I always pity from the bottom of my heart any man who feels that somebody else must be kept down or in ignorance in order that he may appear great by comparison. It requires no courage for a strong man to kick a weak one down.

Lincoln lives today because he had the courage which made him refuse to hate the man at the South or the man at the North when they did not agree with him. He had the courage as well as the patience and foresight to suffer in silence, to be misunderstood, to be abused, to refuse to revile when reviled. For he knew that, if he was right, the ridicule of today would be the applause of tomorrow. He knew, too, that at some time in the distant future our Nation would repent of the folly of cursing our public servants while they live and blessing them only when they die. In this connection I cannot refrain from suggesting the question to the millions of voices raised today in his praise: "Why did you not say it yesterday?" Yesterday, when one word of approval and gratitude would have meant so much to him in strengthening his hand and heart.

As we recall tonight his deeds and words, we can do so with grateful hearts and strong faith in the future for the spread of righteousness. The civilization of the world is going forward, not backward. Here and there for a little season the progress of mankind may seem to halt or tarry by the wayside, or even appear to slide backward, but the trend is ever onward and upward, and will be until someone can invent and enforce a law to stop the progress of civilization. In goodness and liberality the world moves forward. It goes forward beneficently, but it moves forward relentlessly. In the last analysis the forces of nature are behind the moral progress of the world, and these forces will crush into powder any group of humanity that resists this progress.

As we gather here, brothers all, in common joy and thanksgiving for the life of Lincoln, may I not ask that you, the worthy representatives of 70 million of white Americans, join heart and hand with the 10 million of black Americans—these 10 million who speak your tongue, profess your religion—who have never lifted their voices or hands except in defense of their country's honor and their country's flag—and swear eternal fealty to the memory and the traditions of the sainted Lincoln? I repeat, may we not join with your race, and let all of us here highly resolve that justice, goodwill, and peace shall be the motto of our lives? If this be true, in the highest sense Lincoln shall not have lived and died in vain.

And, finally, gathering inspiration and encouragement from this hour and Lincoln's

life, I pledge to you and to the Nation that my race, insofar as I can speak for it, which in the past, whether in ignorance or intelligence, whether in slavery or in freedom, has always been true to the Stars and Stripes and to the highest and best interests of this country, will strive to so deport itself that it shall reflect nothing but the highest credit upon the whole people in the North and in the South.

Lincoln Benedicto: Catawba College Cuban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three newspaper articles and one letter to the editor, which tell a compelling story of a young Cuban patriot in the United States, a 22-year-old university student who has found himself in the position of defending his country's recent revolution to his friends in this country. He has been doing a fine job of it as I am sure you will agree when you read his story. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce to you, to the other Members of the House of Representatives, and to the general readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Lincoln Benedicto:

[From the Salisbury (N.C.) Sunday Post, Jan. 18, 1959]

STUDENT TELLS OF BATISTA CRUELITIES (By Bill Jackson)

"They drove nails into people's heads. They crucified them by nailing them to the walls. They gouged out their eyes, cut out their tongues. They pulled toenails from toes, fingernails from fingers."

As the young Cuban talked, he pulled himself closer to the edge of his chair. Then he exclaimed, "There is nothing exaggerated in what I say. It is the whole truth."

For Lincoln Benedicto, 22, a senior in political science at Catawba College, had just received a letter from home. It was the first in 5 weeks, and originated from Benedicto's home town of Holguin, in Cuba's now-famed Oriente Province. The writer was the young student's mother.

He grasped the envelope in his hand as he talked. This letter had descriptive passages that made the sounds of Castro's guns seem to echo in the very room in which the student sat. One paragraph had driven home a spine-chilling revelation: The Benedicto homeplace in Holguin had been used as a headquarters for Castro's revolutionary movement in that town of 90,000.

ARRESTED

"My mother served as a liaison between the revolutionaries in the hills and visiting newsmen from other countries," said Benedicto. "In mid-October of last year, she was arrested by the Batista regime and threatened with death."

His mother had been alone in the house; the father had been dead many years. Then, a daughter moved in with her three children, and Benedicto speculates this was because his sister knew of many contacts she could make with the rebels.

"The house is a big one by the average American standard, and could easily accom-

modate 40 persons," Benedicto related. "It was located about three blocks from the city square. Mother ran a filling station nearby."

A personal tragedy confronted the young Cuban as he read one portion of the letter. When he first entered this country as a young high school student in 1951, attending the Blue Ridge School at Hendersonville, he became acquainted with a young man from Ecuador. A warm friendship evolved, and on graduation the South American returned to his native soil and accepted a job as reporter on a newspaper in Quito, Ecuador's capital city.

Desiring a personal interview with Castro for a newspaper story, the reporter was sent to Cuba bearing official papers documenting him as a newspaper correspondent. He went directly to Holguin and made contact with Benedicto's mother. She arranged for the clandestine rendezvous with the rebels in the hills of Oriente Province.

KILLED

On obtaining his interview with the rebel chief, the reporter returned to Holguin. He was immediately assassinated by Batista followers.

The mother also revealed the tragic story of a young lawyer, known as Captain Herrera, who had stayed in her home for some time engaged in undercover work for the rebels. One day, while visiting at another home, agents of the S.I.M. (Service of Military Intelligence) arrested the lawyer. Rather than face the impending torture by government agents, he hanged himself.

One of the sordid pictures painted by the mother's words in her letter was that of photographs taken by rebel cameramen and circulated in Oriente Province. Shown in these photographs were neighborhood dogs roaming about the countryside with parts of human bodies in their mouths.

When the S.I.M. entered the Benedicto home in October, they arrested her and told her she would not live long if she did not confess her past deeds and divulge all information relating to her work with the rebels. She protested strongly and maintained her innocence. By the intervention of influential friends, she was set free.

After this, she closed the big house in Holguin and traveled with her daughter and children to Victoria de las Tunas, where they lived until the overthrow of Batista.

"Like many Cubans," said Benedicto, "my mother took a big gamble. Unlike the fate of many Cubans, the gamble paid off, and she's alive today."

He defended the current series of firing squad executions that are taking place in Cuba. "The American people and American politicians have objected strongly to these executions," he said, "but they have forgotten about the massacres and crimes committed by the Batista regime. At the time of these terrible inhumanities, there were no objections from the United States about Batista's treatment of the rebels and their sympathizers. The Americans have forgotten all of this."

Political Science Student Lincoln Benedicto, aptly named after another political scientist, Abraham Lincoln, came to Salisbury and entered Catawba College on the advice of a friend from Brevard. He is president of the International Relations Club at Catawba.

"Not long ago the money from home stopped coming and I was unable to finance my education," he said. "Being an alien, I had to obtain permission from the U.S. Immigration Service in Washington in order to work and earn money to pay my tuition. They don't readily give such permission, but Mr. Cooper (Peter Cooper, public relations director) wrote them a letter and they gave in."

He worked in many jobs, even dug ditches as a laborer. He now works at the Winn-

Dixie Store "doing a little bit of everything."

"I haven't been home in 4 years," he said. "I haven't had any desire to go home with things the way they were. I wanted to remain in the United States to study English and try to understand the American people. It has taken me 6 years to understand them."

In an appearance before the Salisbury Rotary Club last August, Benedicto made a speech in which he predicted the strong arm of Fulgencio Batista would break within 6 months. Recent events have proved him to be an expert in crystal ball gazing.

"I now have another prediction to make," he said last week. "The only remaining dictator in Latin America will fall before the might of the oppressed people when the Dominican Republic follows the example of Argentina and Cuba and topples General Trujillo. I believe this will come within the next 3 years."

[From the Catawba College Pioneer, Feb. 7, 1959]

CUBAN STUDENT REVEALS VIEWS ON REVOLUTION

(By Richard Dorn)

Probably the loneliest man on today's international scene is Cuban Rebel Chief Fidel Castro Ruz. For five and one-half years, the countries of the free world have turned hopeful eyes toward the balmy island of Cuba in expectation that a new democracy would rise out of the fray. The rebels did win out. The world rejoiced.

Then the execution of Batista's henchmen began and a deluge of criticisms and bitter protests rained down around the head of Fidel from those same sources that had a few days before praised him and recognized his new government. The United States, in particular, has termed the executions as "regrettable," "inhuman," "sadistic." Castro says: "I am determined to show no mercy."

LINCOLN INTERVIEWED

In an effort to obtain an unadulterated Cuban viewpoint on the Cuban situation, we have interviewed Lincoln Benedicto. Lincoln's mother and sister worked in the rebel underground during the course of the revolt and one of Lincoln's closest friends was assassinated by Batista's police.

When questioned about his views concerning the executions, he replied: "I am not in favor of capital punishment. The Constitution of Cuba does not sanction it, but at the same time I believe that these executions are serving a necessary purpose. I know what the people feel in this matter and how they think. If Castro did not execute those connected with Batista's regime, I am sure that the people would take the law into their own hands and do it for him. Things would get out of hand; they would kill innocent people. Castro's way is best. It does not spill innocent blood."

Lincoln also pointed out the reason for the peoples' hatred of Batista and all those connected with him. He recounted stories of torture of the most inhuman kind and sadistic terrorization inflicted on Cuban citizens by the Batista government. The army even went so far as to ship the dismembered bodies of the students home to their mothers as examples of what happens to rebel cohorts.

QUOTES FROM CASTRO

Fidel Castro has been quoted as saying that he wants no position in the government. "Power does not interest me, and I will not take it." Still, he dictates the every policy of his present provisional military government and metes out justice via kangaroo courts. The liberal onlooker, Puerto Rico's Muñoz-Marin labels these actions as "a bad thing happening in the midst of a great thing," but what will happen after the

executions are accomplished? Will democracy replace military law in Cuba?

Here's what Lincoln has to say: "I believe that Fidel Castro is sincere when he says he wants no part of the government. He is not the President of Cuba; Manuel Urrutia is. Castro is carrying out the responsibilities of the government. Urrutia handles the diplomacy. He is a good man for President because of his long experience with Cuban law and his high democratic ideals. Military law will no longer be necessary within 18 months to 2 years from now just as Castro predicts. Castro has promised democracy and he will give it."

CASTRO PRESIDENT?

"I think Castro will eventually become President of Cuba, not because he wants to be President, but because the people will demand it of him. Castro is capable and would adhere to democratic principles."

In answer to questions about Raul Castro and Ernesto Guevarra and the Communist leanings, these two rebel leaders have shown, Lincoln would only say this: "To one man communism may be just another form of government. To another it may be a totally nonexistent form of government." Lincoln denied any possibility of the Communists gaining any voice in Cuban affairs and was quick to point out that although 5 of the approximately 13 seats on the newly formed National Labor Union Committee were grabbed by Communists, they have since been "relieved" of their positions.

LINCOLN WELL-INFORMED

Lincoln's study is a virtual library of information on the Cuban revolt. To write here all that he has had to say about the situation would be impossible. The accounts that he is able to relate about the atrocities committed by Fulgencio Batista and his killer cops against the Cuban people are endless. If you have any doubts about the validity of the feelings of the Cuban people, spend a few minutes with Lincoln in his study. He'll show you newspaper clippings, references of testimony in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, relate to you shocking accounts of brutality received firsthand via letters from his mother. It will be an enlightening experience.

[From the Iredell Morning News, Statesville, N. C., Feb. 5, 1959]

NORTH IREDELL LEGION HEARS CUBAN CATAWBA COLLEGE STUDENT ON CASTRO

(By McK. R. Long, Sr.)

Lincoln Benedicto is a political science student at Catawba College, and is president of the International Relations Club at Catawba. He gave the legion an account of the atrocities of the Batista junta, more compact and brief than he has given elsewhere to the press in this State. These closely resemble the horrors inflicted by Nasser on the Israelis, castration and rape, and the known liquidation of 20,000 innocent people. Mr. Benedicto acknowledged that 400 war criminals had been given the gun by Castro's warrant, but insisted it had been done by due process, the disparity between atrocity killings by the Cuban tiger, and Castro's judicial life taking, revealed moderation by Castro.

Again and again he appealed for understanding by the American people, who had been misled by press accounts, in their opinions as to the Castro revolution, which he described as a triumph of democracy. Doubtless when he hears Castro likened to a designing Nasser, the Nasser of the Caribbean, he feels resentment; since General Fidel has about him a cabinet, and has set up rule under President Manuel Urrutia, Mr. Benedicto believes that his hero will follow the constructive line of Magaysay in the Pacific, and not the Mahomet-like line of the Egyptian dictator. One can see how he boils and writhes with protest, as the press

glibly predicts what Castro will do, when he is only in the process of doing it. Why not give a great liberator the chance to truly show his hand, he asks. Why not concede that to lead a country out of such misery and oppression would tax the abilities of the greatest man—Washington or Bolivar? These are his thoughts, even when his speech is convulsed with patriotic anguish, and remembrance that his own mother was arrested only last October by Batista agents, her life threatened, and Mao-like pressure brought on her to inform against the cause. To know how he feels one would have to be aware that his own home, which can house 40, in Holguin, a town of 90,000, was headquarters for the Castro movement in Oriente Province. His mother, like the mother of Andrew Jackson who patched the breeches of the old continentals, fed them, nursed them and finally died because of them, bred in the son a desperate furor for freedom. A heroic mother makes a passionate partisan of a son. Sonora Benedicto was and is the sort of woman who made America possible.

And her son, who works hard in the summer to finish his course in law, is a worthy brave devotee to the cause. Benedicto believes with all his soul, that his bearded leader, a huge man of 6 feet 2, is "the noblest Roman of them all," that he knows where he is going, the reforms he will bring, and that America and the world, should give him time to work things out. No one hearing him can say no to that. Personally, we believe most legionnaires wish Castro well, and that if he stabilizes Cuba permanently, it will help all South America.

[From the Charlotte Observer, Feb. 5, 1959]

THE CUBAN EXECUTIONS?—MERE JUSTICE

The meaning of words is not in the words; it is in us.

What did the Cuban revolution mean to the American people and the rest of the world? It only meant another revolution in Latin America to get rid of another dictator. To us Cubans it meant victory, freedom, peace, joy, mourning, tears, and the destruction of a rotten rule and a group of vicious, cruel, implacable, and blood-thirsty men who killed over 20,000 innocent people.

Is there anything wrong with firing squadrons in Cuba? Perhaps to the rest of the world it is the wrong thing to do. But why don't the same people stop criticizing and start thinking of the executions committed by Batista's followers without any mercy when the revolution was growing in power and size?

This very same group of men was not content with shooting the young, as well as the old, without even giving them a fair trial, but also torturing them with the most horrible, despicable, cruel, barbaric, and inhuman ways ever seen in society.

Now that Castro's men are carrying out executions the people's mind revolts and criticizes this procedure.

Have people thought for a minute how many innocent Cubans will die if these executions are not carried out? The relatives of those who were killed will take the law into their own hands. Then what will the American people have to say about it?

The people of Cuba are asking for these executions and even saying that the Government is acting too leniently against the war criminals.

The American people talk about bringing legal charges and have these men put to trial. But what better legal charges can be brought against these soulless human beasts, when relatives and friends have seen them killing their own people and have brought the legal charges before the rebel jury?

Why are some people protesting the executions in Cuba when they did not even bother to mention the massacres of Batista's regime—a reign of terror which has brought mourning to thousands of Cuban

homes and tears to mothers' eyes at the sight of the mutilated bodies of their sons.

It is my opinion that some people are only concerned with the present, but forget to go back to the past and judge some of its truth.

Since when has the Congress of the United States acquired or bought the rights to manage the domestic affairs of Cuba?

Some Congressmen who did not even bother to stop the selling of arms to the Batista regime, which killed thousands of Cubans, now take the floor and bring charges against the blood bath in Cuba. What role are these men trying to play now? Do they hope to achieve national popularity through such hypocrisy?

For too many years, too many individuals in this country who do not even understand the difference of cultural traits, have stuck or tried to stick their nose into the domestic affairs of other countries in this hemisphere.

The 26th of July revolution led by Fidel Castro and his follower is the best thing that has happened to Cuba since its proclamation of independence.

There has been speculation about the new regime sympathizing with communism and even heading toward another dictatorship. These convictions without doubt have been the ideas of some professional critics whose thoughts and opinions have gone beyond their imaginations.

Let the people of the United States know that Urrutia is running the internal affairs of Cuba and Castro is the chief of a dignified armed force.

Let the vultures of Batista criticize Castro and his cannon policy. These human beasts have no longer power or a clean voice. They have already spotted their name with innocent blood—the blood of their own people.

The Cuban revolution had and has a different meaning to us Cubans. We know the meaning of our thoughts, feelings, and words.

Unfortunately these same actions are not understood and are even confused by outsiders with a different concept of ideas and judgment.

Let Senor Urrutia and the Cuban Congress run the internal affairs of the island. Let our leader Senor Fidel Castro Rux be our guide, our democratic hope.

These feelings of ours are not in the feelings of others; they are in us, they are our feelings.

LINCOLN BENEDICTO.

Constitutionality of 14th Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion over the years as to whether or not the 14th amendment to the Constitution was adopted in accordance with constitutional processes.

On last Thursday, February 5, 1959, one of the distinguished and able members of the house of representatives of the 62d general assembly of the State of Arkansas, the Honorable Talbot Feild, Jr., addressed the Arkansas State Legislature in a most provocative speech on this question. At the same time, he introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, dealing with this subject.

Our forefathers, framers of the Constitution of the United States, in their wisdom provided the right of petition. In petitioning the Congress to consider his proposal, Mr. Feild has given us the benefit of a great deal of research. In a most commendable manner, he points up the difficult problems which are causing so much concern among our people today and proposes a method which he conceived that would resolve these difficulties and would accordingly relieve the imponderable and frustrating concern with so many of our people.

It is with this thought, Mr. Speaker, and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, that I include the speech of Mr. Feild as he gave to the general assembly of our State:

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the house, a moment ago I introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. By your leave I have been granted the privilege of speaking at this time on my proposal. For this privilege I am indeed grateful. We were recently assembled here in an extraordinary session of the general assembly by virtue of a constitutional call issued by our Governor, the Honorable Orval E. Faubus. We considered and enacted laws to regulate the administration and financing of public schools and education, and made appropriations for such purposes.

Additional proposals pertaining to our schools we must soon take under advisement. Before considering any of them we should turn our attention to the 14th amendment, for in the end, only the Constitution of the United States can resolve our crisis. What does it say? We must understand the 14th amendment. It was this amendment that was supposedly interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954 when it also took into consideration psychology and sociology. And, in basing its 1954 decision on the 14th amendment it did so on the assumption that the 14th amendment was constitutionally valid. We are only concerned with the last phrase of section 1 of the 14th amendment. It reads as follows:

"No State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law."

In the case styled *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, decided on May 17, 1954, for the first time since our country was founded our Supreme Court based one of its decisions upon alleged psychological and sociological authority to sustain its view of what the 14th amendment should mean. And, it did this although the highest courts of 23 of the States which adopted the 14th amendment have held that it did not abolish segregation. Neither did the 39th Congress that proposed the 14th amendment, nor a single one of the States that considered it, understand that the 14th amendment, of and by itself, outlawed segregation by race in the public schools. Moreover, the 39th Congress which unconstitutionally submitted the 14th amendment simultaneously passed a law establishing segregated schools in the District of Columbia. At that very time the 39th Congress refused to accept a proposed constitution by South Carolina which included a provision requiring racial integration in the schools. But why, after more than 90 years since the 39th Congress was in session, has the Supreme Court of the United States decided to charter a course more radical, extreme, and unconstitutional than that which Congress inaugurated, submitted, and approved? Is it because those who would destroy our constitutional system of three coordinate branches of Government and States rights see the Negro voter as an avenue through which to accomplish their

purpose and centralize more power in Washington? In the 1954 decision this particular language was used:

"Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

That ambiguous language suggested and resulted in this phraseology being incorporated into Act 7 of the 2d extraordinary session of the 61st General Assembly of Arkansas, which became effective on September 12, 1958:

"Whereas, the Supreme Court of the United States predicated its school integration decision upon the psychological effect of segregated classes upon children of the Negro race, and at the same time, ignored the psychological impact of integrated schools upon certain white children who observe segregation of the races as a way of life; and

"Whereas, legislation is necessary in order to protect the health, welfare, well-being, and educational opportunities for such white children;" etc.

In the Brown case all decisions of the Supreme Court prior thereto which had interpreted the 14th amendment to permit the separate but equal doctrine were overturned, but not the hopes of the Republican Party.

The Emancipation Proclamation by President Abraham Lincoln furnished a dramatic appeal to the Negroes of that day and when the War Between the States ended, Negro voters were brought en masse into the Republican Party. There they stayed until 1936 when a majority of them moved over to the Democratic Party, then under the leadership of President Franklin Roosevelt. It is no secret today that the Republicans are trying to win back a majority of the Negro vote outside the South. President Dwight Eisenhower made wide gains among Negro voters in the North in 1956, but still his Democratic opponent, making the same appeals for their votes, secured 2 out of every 3 Negro votes cast outside the South. Yet in the 1956 election, which followed the 1954 Supreme Court decision overturning the separate but equal doctrine, Eisenhower's share of the vote in 35 congressional districts having more than 10 percent Negro population climbed only from an average of 42 percent in his first election to 47 percent. After soldiers were sent to Little Rock the Republican Party strategy board thought it would climb much higher. However, we all know that they were proven wrong by the returns of the general election last November. Nevertheless, based on the 1956 November elections and voting patterns established thereby 4 million Negro voters hold the balance of power in 14 key States outside the South. In those States the number of Negroes ranges from 4.6 to 15.6 percent of the voting age population, as follows: California, 4.6; Indiana, 4.8; West Virginia, 6.4; New York, 6.5; Oklahoma, 6.6; Pennsylvania, 6.7; Ohio, 6.8; New Jersey, 6.9; Michigan, 7.5; Illinois, 8.1; Kentucky, 8.2; Missouri, 8.3; Delaware, 13.3; and Maryland, 15.6. The total electoral vote in those States is 261. Needed to win the White House, 269. In 1948 it was the announced purpose of the States' Rights Party with Strom Thurmond as its presidential candidate to secure enough electoral votes to throw the election into the House of Representatives where each State would have only one vote. Thurmond received 39 electoral votes and almost succeeded because the loss by President Harry Truman of 16,807 votes in Illinois and 3,555 in Ohio would have resulted in the President being elected in the House. There the voice of the South would carry more political weight than the scattered Negro votes out-

side the South. Two Presidents have been chosen by elections in the House of Representatives. They were Thomas Jefferson in 1800 and John Quincy Adams in 1824.

As our present-day political parties, the Democratic and Republican, were founded by Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, respectively, let us direct our attention to their attitude concerning our pressing problem. Thomas Jefferson was the author of our immortal Declaration of Independence. He was our third President. He favored freedom for Negroes, but he also favored deportation and colonization. He had much to say in regard to the race problem. In one instance he said:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably and in such slow degree as that the evil will wear off insensibly, and their place filled up by white laborers."

In his fourth joint debate with Douglas, Abraham Lincoln thus spoke in September 1858, the 50th year of his life:

"I will say then, that I am not, nor have I ever been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people, and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality, and inasmuch as they cannot so live, there must be a position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

In that same debate he said, "I will add one further word, which is this: that I do not understand that there is any place where an alteration of the social and political relations of the Negro and the white man can be made except in the State legislature—not in the Congress of the United States."

As President he received a delegation of approximately 500 free Negroes at the White House in Washington on August 14, 1862. After preliminaries were over President Lincoln explained that money had been put at his disposal by Congress for the purpose of colonizing people of African descent, a cause he had long favored. Then he said:

"You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races. Whether it be right or wrong I need not discuss; but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think."

"Your race suffered very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it affords a reason, at least why we should be separated."

"Even when you cease to be slaves, you are far removed from being placed on an equality with white people. On this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated best, and the ban is still on you. I cannot alter it if I would. . . . See your present condition, the country engaged in war, our white people cutting one another's throats, and then consider what we know to be true. But for your race among us there would be no war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other. It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated."

It has been 96 years since President Lincoln thus expressed himself. Perhaps we should clearly and frankly examine our atti-

tude today in the South. Our position is clear. The basis of our civilization is the vitality of our culture. It has been preserved by our unwritten law.

The sending of troops to Little Rock was only the beginning of what the South is to face in the months ahead. The chief counsel for the NAACP, Thurgood Marshall, was reported in the Arkansas Democrat on October 3, 1957, to have told an overflow audience of 2,000 at a Negro church:

"We've got the other side licked, its just a matter of time. The period of peace and quiet has passed. Whichever State continues to defy the law will have to answer in court. We will finish the fight * * * and not for one moment deviate from our tactics and our goal." And he said that the goal is the elimination of every form of segregation in every form of life in every part of the country.

In our deliberations here we must enact measures which will present a law-abiding stand for the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of Arkansas. Let no one tell you that the Supreme Court of the United States can amend the Constitution of the United States. Only the States can amend the Constitution. We hear much of late concerning the supreme law of the land. What is it? Article VI of the Constitution tells us. It is often urged that it is what the Supreme Court says it is. That is far from the truth. It would be true if article VI read, "The Constitution as interpreted, modified, and revised by decrees of the Supreme Court, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof," etc., "shall be the supreme law of the land." But there is no reference to the Supreme Court in article VI and, of course, the words as interpreted, modified, and revised by the decrees of the Supreme Court do not appear therein. There is much evidence indicating that even those strongest advocates of an all-powerful Supreme Court are becoming concerned as more and more citizens realize that decisions of the Supreme Court are not the supreme law of the land. The Associated Press, under a New York dateline of last December 12, reported Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, as saying that a constitutional amendment is needed to settle once and for all that the Supreme Court has the final say on the constitutionality of any law. And, he was quoted as saying, "The Constitution does not now specifically vest the Supreme Court with authority as a final tribunal to declare an act of Congress or a law of a State to be contrary to the United States Constitution, but tradition, historical acceptance, and the continuity of the Court decisions for over 150 years have confirmed this authority."

Every citizen must speak out. Jefferson lighted the path for the Democrats, and Lincoln did the same for the Republicans. The power of the Supreme Court must be curbed, Congress must act, the States must act, and recent decisions must be reversed. The 1954 decision is insignificant in comparison with other recent ones. Among many new concepts adopted by the Court are the views that a witness need not answer even though he knows where an atomic time bomb is hidden which may blow up an entire city; that persons may preach openly the forcible overthrow of our State and Federal Government; that the various States may not punish those who would overthrow the Government by force; that permit confessed rapists and other criminals to go scot free on technicalities; and that restrict the power of Congress itself to get information needed for legislative purposes. Curbing the Supreme Court should become the business of all 49 States. Both Jefferson and Lincoln often spoke out against the Supreme Court of the United States. They both favored law and order as we well know, but they well realized that a reckless Su-

preme Court could pervert the Constitution and destroy our Republic.

They said the exact opposite of what the six judges of the Eighth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals said in their majority opinion delivered in St. Louis on August 18, 1958, in implying that "popular opposition" to Supreme Court rulings could be made the basis for Court injunctions. In effect this is in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States for it would end free speech and free assembly once a Federal court order was put into effect on an issue in public controversy.

Certainly we should recall what Abraham Lincoln said 100 years ago with reference to the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court. It is important to remember that the Dred Scott decision established the false idea that the Court could hold anything unconstitutional for any reason suitable to the Court, whether warranted by the express words of the Constitution or not. Using as authority Chief Justice Marshall's assertion that the Court had a right to declare a law unconstitutional, the Court went far beyond anything dreamed of by Marshall. From the Dred Scott decision sprang the notion, still prevalent, that the Supreme Court is the highest of the three branches of Government, although the Constitution established the three branches as coordinate and equal. Presumptuous and extravagantly despotic, the Court proclaimed, in effect, not only supremacy over the two other branches of Government, but superiority over the will of the people. In magnanimous language the Court announced that questions of "peace and harmony of the country required a settlement of them by judicial decision." It was this case, then, that really made of the Supreme Court a superlegislature without responsibility—one above the constitutionally elected legislature of the people. About this decision of the Supreme Court President Lincoln said:

"If this important decision . . . had been before the Court more than once, and had there been affirmed and reaffirmed through a course of years, it then might be, perhaps would be, factious, nay, even revolutionary, not to acquiesce in it as a precedent."

"But when, as is true, we find it wanting in all these claims to the public confidence, it is not resistance, it is not factious, it is not even disrespectful, to treat it as not having quite yet established a settled doctrine for the country."

Thomas Jefferson on one occasion had this to say:

"It has long, however, been my opinion, and I have never shrunk from its expression . . . that the germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the constitution of the Federal judiciary; and irresponsible for impeachment is scarcely a scarecrow—working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the Government of all be consolidated into one."

"To this I am opposed; because when all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government or another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

Recently, on October 3, 1957, the Honorable Stanley F. Reed of Kentucky, a retired Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, who participated in the 1954 decision, made a speech before the State Bar of California. In that speech he quoted the view expressed by President Andrew Jackson in a message to Congress on July 10, 1832. President Jackson said:

"The authority of the Supreme Court must not, therefore, be permitted to control the Congress or the executive when acting in their legislative capacities, but to have only such influence as the force of their reasoning may deserve."

It is not only the South that is alarmed over today's Supreme Court. Almost 2 years ago, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Arizona made a speech in Phoenix before the Hiram Club. He declared that the present Court (and I quote him) "is a greater danger to our democratic form of Government and American way of life than any forces aligned against us outside our boundaries." And in regard to the 1954 decision, he said:

"Regardless of what we as individuals may think about the justice or injustice of segregation, I here assert without hesitation or reservation that the decision was not based upon logic or law."

"I further charge that the processes followed in reaching the decision's conclusion violate all procedures of due process known to American jurisprudence."

In 1957, a special committee, the committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions, was appointed by the National Conference of Chief Justices. This special committee submitted its conclusions in a resolution submitted to the Conference of Chief Justices in Pasadena, Calif. On August 23, 1958, by a vote of 36 to 8, with 2 members abstaining and 4 not present, the resolution was adopted. Therein on 12 occasions they pinpoint the 14th amendment and in one instance gently but pointedly stated:

"We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly somewhat less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court would, or should, have the almost unlimited policymaking powers which it now exercises."

At another place in the report one could not fail to read with alarm the following:

"It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast."

The special committee that was headed by Chief Judge Frederick W. Brune of the Maryland Court of Appeals, included top judges from seven Northern States and three Southern

States. Although our own Chief Justice Carlton Harris was not present at the conference he was quoted by the Associated Press on October 5, 1958, as having said that the resolution cogently expressed his sentiments. The Gazette Press Service under a Pasadena, Calif., dateline reported that the resolution accused the Supreme Court of making hasty, impatient, decisions without proper judicial restraint and acting as a policymaker.

The crisis existing in the Commonwealth of Virginia as well as the situation confronting us of Arkansas and the rest of the Nation has mainly resulted from the 1954 decision which has attempted to change the long-respected interpretation of the 14th amendment. Yet, that amendment was never constitutionally ratified. In fact, it was not even constitutionally submitted by the Congress to the States. Let us turn back the pages of history. After the death of President Lincoln, President Andrew Johnson pledged to carry out the policies of his predecessor. Two months before the end of the War Between the States Congress passed the 13th amendment and at the close of the war it was being considered by the various States. Following Lincoln's plan, white loyal governments were organized in the South. Certain conditions were required of the defeated Confederacy. They were met and all the newly elected legislatures ratified the 13th amendment. Thus, in the summer of 1865 the Southern States were formally and officially counted back in the Union. Yet in December of the same year the duly elected Representatives and Senators from the Southern States were not admitted to their seats in the 39th Congress. They were blocked by Thaddeus Stevens, a Congressman from Pennsylvania. So, with the 39th Congress unconstitutionally excluding the Representatives and Senators, Congress did not on June 16, 1866, by sufficient valid votes submit the 14th amendment to the various State legislatures for ratification. Even the language of the article V of the Constitution of the United States that governs the method of amending the Constitution clearly sets forth "that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The 14th amendment was promptly rejected and ratification failed. Let us examine the vote of the legislatures of the Southern States at that time. The following States rejected the 14th amendment as hereinafter indicated:

Rejection

	House	Senate	Date
Texas	70 to 5	21 to 1	Oct. 13, 1866
Georgia	147 to 2	38 to 0	Nov. 9, 1866
Florida	49 to 0	20 to 0	Dec. 3, 1866
Alabama	66 to 8	28 to 3	Dec. 7, 1866
North Carolina	93 to 10	45 to 1	Dec. 13, 1866
Arkansas	68 to 2	24 to 1	Dec. 17, 1866
South Carolina	95 to 1	Rejected	Dec. 20, 1866
Virginia	74 to 1	27 to 0	Jan. 9, 1867
Mississippi	88 to 0	do	Jan. 25, 1867
Louisiana	Unanimous	Unanimous	Feb. 5, 1867

Tennessee had ratified the amendment in July of 1866, although public sentiment in the State was against ratification. Outside the South, six States also failed to ratify the amendment. They were New Jersey, Ohio, Kentucky, California, Delaware, and Maryland. Since there were then 37 States in the Union, 28 were necessary for ratification. Only 21 had responded favorably. Oregon withdrew its ratification before adoption was proclaimed. Failure of the amendment to be ratified infuriated Thaddeus Stevens and his followers. They decided they would force the South to ratify the 14th amendment so they passed in the Congress a Federal law that abolished all the Southern State governments and placed the

South under military rule. President Johnson vetoed the act, but in March of 1867 they passed it over his veto containing the provision that no Southern States could be readmitted to the Union until the 14th amendment had been ratified. The South was divided into five military districts with a general in command of each.

During this period of military control designed to force the Southern States to ratify the 14th amendment, a newspaper editor in Mississippi named McCardle exercising his freedom of the press guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, wrote strong protesting editorials. He was arrested by Federal troops and held for trial before a Federal military

commission. The Supreme Court had theretofore held that the military did not have jurisdiction to try civilians if the civil courts were available. The military ignored that decision, so upon being denied a writ of habeas corpus by the lower Federal court he appealed to the Supreme Court. After the case had been argued before the Supreme Court and a decision was awaited, what do you suppose happened? The Congress quickly passed a law depriving the Supreme Court of jurisdictions in such appeals. Although President Johnson vetoed the law it was passed over his veto and the Supreme Court then held that the Congress had the power to withdraw the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court at any time. So, you see another example of how the Constitution of the United States was disregarded in order that the 14th amendment could be forced into the Constitution.

It was the duty of each commanding general to provide for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention. Large numbers of illiterate Negroes sat in all the conventions which were mainly controlled by the carpetbaggers and scalawags to adopt new State constitutions and govern the State elections. Nothing Hitler or Stalin ever did in conducting elections in Germany or Russia was any worse than what then happened in the South. The Negroes were brought into the Republican Party. Terror reigned over the South. There was really no law. Few southern white people were permitted to vote. The voting and the counting of the ballots was a farce. Negroes, carpetbaggers and scalawags were swept into office under the banner of the Republican Party.

We are here assembled in the 62d general assembly, but it was the 17th general assembly that is recorded as ratifying the 14th amendment for Arkansas. There never was any 17th general assembly. Mr. Spenger, the records should be corrected. The so-called members of the so-called 17th general assembly were never elected, nor were they legally appointed or selected. Staples in his book, "Reconstruction in Arkansas," has reported:

"The voting took place not in or near the county concerned, but on the streets of Little Rock. It was charged that when it was deemed necessary to have a county represented, William Fishback would pick out some fellow to represent it, let him vote, certify the election, and let the member take his seat in the legislature. A member of the legislature claiming to represent Hempstead County died, and his successor was seated before the man was scarcely buried. Nixon, the representative-elect from Franklin County, was killed while on his way to Little Rock; and in a day or two before an order for an election could have reached the county, a distance of more than 100 miles from the capitol, a man appeared and took his seat as representative from Franklin County."

I hold in my hand photostatic copies of the four pages comprising the Weekly Arkansas Gazette dated April 7, 1868. It reports firsthand how those who called themselves the elected representatives of the people, with the aid of a locksmith, gained entrance to the capitol building, prepared it for their legislative session, and how they went about voting to ratify the 14th amendment by the unanimous vote of 56 to 0 in the house and 23 to 0 in the senate. On the front page of this paper this is written:

"Were the people of Arkansas free citizens of the Republic, enjoying the rights and privileges sought to be guaranteed to all under the National Constitution, if civil law were recognized and the fundamental law framed by the people held sacred, then we would not be compelled to witness with humiliation the overthrow of our State government and the setting up of the rule of a

few conspirators of bad character backed by a horde of ignorant black dupes.

"The instrument under which they claim to be a legislature, has been rejected by the people by a large majority."

Is there any wonder that the legislatures then ratified the 14th amendment? Here is the ratification by States:

	House	Senate	Date
Arkansas.....	56 to 0.....	23 to 0.....	Apr. 6, 1868
Florida.....	23 to 6.....	10 to 3.....	June 8, 1868
North Carolina.....	82 to 19.....	34 to 2.....	July 2, 1868
South Carolina.....	108 to 12.....	23 to 5.....	July 9, 1868
Louisiana.....	Ratified.....	22 to 11.....	Do.
Alabama.....	94 to 3.....	33 to 0.....	July 13, 1868
Georgia.....	89 to 71.....	Ratified.....	July 21, 1868
Virginia.....	126 to 6.....	34 to 4.....	Oct. 7, 1869
Mississippi.....	87 to 6.....	23 to 2.....	Jan. 7, 1870
Texas.....	Ratified.....	Ratified.....	Feb. 18, 1870

Even when Secretary of State Seward by official proclamation dated July 28, 1868, declared the 14th amendment ratified he did so with reservations. If ratification by all of the southern States be counted, and there were Virginia, Mississippi, and Texas recorded as ratifying after adoption was declared, there is strong evidence that even the unconstitutional ratification failed by one State. Let all American citizens ponder and forever remember these two facts: First, not a single member in any State legislature of the United States, North or South, who belonged to the Democratic Party, voted for ratification of the 14th amendment; and second, in every State legislature, North or South, where the Democrats outnumbered the Republicans the 14th amendment was rejected. In the bitterness of defeat the South offered no further contest. It was to remain helpless under military occupation and rule for 10 years. Nevertheless, the issue was raised but the Supreme Court said the action was political, not justiciable. As recently as 1939 the Supreme Court again indicated that it would not look into the political departments of the Government. Involved was the question of whether a State legislature that had once rejected an amendment could later ratify it. The Court's refusal was based on the fact that the Secretary of State alone is authorized to make the determination. Yet, the right of a State, by action of its legislature, to change its mind at any time before the proclamation of adoption is issued by the Secretary of State has been confirmed in connection with other constitutional amendments.

Following the unconstitutional adoption of the 14th amendment the illegally elected Representatives and Senators were seated in Congress. Thaddeus Stevens and his Republican colleagues were gleeful for it seemed to them that they had indeed achieved a brilliant coup and that with their control of the Negroes the Republican Party would always remain the dominant party of the South. It is because of what happened during this tragic era that even today many among us refuse to vote for any candidate of the Republican Party. Finally, under the coordinated efforts of resourceful and capable southern leaders, the South held the balance of power in the presidential election of 1876, and Rutherford B. Hayes, a Republican, was elected. President Hayes withdrew the last Federal troops from the South in 1878. But the sordid story of these tragic years which was worse than the 4 years of war has been handed down from generation to generation so that even today the Republican Party receives little consideration in the Southern States.

Already racial conflicts are spreading throughout the United States. It could well be, if no solution is forthcoming within the next few years, that Congressmen from Northern and Western States will appeal in the Congress to their southern colleagues for

assistance and votes in order that they may solve their own racial problems.

From Washington, D.C., came the report in the fall of 1958 that its integrated public school system contained 78 percent Negro children. In 1930 the percentage of Negro children was only 27.1 but it is now predicted that by the fall term of 1961 the percentage will be 90. That is only 2 years away. And, in December it was reported that public school officials in the District of Columbia are faced with a staggering problem of babies born to unmarried schoolgirls under 16 years old and increasing venereal infection of schoolboys and girls through the age of 17. There were 896 reported cases of the disease for the 12-month period ending June 30, 1958.

We will soon be preparing to act upon the measures which have been submitted for our consideration. Beyond the passage or defeat of these proposals we, and everyone, should be hopeful of a constitutional solution. Today I submit to you and to the Nation, a solution. The solution hereinafter proposed is, in my opinion, constitutional. Violence and chaos cannot be permitted. The Constitution of the United States must be upheld. We must all be law-abiding citizens.

The history of the adoption of the 14th amendment has been reviewed. Fortunately the Constitution of the United States provides that any citizen may petition the Congress or the legislatures of the various States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States. My proposal is a proposal that should appeal to all citizens, whether from North or South, sense of fair play and justice. It will afford citizens of every State an opportunity to take a stand for the Constitution, for compliance with the constitutional processes, and for upholding the law—the supreme law of the land, if you please. Let me now read the proposal to you.

1. The chairmen of the standing committees of the Congress of the United States shall each, within 30 days of the ratification of this article as an amendment, appoint one member to a Commission to be known as Commission on the Constitutionality of the 14th Amendment, not withholding other provisions of the Constitution vesting appointive power in the executive branch of the Government.

2. No person shall be appointed who shall have not obtained the age of 45 years and been 30 years a citizen of the United States and for 20 consecutive years been engaged in the general practice of law.

3. Within 60 days of said appointment the said Commission shall begin hearings to determine the constitutionality of the deprivation of equal suffrage in the Senate of the 39th Congress, the submission, and ratification of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prior to the date of December 31, 1870.

4. Within 18 months of said appointments a formal written report of the findings of said Commission shall be filed with the Secretary of State of the United States and copies thereof made public.

5. Upon the filing of a finding that there was an unconstitutional deprivation of equal suffrage in said Senate, or said submission, or ratification then said amendment shall after 30 days become null and void, unless within 30 days a national referendum be called as provided herein.

6. Within 30 days of the filing of said findings the Secretary of State shall upon the application of the legislatures of five States call for a nationwide referendum to be conducted on the first Tuesday following a period of 120 days from the filing of the findings in accordance with the laws of the various States. There shall appear on the ballot only "Approve Commission finding" and "Disapprove Commission finding." Should the Commission finding disclose an unconstitutional action in either of the three instances then upon a majority vote of

all those voting in the 49 States to "Approve Commission finding" said amendment shall become null and void. Should the Commission finding not disclose an unconstitutional action in either of the three instances then upon a majority vote of all those voting in the 49 States to "Disapprove Commission finding" said amendment shall become null and void. The result of said election shall be final, decisions of the Supreme Court notwithstanding.

7. The Congress shall promptly provide adequate compensation for members of said Commission, its staff and all other expenses.

It has been suggested that a nonprofit association be formed for the purpose of explaining and circulating this proposed amendment so that it might be proposed and passed in at least the necessary two-thirds of the legislatures of the 49 States. Congress would then have to call a Convention for the consideration of the proposed amendment.

The fathers of many of us here today survived those tragic years, and the story of those dark and horrible days of Reconstruction are known to all of us. We are all aware of the complex problems we face. Because life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness was denied the people of the South during reconstruction there has been kept alive within all of us the frightening knowledge of what disaster would befall the United States should strife and turmoil within our country contribute to the weakening of our defenses against enemies of our Republic.

In closing, I say we must dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the United States of America. Our Republic was founded upon a deep and abiding faith in God. May our labors and efforts in these trying days be blessed by divine guidance so that the Stars and Stripes shall forever wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave and that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness shall never vanish from this wonderful country of ours, the United States of America.

How Many Latin Americans Have Died Under U.S. Guns?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Galarza, Ph. D., former Director of Labor and Economic Affairs for Latin America of the Pan American Union, which appeared in the *Gazette and Daily*, of York, Pa., on January 27, 1959:

A GREAT BETRAYAL: AMERICA'S COUNTERFEIT DEMOCRACY

(By Ernest Galarza, Ph. D.)

WASHINGTON.—It seems to me that recent protestations by the State Department to the effect that it had not been sympathetic with the Batista government of Cuba require some critical examination.

It recently was quoted widely as declaring that it had objected repeatedly to what it called the Batista government's misuse of military aid provided for the defense of the Western Hemisphere as a whole. It also pointed out that arms shipments were halted last spring.

Yet Batista's record as an unscrupulous political buccaneer has been public knowledge for 20 years. The terror that he has

maintained in Cuba since he last seized power was enforced with U.S. military equipment and in the presence of a U.S. military mission.

Was the American Ambassador finally moved to compassion last spring when our arms shipments stopped? I believe that the real reasons for this change have still to be made clear to the American people.

The truth that starkly faces the Cuban people is that our diplomatic and military agents in Cuba, representing the awful might of our country, coexisted comfortably with Batista's terror.

The importance of this fact comes into focus when one realizes that the people of Cuba are not alone. Throughout Latin America the coexistence of our democratic piety with insolent, bloody military dictatorship has been exhibited.

Our arms, mostly obsolete for military operations against a great power, are still modern enough to shoot down civilians in the streets, the factories, and the jails. They have gone to Odra in Peru, Somoza in Nicaragua, Perez Jimenez in Venezuela, and Trujillo in Santo Domingo, to mention only a few.

Surely State Department representatives arguing now on behalf of our democratic government will not plead that the Department did not know what was going on. I, for one, cannot believe that such massive ignorance is possible with diplomats. But if it is possible, then those who permitted so much damage from such vast incompetence ought to get out.

I say damage in many contexts. Who can compile the roster of those who have been murdered, tortured, and maimed in the last 10 years in the jails of Santiago de Cuba, Havana, Bogota, Caracas, Lima, Buenos Aires, Cuidad Trujillo, and Managua? Are they hundreds, thousands, or tens of thousands who, since Pearl Harbor, have been summarily executed in Latin America, without trial or appeal, because they disagreed with dictators we had armed?

How many trade-union leaders have disappeared without trace for trying to do what 50,000 union representatives do every day in the United States? How wide and deep is the damage done by the system of indentured labor to which the Governments of the United States and Mexico, acting through their diplomatic agents, have agreed by consigning half a million Mexican workers every year to the corporation farms of our country?

There are many Latin Americans who love the United States and its democratic promise with a passionate devotion. I am one of them. But many of the men who have been officially the stewards of our relations with Latin America have undermined that promise.

And the gap between many of these officials and Latin America widens into suspicion, bewilderment, and finally hatred. Our expected democracy has frequently been counterfeited in this process.

I have had the opportunity to observe at close quarters this counterfeiting process at work—and with increasing nausea. During World War II, when the issue between democracy and totalitarianism was at deadly heat, we mobilized the support of Latin America to our cause.

This mobilization was economic, military, and moral. A new agency was created in our Government for the specific purpose—the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. And never before or since have we done so much to stir in the minds of the Latin American people so burning a desire for the American democratic promise.

But, even as the war progressed, our arms were used to destroy trade unions, suppress civil liberties, and crush constitutional government. And these means were justified to

the end of maintaining war production to defend democracy.

Hostilities ended; and not long afterward our ally General Penaranda, of Bolivia, massacred the tin miners of Catavi with his regiments and our arms. We rewarded the general with an honorary degree from Columbia University—an ingenious public relations touch suggested by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Penaranda was an illiterate professional militarist.

In the Senate's forthcoming investigation of our relations with Latin America, I hope we shall pick up the thread of our wartime commitments. I think we shall find that we have acted as though World War II gave American business an insider's chance to "move in."

Militarily, we have continued selling arms to dictators who didn't mind our moving in as long as they could collect fortunes in tribute and loot. Morally, we have abandoned democracy to dubious battle with those we armed with money, prestige, and guns.

I do not think it is possible to condone the wave of counter-terror which is now sweeping Cuba, because it is never possible to condone terror. To challenge terror, to discredit it morally, to shackle it, and finally to destroy its threats to individual and political fulfillment, has been the great historic task of democracy. We may, therefore, rightfully call upon Castro to put an end to the wholesale killings now taking place in Cuba. We may ask him to use the power he now has to bring a new Cuba into life, rather than bring the old one to its death.

But in asking this, we must face ourselves as well as Castro. We must admit that when Castro asks us where we were in not protesting when Batista's Tigers killed systematically—and for pay—he is raising legitimate questions. For what Castro asks, and through him all of Latin America asks, is this:

Are we opposed to terror only when people, out of a closed and furious despair, rise and kill their tormentors? Is there an acceptable kind of terror, when it is practiced by political henchmen of ours such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Perez Jimenez?

Or are we opposed to terror anywhere and everywhere? And, if so, are we willing to join hands at last with those who have suffered from terror, and who only want, as we have promised them, our sympathy, our understanding, and our active material and moral support to establish the democracy that challenges, shackles, and finally destroys terror?

Behind the blind passion of the momentary terror in Cuba, there are, I believe, demands of the human spirit that have been mutilated and betrayed. I believe that with the Cuban people, as with many other people of Latin America, these are just demands.

Unless we begin to help the democratic aspirations of these people instead of continuing to hinder, we shall end by losing their trust and friendship completely—and we shall deserve it.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Texas School Arouses Envy of Observers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, nearly everyone talks about the need to improve our educational system. But the citizens of San Angelo, Tex., are doing something about it. In fact, they were doing something about it long before the launching of the first Soviet satellite dramatized our problems.

In the fall of 1955, school officials in San Angelo set about to establish a bold, new program for grade-school education. These early efforts are now producing gratifying results, as an Associated Press article, published in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of February 8, points out.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS SCHOOL AROUSES ENVY OF OBSERVERS—PROGRAM IS RADICALLY DIFFERENT

SAN ANGELO, TEX., February 7.—Word is getting around that this west Texas city has come up with something radically different in public school programs.

Even the most violent critics of American education are impressed by the curriculum. School people come to take a look at the physical layout, and walk away talking to themselves in envy.

As the word spreads, the mail pours in: "How did you do it?"

The school authorities here do it by letting their imaginations run wild, then taking infinite pains with the details. They keep the best of the old, and try the most promising of the new—and all the time they work toward just one goal: The best possible education for every child, regardless of his capabilities.

LEARN MORE AND MORE

This approach has touched off a chain reaction in San Angelo. As the pupils learn more in the lower grades, the courses in the upper grades must be beefed up to hold their interest.

Consider, for instance, the limited teaching of science in the elementary grades.

In the fall of 1955, Robert H. Mayfield, curriculum project director, set about to find a new approach to make a grade school science program effective.

For 2 years Mayfield and his assistant, a physics teacher, Claude C. Wooley, studied the problem. They held long conferences with the teachers of grades one through six, then called in junior high teachers to insure continuity of the program.

COVER SIX AREAS

It was first decided to cover six major areas of science in each of the first six grades. These are nature (biology, zoology),

the universe (astronomy, space meteorology), the earth (geology), simple machines (levers, inclined planes, wheels, and pulleys), electricity and magnetism (door bells and compasses), and heat, light, and sound.

Few grade school teachers could handle such a program. It was necessary to teach the teachers how to teach science.

This was taken up in a series of teachers' handbooks which outline just what scientific concepts are attainable by the pupils in each grade.

Next came the mobile library-laboratory units. Each unit is in the form of a desk and is designed especially to deal with one of the six major study areas listed above.

HOW PROGRAM WORKS

The program was ready to go in the fall of 1957. This is the way it works:

At least once each week, a mobile unit is wheeled into every grade-school classroom in San Angelo. The teacher, from her handbook, has decided what experiment she can conduct to illustrate best the day's lesson.

A card file in the desk shows her just where to find each item of equipment needed. Another card file shows her how to carry out the experiment, the observations to be made, and the conclusions to be reached. A third card file lists suggestions for the pupils, outlining separate projects they can tackle on their own; and pegged to their levels of achievement.

SIX UNITS ROTATE

A complete set of six units, covering all six of the major areas of studies, is assigned to a group of six buildings. Each 6 weeks the units are interchanged within the buildings. Thus while the pupils in one school are studying simple machines, those in another school are studying electricity and magnetism.

The libraries which are part of the mobile units are not pegged to any one reading level.

START NEW COURSE

Mayfield estimates each unit has an original cost of \$600 and the annual cost of maintenance and improvement is about \$125. Since one unit serves six buildings during a year, that \$600 provides each school with about \$3,600 worth of equipment.

Last year the new science program was in effect only in grades one through six. This year a new course was started for the seventh grade, introducing science of measurement, elementary astronomy, botany and chemistry, functional anatomy, and heat, light, and sound.

That same course is also being taught to this year's eighth graders. Since the seventh graders are getting it this year, a new course must be ready for them when they start the eighth grade next year.

This system, while it obviously improves the teaching of science, has some built-in work-makers. It seems likely that the whole science curriculum, from first grade through high school, must be overhauled.

BOOST ALL ALONG LINE

"By the time kids have 8 years of science as we are teaching it," says Mayfield, "they're going to be too far advanced for what is now ninth-grade science. We're going to have to boost this thing up all along the line."

This comment bears out what Superintendent George B. Wadzeck says about the San Angelo system: "In 15 years, the kids

with the IQs of 75 (well below average) are going to be learning as much as the average student is today."

Mayfield emphasizes, however, there is no desire to produce a high school graduating class composed strictly of budding scientists.

"This is a science exposure program," he says. "We want to expose the student to science the same way he is exposed to measles. Just like the measles, it won't take on all of them."

WARY OF NEW IDEAS

The grade school science program is just an illustration. Every course of study in the San Angelo schools is being developed in the same way—and it isn't easy.

Teachers with many years' experience are sometimes loath to adopt new ideas. Students who have their hearts set on being engineers, although they can't add 2 and 2, don't like being told they can't take physics because their math grades aren't high enough.

Address by Hon. Alan Bible, of Nevada, Before the Almas Temple Shrine Club, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] made a very interesting speech before the Almas Temple Shrine Club in Washington, D.C. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, ALMAS TEMPLE SHRINE CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 13, 1959

Fellow nobles, I deem it a real pleasure and a distinct honor to be afforded the opportunity of speaking to the Almas Temple Shrine Luncheon Club today—and, before going any further, I bring you the warmest expressions of goodwill from Kerak Temple in Reno, Nev.

In a world that seems bent on devising means to bring about its own destruction, it is refreshing to participate today among men of good will, who espouse the high principles of peace and understanding.

Only this week I had the pleasure of reading the definition of a Mason and a Shriner—from no less an authority than George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America.

A Mason, he said, is a man who believes in God and practices that belief. A Mason is a man who believes in brotherly love and practices his belief. A Mason is a man who uses the symbols of the builder to set for himself and his brethren a code of life which refines his thoughts, purifies his sympathy, and broadens his outlook, it amplifies his

friendship, exalts his morality, and tames his passions.

Mr. Stringfellow described a Shriner as a Mason who realizes the work of his craft—exemplifying the high code of morality—requires refreshment. In obtaining that refreshment, Shriners adopted the code, 59 years ago, of pleasure without intemperance, hospitality without rudeness, and jollity without coarseness.

We live today in a world of tensions. The ever-quicken tempo of our times would seem to exclude anything but the mad rush for material gains, yet I have detected in frequent trips through our land a spiritual reawakening and a rebirth of tolerance that give ample evidence of a brighter future. Surely the great work of the Shrine in behalf of crippled children—regardless of race, color, or creed—epitomizes to the fullest extent the fact that charity is not a forgotten virtue.

As Americans we must summon all of our collective strength to meet the challenges posed by Soviet Russia and its ill-disguised efforts to gain world domination. But in this life-and-death race for survival, we must not for one instant lose sight of our dependence upon divine providence for spiritual guidance and the constant realization that "man does not live by bread alone."

Unquestionably, these are times that demand the utmost cooperation and effort of all citizens toward making our country stronger in a material sense. Equally important, in my opinion, is the need for even greater effort to utilize more fully our vast resources of the spirit. Only by so doing can we demonstrably prove to all the world that strength really does come from unity.

Although most of you here today are familiar with the event, I am sure you will not mind if I recall the valiant epic of the four chaplains who, with arms linked, perished with their ship in the North Atlantic in World War II, after giving their own life preservers to others.

I read this magnificent story in a book called "Sea of Glory," by Francis Beauchesne Thornton. The four chaplains were George Lansing Fox and Clark V. Poling, Protestant ministers; Father John P. Washington, a Catholic priest, and Alexander D. Goode, a Jewish rabbi.

The chaplains and their unit were en route to Greenland early in 1943—in the terrible days of German submarine supremacy, when the U-boats unmercifully menaced our shipping lanes and made that particular run a thing of danger and terror.

Their ship was a lumbering old freighter, capable of 10 knots at best. Precisely at 1 a.m. of a February morning, the cold Atlantic silence was broken by a shattering explosion as a German torpedo found its mark amidships. As Mr. Thornton described it: "Everywhere about the ship in the terror-ridden interior and on the crazily tilted deck, the four chaplains moved among the men with helpful words, giving some the strength to live and some the courage to die."

When pandemonium was at its height, when it became apparent that the ship would soon sink, those chaplains gave their life preservers to other men and made the heroic decision to stay with the ship. As the author states: "Catholic, Jew, and Protestant each proved that night that courage knows no distinction of creed, bravery no division of caste."

Here we see exemplified the highest type of courage and self-sacrifice. There are other kinds of courage, too, and I refer particularly to the courage to live. While we feel that the present age confronts us with problems of almost staggering proportions,

we should remember that every generation in our history has had problems—and we have always had men of courage who would rise to the challenge.

Yesterday we observed the 150th anniversary of the birth of such a man. If any person had cause on many occasions to despair and throw in the sponge, it was Abraham Lincoln. His political career was a succession of set-backs. He was defeated for the legislature, he was defeated twice for Congress and twice for the Senate, and he was defeated for nomination as Vice President in 1856. His election to the Presidency in 1860 thrust upon him a burden that was almost insupportable, yet his faith propelled him through the darkest hour in our country's history. Lincoln firmly believed that God had entrusted him with a mission, and in this knowledge he gained the strength that sustained both him and the Nation for which he labored. Lincoln had his watchword. It was stated simply, "With God's help, I shall not fail."

This is a creed all of us could well adopt today, not as a mere utterance but as something to put into practice in our daily lives. As Masons we should strive all the more to translate our precepts into our everyday living—to fight bigotry and intolerance wherever we find it, to inculcate into our youth the importance of fair play, to broaden our horizons beyond our own little circumscribed areas; in short, to give proof that we are alert to our responsibilities as citizens of the greatest country on earth.

In this respect, the great poet, Edwin Markham, wrote:

"We are all blind, until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man.
Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilds goes;
In vain we build the work, unless
The builder also grows."

If we are to move forward and maintain our place as leaders of the free world, if we are to leave a legacy of strength and determination for our children—indeed, if we are to survive at all in an age of potential destruction—we must shoulder today's burdens and responsibilities—willingly, resolutely, and courageously.

Fortunately, the great majority of Americans are turning more toward the truths of religion which spell out a code of conduct that can only lead to a stronger country and happier citizens. A look at Russia makes the contrast all the more startling. There we have the sordid spectacle of an ideology which demands that personal honor and integrity be subjugated to the state—not only in the field of government, but in art, literature, science, medicine, and all lines of endeavor.

We in America are bountifully blessed with the resources needed to keep our defenses strong. To complement this pool of resources, I believe we should all draw more upon that even greater reservoir of the spirit that has abounded in our country since its founding more than 180 years ago.

As Masons committed unequivocally to upholding freedom and justice, not only in America but throughout the world wherever tyranny rears its head, we should be leading the way in man's constant battle for human betterment. We should be more than lodge members. We should be articulate spokesmen in a world that sorely needs a voice of hope—and courage—and truth. To fulfill the obligations of our order we can do no less—to fulfill our responsibilities as Americans we must do more.

Television Booster Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under privilege to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a news report by Mr. Frank W. Vaille, an able reporter for the Associated Press for the West, which appeared in the Wenatchee Daily World, Wenatchee, Wash., recently. This article concerns the problems we are having in attempting to protect the rights of people in remote areas, particularly in the mountains, where deep canyons prohibit the reception of direct radio TV impulses:

HORAN, MAGNUSON SEEK TV SOLUTION

Two Washington Congressmen are soliciting views of other western Members on a proposed bill to solve the knotty problem of television booster stations.

The bipartisan move has been undertaken by Representatives DON MAGNUSON, Democrat, and WALT HORAN, Republican, in the wake of continued opposition by the Federal Communications Commission to booster station operations.

The Commission Tuesday extended until June 30 its deadline for operators of VHF (very high frequency) boosters to convert to UHF (ultra high frequency) translators. Boosters and translators are TV systems that serve small isolated areas.

The Magnuson-Horan proposal would create within the Commission a community television bureau to study technical and financial problems faced by small communities in obtaining TV service.

All applications for UHF translators or any other facilities which may be authorized for operation in the future would be referred to the bureau for study and recommendation.

As used in the bill, the term "small community" is defined to be one with fewer than 25,000 inhabitants.

The bill takes no position as to whether the Commission should or should not license the VHF boosters it now frowns upon. It does say, however, that should the Commission decide to license such operations, it will waive for stations in existence prior to 1959 the present requirement that construction licenses be obtained before construction is started.

One theory behind the new approach is that the present controversy between the Commission and operators of booster stations, mainly in the West, result in part from a lack of understanding by both sides as to the problems faced by the other.

Through creation of the bureau, it is felt, both sides will obtain a better understanding of the problems and come to an acceptable decision.

I would also like to include the following article which appeared in the Wenatchee Daily World newspaper describing just how much it would cost the people in my State to convert from VHF boosters to UHF translators:

COMPLETE UHF CHANGE WOULD COST \$11 MILLION

PATEROS.—The Washington State Television Reflector Association estimated today

that it would cost \$11 million to convert all the reflectors and home sets in the State to UHF.

Francis Adams, president, said this cost included converting community transmitting antennas from VHF to UHF and converting individual sets and home antennas.

Adams said the association was urging citizens to write their Congressman in protest against the costly changeover being demanded by the Federal Communications Commission.

"Let Congressmen know we can't afford it," he urged.

Along with these news reports, I would like to include a brief résumé of the problem which now faces those of us in Congress, the Federal Communications Commission as well as those I want to continue to have the privilege and benefits of television.

One of the primary purposes of the Federal Communications Commission is to provide good, as well as economical television reception for the people of America. In my congressional district, however, hundreds of TV screens, operated by means of VHF booster stations, were dimmed recently by an FCC decision.

As I have indicated, the topographical terrain in my State is wide and varied—from the flat, rolling plains of the wheat country to the rugged mountains in the entire northern and western portions.

When television first came into being years ago, almost everyone became interested. Nearly every family acquired a television set. Three television stations began operations in Spokane and have been providing good TV ever since.

But, some of our people, living in the valleys and canyons or in small isolated communities, found that their sets simply could not get the picture. As a result, they began looking for ways to bring the signal into their homes.

The first solution was found in community antenna television operations. A private organization simply brought the TV signal into the sets of their subscribers via the cable. The picture was satisfactory and the cost, in localities where there were enough patrons, was not too prohibitive. But, in the small, isolated communities—maybe 20 or 30 families—the CATV system was ineffective simply because there were not enough subscribers to make it economical and practical for the companies.

Thus, other solutions were sought. I believe the next method employed was the UHF translators. These facilities picked up a signal and retransmitted it on the ultra high frequency band. There were two basic objections to the UHF translators, however. The cost made it impossible to put them to practical use in the small communities. Besides this, they had never been tested in the rugged mountainous areas.

Finally, another method was found in the VHF boosters. These boosters were similar to the translator operations except they operated on a different band of the television spectrum. The boosters were relatively inexpensive and they provided a good picture even in the rugged hills. Folks in my district cooperated in erecting their booster stations. They pooled their money, their

work, and their ingenuity and put up their towers. Then they watched television.

The Federal Communications Commission, however, announced that these boosters could not be licensed because they were causing interference and they could not find a way of regulating their operations. They recommended that UHF translators be substituted. The people protested this action and as a result, the FCC allowed the boosters to remain in operation until a complete investigation was accomplished. This survey was made although I do not believe it was complete. UHF translators were not put to practical test in the mountains; no consideration was given to the economic impact on the small, rural, or isolated communities and it was never proven that all VHF boosters caused interference. As a result of their investigation, the FCC declared the boosters to be illegal operations and ruled that they be discontinued. Ninety days were allowed for the booster districts to file an intention of conversion to UHF translators or to shut down. To many people, this was a cruel blow. Many protests were received, once again, from both the television viewers and from the Members of Congress. The FCC then extended their 3-month conversion period to 6 months.

I wish to make it clear that the FCC is faced with a terrific task in trying to solve this problem. But, the problem is not solved by any means. This situation does not exist only in my district, but in many sections of the country. Recently, I, along with several colleagues in the House and Senate, introduced a resolution which states that it is the sense of Congress that the FCC should authorize the operation of VHF booster facilities where it is a matter of public convenience and necessity and where such operation does not actually cause objectionable interference. I am hopeful that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will see fit to call for an on-the-spot investigation to be made into this situation to determine if they actually cause interference and, also, if UHF translators will work.

Perhaps this problem could be solved if all the facts were considered. In my opinion, this problem could and should have been prevented. In order that future, similar situations do not arise, I have introduced a bill which would establish a Community Television Bureau in the Federal Communications Commission. This Bureau would study the technical and financial problems involved in bringing television service to the residents of small communities and rural and isolated areas. They would also consult with and advise small communities on such problems. I feel that this would help to establish a good relationship between the viewers and the Federal Communications Commission and would enable them to settle their problems on a mutual basis.

I do hope that my colleagues will lend their full support to these measures in an effort to provide all of the people of our country with satisfactory television.

What Are Missiles For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "What Are Missiles For?" which appeared in the February 6 edition of the Washington Post.

I found it to be a very challenging commentary on the status of our missile program and the importance of keeping abreast in the arms race. The editorial points out quite correctly that only with an adequate defense program can we hope to negotiate realistically with the Communist bloc in an attempt to reduce the dangers of a hot war.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHAT ARE MISSILES FOR?

What is the fundamental purpose of the American missile and defense program? In the immediate sense the purpose, of course, is to deter attack upon the United States and its allies—or, if worst comes to worst, to destroy the warmaking capability of the enemy. But in the larger sense, surely, the purpose of this country's defense efforts is to make possible realistic negotiations with the Soviet Union and Communist bloc to remove some of the causes of friction and reduce the danger of nuclear annihilation.

Such negotiations in a mutual interest, if they are practicable at all, probably must proceed from a basis of rough parity of military power. Fruitful negotiations proved impossible when the Russians were in a position of military inferiority; every device of Soviet diplomacy and propaganda was directed toward frustrating the sort of discussion in which the Soviet Union might be at a disadvantage.

The opposite side of the coin is that if the Russians were in a position of military superiority, the United States and its allies themselves would be at a disadvantage in seeking beneficial negotiations on arms control and some useful accommodation on German and European security. We have already witnessed the attempts of the Soviet leaders to throw their weight around in the wake of their success with the intercontinental missile. Their boasts do not necessarily connote an intention to provoke a war, but obviously the Russians are not going to make significant concessions if they think that they can frighten the West into accepting their asking price.

The meaning of all this, in terms of the present argument over the missile program, is that what the administration says and does now can have a great influence on the Soviet attitude toward negotiations. Lamentably, the impact of most of the official statements so far has been to weaken the bargaining position of the West.

Secretary McElroy has acknowledged that it is administration policy to accept a numerical inferiority in intercontinental missiles over the next few years, on the stated assumption that other weapons and means of delivery will keep a balance. The real explanation, evidently, is the effort to maintain a fictitious budget balance. Such arguments conspicuously omit comparisons of Soviet

and American intermediate missiles as well as this country's neglected limited war capability.

Admittedly the present liquid-fuel missiles such as Atlas are primitive and cumbersome when contrasted with the more sophisticated types under development. Conceivably the administration's hope is to overcome any numerical inferiority quickly when such solid-fuel missiles as Minuteman and Polaris become available. But there is no guarantee that some new budget drive will not limit an effort to regain parity. Overly futuristic planning, moreover, ignores the effects of inferiority over the next several years.

More recently Mr. McElroy has shifted ground to make it appear as if the United States will nearly equal the Soviet Union in intercontinental missiles this year. This approach both misleads the public and begs the question, for it conceals a calculated decision to accept numerical inferiority in the not-distant future. It is very unlikely that the Russians are deceived by such a maneuver; indeed, some of their recent intransigence at Geneva and elsewhere may reflect an awareness of American intentions. The real victims are the American people who have not been told the straight facts about the country's defense position.

It is therefore quite understandable that many Members of Congress, including some of the administration's staunchest Republican supporters, are seriously worried by the missile numbers game and by their inability to get frank information. Senator CLIFFORD CASE made the point in his comment on the assurances by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee about the testimony of General Twining, himself under restraints: "How much better . . . if the public generally knew the grounds for his confidence—and the grounds for the apprehension for the future that he also expressed."

Inasmuch as judgments are involved, it is very difficult to obtain a single flat version of objective truth in the missile muddle. But one thing that congressional leaders who are disturbed by the lack of candor can do is to question more pointedly the responsible military officers concerned and to insist that the administration gag rule be cast aside. Another thing they can do is ask to see the intelligence estimates upon which administration policy is based and to make their own evaluation. Intelligence is an inexact science, but there is a long record in the administration of distorting the meaning of available intelligence under a gloss of optimism.

The most basic responsibility, however, is that of the administration—to its own constituents, the American people, and to the cause of world peace. One would have thought that the ghastly miscalculation in advance of the first Soviet sputnik would have placed the administration on guard against the disastrous psychological impact of American inferiority. The net effect of the present refusal to state and face the facts could well be to undermine the chance of real negotiations and, apart from the danger of inviting Soviet adventurism, to blight the hope of a secure peace.

NEA Not Serving Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in this age of specialization, education has

come to be one of the most crucial issues of our time. Not all who work in this field are contributing to the best interests of our Nation. The able editor of the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., has pointed this out most realistically in an editorial entitled "NEA Not Serving Education," published on February 15, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEA NOT SERVING EDUCATION

Among the thousands of special interest groups lobbying in Washington, none is more active than the National Education Association.

The association supports a sizable staff which, in addition to buttonholing Congressmen, grinds out an endless stream of news releases, handsomely printed and costly brochures, motion pictures, and other propaganda material.

All this is designed to persuade all who will look or listen that the country is doomed unless the Federal Government undertakes a massive aid-to-education program immediately.

At best, much of this stuff is wasteful. Occasionally, it is downright deceptive.

An example arrived at our desk the other day. It was a brochure entitled "Can America Afford Better Schools," and an accompanying news release summarizing the pamphlet. Both exhibit the same characteristics of slanted, misleading statements, distortions, and deliberate omissions.

Both are patently designed to prove that local and State efforts can never—no never—be sufficient to support a decent school system, and that the only possible alternative is Federal aid to education.

As an example of how this point is dragged in through the back door is the following statement:

"Right now, the Federal Government with its efficient, streamlined collection system brings in almost 3 out of every 4 tax dollars."

Nowhere does the association argue the point that the Federal tax system is efficient or streamlined. It merely states that it is, and then goes on to use the statement to bolster another point.

Of course the Federal Government's tax system is neither efficient nor streamlined. It is archaic, unjust, wasteful, discriminatory and staggeringly complicated as every Collector of Internal Revenue within recent memory has publicly testified and as every Member of Congress will admit.

It is part of the National Education Association's creed, however, that nothing the Federal Government does can possibly be wrong, and nothing State and local governments do can possibly be right, and so the facts are abandoned.

Unless the Federal Government assumes a reasonable share of school costs, the association's most recent publication asserts several communities, none of whom are identified, face some really hair-raising tax increases. Of course, it never occurs to the pundits of NEA that these increases might be averted if the Federal Government would decrease some of its taxes and allow that money to go instead to State and local treasuries.

This serves also to illustrate another of the association's blind spots. School costs are bound to go up, it declares, and if local and State agencies remain the chief support of schools, then local taxes are going to increase, which is bad.

But won't Federal taxes go up, too, if the Federal Government attempts to meet those costs? And isn't that just as bad? Not, apparently, to the National Education Association.

This is the basis for all the liberal, free-spending arguments. Government money—that is, Federal Government money—is as free as the air; it comes from nowhere, at no cost, and it can be spent and spent and spent.

The fact is that, as has been proven time and again, the more efficient way to both collect and disburse tax moneys is at the local level. This avoids the hidden costs of bureaucratic proliferation, unsupervised projects of dubious value, and mistakes of judgment due to lack of familiarity with local problems.

This newspaper firmly believes that a greater effort, financially and otherwise, is due our schools. We have urged, and will continue to urge, that school patrons in Greenville County support the increased local taxes so vitally needed for the future of our children.

If that effort is made, we are confident that our schools can perform the tasks they should, the National Education Association to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is little short of tragic that the association should dissipate its efforts, not to mention the dues of its well-meaning members, in belittling local support of the Nation's schools. In so doing, it is not serving the best interests of education.

The fact is that State and local governments can and should meet their own educational needs, and they can do it better and more cheaply than it could be done under any program administered by a vast new Federal bureaucracy.

Greenville County, and the State of South Carolina are a case in point.

Considering the many handicaps under which we have labored, the long war period when no schools could be built and the rapid increase in the school population, we have done well up to now. We need to do more, of course, and we presently face something of an emergency which has been gradually building up.

But we can meet the emergency; we believe we will do it; and we believe further that we will go on to meet the needs as they develop in the future.

A week from Tuesday the voters of the Greenville County School District will express their views on a proposed local bond issue to supplement State funds for the building program. It is a crucial vote, and it might have a bearing on whether we continue to manage our own schools and educate our children in our own way, or gradually turn them over to the Federal Government with heaven knows what results.

In the interest of presenting all the facts, News Reporter Gil Rowland, who is a former teacher, has made an intensive study of the schools and has a background of years of reporting news of education, has prepared a nine-part series on our present school situation.

To those who express an interest in education and who say they have not been fully informed, we commend this series of stories, which starts today. Anyone who reads them and thinks about them and, if he desires, checks behind them at the source, will be prepared to cast an intelligent vote on February 24.

Getting Along Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been intensely

interested in all efforts that our country can make to present America to those who live elsewhere, in the best possible light. My experience as a soldier in foreign lands in World War II underlined for me the need for building friendships among the peoples of other lands, preferably friendships based upon personal contacts and mutual understanding and respect. I can remember very well that as we left New Guinea and approached the Philippine Islands early in 1945, we were given by the Army simple, understandable and interesting reading material to orient us and to allow us to be more truly friends of the people we were to meet and assist in their efforts for freedom. Despite all the good work our Diplomatic Corps may be able to do toward establishing good relationships with people in foreign countries, they could never make anywhere near the impact that is made by numerous Americans traveling abroad.

In the first Congress in which I served—the 81st—I wrote to the Department of State and urged that a program of this nature be established within the Department of State. I suggested printed material, moving pictures aboard tourist liners, and other devices. Through the years that have followed, I have persistently interested myself in this and I am glad to record that both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations made very significant steps forward in this field.

There have been two substantial difficulties in this. One is that there has been a feeling in the Department of State that the Government of the United States should not be the chief source of such activity, and the other difficulty has been the obvious one of trying to evade lecturing people on what they should do. The two difficulties are interlocked. I have never had much sympathy with those who feel that the Federal Government should not be active in this field. Characteristic of the Department's position through the years is the following statement from an August 5, 1950, letter to me from the Department of State:

It is definitely felt that the Department should not put itself in the position of trying to tell private individuals how to behave when traveling abroad.

Similarly I heard from the Department of State on March 4, 1953, as follows:

It has been found from experience that participation by non-government organizations and groups in this type of venture is of great psychological benefit and eliminates the element of "propagandizing" the American public.

I am glad to see that this reluctance on the part of the Department of State has been giving way to a more realistic appreciation of the urgency of the matter and to the needs of the security of our country. Although there has not been a complete abandonment of the early reluctance by the Department, there has been a gradually increasing emphasis on what can be done in this field. The person-to-person program now underway is outstanding, although still not doing all that it should do.

I am happy to include at this point in the Record an excellent publication published by the Department of State this month entitled "Getting Along Abroad." This is largely the result of the dedicated public service of Miss Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office of the Department of State. The publication reads as follows:

GETTING ALONG ABROAD

The passport of the United States is a valued credential. It requests that in the countries you intend to visit there be provided you, as an American citizen, safe passage, lawful aid, and protection in case of need. As the holder of this passport, you will be the guest of our neighbors and friends in the world family of nations.

Year after year increasing numbers of our citizens travel to foreign countries. In most of these lands there exists a reservoir of good will for the United States, but in some areas our country and its aspirations are less well understood. To all the varied peoples of these many countries, the bearer of an American passport represents the United States of America.

Most Americans know that they will get better results and enjoyment from their travels abroad if they conduct themselves with the same restraint, understanding, and good manners they would expect from visitors at home. Most Americans who travel abroad are aware that their conduct as guests in a foreign country can have an important bearing on the good will of other nations toward the United States. Consequently they try to understand and appreciate the economic problems, customs, restrictions, and regulations of the lands they visit.

Many citizens also try to learn something about the countries they intend to visit before they get there. In that way they are better able to appreciate the contributions of those countries to the world's culture. They seek to respect the local laws and try to avoid inadvertent acts or misinterpretations which could be embarrassing. They familiarize themselves with local customs, such as the manner in which people dress in churches, restaurants, theaters, and other public places. In short, they show abroad the same consideration for others that they do at home and, consequently, they are our most effective and welcome ambassadors of good will.

As you travel abroad, the respect you show for foreign laws and customs, your courteous regard for other ways of life, and your speech and manner help to mold the reputation of our country. Thus you represent us all in bringing assurance to the people you meet that the United States is a friendly nation, dedicated to the search for world peace and to the promotion of the well-being and security of the community of nations.

Also from the Department of State is the following publication entitled "Do's and Don'ts Information and Travel Tips." This 1959 publication is also the product of Miss Knight and her fine staff and it reads as follows:

"DO'S AND DON'TS INFORMATION AND TRAVEL TIPS"

LOST PASSPORTS

Every year the Passport Office spends considerable time and effort in tracing lost passports, issuing limited passports to citizens who lose or misplace them, and warning citizens against altering or mutilating their passports. Travelers are cautioned to protect their passports from loss, mutilation, or misuse.

DO'S AND DON'TS FOR EVERY TRAVELER

Safeguarding passports, checking their validity, and acquiring visas are the responsibilities

of passport bearers. This is true in all countries in the world. As a potential traveler, the following information is brought to your attention. Observance of these suggestions may save you embarrassment, delay, expense, or difficulty with officials of foreign governments.

Do sign your passport as indicated on page 2 of the passport. It is not valid unless it is signed by the bearer.

Do fill in the information required on the inside front cover. In case of accident, or other circumstance, it may be necessary to contact designated agent or next of kin.

Do register it if you must mail it.

Do keep it safe. Your passport is a valuable document. Its loss or disappearance can cause you considerable delay and expense.

Do notify the Passport Office, Washington, D.C., if your passport is lost or stolen; or, if abroad, notify the nearest American consul.

Do check the validity of your passport before you travel. If in doubt, consult the Passport Office or the nearest American consul.

Do check the visa requirements of the countries you plan to visit. This is your responsibility.

Don't lend your passport for use by a friend or stranger. Remember that it is an official Government document for use only by the person or persons to whom it is issued.

Don't use your passport as collateral or pledge.

Don't alter, insert, or overwrite any information or entry in the passport. If a change is necessary, it must be made officially by authorized Government agents.

Don't tamper with the passport picture. Insist on getting a good one and then accept it as part of your official identification.

Don't use the passport as a notebook, scrapbook, or autograph book.

Don't pack it in your luggage. When traveling, keep it readily available but safe.

Don't tear or substitute pages in your passport.

Death of Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Rilea, Commandant of Oregon National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of Oregon's outstanding soldiers and military leaders, Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Rilea, died recently in our State at the age of 63. Mrs. Neuberger and I knew him well, because as adjutant general of the Oregon National Guard, he had many contacts with our State legislature and with the Federal Government. He was typically a product of our State, and I can remember visiting his pioneer parents in the remote hamlet of Agness, far up the canyons of the beautiful Rogue River.

The Oregon Daily Statesman of Salem of February 5, 1959, paid a merited and deserved editorial tribute to the late General Rilea under the title of "All His Life a Soldier." Because the editorial so appropriately epitomizes this illustrious son of Oregon and leader of our National Guard, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL HIS LIFE A SOLDIER

All his life from age 18 on Tom Rilea was a soldier, and a good soldier. He enlisted in the Oregon National Guard in 1914, and remained a member of the guard until his death Tuesday at age 63, save for the periods when the guard was summoned into Federal service. For him that was three times, first when he served as bugler for his regiment when it stood guard on the Mexican border in 1916, next in the First World War when he rose from rank of regimental sergeant to captain, and third in the Second World War when he was assistant commander and for a time acting commander of the 41st Division in whose training he had played an important part. After field service in the action in New Guinea he was called back to Australia to administer the great supply base at Sydney. He returned home under physical disability which required his hospitalization for a time. On discharge from Federal service in December 1946 he assumed the office of adjutant general to which he had been appointed in 1941 to succeed the late Maj. Gen. George A. White. Named brigadier general in 1931 at age 35 he was advanced to major general in the National Guard in 1948.

General Rilea was devoted to the Army and to the guard. Under his leadership the Oregon National Guard has rated high. He insisted on high standards of performance and gave due recognition to achievement. High military honors have been his; and now in death he merits the high commendation of the people of Oregon for service well performed.

Reds Map Your Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, by Louis Francis Budenz, entitled "Reds Map Your Death." The article appeared in the February 7 issue of the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader.

Although the article is sobering reading, it is vital reading for all of us, because it gives further evidence of the constant plotting and planning by the Soviet Union for the destruction and enslavement of this country. Certainly, for all who can and will read, there is clear and ample warning of the Soviet blueprint which plots for us economic strangulation as a substitute for military destruction. We must gear ourselves immediately for as effective a defense against this economic warfare as we have geared ourselves for in the case of defense against military aggression.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS MAP YOUR DEATH

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

Long before the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union convened in Moscow last week, advance Red acclamations for its projected proposals ringed the globe. The Communists everywhere beheld

in this congress the promise of big things, and above all, the ability to get America to dig its own grave.

Every outstanding occurrence in the "motherland of the toilers" occasions expressions of devotion to Soviet Russia among the comrades everywhere. This is strikingly the case with the party congresses of the mother party, because at these congresses the dictator of the world's Reds tells his followers in all lands how they are to think and what they are to do.

When the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States hailed the congress from afar, in special greetings to the party of the Soviet Union, that was not surprising. When it proclaimed the congress itself to be a momentous event, that was also to be expected. And it was to be noted that the American Reds concentrated on the glories of the 7-year plan which Khrushchev had brought forward and which was to be approved at the congress.

The plan was effusively saluted as a guarantee of peace and peaceful coexistence, in the fact that it would bring about a stimulus to the growing number of exchanges and visits, such as that recently made by Mikoyan.

Most significantly, these greetings of the American party omitted any reference to the boasted purpose of the plan, to outstrip the United States in production by 1965 or 1970. The corollary of that end was also omitted, namely, the eventual achievement of communism and therefore the necessity for world Soviet dictatorship and the obliteration of the United States as a nation.

Without doubt, this omission was intentionally carried through, so that the party here could not be accused of plotting with Moscow to degrade the United States, which is precisely what is being done.

The party leaders here had certainly read and digested the preview of the congress appearing in the December issue of International Affairs and entitled "Great Vistas." There we read that it is evident from Khrushchev's advance theses that the 21st congress will make a decisive contribution to the victory of the new Communist system over the old, capitalist order. It is proclaimed to be a milestone along the path under which "the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union is bringing this happy time, the era of communism, nearer to our day."

And so we learn further from International Affairs: "The theses of Khrushchev's report (released for study in advance of the congress) show that the Soviet Union has entered a new phase—the phase of the large-scale building of a Communist society—in its transition from socialism to communism."

And thus, the comrades are fired with the frenzied notion that the promise of Marx and Engels—that "an earthly paradise" would come into being as a result of the Soviet dictatorship—is coming true.

But every comrade knows that this Communist society, which constitutes the "earthly paradise," cannot be achieved in full until the world Soviet dictatorship is first established. And thus it is that when Khrushchev envisages such an upsurge as will relegate to the second place "all capitalist countries, and chiefly the United States and then looks forward to communism," he is calling the Reds everywhere to a worldwide crusade for the sabotaging and subjugation of all opponents of the socialist system.

It is most singular that the omission registered by the Communist Party here of any mention of this oncoming communism, so that the party cannot be accused of planning our ruin, finds its reflection in a similar omission of this promise in the general press of the Nation. As often as such incidents have occurred in the past this latest is a startling one, as it fails to let the American people know that the whole scheme of "cultural exchanges," Mikoyan visits, and other

such peaceful enterprises open the door for widespread industrial and political espionage intended for our destruction."

This open pledge by the 21st Red congress to effect our demise by strangulation appears in other features of Khrushchev's report, which has also been omitted from the general press. With these we shall deal later. For the moment the intrigues of the 21st congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union furnish a warning to us that if we wish to save ourselves we must immediately insist that Washington end all relations with the Soviet world.

Huntington, W. Va., Is Lauded by Senator Randolph as All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, each year 11 U.S. cities are selected by a jury of distinguished citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League to receive awards presented under the joint sponsorship of the league and Look magazine for outstanding action in bringing about civic improvements.

West Virginians were happy when one of their cities—Huntington, the county seat of Cabell County, situated on the Ohio River—was honored with a place on the 1958 All America City team.

It seems timely to mention that Clarksburg, W. Va., was so recognized in a previous year.

Presentation of the award was made at appropriate ceremonies in the city of Huntington the evening of February 10, 1959. It was my privilege to have accepted an invitation to participate in the program. Weather conditions prevented me from making the air trip from Washington. I had prepared comments for the event, copies of which were made available to the chairman of the award committee and presented to officials of the city of Huntington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, extracts from my salute to the officials and citizens of Huntington on the occasion of the celebration of the All America City Award which was so justly deserved.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT ISSUED BY U.S. SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH ON THE OCCASION OF THE HUNTINGTON, W. VA., ALL-AMERICA CITY AWARD CELEBRATION, FEBRUARY 10, 1959

The fine people of Huntington—officials and voters together—have given dramatic evidence of the continued vitality of democracy. Too frequently today we Americans, as private citizens, are inclined to respond to the problems that face us with complaints rather than constructive efforts. Too often the complaint is followed by the purely rhetorical question: "But what can the mere individual do?"

Yes, the people of Huntington have answered that question in unmistakable terms. They have shown with eloquent testimony the resources of the individual citizen when he or she joins others in a voluntary and co-operative venture. And, in so doing, they have translated the ideals of modern democracy into the realities of Huntington today.

Democracy means more than merely a way of electing one's representatives. It means more than the traditional 18th century regard for individual liberties.

Modern democracy means, first of all, the participation of the individual in public affairs. And, secondly, it means that public affairs encompass more than matters of Government policy alone. In a modern society the quality of democracy must permeate all of our cultural institutions; it cannot be restricted to elections and the matter of the ballot alone. This ideal condition of democracy the fine and faithful folk of Huntington have achieved in fact as well as in principle.

In Huntington's new schools, swimming pools, art gallery, and hospitals, as well as the new form of city government—in all of these, and more—it is clear that its people have, through citizen effort, defined the meaning of a democratic culture in the 20th century.

May the rest of West Virginia and the Nation read the lesson of the past 10 dynamic years in Huntington.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, numerous statements have been made recently commemorating the long struggle of the Ukrainian people for freedom. I have read with great interest the very fine address made by the Honorable Robert Gray, Secretary to the Cabinet, before the Ukrainian Congress Committee in Philadelphia on January 24. I believe it should receive wider notice and attention, and ask unanimous consent for the address to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT GRAY, SECRETARY TO THE CABINET, BEFORE THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE IN PHILADELPHIA, PA., JANUARY 24, 1959

I hope I can express fully to you my pleasure at being with you tonight and the honor I feel in being associated with this meeting of free men and women, assembled in rededication to the sacred cause of liberty.

This anniversary which stirs the hearts of freemen everywhere has its background in history a hundred years ago when Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian people's greatest poet, pleaded for human liberation. Based on a rich historical heritage which had developed during the preceding 11 decades in spite of repressive Russian rule, this occasion tonight was then born.

A great deal has happened to the world of freemen in the century that has passed. In our own country, it was less than 100 years ago that Abraham Lincoln was first elected

to the Presidency. At that time, 31 million Americans were America, and ahead of them lay a struggle which would challenge not only our survival as a nation, but democracy's survival as an instrument of government for freedom-loving people. Today America is the fortress of freedom, not only for the 175 million citizens who proudly call themselves Americans, but for countless millions in lands other than our own.

What has brought the United States to her position of leadership among the nations championing freedom's cause? What has inspired this youth among the great powers of the world to take on with such missionary zeal the task of serving and relieving the oppressed peoples of the globe? To answer those questions, our natural inclination is to turn to our own fight for liberty and the heritage of the Pilgrim fathers and the spirit of 1776. But there are none alive today who heard the original toll of the Liberty Bell, and our compassion for those in freedom's fight might also be dead if it had not been rekindled by subsequent forces down through the years. The most powerful of these forces is the new blood which has been transfused into this Nation from every nationality on earth, bringing with it the traditions and the creeds and the colors and the religions and the artistic talents of the peoples all over the globe. And bringing with it, too, fresh awareness and compassion for the oppressed of the world's citizenry.

America's reputation as the melting pot of nationalities comes not from some shallow slogan which reads well in the international press, but has had no effect on us as a country. The numbers migrating to this country since our struggle for freedom have not been in token amounts but of flood proportions. Our records go back only to 1820, but from that year to the beginning of this one, over 41 million foreign nationals have migrated to our shores. This gives America the right to call herself the fortress of freedom. This is her badge of honor and this is her greatest point of pride.

If you have not done so, treat yourself to the opportunity of greeting an immigrant on the day his papers become final and as a citizen he takes the oath of allegiance to the United States for the first time. I guarantee you it will be a long time before you again take your citizenship for granted.

Perhaps the melting pot is a poor simile to use in describing the assimilation of these foreign nationals and their Americanization, for it implies that the wide variety of ingredients that go into the pot are completely uniform when they come out, and have lost all individuality and all identification with foreign lands. Thank God this is not so, for America would be a great loser if it were. What takes place in the Americanization of a new citizen is not a canceling out of old family ties and heritage backgrounds, but the superimposing of a first allegiance to the United States. There is no more fiercely patriotic group in our country than those who, through naturalization, have gained their citizenship the hard way—studying our history, becoming acquainted with our laws, and making declarations of loyalty and allegiance which many natural-born citizens have never been called upon to make. But these citizens have brought with them more than a burning loyalty to their new land. They have brought with them and have passed on to the natural-born citizens who are their sons and grandsons, the rich heritage of other lands and the knowledge of the oppressions, the hardships, and the struggles of other peoples.

I hope you begin to see how each of us in this room tonight is here identified. I am positive that the great majority of you have never been to the Ukraine. I am equally sure that the majority of you are natural-born Americans. You meet as Americans of

Ukrainian extraction, proud of your heritage and background and aware that your responsibility for keeping alive the hope of the oppressed peoples of the Ukraine, for working in their behalf, and in making America aware of their plight—aware that all this is among your patriotic duties as American citizens.

May I tell you the greatest truth I have learned in 3 years in Washington? As a citizen of Nebraska, I used to indulge myself in that favorite American pastime—that luxury of life in a democracy—grousing about my government. I would say "Why don't they do this or that," or "They ought to"—they, they. But I have learned a big truth in my days in the Capital and it is this: In a democracy, we—you and I and our fellow Americans—we are the "they" in government. Our Government will serve us well only if we serve it well. It will be intelligent and well informed only if we are. It will have a conscience only if we do. This is why I urge every individual to take a more active, intelligent, patriotic part in government. We must keep interested and informed in the affairs of our Nation and we must keep our Nation interested and informed in the affairs of the world.

To this end, your efforts in keeping your Government aware of the plight of the Ukrainians is good citizenship of the highest order.

Absorbed into the Soviet Communist bloc following a series of invasions and bloody battles in 1919 and 1920, the people of the Ukraine today are forced to work for the aggrandizement of the Soviet Communist State. Long known as the breadbasket of Europe, the Ukraine is now the breadbasket of Russia. She is producing 70 percent of Russia's sugar and a quarter of her grain. She provides Russia with half of her coal and half of her iron ore. Yes, Russia benefits greatly from the captive lands and peoples in her empire. But for her it must be a disquieting thought to realize that non-Russian peoples are the majority peoples of the Soviet Union. This is the weakest link in the Soviet plan for world conquest, and one of the great threats to Soviet imperialism today is the strong nationalist feeling in the Ukraine.

The people of the Ukraine became one of the first peoples to be subjugated by communism. Following this event, the world began to realize that in Communist expansionism, free peoples everywhere faced one of the worst types of aggressive imperialism. Communism is the grave enemy of freedom and national independence. Wherever it penetrates, it agitates, subverts, and destroys. The system itself is based on mechanistic conformity, both in terms of human beings and national groups. It turns men into cogs in the materialistic machine, thinking and acting under central dictatorship.

Thus the men in the Kremlin have been implementing the Marxist-Leninist blueprint for world conquest. The Soviet threat is as old as communism. Thirty-five years ago Lenin said, "First we will take Eastern Europe, next the masses of Asia, and finally we will encircle the last bastion of capitalism, the United States." This Lenin statement charts the strategy, and it has been like a polar star to the succession of rulers in the Kremlin. To Russia, world domination was and world domination is, the goal.

International communism seeks domination through the use of every conceivable weapon—propaganda, subversion, infiltration, offers of Trojan Horse economic assistance, and outright aggression. It uses these weapons singly or in various combinations.

America cannot stand alone in this kind of world. Since 1945 we have entered into collective security treaties with 42 other nations. This system of collective security with its massive defensive strength has

brought to a halt outright armed aggression and has given assurance to nations exposed to attack. With our allies we face aggressors in the world with this resolve: We believe that there is strength in guided motives as well as in guided missiles but we will make whatever sacrifices are necessary to back up those principles with the necessary manpower, material, missiles, and money.

We are in an age which holds great hopes and at the same time grave perils for mankind. In our nuclear world there is no acceptable alternative to persevering in our quest for a durable peace. But the peace we seek is a peace founded on justice, freedom, and economic and social progress—a true peace, based upon the eternal values which are the foundation of our enlightened civilization.

Freedom is the most precious of these eternal values. The whole political history of the human race is the unfolding of the never-ending fight for freedom, and as long as there are people in the world who are not free, that fight will go on. History, with its oft-repeated record, can give little satisfaction to the Russians, for it repeats this story over and over. No oppressed people has remained forever enslaved.

President Eisenhower has said, "All history testifies that the memory of freedom is not erased by the fear of guns, and the love of freedom is more enduring than the power of tyrants." Meanwhile, freedom-loving people everywhere owe it to the cause of liberty to continue to keep alive before the world's conscience the great injustice of the subjugation of some of the peoples of the earth. America must work to sustain the faith of the Ukraine and the faith of her people in the ideals of freedom. May God give his rich blessing on the cause for which you work and on you all. Thank you and goodnight.

Russian Actions Compared to Mikoyan Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Nashua Telegraph, one of New Hampshire's leading newspapers, on Thursday, February 10, 1959.

Editor Fred H. Dobens, editor of the Nashua Telegraph, an outstanding newspaperman and a fine American, points to the tape recording of how the Russians plotted to shoot down an unarmed U.S. transport plane as a justification for my disapproval of the red carpet treatment recently given to Mikoyan in this country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES RIGHT AGAIN

New Hampshire's Senator STYLES BRIDGES was almost alone among his colleagues, a few weeks ago, when he scored the red carpet treatment given Anastas Mikoyan, Russian leader, by U.S. businessmen. BRIDGES was called everything by some, principally for attempting to throw a roadblock

into possible peaceful U.S.-Russian relations.

The tape recorder incident, showing how Russians deliberately shot down a U.S. plane seems to indicate that they never will have good relations with us and that Senator BRIDGES has sized them up pretty well, all along for many years.

He says:

"On January 17, 1959, I rose on the floor of the U.S. Senate to deplore the red carpet treatment accorded Deputy Premier Mikoyan by some of our industrialists and Wall Street bankers. I also decried the action of some of my senatorial colleagues who had seen fit to honor and to lunch with Mikoyan under the very dome of the U.S. Capitol, that citadel of freedom and beacon light to the free world. I stood almost alone on the floor that day in upholding my position but I was not disturbed because I knew full well that it would eventually be justified.

"I yet did not realize how soon my stand would be vindicated. Today's shocking and incontrovertible revelation by our State Department should be proof enough to anyone that Soviet duplicity and ruthlessness are still the order of the day and that Mikoyan's visit was one more cheap Soviet ruse. My patriotic blood was never more stirred than when I heard the tape recording of the Russian duck shoot, over Armenia, of our unarmed transport plane. Feeling as I do myself, the feelings of the mothers, fathers, wives, children, and friends of our airmen must be indescribable.

"In my Senate speech, I noted that 6 bodies of the 17 men aboard had been returned to us and I called upon Mikoyan for an accounting of the other 11. Mikoyan was also questioned by our State Department. In the light of the disclosed evidence, Mikoyan's replies that 'the plane had crashed' and that 'the Soviet Government had given all the information it had' only reveals continuing Soviet perfidy of the highest order.

"I could only wish that all who feted Mikoyan and all who thought the Russians could now be trusted in negotiation should have continually dined in their ears the tape recording of this act of murder which was applauded by Soviet commanding officers and high officials."

Missions or Missiles—This World or the Moon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a sermon by the Rev. Clay Cooper, of Spokane, Wash. I think that Reverend Cooper has pointed out some things that are well worth our heeding.

The sermon follows:

MISSIONS OF MISSILES—THIS WORLD OR THE MOON?

(Sermon delivered by Rev. Clay Cooper on Horizons Unlimited, the missionary radio network of Vision, Inc., Spokane, Wash.)

"And Christ said unto them, 'Go ye into all the (this) world and preach the Gospel to every creature.'" (Mark 16:15.)

"The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's: but the earth hath He given to the children of men." (Psalms 115:16.)

There's a lot of talk about getting a man to the moon. Had you taken a pair of scissors and deleted everything from the morning press that had to do with moonshots, satellites, and communism you'd probably have had shredded newspaper for breakfast. In fact, getting to the moon all but monopolizes the imagination of tens of millions of Americans. The whole atmosphere is filled with "oh's and ah's" every time the next Russian Sputnik rockets into the sky.

With all this furor about getting a man to the moon, it had better be soon, or there will be a lot of disappointed scientists—and a lot of dissipated dollars. Everybody knows it's borrowed billions we're spending to get a man up there, but few seem to comprehend one grave danger in this wild, headlong scamper to keep pace with the Reds in their probes into outer space. We are so all-fired concerned that the Russians may beat us there we are actually stampeding into a crash spending program, seemingly unaware that we are about to satellite ourselves into bankruptcy.

This is a reminder that while striving for the moon, we could be losing the earth. And let us not be deceived, that's what the Communies want more than anything else. This world, the one right down here, every hemisphere of it—lock, stock, and pickle barrel. And we are falling for their "other world" diversionary tactics head over heels. And they are expert in the field. Remember how they focused our attention elsewhere while they were carving Korea? While we were parleying in Geneva, they were parcelling Vietnam. While our eyes were glued on Lebanon, they were chipping away at Matsu and Quemoy. While we were digging out from under the rubble there, they were opening the Berlin front. Now, they draw our attention to worlds above as a feint to decoy us away from this world below, the real focal point of their prime and ultimate objective. It's this world they want. They don't want the moon half so much. What would they do with it after they got it? Let people everywhere pray God to jar us from this trance, for that's what it is, a profound state of abstraction of mind and spirit which is causing us, like the children of Hamelin, to follow the siren notes of Red Pied Piperism. It is leading us, in this hypnotic state, off into oblivion by diverting our attention from the world to the moon.

For us to act suddenly and unconcernedly from some common panic-impulse or technological inferiority complex, and in a hasty, frightened manner, is exactly what the Russians are hoping we will do. If we can be stampeded, like a herd of cattle, into a race for the moon, this world is theirs. They are playing for high stakes, the world, this world, bear in mind . . . not the Moon or Mars. And unless we wise up to their strategy of diverting our attention away from their real pearl, it will wind up being another case of "while we were busy here and there, it was gone." If they can keep us engrossed with the moon, they'll have a lot less trouble engulfing the earth.

It's time we stopped chiding ourselves about Russia having attained the conquest of outer space. A misnomer, if there ever was one. "Penetration" is a far more suitable word, and penetration falls far short of conquest. And besides, if (I say if) the Moral Governor of this universe interprets this penetration as an intrusion on His preserve, His domain—as some hold—let us be glad the Russians have this questioned honor. Perhaps there was more of God in our failures than in their successes. Many conscientious people feel, most sincerely, that such aspirations are rank presumption

with a tinge of Tower of Babel added. They base their convictions on such verses in Holy Writ as, "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's; but the earth hath He given to the children of men." Psalm 115: 16.

Now, what is to be our attitude? A negation of the scientific achievements of the Kremlin's crowd? A minimization of the fact they are farther down the road than we are in certain fields of technology and the use of psychological weaponry? Shall we pooh-pooh their sputniks and asteroids? Keep our fingers crossed and hope we can catch up with them before they can absorb us, or annihilate us?

Laboring under the notion that whoever gets up there "fustest with the mostest" will decide the fate of the world, is to act under sheer delusion. News of a landing on the moon would leave two-thirds of the people of the world cold. What could landing a man on the moon possibly mean to a starving man in Morocco? News of the landing of the Son of God on this planet, one starlit night, would mean a lot more, and this is the news the majority of mankind is waiting to intelligently hear for the first time. Or, having heard, understand by witnessing in you and me the reality of the Transforming Truth "that makes men free." We need to keep in mind it's not something we shoot from earth up into the heavens, that is going to save the world. It is rather someone, who came down from heaven to earth. That was the pivotal point in history. Not the launching pad at Cape Canaveral, but the manger at Bethlehem, and the night the Saviour descended from the upper world (wherever it is), to grace this planet and bring personal salvation with the promise of the "life that now is, and that which is to come."

It is a source of amazement that so-called Christian nations are frantically competing with Communists in quest of the moon. Let the Reds reach unknown worlds first, if they will. We are to major on this one. This world is to be the world of our main concern, this world with all its known people and their known problems. Seeking to plant the Stars and Stripes on the pock-marked moon, when the blood stained banner of the cross has yet to be lifted over more than half of this terra firma, falling victim to a celestial megalomania, under the planned and announced prodding of the Reds, all oblivious to our terrestrial mission, could prove the fatal mistake.

We are not to get side-tracked. Nowhere is the Christian—individual, church or Nation—commissioned or commanded to go to some other world, but there are multiplied commands to go, or make it possible for others to go, with the transforming message, the blessings and provisions of Christianity "into all this world." We are to keep on the job of telling it (and living it), until it rings in the ear of every living man. It is our solemn responsibility to see to it that that message with all its wondrous significance is brought to him. Herein lies the very heart and core of the troubles of this crises-ridden age, our having not been enough mission-minded in the past. Now we are crowded into being missile-minded.

This, then, is the message every God-fearing nation needs to hear. Sending men and missiles to the moon, is not half so important as sending missionaries to Madagascar and Martinique. Why should we spend billions to learn if there are men on Mars, when we already know of millions of miserable men in Mexico and Mozambique? People who cry for our recognition of their poverty of body and spirit? People needing and deserving our attention? Pointing a needle-nosed Atlas or Jupiter, into the azure, is not nearly so convincing to a crippled Asian leper, or a syphilitic-blinded child in Africa, as the needle on the end of the syringe in the missionary doctor's hand. That needle

holds hope of a better world for him, something an orbiting satellite cannot do. And he represents about a billion and a half people in a similar or worse condition. The have-not nations of the world look to us expectantly, and we must beware lest we frustrate the purposes of providence in the race to space while neglecting the men at our gates.

I leave to the theologizer and politicians the moral and political issues involved in going to other worlds, but as the utter need and necessity of our "going into all the (this) world with the Gospel," in obedience to the command of Christ, there can be no argument. If we had our job all done, down here; if the great commission, as given by Christ, had now reached completion; if we had now successfully prosecuted the cause of world missions; if the world, this world, were now saturated with truth; if disciples had now been made of every kindred, tongue, tribe, and nation, that would be a horse of another color. But, the world predicament being what it is, if it's a toss between trillions for missiles and trides for missions, a man on the moon or a missionary on Madagascar, we must not hesitate to choose the better part. Not that this is an appeal to scrap every reasonable security measure. It is not. But it goes beyond keeping our powder dry and our fingers crossed. To keeping our knees bent.

Finally, this is an appeal to Christian nations to take care lest they be duped into majoring on missiles and minoring on missions, and wake up too late to realize that while they were looking at the moon, they lost the earth. Let Russia's sputniks encircle the sun, we'll keep our arms around this world. And if our own beloved Nation should go down, serving and saving humanity, obediently trying to fulfill the great commission, honoring and trusting God, then glory be. It's certain she'll go down if she doesn't.

Lessons of the Mikoyan Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Christopher Emmet entitled "Lessons of the Mikoyan Visit," which was published in the January 31 edition of America magazine.

I found the article to be a very informative résumé of the visit of the Soviet Deputy Premier as well as a forthright commentary on the lavish treatment accorded him on his recent visit to this country. I believe Mr. Emmet performs a distinct service by his forthright presentation of the facts surrounding the Mikoyan visit last month.

I was so impressed with Mr. Emmet's approach to this situation that I am using this means to bring it to the further attention of the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSONS OF THE MIKOYAN VISIT

(By Christopher Emmet)

It is universally conceded that the visit of Anastas Mikoyan, Deputy Premier of the

U.S.S.R. to our country has been a great public-relations success. Qualified observers like Edward R. Murrow and Harrison Salisbury go further and point out that it is also a political success for the Soviet Union. There has been almost no political reaction, except from refugees, or publicity to balance the skillful utterances of the deputy Soviet leader and the praise heaped upon him by his hosts, who include many of the leading industrialists of the country as well as Senators and leading State officials, notably the newly elected Governor of California.

A luncheon was also given for Mikoyan by James Carey, secretary of the United Electrical Workers, which was attended by Walter Reuther. However, George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, refused to attend because he would "not sit down with the representative of a nation under whose guns hundreds of working people die each day." Other notable dissenters from the chorus of praise were Congressman WALTER H. JUD of Minnesota, famous as a former medical missionary and authority on China; Al Hayes, president of the Machinists International Union; Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston; and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, all of whom condemned the fulsome receptions. Later the roster of critics received a notable addition in the person of former President Harry S. Truman in an article published by the North American Newspaper Alliance on January 19.

HATS OFF TO A BUTCHER

The critics do not oppose serious negotiations with the Soviet Union. What they do object to is fraternization with the spokesman of a bloody-handed dictatorship which is responsible for the torture and death of untold tens of millions, which holds 100 million East Europeans in bondage today, and which has placed a gun at our heads at this very moment by its ultimatum on Berlin.

It has been wrongly reported that Mr. Mikoyan had withdrawn the Soviet ultimatum. All he did was to refuse to call it an ultimatum. He did not change an item in the Soviet plan nor change the date on which it will be put into effect. Therefore, his call for counterproposals under the threat of the ultimatum amounts to blackmailing us into offering at least some new concessions. We cannot negotiate with the deputy Soviet leader in honor or on equal terms until that threat has been withdrawn. Still less is it a time to fraternize with him, overwhelm him with hospitality, and give him the impression that the American people are indifferent about Soviet crimes and aggressions, in which Mikoyan personally participated in Hungary.

What is happening is not negotiation. It is not even a dialog, where two sides are presented. It is a triumphal tour by Mikoyan, during which he is given a platform from which to cajole and deceive audiences of leading citizens throughout the country. Harrison Salisbury in the New York Times on January 10 reported: "Mr. Mikoyan's remarks won him a rousing ovation by an audience of over 300 of Chicago's most important lawyers." The following day he wrote: "The fact is that * * * he is having an impact on many leading Americans."

The customs of politeness and hospitality prevent his hosts on these occasions from stating the free world's point of view with any force or frankness, even if they were capable of it. And anyway, how many private American citizens are equipped to debate political questions with the No. 2 political leader of the Soviet Union? The audience is allowed to ask him questions, but considerations of courtesy censor the questions also.

How, for instance, can one politely ask Mr. Mikoyan why he participated in the betrayal of General Malet, who was captured while negotiating under a flag of truce in Hungary,

where Mikoyan handled the preliminary negotiations; or whether it is true that Mikoyan shot Beria in the back of the head, as Khrushchev told a delegation of visiting French Socialists? How can one politely say that the Soviet Government has violated a hundred treaties, promises, and agreements and, therefore, cannot be trusted? The results is that the American side of the debate automatically goes by default and the tour takes on the aspects of a Soviet political as well as personal triumph. That is why such discussions should be left to trained diplomats, whose function it is to negotiate for specific, limited and self-enforcing agreements.

Some who welcome Mr. Mikoyan's visit advance the argument that he will see with his own eyes America's immense economic strength. This is supposed to make him return to Russia resolved to sin on more. But why should anyone imagine that Mikoyan, for generations the leading economic administrator in the Soviet Union, underrates the power of America's economy? Mikoyan, who was in charge of the distribution of United States lend-lease to Russia during the war, should know better than anyone else the miraculous feats of American production and technology, which rushed vast quantities of desperately needed arms and materials to Russia across mountains and even over the submarine-infested Murmansk run. He certainly knows that those supplies saved the Soviet regime and his own job.

Mikoyan did not come here to look at America's economic strength but to look for America's political weakness. He wants to find how far the American people will continue to support the heavy risks and sacrifices needed to stand behind their allies in Berlin and elsewhere. If he finds no evidence of real resentment toward Soviet policies among the American elite whom he meets every night, why should he attempt to change them?

Mikoyan is asking us to trust his government at the very moment when it is proving itself once again to be unworthy of trust. Most of what Mikoyan says is an indirect appeal to American industrial leaders, and to all others who will listen, to repudiate the announced policy of our Government. He appeals for trust and the leading lawyers of Chicago applaud him, just after the President's state of the Union message reminded us that because the Soviet Union has broken innumerable agreements we cannot make new agreements unless they are self-enforcing.

But the visit is something more than a propaganda effort to butter up and soften up American public opinion. Mikoyan has another angle which may kill three birds with one stone. He hopes that his visit will deceive the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, including the Russians, about how Americans really feel. When Mr. Mikoyan met Secretary Dulles, the American photographers naturally took pictures of the two men. But Mikoyan's Russian photographers concentrated on getting shots of the American cameramen begging Mikoyan for just one more picture. These Soviet photographs, and others showing smiling receptions to Mikoyan, are being used in every newspaper, moving-picture house, and TV newscast behind the Iron Curtain to give the impression of Mikoyan's popularity in America, and thus discourage further resistance.

In the Nazi regime, Herman Goering occupied a position roughly parallel to that of Mikoyan in the U.S.S.R. Goering, too, played a great role in the economic organization of a totalitarian state. He, too, was more friendly and flexible with foreigners than the other Nazi leaders, and his joviality and flexibility were used to persuade the Federation of British Industries to make their infamous agreement with Goering on the eve of the Munich Conference. One of the arguments the British appeasers used to

justify these deals was that they would strengthen the peaceful elements in the Nazi government, supposedly represented by Goering. Mikoyan's apparent reasonableness is being used to fool Americans in the same manner today.

Another grim parallel suggests itself: Is it conceivable that American public opinion would have "stood still" for a similar triumphal visit to the country by Goering during the days of our cold war with Hitler before Pearl Harbor, or any time after the Munich Conference? And yet, before the attack on Poland in September 1939—in which Soviet Russia joined—the record of Nazi crimes and aggressions had been trivial compared to that of the Soviet Russia of today. Mikoyan has been the beneficiary of all those crimes, for he has not only survived but advanced with each new turn of Soviet politics. For instance, he negotiated and administered the economic agreements under the Hitler-Stalin pact which helped the Nazi war effort during the first 2 years of the war—and then distributed United States lend-lease.

THOSE WHO PROTEST

Because of all this we are grateful to the humble refugee pickets who alone have tried to remind the American people of the fundamental issues between the Soviets and ourselves. Although their methods of protest may not always be well chosen (who in conscience can blame them?), we believe their attitude is more representative of the way the average American really feels than that of Mr. Mikoyan's wealthy hosts.

Adlai Stevenson has appealed for an end to these hostile demonstrations on the ground that he and other leading American citizens were well received in the Soviet Union. Mr. Stevenson's analogy would be more apt if he, too, had participated in breaking treaties and betraying the freedom of small nations. Mr. Mikoyan has turned what was announced as a private, informal vacation into a triumphal state visit at the very time of the Berlin ultimatum. And what of the recent stoning of the American Embassy in Moscow with the connivance of Soviet police?

Nothing need be added to this editorial comment from the New York Mirror of January 13:

A sickening paragraph about Anastas I. Mikoyan comes under the byline of Harrison E. Salisbury in the New York Times:

"The outbursts [against Mikoyan] have begun to take on more and more the aspect in miniature of the disorders that attended Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's tour of South America last spring."

Rot. Demonstrations against Mikoyan are by people whose kin and friends were murdered in the Soviet rape of Hungary, a crime in which Mikoyan played a bloody, double-crossing role.

Whom did Nixon murder? The Communist rigged riots against him were directed at the United States for Communist purposes.

Mikoyan is entitled to formal courtesy and physical protection, no more. Any attempt to gloss over his brutal crimes is an insult to humanity and the ideal of human freedom.

Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful letter written by David K. E. Bruce, our Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, paying tribute to the life of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM DONOVAN—GENERAL'S QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP, VIVID PERSONALITY RECALLED

(The writer of the following letter is U.S. Ambassador to West Germany.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The news of Bill Donovan's death is a profound shock to all of his associates, friends, and acquaintances. It hardly seems possible that this ageless man, this almost elemental force of nature, has been removed from our immediate contact.

Wherever there was a stir, and especially whenever—all too frequently—trouble brewed, Donovan was there. He was an adventurer, in the best sense of the word, in the modern world.

Imagination and the quality of great leadership were his dominant characteristics. The word "impossible" was not in his lexicon. What man had done was only a springboard from which to vault into the unknown.

CAREER OF OSS

I was most closely familiar with him during more than 4 years' service in his Office of Strategic Services organization. There he was the inspirer of more than 30,000 people. All were fish in his net, tumbled together in what, organizationally, appeared to be chaos.

His mandate was almost unlimited in the field of clandestine activities. Nor did any chief ever as readily respond to such a challenge. Something had to knit together beings so disparate, recruited for tasks so indefinite. The polarization came from one individual—Donovan.

In the midst of the gravest preoccupations, with a task so comprehensive as, at times, to appall his subordinates, the general remained unruffled, calm to deal with the exigencies of worldwide covert operations; but able to turn what seemed an equal concentration on the marital, or extramarital, problems, the health or illness, the financial tribulations or any other concerns of those who worked for him.

He contracted enmities, but never as readily as he made friends. Giving complete loyalty himself, he commanded it from others.

He taxed his brain and body without mercy. In his sixties, he was still a threatening opponent on a squash court. Sleep he scarcely considered a necessity but an imposition by nature on man's obligation for self-improvement. For him no moment was an occasion for idleness. On uncomfortable and dangerous airplane flights he was usually discovered amusing himself with a German, French, Spanish, Italian, or other grammar, unless he was concocting a complicated scheme to harass the enemy.

EXCITEMENT OVER IDEAS

His personal charm was disarming. His sympathies were almost universal. He could not abide cowardice, being so constituted that this weakness was incomprehensible to him.

His imagination was unlimited. Ideas were his playthings. Excitement made him snort like a race horse. Woe to the officer who turned down a project because, on its face, it seemed ridiculous, or at least unusual. For painful weeks under his command I tested the possibility of using bats—taken from concentrations in western caves—to destroy Tokyo. The general, backed by the intrigued President Roosevelt, was only

dissuaded from further experiments in this field when it appeared probable that the cave bats would not survive a trans-Pacific flight at high altitudes.

He was a torchbearer of much that was most luminous during American participation in wars. In civil life he was adamant in the protection of our liberties and traditions.

I feel I can speak for thousands of others who served him during his great period in saying that I wish we had adequately conveyed to him during his lifetime the deep affection and admiration we always entertained for him.

DAVID K. E. BRUCE.

BERLIN, February 9, 1959.

Oregon Reviews 100 Years of Statehood, Looks Forward to Another Century of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, celebration of a historical milestone represents an opportunity both to recall the past and assess the future. The occasion of Oregon's centennial has stimulated such dual analysis by two of my State's leading newspapers, the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal. Both papers have contributed significantly to Oregon's development; both comment from a rich background of service to the people of Oregon. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial titled "Oregon Has Come a Long Way" from the February 8, 1959, centennial issue of the Oregon Journal and an editorial headed "Reading, Living History" from the Oregonian's centennial issue of February 11, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Feb. 8, 1959]

OREGON HAS COME A LONG WAY

This is Oregon's year to celebrate, joyfully and proudly, 100 years of statehood. It is a time to look at history—from the days of British, French, Spanish, Russian, and American exploration, more than a century and a half ago; through the great fur-trading era, when McLoughlin and Astor, Bonneville and Wyeth probed the wilderness, built forts, sought quick riches by bartering with the Indians who had filtered down into the Northwest from Asia, via the Aleutians, 10,000 years before.

It is a time to review the deeds of the hardy men who attended the "divide" meeting at Champoege, who acquired 2,500,000 virgin acres in donation land claims, cleared the trees away, built towns, schools, churches, mills, river boats, roads and railroads, pioneered the agriculture, horticulture, lumber, textile, and fishing industries, and passed successfully through provisional and territorial governments to statehood. That was the real beginning.

As times goes, it seems only yesterday that the first settlers came over the Oregon Trail in the 1840's and 1850's—first a handful, then

by hundreds, then by thousands—seeking their fortunes in a benign green land.

Yet when you weigh the progress Oregon has made, when you see the strides we've taken in industry, in food raising and processing, in transportation, education and the arts, in taming great rivers, in developing world trade, it seems centuries ago.

It's a long way we've come—from the trading posts and missions to great cities and the teeming ports; from covered wagons to jets; from tiny sawmills in the wilderness to giant woodworking plants; from crude blacksmith shops to light metal plants; from oxen to atomic energy; from Indian canoes to oceangoing freighters and the tug-barge combos that ply our rivers.

It's a wonderful story, all in all, this story of the 33d State in the Union.

And we'll tell this story to the world this year, in the Exposition and International Trade Fair and the International Garden of Tomorrow. We'll read it in pagentry, in music and drama, in historical and commercial displays. We'll sell it anew to ourselves and our several million visitors, some of whom will see for the first time our magic mountains, our great rivers, our friendly cities, our teeming industries—and will want to come again.

Part of this centennial story is told today in the Journal's centennial edition, which in itself is a tribute to Oregon's glorious past, its leadership in commerce and industry and the arts, its future opportunities. Each is unexcelled.

So we repeat: This is Oregon's year to celebrate, joyfully and proudly, 100 years of statehood. They've been exciting, wondrous years. They've been good to us all.

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 11, 1959]

READING, LIVING HISTORY

One certain, positive benefit to flow from the observance of Oregon's Centennial year will be the instruction of Oregonians in their history and their heritage. This is not to imply that we are merely taking note of events that are dead and gone, that the act of celebration of 100 years of statehood is no more than the contemplation of those 100 years and what went before. Quite the contrary, the real value in a knowledge of history is to obtain thereby a perspective on the present and future.

If there were no Oregon future, there would be no sense in reviewing the Oregon past. If there were no Oregon future, there would be no purpose in an Oregon centennial. While we read history, we make history, and, if it were not so, the reading of history and the commemoration of its milestones would both be a waste of time.

When Oregon had been but 3 years a State, a man who understood the uses of history had this advice for his countrymen: "Fellow citizens," said President Abraham Lincoln, "we cannot escape history. We * * * will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation."

So it is for Oregonians who this week have both the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, Thursday, and the 100th anniversary of statehood, Saturday, from which to draw the inspiration that can come from the knowledge of great events and great deeds of the past. We, too, will soon be a part of that past. Will we so build that future generations will find it worthwhile to reflect on this period in our history? That is the question of the centennial year. How it is answered will determine whether or not Oregon is worthy of its past.

The natural wonders that attracted the explorers and settlers to Oregon in the dawn of its recorded history remain wonders in the

20th century. The Columbia River is not the Northwest Passage of legend, but it is a water system in some respects second to none other on the continent. The rich land that drew men and their families the breadth of the country has been found to be even more exceptional where its specialties have been discovered and exploited. The trees are here, some of them dating from other centuries; and history has taught lessons of silviculture and moderation in harvest.

We are heirs to a marvelous land and a dramatic tradition. The full potentialities of our endowments have scarcely yet been realized. No other corner of the Nation is more appealing in an age of dwindling resources of space, land and water. No other region promises more certainly the fulfillment of human desires in an era of ever-increasing leisure. No people anywhere can call up, from a look backward into history, a more powerful inspiration for achievement in the future.

The people of Oregon need blame only themselves if Oregon's second century is not better than the first. It should be—vastly so—not merely in material progress, but in the more profound aspects of living. It will be if Oregonians read their history with understanding.

Lt. Col. Richard J. Meskill, an Active Servant of His Country and His God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am sure all agree that high ideals are a wonderful thing, but unless these beliefs are translated into actions, they have no effect.

My home State of Texas, and this Nation, suffered a great loss recently with the untimely death of Lt. Col. Richard J. Meskill, U.S. Army, retired, in San Antonio, Tex. Colonel Meskill was a man who not only held to his high beliefs, but governed his actions accordingly. He served his Nation and his God honorably and well.

During his active military career, Colonel Meskill distinguished himself in international riding and shooting championships. He continued to serve this Nation with the U.S. customs service and later as postmaster at Texas City, Tex., until his retirement in 1952.

He was a charter grand knight of the Father Roach Council, Texas City Knights of Columbus, and a charter member of the St. Mary's Holy Name Society, Texas City, and a Third Order Dominican.

In addition, he held offices in the Postmasters Association of Texas and the Retired Officers Association.

Colonel Meskill's life can well serve as a guide for others. He lives on in the fine lives of his family. One of his sons, Mr. Dick Meskill, is editor of the Alamo Messenger, official Catholic newspaper of the archdiocese of San Antonio.

Mr. President, as a special recognition of this fine life, I request unanimous

consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on Colonel Meskill which appeared in a recent issue of the Alamo Messenger, under the heading, "Ordinary Presides at Funeral Rites for Colonel Meskill."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDINARY PRESIDES AT FUNERAL RITES FOR COLONEL MESKILL

Archbishop Robert E. Lucey presided at solemn funeral services for Lt. Col. Richard J. Meskill, 72, U.S. Army, Retired, in St. Peter Prince of Apostles Church on January 20. Colonel Meskill died in Brooke Army Hospital January 17 after an illness of several months. His home was at 111 Windmill Road in St. Mary Magdalen's Parish.

Father Carlos J. Quintana, of St. Peter's Parish, was celebrant of the requiem mass, assisted by Father Joseph L. Daspit, C.M., of Assumption Seminary, and Father John Kukral, of Texas City, as deacon and subdeacon, respectively. Msgr. Alexander C. Wangel, of the Alamo Messenger, was master of ceremonies.

The sermon was preached by Father Charles M. Sacco, of Beaumont. Attending in the sanctuary was Auxiliary Bishop Stephen A. Leven. Other members of the clergy attended in the transept of the church. The archbishop gave the final absolution after expressing his condolences to the family of Colonel Meskill.

Colonel Meskill had retired as postmaster of Texas City, April 30, 1952, after a period of 7 years' service. Prior to that he served with notable distinction in the Army, having won several international and interallied horsemanship and shooting championships following World War I.

Following his military retirement in 1930, Colonel Meskill served as inspector with U.S. Customs Service until May 1945, when he was appointed by President Harry Truman to fill the vacancy in the Texas City Post-office.

Colonel Meskill was charter grandknight of the Father Roach Council, Texas City Knights of Columbus, and an active member of the Postmasters Association of Texas, and the Retired Officers Association, in both of which organizations he held offices.

He was also a charter member of the St. Mary's Holy Name Society, Texas City, and a Third Order Dominican.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Cora M. Tarpey Meskill, daughter of a pioneer Texas City family, and by two sons, Richard J. Meskill, Jr., and William D. Meskill; and by daughters, Sister Miriam, V.I., Houston, and Misses Cora E. and Catherine Jane Meskill, both of San Antonio.

In addition to listed survivors, Colonel Meskill is survived by three sisters, Mrs. M. J. Herwood, Los Angeles; Mrs. Mary Chamberlain, Springfield, Mass.; and Miss Josie Meskill, Ireland; and by three brothers, Dan Meskill, Bronx, N.Y.; John and James Meskill, County Cork, Ireland.

Honorary pallbearers were Carl Nessler, R.H.S.; George Carrague, John C. Gee, and Richard Carroll, all of Texas City, and Judge Andrew A. Hickey, of Alta Loma, and former postmaster, Raymond A. Stewart, of Galveston, as well as Felix Stehling, Fredericksburg, and Paul C. Pfeiffer, San Antonio.

Active pallbearers were James A. Whalen, K.S.G.; Chester Griffin (Texas City), Albert Greene, John Fox, Edward Culligan, and Maj. Gen. Neill C. Johnson, all of San Antonio.

Interment was in Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery with full military honors. Zisk-Kearns Funeral Home was in charge of arrangements.

Oregon Commemorative Stamp Released at Historic Astoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 14, Oregon celebrated its centennial, commemorating the 100th anniversary of statehood. Quite appropriately, the Post Office Department has issued a 4-cent Oregon statehood centennial commemorative stamp, which was first placed on sale February 14 at the post office at Astoria. An initial printing of 120 million copies of the centennial stamp has been made, and it is estimated that more than 500,000 first day covers were issued by the Astoria postmaster, Neil L. Morfitt, and his fine staff.

It is indeed appropriate that historic Astoria, at the mouth of the great Columbia River, with Fort Clatsop National Memorial located nearby, was chosen as the city for the first day issue. The Oregon centennial stamp, printed in a blue-green color, emphasizes the rear view of an unhorsed covered Conestoga wagon, typical of those used over the Oregon Trail by early settlers, with Mt. Hood to the right. There has been some public criticism of the stark realism of the stamp design.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Post Office Department, Mr. L. Rohe Walter, special assistant to the Postmaster General, gave the dedication address for the Oregon centennial postage stamp at Astoria. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Post Office Department release on Mr. Walter's able speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK BY L. ROHE WALTER, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, OREGON STATEHOOD COMMEMORATIVE STAMP CEREMONY, ASTORIA, OREG., FEBRUARY 14, 1959

We are gathered here today in Astoria, Oreg., the site of the first post office and customhouse on the Pacific coast, to dedicate a U.S. postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the statehood of Oregon.

We do so with gratitude to the sturdy people of this scenically beautiful and highly productive State, who, over the years have made and are making such remarkable contributions to the national heritage and welfare of the United States.

As we look back, we recall that in May of 1792, an American sea captain, John Robert Gray of Boston, Mass., sailed his ship, the *Columbia*, up the river of the west to become the first to drop anchor in the inland waters of this vast and legendary body of water.

Claiming this area for his new Nation and naming the river after his ship, Captain Gray and his hardy crew penetrated lands which for generations had intrigued and mystified the greatest explorers from many lands, including Sir Francis Drake, who had seen this wilderness in 1579 and poetically named it New Albion.

Thirteen years after Captain Gray's trip, the famed explorers Lewis and Clark, under direct authority of President Jefferson to determine direct and practicable water communications across the continent, for the purpose of navigation, reached the headwaters of the Columbia.

Their published accounts, as the first explorers to reach Oregon by an overland route, created national interest leading to the establishment, in 1811, of John Jacob Astor's Pacific Fur Co. and an awareness by many others of the lucrative potentials of this region.

From those early days to the present, Oregon's history is replete with the names of individuals whose deeds form an inspiring story in the growth of our Nation and of the Beaver State, the 33d to be admitted to the Union.

Typical of these great leaders who have contributed to Oregon's welfare were the "white-headed eagle," Dr. John McLoughlin, who for 20 years governed this area from his home, Fort Victoria; Hale Jackson Kelly, the ex-Boston schoolmaster whose lectures and writings contributed so much to the encouragement of emigration to Oregon that he earned the title "Father of Oregon"; and, of course, the missionaries of many faiths who left comfortable and established parishes to teach Christian religion and ethics to the Indians, to build churches and missions, and to implant the teachings of faith in God, so necessary in the development and progress of a new and free land.

Joining with them, of course, were the pioneering thousands of men and women who, in the Oregon-or-bust wagon trains, made the long, arduous, and dangerous 2,000-mile trek along the Oregon Trail from the banks of the Missouri to the virgin lands of this great State.

The nearly 2 million Americans who now live in your 97,000 square miles of beautiful mountains, rich river valleys, and seashore coasts, and your impressive cities, represent the sturdy pioneers of many lands who saw, and achieved here the fulfillment of their individual desires for freedom under a democratic form of Government. And each left his special imprint upon his—and your—free land.

You today, as those who preceded you, are men and women possessed of great strength; of abiding faith; of calm but courageous understanding; of infinite wisdom and vision.

All America—and the world for that matter—is aware of the contributions your great State of Oregon has made in the fields of fishing, shipbuilding, national defense, public education, hydroelectric power, food products, and the beef cattle and sheep industries.

To the fisherman, the hunter, to those who enjoy the quiet beauties of nature or the zest of vacationing beside fresh-running streams, in rugged mountain country, in fertile valleys, or along sandy ocean beaches, Oregon is an unparalleled attraction.

In this Oregon statehood centennial stamp the Post Office Department has tried to symbolize the history, the beauty, and the richness of Oregon. By issuing 120 million of these stamps, we hope to remind not only Americans but all peoples of the contributions the State of Oregon has made to their progress and welfare.

The design of this beautiful new stamp was the inspiration of the noted artist, Robert Hallock, of Newtown, Conn., who is present here today.

After first-day sales here in Astoria, 120 million Oregon statehood stamps will go on sale throughout the Nation in 36,000 U.S. post offices. As part of the centennial celebration, it is our hope these stamps will also serve as invitations for Americans to

visit the Oregon Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair, opening in Portland, Oreg., on June 10.

In concluding, it is my privilege to now present albums of these new 4-cent Oregon statehood stamps, autographed by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, to a group of distinguished Americans.

Health-for-Peace Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has long been recognized as the Senate's "Mr. Health." His dedication and devotion to the cause of medical research and to public health have won him acclaim throughout the country. Programs which he has sponsored have been beneficial to people in every nook and corner of this land.

In keeping with this record of concern for the public welfare, the senior Senator from Alabama is now sponsoring a proposal which would expand U.S. support of international medical research. Fifty-nine Senators were pleased to join with him. I am happy to be one of them. Through Senator HILL's health-for-peace plan, we can take another step forward toward that international understanding which is so necessary if world tensions are ever to end.

An excellent article written by Dr. Howard A. Rusk regarding this proposal was published in the Sunday edition of the New York Times of February 8, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF SCIENTIFIC TEAMWORK BEHIND THE HEALTH-FOR-PEACE BILLS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Last Monday Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat of Alabama, reintroduced in the Senate his bill to expand U.S. support of international medical research. In a strong show of bipartisan support, 59 of Senator HILL's colleagues joined him in cosponsoring the legislation.

Representative JOHN FOGARTY, Democrat of Rhode Island, has also reintroduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives.

This legislation, known popularly as the health-for-peace bill, would create within the National Institutes of Health a new National Institute of International Medical Research with an annual appropriation of \$50 million.

These funds would be used to encourage and support research and the exchange of information on research, the training of research personnel and the improvement of research facilities throughout the world.

The bill would authorize grants to support such activities ranging from research in basic science to research in rehabilitation. Grants could be made to foreign and Ameri-

can universities and research organizations and to voluntary and governmental international agencies such as the World Health Organization.

Under the plan, a National Advisory Council for International Medical Research, composed of nongovernmental leaders, would establish policies, make recommendations and approve grants and loans under the program.

COUNCILS WOULD ADVISE

The existing specialized advisory councils on heart, cancer, arthritis and metabolic diseases, neurological diseases and blindness, vocational rehabilitation and similar specialized fields would advise the new National Advisory Council for International Medical Research on specific projects within their particular area of interest and competence.

The program would not replace any of our current programs of multilateral international health activities through the World Health Organization or UNICEF or any of our bilateral activities conducted through the International Cooperation Administration.

Nor would it supplant the research programs being conducted through the International Cooperation Administration.

Nor would it supplant the research programs being conducted in the United States through the National Institutes of Health. It would enhance these activities and at the same time provide a mechanism and funds for uniting science throughout the world in a greatly expanded global attack on disease and disability.

The key factor in grants from the new National Institute for International Medical Research, over and above the usual criteria applied to research projects, would be their international implications.

Although there are innumerable corollary values in Senator HILL's proposal, it is based primarily on recognition of the fact that medical research is so highly complex and interrelated that victory over any disease or disability can be achieved only through the research results of many scientists throughout the world.

FULL OF EXAMPLES

The history of medicine is replete with examples of this.

It was a Dutch scientist in 1676 who first revealed the world of micro-organisms. An English physician, Edward Jenner, who observed in 1796 that vaccination prevented smallpox, provided the basis for modern immunological concepts.

Iwanowski, a Russian, identified the first virus in 1892. Two Canadians, Sir Frederick Banting and Charles Best, were the first to isolate insulin in 1921.

The Spanish neuroanatomist, Santiago Ramon y Cajal, and the Italian histologist, Camillo Golgi, shared the Nobel prize in 1906 for their work on the structure of the nervous system.

The list goes on and on—penicillin from England, cortisone from the United States, rauwolfia from India, sulfonamides from Germany.

The health-for-peace bill is a direct outgrowth of the proposals of President Eisenhower in his 1958 state of the Union message for a science-for-peace plan to attain a good life for all. As the first step in such a plan, President Eisenhower at that time invited the Soviet Union to join in the current 5-year program for the global eradication of malaria.

The President then stated our willingness to pool our efforts with the Russians in other campaigns against cancer and heart disease and the other scourges of mankind. "If the people can get together on such projects," he said, "is it not possible that we could then go on to a full-scale cooperative program of science for peace?"

DISCUSSED IN MOSCOW

It was to discuss the proposals for a greatly expanded international medical research program that Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, went to Moscow in early December for his now-famous 8-hour interview with Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. The first 2 hours of the interview were spent discussing international medical research.

In a statement issued in Moscow after the interview, Senator HUMPHREY reported the Soviet Premier had given enthusiastic approval to the proposal.

He said further: "During my interview with the Premier I had noted that areas of disagreement between our respective foreign policies remain broad and deep. It does not appear that, for a considerable time, these differences will be resolved. In the meantime, we need to learn how to work together, and the best place to start is in the non-political area. The world is hungry for some evidence of effective Soviet-American collaboration. One of the best areas in which to start is in the field of health."

The fact that 59 other Senators joined with Senator HILL in cosponsoring his health-for-peace bill indicates that a majority of the Senate agree with the statement of Senator HUMPHREY on the need for such a program and with Senator HILL that his proposals would help meet that need.

They realize that not only will such a program improve international understanding but also may well provide a breakthrough on the killing and crippling diseases that plague mankind.

Every citizen in the United States has a personal stake in this program.

The enthusiastic congressional support of the health-for-peace bill gives dimension and significance to the aphorism of the late Sir William Osler, who once said: "The great republic of medicine knows and has known no national boundaries."

Observations on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 10 the Greenwood Index of Greenwood, S.C., editorially demonstrated what appears to me to be a crucial issue with respect to our foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that this enlightening editorial entitled, "Observations" be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the observations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS

Modern diplomatic quandaries arise from surging nationalism among underprivileged peoples. Shall the United States foster this feeling, in the spirit of our own revolution, or is the course of realism to say that these people are not yet ready for self-government?

There is no sure answer. This observation by William Henry Chamberlain in the Wall Street Journal is worth reading on the subject: "A few conclusions may be drawn from the experience of the ups and downs of democracy. This system must grow from within; it cannot be artificially implanted by a few young enthusiasts drawing up an

admirable paper constitution and shouting a few slogans. Democracy has no reality without widespread education and a diffused ownership of private property. The United States will be well advised to frame its foreign policy not by abstract considerations of whether a foreign country is a democracy or a dictatorship, but by positive evidence that the country is going our way politically and recognizes bonds of common interest."

**Address by Hon. William F. Knowland at
Lincoln Day Banquet**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a speech delivered last Thursday, February 12, 1959, by the Honorable William F. Knowland at the annual Lincoln Day banquet of the Young Men's Republican Club of King County, in Seattle, Wash.

A Member of the U.S. Senate for 13 years, during which time he served as both majority and minority leader, Senator Knowland draws from his vast experience to outline several goals for the Republican Party and for America, as a whole. The speech, delivered on the birthday of our first great Republican President, presents a very straightforward approach to the grave problems facing our Government today, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET, YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB OF KING COUNTY, FEBRUARY 12, 1959, SEATTLE, WASH.

Fellow Americans, this is no time for defeatism. It is the time for reflection, for constructive criticism of past action or inaction, for reorganization and for a forward movement along the whole front.

It was Abraham Lincoln in 1858, the year of his defeat for the Senate and 2 years before his election to the Presidency, who said:

"If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do and how to do it."

For us as Americans and for us as Republicans has come simultaneously the imperative need to stop, look, and listen in order to determine, if possible, where we are and whither we are tending.

The Whig Party failed to do this in the 1850's and passed out of existence.

The Nation in the 1840's and 1850's failed to solve the slavery question and the decisions were finally made in the fiery crucible of a great civil war.

There is much talk these days about the need for precinct organization. This is, of course, vitally important. But to make this No. 1 on the list is to put the cart before the horse.

It seems to me that as Republicans we must first determine for what we stand rather than for whom we stand.

Neither our domestic problems nor our international dangers can be determined safely by officials selected on the basis of the best "Pepodent smile" nor on the basis that regardless of the principles or policies for which he stands that the incumbent of one's own party has permanent tenure in the office he holds.

Such an approach in these critical times can lead to decay in our party and disaster to our Nation.

It is far less fatal for a party to lose an election than to become all things to all men in order to win.

Would it not be well for Republicans (and Democrats, for that matter) to hold annual conventions in each of our States in order to get a real grassroots understanding as to what the rank and file think and the things for which they want their party to stand?

I do not believe this can or should be left to the office holders alone. The party is far bigger than any gathering of incumbents on the local, county, State, or National level.

At times the officeholder may think his own reelection is more important than giving the people clear-cut decisions on major policy matters. To him it may be, but to the party and the Nation vacillation, and postponing the decision may lead to a more violent outburst later on, as was the case 100 years ago.

Some basic decisions need to be thought out and fought out ahead of the national nominating conventions.

No single person or small group has the answer to all our problems as a Nation or a party. But I do have a confidence that out of the ranks of the people will come the principles and the leadership to again save our Nation at one of the great turning points of history.

Nations, parties, and individuals have both victories and defeats. They can and should learn from both.

I have no regrets for having raised the issues or having made the fight in California last year. It helped, I believe, to alert the people of our State and of the Nation to some of the problems ahead of us.

Despite misrepresentation of my position and the propaganda efforts of the labor bosses, the facts of the matter are that I believe in strong and effective unions.

I said last year and I repeat now:

"Unions should be responsible to their own membership and to the American public. With power must always go responsibility. Collective bargaining must not become collective bludgeoning."

Since last November, James Hoffa has announced his intention to have every policeman wear a Teamster membership button.

I do not believe this would be conducive to impartial law enforcement, for the public good, nor indeed in the best interests of labor unionism as a whole.

How can we best preserve our priceless heritage? This is our challenge as a Nation, as a party, and as individuals.

You here will play a part in the great decisions that will win or lose this historic battle.

What are my beliefs in this regard?

I give them to you, as the reflections of one who for 30 years has been active in the ranks of the Republican Party and for the past 13 years as a Member of the U.S. Senate during the last 6 years of which I served as both majority and minority leader:

1. We must preserve the Federal constitutional system and actively oppose the tendency to break down State lines.

2. We must preserve American competitive enterprise from the monopolistic onslaughts of both big business and big labor.

3. We must stand for responsible and solvent government on the local, State, and National level.

4. We must stand for the protection of the individual citizen against the encroachments of the criminal underworld, labor goons or business racketeers, and this is and should remain primarily the responsibility of local and State authorities.

5. We must stand for the protection of our Nation, its constitutional government and the free world, and for this we must primarily depend on the Federal Government and such reliable allies that care to be associated with us in this common effort. We must understand that you cannot purchase either individual or collective friendship.

6. We must preserve the incentives that will continue to encourage investors to take risks to start new businesses or enlarge existing ones so that more job opportunities will open up for our increasing population. Too high a tax structure, invasion of the Government into price fixing, and labor's encroachment upon responsibilities belonging to management can weaken, if not destroy, these incentives.

7. Government should not become confiscatory in its tax levying. Except in case of war, Federal income taxes should not exceed 33½ percent of personal income nor more than 40 percent of corporate income. Out of the earnings of corporations and the savings of individuals must come the capital investment to keep American industry ahead of that of the totalitarian Socialist-Communist state.

8. Every American citizen of voting age is entitled to vote, based on standards of qualification applicable without regard to race, color, or sex. The citizens of all the States have an interest in seeing that the citizens of none of the States are denied such rights.

9. Federal funds will ultimately lead to Federal controls. Federal encroachment in the field of education should be resisted.

10. In guarding the rights of one group we must not abuse the rights of other groups. The right to determine one's religious, fraternal, and social associations is fundamental and should not be surrendered upon any pretext of protecting minority rights.

Now these are not all inclusive by any means. But to me all are pretty fundamental and furnish a point around which large numbers of present-day Republicans, Democrats, and Independents (north, south, east, and west) might join together with a common objective and a mutuality of interest.

Once we establish a large area of agreement on principles we are then in a position to sign up large numbers of workers who can campaign with intelligence and enthusiasm for the candidates running on an understandable and agreed program.

Too often now the worker is unclear as to what his party stands for or who the party spokesman is. He may find his candidates for several offices opposed to each other on rather fundamental issues. This only adds to disunity and discouragement to the precinct worker and confusion among the voters.

Our Nation would not have been founded and the Union would not have been preserved if men and women had not been prepared to stand for certain fundamental principles, regardless of cost.

The preamble to our Constitution states: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The Constitution provides for its own amendment. By two-thirds vote of both houses and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

Under this and related provisions our Constitution has been amended 22 times.

While it is a cumbersome process neither the executive, legislative, or judicial branches should seek to or be allowed to short circuit this procedure in letter or in spirit.

Relating back now to the 10 principles of constitutionalism let us examine specifics.

1. The growth of the Federal Government has been astronomical in character. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches have all at one time or another expanded Federal power and whittled away at the rights of the States. This trend needs to be reversed now before we pass the point of no return.

2. The Republican Party should forthrightly fight for the American private enterprise system. New Dealers with governmental economic control of prices and wages are as dangerous to the future of free enterprise as are avowed Socialists who believe in Government ownership of the means of production. Whenever the people want New Dealism or socialism they will take the original and not a faded carbon copy.

3. No responsible official can ignore the fact that today our public debt is over \$300 billion and that the interest on it amounts to over \$8 billion a year.

This interest charge is greater than all income into the Treasury as late as 1941 and all expenditures as late as 1938.

The time has come for a drastic curtailment of foreign aid as a necessary step to putting our domestic finances in order. Foreign aid is used as a leverage for all kinds of local projects.

Sooner or later the overburdened taxpayer is going to ask if there is any more excuse for his paying for unconsumed agricultural products than for unsold refrigerators, unused paper or uncrated bicycles.

4. A government that cannot protect the legal and constitutional rights of its citizens is not worthy of being supported.

Our ancestors left the Old World to get away from compulsory church membership. Compulsory union membership can negate the basic freedom of choice which Americans once held dear.

5. Freedom is indivisible. Lincoln said our Nation cannot be half slave and half free. Nor in our time can the world.

It has never made sense to me for American funds to be used in support of Communist Yugoslavia or Poland. Between them they have received over \$2 billion.

This same sum of money very likely could have given us an earth satellite ahead of the Soviet sputnik.

How much more effective this would have been on friend, neutral, and Communist alike than pouring our free enterprise dollars into these Communist sinkholes.

6. At Washington and throughout the Nation there are doctrinaire forces that believe in a regimented economy.

Under the slightest pretext they will move openly to reestablish OPA-type controls over prices. Inevitably this will lead to wage and commodity allocation controls and to the same chaotic conditions existing in 1946 and 1947, which brought the end to OPA.

There has been, in some quarters, a steady encroachment of labor upon the responsibilities of management that is becoming a detriment to small business and tends to cause small operators to sell out to large competitors. This trend whether resulting from inequitable labor demands or a growing multiplicity of tax burdens is most harmful to our economic structure of which small business is an integral part.

7. Today the Federal Government is a major partner in most of the larger companies of the Nation, taking 52 percent in corporate income taxes.

The personal income taxes, Federal and State, are at the point where they put a wet

blanket on the incentive which helped to build our Nation from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic coast to a great world power of 170 million, the most productive the world has ever known.

The drying up of savings for investment could slow down the continued modernization of American industry which is so essential if our productivity is to keep ahead of the Soviet Union.

8. Those who believe in States rights, as I do, will be on firmer ground if the constitutional right of citizens to vote without discrimination on grounds of race or color is clearly manifest in all 49 States.

Then the power and dignity of the States to run their own affairs will rest on a firm foundation not easily assailable by those who would make the States, in effect, Federal provinces.

9. If there is any function in which the local people should keep control it is in the field of education. Where Federal funds go, ultimately Federal control will follow.

There is no such thing as free Federal money. It comes from the people residing in the 49 States. However, a dollar flowing from the States to Washington suffers substantial attrition before it comes back as a grant in aid.

10. The American Constitution was founded on the principle that the individual had certain rights that neither the Government nor even tyrannical temporary majorities could take from him.

For example, not even a unanimous vote of Congress, the approval of the President, or the action of the Supreme Court can take away his freedom of religion, press, or right to peaceably assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude—15th amendment—or by reason of sex—19th amendment.

As we have already pointed out, approval of amendments takes a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress and three-fourths ratification by the States. No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed—section 9, article I.

There is one section of the Constitution that cannot be amended even by the amending process. Article V states "and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Minorities as well as majorities can at times be arbitrary as against the right of an individual to select his religion, his occupation, his fraternal colleagues, or his individual associates.

The great asset of our way of life is that we uphold the dignity and independence of the individual citizen and our Constitution makes certain that the State is his servant and not his master. We believe in a divine being and communism is a godless tyranny.

These are the great contrasts with totalitarian communism or fascism.

On these basic differences there is not and there cannot be any weakening of our faith or our beliefs.

We are admonished by Second Corinthians: "Be yet not unequally yoked together with unbelievers for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness and what communion has light with darkness?"

Almost 100 years have passed since Abraham Lincoln's election to the Presidency. His words come ringing down through the ages: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. . . . The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in history to the latest generation. In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. . . . We shall meanly lose or nobly save this last best hope of earth."

A Southern Editor's Views on Forced Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for the benefit of the many who did not have the opportunity of hearing Thomas R. Waring, editor of the Charleston News and Courier, present his brilliant defense of the southern position on forced integration of the races on the nationally telecast Chet Huntley Show of Sunday, February 8, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Waring's statement, entitled "Editor Offers a Southerner's Views," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR OFFERS A SOUTHERNER'S VIEWS

(By Thomas R. Waring)

Mr. Huntley's proposal that the NAACP withdraw from the South would meet with hearty approval, I believe, among most southerners—but not for the reasons Mr. Huntley has expressed. As I understand it, Mr. Huntley believes that mingling of the races could be accomplished with more speed and harmony if the NAACP removed itself. Mr. Huntley has presented legal and other reasons why mixing the races is right. I would like to offer a different viewpoint.

OPPOSED TO IT NOW OR LATER

I am a spokesman for no organization or group of people. I am a newspaper editor in a position that offers opportunities to observe and report on people in the region where I live.

I believe it is a fact that the overwhelming majority of southern people are unalterably opposed to mixing races in public schools. They are opposed to it now or later.

They hold this view not on account of hatred or bigotry, as you may have been told. They hold it because they sincerely believe, on the basis of firsthand experience, that separate schools are best for both races.

In presenting this as the view of the majority of southerners, I refer to white southerners, because they are about 75 percent of the population. But the proportion varies greatly. In my home community, for instance, the population is about 50-50. In some neighborhoods, Negroes outnumber whites 10 to 1. In many school districts integration would mean sending white children to Negro schools.

While I do not pose as a spokesman for the colored people, nor pretend to read their minds, I believe that most of them are happy and satisfied. I do not believe the NAACP by any means represents a unanimous feeling among the southern Negroes.

If some southerners are willing to accept token integration rather than shut down their schools it does not mean that they approve, or accept it permanently. Even token integration brings tension and constant threat of disorder, as well as fear of other evils.

If integration is wrong, as we believe it is, we do not concede that a little bit of it is right. The strength of resistance testifies to the depth of this belief. The choice between separate schools and no schools is an agonizing one for people who have spent years developing an education system.

TRAPPINGS OF THE POLICE STATE

Cordons of police ringed the school at Arlington to enforce admission of four colored children. Not even parents were allowed near the schoolhouse. An Associated Press reporter said the scene presented a picture of Alcatraz, southern style. The trappings of the police state were mounted within sight of the U.S. Capitol.

It is not alone the entrance of a few colored children at Arlington or elsewhere that created all this furor. White southerners are more accustomed to Negroes than people in other regions. It is the seizure of rights and powers for local self-government that makes southern hearts turn cold.

The Supreme Court has rewritten the Constitution it swore to uphold. Chief Justice Holmes, Justice Brandeis, and other liberals accepted the law of the land to mean the States have a right to operate separate but equal schools.

Whether the South closes public schools under threat of mixing, or struggles in some regions with the perils of integration, public education will be damaged.

For white pupils, standards of education will decline. This has been the experience in Washington, D.C., and in other places that have undergone mass integration. The statement is well documented and I haven't time to explore it further.

For colored pupils, the relaxed and familiar conditions of their own schools are lost. Discipline breaks down. We have no blackboard jungles in the South, and we do not want them.

PUBLIC EDUCATION IS BOUND TO SUFFER

Though not all southern schools, white or Negro, have achieved the highest standards, they have vastly improved in recent years. Southerners have spent billions of dollars on them. They had a contract with the Federal Government that guaranteed separation of the races. They would not have taxed themselves for mixed schools. And nobody knows how long they would continue to support schools they don't control. In any event, public education is bound to suffer.

Local self-government, through division of State and Federal powers, is the keystone of our Republic. It is being torn apart for the sake of a sociological experiment. If a police state is substituted for the Republic, no race will gain.

Once before, in prohibition, the United States experimented with sociology. Prohibition was a failure. It brought on bootlegging and a crime wave. Eventually the people came to their senses. They repealed prohibition. At least, it had the authority of lawful constitutional amendment. This time the experiment is with the lives of children—on the basis of court decrees.

Southerners are concerned for the welfare of both races. They realize the need to educate colored people as well as white. They need colored citizens for manpower in the burgeoning new industries. They want to build the earning power of Negro workers so they can carry more of their share of the economy.

GOVERNOR COLLINS' COMMENTS

In his inaugural address last month, South Carolina's young Governor, Ernest F. Hollings referred to these problems. He said, and I quote:

"I shall not dwell on the subject of segregation as it affects race relations. We have all heard too much on this subject and there is too much to be done in the days ahead for us to waste our energies and arouse our tempers over a subject upon which we, in South Carolina, are in essential agreement.

"We are fortunate in having a well nigh boundless store of good will and understanding among all races and beliefs in South Carolina. In our schools, peace patrols the

school corridors; unlike New York, we do not need armed guards. The Negroes of our State feel that schools are intended for education. They feel that their Governor and general assembly are doing everything possible to provide them the best educational program and the best opportunity to succeed on an individual basis. Let alone, we shall continue to do this.

"As a practical matter, this can only be done in the segregated pattern, and for those who would by integration destroy the education, culture, opportunity and friendship of both races, I simply state that our position of determined resistance remains unchanged."

Southern people are not, as you may have been told, captives of blind leaders who will not or cannot read the signs of progress.

DEFINITION OF A MODERATE

The people demand that their public schools be separate. We hear sometimes about Southern moderates. A moderate is an integrationist who isn't in too big a hurry. Fast or slow, most southerners are convinced that mingling the schools would be disastrous.

What is the aim of integration?

It is not improvement for white pupils. Educational standards in mixed schools would have to be reduced to the lowest common denominator.

LEARNING NOT PROMOTED BY TENSION

It will not improve education for Negro pupils. An atmosphere of tension does not promote learning. Discipline would have to suffer when any classroom incident is likely to explode into a racial incident.

It would not promote good relations between the races. Both North and South, integration or attempts at it have created racial trouble.

It will not create respect abroad for the United States. Internal squabbles involving troops, police, and constant arguments over rights and freedoms are signs of unstable conditions.

If the aim of integration is to sustain legal and sociological theories, without regard to practical effects on human beings, it is not defensible.

If the aim is to humiliate the white southerners, it is beneath contempt.

If the aim is to raise the status of the Negro, it won't work. The Negro needs many things more than he needs association with white people on an involuntary basis.

While national diplomacy courts favor in foreign countries, on the domestic front the American Government is not seeking to win friends and influence people in Southern States.

I shall not attempt to explore the reason for those policies. They are in large measure political.

NAACP CREATES DIVISION, ANIMOSITY

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has been able to exploit these political forces. It has achieved a balance of power out of all proportion to its actual worth. Millions of white southerners have become an unorganized and oppressed minority.

The NAACP creates division and animosity. Some of its leaders have official records of contacts with subversive organizations. Their names have been published in reports of congressional committees.

With its political allies, the NAACP has set up a virtual censorship on race.

One minor bit of evidence is the removal of dialect from magazines, books, and newspapers. Though Negro dialect is forbidden, a California cartoonist who lampooned the southern speech of Governor Faubus was singled out recently for some kind of freedom award.

Negro crime in cities is appalling, but the facts are being deliberately disguised in the Paper Curtain press.

Superior force may overwhelm the South, as it has done before. But troops and police cannot forever suppress millions of resourceful people.

I do not believe the rest of the country wants some of the States to become concentration camps for the sake of mixing white and colored children against their parents' will.

Lee Wooden Talks to Vernonia High School Students on Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at a time when the rural electrification movement is under attack, it is well that Senators and Representatives should be refreshed regarding its origins and accomplishments.

One of the great pioneers of rural electrification in the Pacific Northwest is my good friend, 77-year-old Lee Wooden, of Jewell, Oreg., who is the longtime president of the Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Mr. Wooden is a frontier farmer and lumberman, now retired. In his own words, he remembers what it was like in the Northwest and in Oregon during the era of kerosene lamps and candles. I know, too, not from personal experience but because Mrs. Neuberger's farm family had none of the blessings of electricity until Bonneville Dam was built and the REA financed rural powerlines.

In the February issue of Northwest Ruralite for 1959, there is reprinted a sincere and direct speech which Lee Wooden delivered to the students of Vernonia High School in the lumbering town of Vernonia. The speech is entitled "What Rural Youngsters Should Know." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Lee Wooden's address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHAT RURAL YOUNGSTER SHOULD KNOW

(By Lee Wooden)

(Seventy-seven year-old Lee Wooden, president of the Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association and pioneer Clatsop County timberman and farmer, tells people he has retired. Lately, he has been making a hobby of bringing to the young people of his State an awareness of the meaning of rural electrification. In case you never knew, or have almost forgotten what Mr. Wooden knows so well, Ruralite reprints here some of the story he recently told students at the Vernonia, Oreg., high school.)

Prior to 1935 only 1 farm in 10 had electricity at the turn of a switch. On May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration was created by executive order of President Roosevelt. That order not only established REA, it also appointed that famous engineer, Morris L. Cook, as the first Administrator.

Congress immediately appropriated \$100 million to be loaned to both commercial and public utilities. This money was only for

the extension of existing electric lines into farm areas which at that time did not have electric service. The order made no mention of the formation of electric cooperatives to do the job.

One full year was lost in a futile effort to introduce the existing electric utilities to borrow the money at a low rate of interest, and then Congress realized that it was useless to try further persuasion, and passed the Norris-Rayburn Act, known as the REA Act of 1936.

The Norris-Rayburn Act was signed into law on May 20, 1936, by President Roosevelt. This act gave to the farmers and rural people the right to form their own electric cooperatives and to borrow the money at a low rate of interest to build their own electric systems.

Today, more than 21 years since the REA Act of 1936 was passed, not 1 farm in 10, but 96 percent have electricity at the turn of a switch. Electricity does more to raise the standard of living in the home than any other commodity, and does many more jobs on the farms than is required by the city dweller.

Each cooperative member has a voice and a vote at the annual membership meetings. The members elect a board of directors and establish the policies that govern the management of the cooperative.

On May 11, 1935, when President Roosevelt signed the Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration, commonly referred to as REA, he had two main objectives in mind. First, there was a great need to extend electric lines into farm areas, not only to raise the standard of living in the homes and on the farms of America, but also to eliminate much of the drudgery of farm life and make the farm homes a better and much more pleasant place to live, and increase their productivity. Second, the Nation was in the worst depression ever known in the history of this country.

This new business, created by the building of nearly 1,000 electric cooperative systems throughout the Nation, has had a great stabilizing effect nationwide. This wonderful program has created new wealth, new business, where none existed before, and new jobs in untold numbers.

It is estimated that for every dollar loaned to electric cooperatives, more than \$6 have been spent for appliances and equipment, thereby greatly increasing employment, and greatly benefiting the entire economy.

All of the nearly \$3 billion loaned to electric cooperatives by REA is being repaid over a 35-year period at 2-percent interest, and to date better than 39.9 percent of all payments, both principal and interest, are either current or paid in advance of the due date.

While the REA was not created to make a profit on the money loaned to the cooperatives, according to figures as of February 1957, the Government had netted \$47.5 million. That is, the money collected as interest was that much more than the cost of money to the Government.

The members of an REA-financed cooperative own their electric systems and, since such cooperatives are nonprofit organizations, any surplus at the end of the year is credited to the member's account in direct proportion to his yearly payment for service. The 4 million members of the nearly 1,000 REA-financed electric cooperatives represent more than 15 million people. Oregon's 15 REA-financed electric cooperatives have 33,000 members and represent more than 100,000 people.

Many of the new members do not remember the tallow candle and the kerosene lamp and lantern. Most all newspapers and magazines, as well as all other media, carry vicious propaganda advertising against locally owned electric cooperatives. The fight is being carried on both at the State and national level

and unless the members fight for their rights they may become weary of the struggle and lose their own electric systems.

Supreme Court Not Sacred to Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there has been in recent times much controversial discussion concerning the morality of criticism aimed at the U.S. Supreme Court. While even the greatest statesmen of every age were not infallible, a review of their attitudes can often be helpful in deciding current controversies. The able columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, has made a definite contribution by discussing the attitude of President Lincoln toward the Court in his column entitled, "Supreme Court Not Sacred to Lincoln," published in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on February 15. I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT NOT SACRED TO LINCOLN

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation celebrated last week the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Eloquent eulogies were spoken—and he deserves them all. But if what Abraham Lincoln said just 100 years ago were attributed today to anyone else in public life, the same utterances would be denounced as coming from a racist, or extremist, or a person who defies the Constitution.

Few people realize how outspoken Abraham Lincoln was against a Supreme Court decision and how he insisted that a mere overturning of precedent in a ruling was not settled law. It was just 100 years ago when Abraham Lincoln was debating with Stephen Douglas in the State of Illinois. Only a few months ago the Library of Congress published a book containing facsimiles of the printers' copy of the stenographic record of Lincoln-Douglas debates as edited and prepared for the press by Abraham Lincoln.

Following is a quotation from Mr. Lincoln's speech delivered on July 13, 1858, at Chicago:

"The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision (of the Supreme Court of the United States) is a degree of sacredness that has never been before thrown around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why, decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very Court before. It is the first of its kind; it is an astonisher in legal history—it is a new wonder of the world."

In speaking further of the Dred Scott decision, Mr. Lincoln said at Quincy, Ill., on October 13, 1858:

"But we nevertheless do oppose that decision as a political rule which shall be binding on the voter to vote for nobody who thinks it wrong, which shall be binding on the Members of Congress or the President to favor no measure that does not actually

concur with the principles of that decision. We do not propose to be bound by it as a political rule in that way. . . . We propose so resisting it as to have it reversed if we can, and a new judicial rule established upon this subject."

In another speech delivered in Chicago on July 17, 1858, Mr. Lincoln quoted with approval a letter from Thomas Jefferson, written in 1820, which declared that if the judges of the Supreme Court are to be considered as "the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions," this could be a "very dangerous doctrine indeed and one which would place us under the despotism of an obligarchy."

In a speech delivered at Ottawa, Ill., on August 21, 1858, Mr. Lincoln took up the race question. He denounced slavery, but then added:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which in my judgment will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas, he is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hands earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man."

"What next? Free them and make them politically and socially our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of white people will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if indeed it is any part of it. A universal feeling whether well or ill-founded, cannot be safely disregarded. We cannot, then, make them equal."

Jobless Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial which appeared in the February 3, 1959, edition of the Muskegon Chronicle supporting Federal standards in the field of unemployment compensation. On this extremely important issue, one which I hope this Congress will resolve along the line suggested by the Muskegon Chronicle, I am sure all will profit from a reading of this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBLESS PAY

Congress is getting a number of proposals for setting up a nationwide minimum standard for unemployment compensation, instead of leaving this to the action of each separate State.

There is a tremendous need for national legislation on this subject. Congress has talked about it now for several years, but nothing definite has been done.

Why should States be permitted to compete with one another on the basis of below-minimum unemployment schedules? That is the way it is now. Just as we have a national minimum wage law for industry engaged in interstate commerce, so we should have a national minimum jobless pay level.

The advantage to Michigan is obvious. Our State is one of those that have shown a decent concern for people in industrial employment who are laid off through no fault of their own. Nearly all States have a lower standard of jobless pay than Michigan.

Yet in the process this State has placed itself at a competitive disadvantage with the others that adhere to niggardly standards as a lure to industry, or because labor in those States has a weak voice in its law-making process.

Ever since he became President, Mr. Eisenhower and his Secretary of Labor have urged an increase in the amount, duration and coverage of jobless benefits.

But the situation is as uneven as ever on a State-by-State basis. It should be as apparent to Members of Congress as to everybody else that a national minimum standard is the only solution.

Not many days ago somebody introduced a bill at Lansing to provide unemployment compensation in this State for as long as a person is out of a job. In view of the condition facing Michigan, it is a nonsensical proposal, the main purpose of which was to serve as an entering wedge to extend the present limit.

The cure for Michigan's unemployment is more jobs, not more penalties on present employers and a still greater discrepancy between the jobless pay level of this State and the considerably lower level in most other States.

National legislation, bringing all States to a decent minimum jobless pay standard, is the answer. Michigan Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, should unite behind such a measure.

Foreign Alumni: One of America's Greatest Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today we recognize that tensions in the world which result in fear, distrust, and misunderstanding are a deterrent to world peace. Currently, we are trying to find ways and means of breaking through the barriers to create better understanding among the peoples of the world.

Recently Mr. Don Anderson, vice president of the Wisconsin Alumni Association, published a thought-provoking article in the Wisconsin Alumnus, en-

titled "Foreign Alumni: One of America's Great Assets."

In his article, Mr. Anderson points out that men and women from other lands—educated in American colleges and universities—can and are serving in their own nations as important reflections of our way of life.

Educated in our principles and ideals, they are acting to create better understanding, and often to correct the distortions being spread about us by Communist propaganda.

I am pleased to say that the University of Wisconsin—a truly great institution of learning—is now educating about 649 students from 70 nations. Over the years, almost every country in the world has been represented at this fine university.

As alumni of Wisconsin, many of these students will carry back to their homeland a better understanding of this great country.

As a basis for activities, a number of these alumni have organized groups or clubs abroad. Today, for example, Wisconsin has alumni clubs in Bangkok, Manila, Tokyo, and Honolulu. In other nations there are informal get-togethers of alumni.

The expansion of such efforts—based on private initiative, foresight, and constructive thinking—would indeed make an important contribution to creating a better understanding of us among the nations of the world.

To give my colleagues the benefit of Mr. Anderson's thinking on this program, I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN ALUMNI: ONE OF AMERICA'S GREAT ASSETS

(By Don Anderson)

I hope that the day will come when every country in the world has an organized group of Wisconsin alumni, meeting regularly, continuing to learn the lessons that any good school has to teach its children no matter how long they have been out of the classrooms, sending back to this campus the experience and support that every school needs from its alumni.

Dr. Hu Shih, scholar and former Chinese Ambassador to the United States, once said that America's greatest contribution to education was its revolutionary concept of the alumnus, its concept of the former student as an understandable responsible partner and champion.

Wisconsin has been fortunate, especially in recent years, in having strong alumni relations. I would ask that this spirit be extended in a larger degree to the foreign students who come to study here. From classroom and laboratory they get much that a university has to offer. I would like to see them better encouraged to be loyal Wisconsin alumni after they have returned to their homelands. It can be a source of continuing benefit to them, a source of new wealth to the University itself.

It is not known exactly when the first foreign student registered here. There were none in the 1870's. In 1905 there were 33. This year we have 649 students from 70 nations. The leading country is India with about 100 students.

It is estimated that altogether 3,800 foreign students have attended school here. Practically every nation in the world has been represented. If a university gives its students not only knowledge but loyalties as well, is it too much to suggest that there is a little flavor of Wisconsin in every one of the world's communities? Would it not enrich us and the rest of the world to have those loyalties deepened and strengthened?

This program is one that cannot be carried out by faculty and administration alone. It calls for planning and effort by the student body. It will require planning and programing by the alumni association, because it is easy to lose these alumni once they have gone back to their native lands. It needs the understanding and the hospitality of Madison and other Wisconsin communities to help give our foreign guests an understanding and an appreciation of American home and family life.

Much has been done along these lines already, but there is room for improvement.

Too many Americans fail to appreciate the importance of having foreign students here to live and study with us. I think that failure of understanding is almost as common in the university community itself as it is elsewhere in the American scene outside the halls of ivy. Too often we look at these visitors in terms of a favor we are doing them, a privilege they could not enjoy were it not for the largesse of the American taxpayer and his tax dollar. I suggest that if there is anything of merit in our social order, in our economics or our politics, if there is any importance in impressing the rest of the world with the validity of our philosophies, then we are the ones who benefit when the foreign visitor is exposed to our ideas and our way of life which often show to their best advantage in our American university communities. We should be the ones who are grateful for the opportunity offered us.

Roy L. Matson, editor of the Wisconsin State Journal, recently returned from a 3-month tour of duty in India for the State Department. He also visited Thailand, Hong Kong, and Japan. He lectured and talked informally to thousands of people of every conceivable variety of political opinion and ideology. Along the way he met hostility, disbelief, or scorn for the United States and the West. Always there was one shining exception, one person or group of persons, who at least understood us, even if they did not always agree with us. That exception almost invariably turned out to be the graduate of an American university.

If, in their mind, there was not complete agreement, there at least was understanding and that is not a little thing.

The American, face-to-face and in association, is not the frightening thing his detractors abroad sometimes paint him. In no better way can the American be drawn in his true light than by having the man from abroad live with him and learn with him. In no better way can the man from abroad learn that behind and beneath the American's breezy front, his laughter, his insanity at world series time and football season there lies the American ideal.

It is a thing that is discovered with some surprise by many if not most from abroad: the American concern for opportunity and justice for the common man. Once discovered it is a thing remembered, appreciated, and treasured. And it is a thing that is as powerful to American friendship and advantage as all the defense alliances and power pacts we can devise around the world.

As important as these larger values are the smaller ones that accrue. They are the friendships which develop between classmates. An intelligent and cultured foreign student brings breadth and delight to dor-

mitry, fraternity or rooming house. Those of us who have had them live in our homes know how much richer our family has been made by the contact, and the deep and lasting friendships that have come from them.

Wisconsin now has alumni clubs in Bangkok, Manila, Tokyo, and Honolulu. Tom Brittingham's Vikings get together informally on occasion in Scandinavia. I hope that the day will come when every country in the world has an organized group of Wisconsin alumni, meeting regularly, continuing to learn the lessons that any good school has to teach its children no matter how long they have been out of the classrooms, sending back to this campus the experience and support that every school needs from its alumni.

Wisconsin has two great declarations of principle and policy. The first is the one on winnowing and sifting on the plaque at Bascom Hall. The other is that the boundaries of the State shall be the borders of the campus.

Can anything but good come from extending the borders and the boundaries to include the sons and daughters of Wisconsin wherever they live in this whole world?

How They Steal and Hide Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the recent Cuban revolution is bringing to light many sordid facts concerning the deposed Batista regime. Looting seems to be the common practice of Latin American dictators.

Jack Anderson exposes Batista's methods in an illuminating article published in the *Parade* magazine section of yesterday's *Washington Post*. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "How They Steal and Hide Millions," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THEY STEAL AND HIDE MILLIONS

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Swiss bankers who specialize in secrecy helped ex-dictator Fulgencio Batista rob the Cuban people of millions before his blood-and-booty rule came to an end. Yet he is only the latest in a long line of Latin American dictators to get away with vast loot and retire to a life of luxury.

Argentina's Juan Peron, kicked out by an army revolt in 1955; Peru's Manuel Odría, ousted in 1956; Colombia's Rojas Pinilla, toppled from power in 1957; Venezuela's Perez Jimenez, thrown out by his people a year ago—all escaped with the fabulous fruit of years of graft and corruption.

The surviving dictators, Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic and Alfredo Stroessner of Paraguay, are reported to have huge fortunes salted away against the day they may be forced to flee. Nicaragua's Anastasio Somoza was similarly prepared against poverty when an assassin's bullet (one of the hazards of his profession) found his heart in September 1956. His misfortune may well have been some Swiss banker's windfall. The money in his secret accounts may have been

so well hidden that no one knew how to claim it all. In that case it would have had to revert to the bankers.

The drama of Batista's New Year's Eve flight to the Dominican Republic, reputedly with suitcases stuffed with high denomination bills, poses a problem not only for Latin America, where dictatorship flourishes, but for the United States, too. With billions of American tax dollars being poured into the Latin American aid program, it is important to know how these vital funds can be raided so ruthlessly and huge sums vanish so completely.

Since Batista's exist, *Parade* has made an exhaustive investigation of the great dictatorship racket. How do the dictators rob their people? More important, how do they cache the money? *Parade* contacted authorities in Havana and here in Washington, talked with top officials of the Cuban Embassy here, interviewed Batista henchmen who have taken refuge in this country, checked with the State and Treasury Departments, even succeeded in prying loose exclusive information from the cagey Swiss bankers who hold the accounts of the dictators, both fallen and fearful.

THE REAL TREASURE

From this mass of material, one startling fact emerges. While there are many ways of robbing a country and hiding money, the dictator's real treasure chests lie far away, in Geneva and Berne, to be unlocked only by secret codes. Their accounts are identified only by numbers so closely guarded they never are committed to paper, only to memory.

Parade was permitted to see a Swiss code account held by one Batista aide. There is nothing like it elsewhere in the whole system of banking. The secrecy of Swiss banks is protected by the bulky Swiss constitution itself. Not even the Government can force a bank to disclose the name of a depositor, the amount to his credit or the record of his deposits and withdrawals. Result: the Swiss have become the world's leading bankers and their vaults the repository of most of the world's shady money. Not only dictators but gangsters, gun smugglers, dope traffickers, and the white slavers have stacked their money with the Swiss.

Swiss secrecy has become such a valuable commodity, in fact, that the banks of Geneva and Berne pay commissions of 3 to 5 percent to anyone who can bring in a large secret account. Some banks go further and offer an additional 10 percent of all that can be salvaged should the depositor suffer an accident and the money remain unclaimed. After a reasonable waiting period, the bank concerned usually seizes the money. No wonder Latin American dictators, with their high casualty rate, are welcome clients.

Swiss bank transactions can be bizarre. Although one representative insisted that the total number of secret accounts is far smaller than generally believed, he did acknowledge that it would be impossible for the Swiss Government or anyone else to guess the number of such accounts or how much is contained in them. He told how his bank had once received \$4 million in French francs that had been floated across a lake.

The secret depositor apparently could not escape across the French border with the money. So he packed it in a barrel and painted instructions on the outside, asking the finder to take it to a certain bank in return for a reward. Inside the barrel were code instructions telling his bank to whom it belonged and how much reward should be paid. The depositor then waited for a favorable wind, launched the barrel and watched it drift into the darkness. It was picked up next morning by a Swiss fisherman, who scrupulously obeyed the painted instructions.

The code system is so complex that it defies breaking. The depositor is given a

secret code number, then is provided with a set of tables that enables him to communicate with the bank by other code numbers. His account number is known only to himself and the bank managers. The set of tables provides serial numbers for messages; even the date and type of currency must be identified by a number from the secret tables.

Without this elaborate code, he would have to negotiate in person. He would then identify himself by his memorized number and supply whatever additional confirmation the bank required. This would depend on instructions given by the depositor on opening the account; perhaps some incident from his childhood, or the name and age of a distant relative.

Holders of numbered accounts receive statements only upon request. Then the statements are mailed in plain envelopes with the address scribbled, looking on the outside like a letter from a friend.

Beyond the slightest doubt, Batista, Peron, and the others have not one but many such accounts. They have siphoned millions into secret Swiss accounts, held by themselves and their graft-grabbing compatriots.

HOW MANY MILLIONS?

Batista may have left Havana with dollar-crammed suitcases, but it would be only his petty cash. The fortune he amassed was too huge for so picaresque a means of transport. He had been getting booty out of Cuba for years. How many millions he acquired probably never will be known. It is doubtful that he even knows the amount himself. The new Cuban Government is working day and night trying to unravel Batista's financial skull-duggery, but it will be months before even a faint outline of the plot emerges.

Some authorities in Havana estimate that he got away with \$200 million. Congressman CHARLES PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, who championed the rebel cause in Congress by putting pressure on the State Department to stop the flow of U.S. arms to Batista, believes that \$500 million is nearer the mark.

"I intend to ask the Treasury and Justice Department to investigate Batista's holdings in this country," PORTER informed *Parade*. "I also intend to explore what steps can be taken to return this money to the Cuban people from whom it was filched."

During the first Batista years in power (1933-44), he amassed a personal fortune of more than \$60 million. This much became a matter of official court record when he divorced his first wife, Elisa Godinez, to marry his mistress, Marta Fernandez. The divorce settlement: \$15 million in cash, checks, and property.

It was generally conceded the \$60 million was only the part of the Batista financial iceberg showing above water. The bulk of it was well below the surface. His code accounts in Switzerland were beginning to bulge. He siphoned off other funds into U.S. banks, stuffed safety deposit boxes with bearer bonds, bought real estate in Jacksonville and Daytona Beach, Fla.

Outside Havana he built the luxurious Kuquine estate, giving it all the fancy trimmings he had dreamed about as a peasant boy. All the rooms were marble-floored, the cellar mahogany-paneled. He built another mansion at Daytona Beach to house him during his voluntary exile (1944-51).

But it was not until he returned to Cuba in 1951 that the ex-sergeant (who got his stripes for his skill at shorthand, not soldiering) really hit the jackpot by taking charge of Korean war profits. This was the period known in Cuba as the Dance of the Millions. Sugar almost came to be worth its weight in gold dust; the price soared from ½ cent to 8 cents a pound. He also changed the gambling laws, to make Havana a wide-open rival to Las Vegas and Reno. Batista raked in the greenbacks like autumn leaves.

THE GANGSTERS MOVE IN

For the Cuban people, the Dance of the Millions rapidly became a Danse Macabre. Headed by Meyer Lansky, one-time beer baron who had become acquainted with Batista in Florida, American gangsters began to move in. If they thought they had anything to teach Batista, they soon learned differently.

Batista's grip on Cuba was so complete and ruthless they were left openmouthed. His rackets went right down from the biggest companies to the smallest bootblack. Little shopkeepers paid \$2 for opening each morning, another \$2 for closing each night. Taxi drivers paid \$1 for the privilege of parking in a given spot. The national lottery, always a feature of Cuban life, had become almost Batista's personal property. His associates were paid off in batches of tickets that they could either sell or hold. They also ran five illegal lotteries, called Molitos, without interference.

Batista's vivacious wife, taking her lead from Argentina's notorious Evita Peron, received a monthly check of \$70,000 to spend on charities. It was money to spend as she wished. Her brother, Roberto Fernandez, as Cuba's Government Sports Director was the country's slot-machine king. He tapped every gambling machine in the island for 50 percent of the take, including those on which children played during the village fiestas. General Francisco Tabernilla, the army chief, pocketed a percentage of every bottle of Scotch whisky imported into Cuba. (Whisky came to be known as Old Tabernilla.) Other Batista men drained off tribute from prostitution, trade unions, public work projects. Under the table, the dictator always got his cut.

U.S. racketeers, graduates of the roaring twenties, gained a grudging admiration for Batista as they planned their lavish hotel casinos. He was ready with Government millions to provide financing. He gave special low-tariff rates for materials such as steel and concrete that had to be imported. Here were lush pickings. Contractors imported twice as much as they needed, then sold off the surplus for huge profits on the open, eager market. But in every case Batista, the donor of this financial banquet, expected his kickback, and his police were around to see that he got it.

Batista was quick to devise a means of keeping the enormous sums he was accumulating out of the Cuban banking system, which, clinging to old-fashioned honesty, required bookkeeping. He set up an institution with the impressive name, Banco de Desarrollo Economico y Social (Bank of Economic and Social Development). It was less formally known as Bander.

AN OPEN SECRET

On the surface, Bander was supposed to be a special bank for handling a \$350 million fund earmarked for public works. Actually it functioned as a clearinghouse for graft, complete with numbered accounts patterned after the Swiss system. It was not a particularly well-kept secret that the military and public works projects processed through Bander were handled on a 50-50 basis—50 percent for the project, 50 percent for Batista and his friends.

The day after the Castro rebels moved into Havana, they acted swiftly to sequester the bank accounts and seal the safety deposit boxes of everybody connected with Batista. Through a special Ministry for the Recovery of Stolen Property, the new Government is attempting to recoup some of the graft.

A Castro spokesman told Parade that investigators already had unearthed an office that controlled 40 companies worth an estimated \$40 million. Most of the stock was issued in blank to the bearer. They have traced much of the stock to members of Batista's family, and are satisfied that the

40 companies are merely fronts for the dictator himself.

However much the new Cuban Government may recover of Batista's loot, it will still be only a fraction of the millions extracted from Cuba.

Other dictators and racketeers, present and future, will go on escaping with millions, just so long as there are welcoming bolt holes into which they can pour their money. Bolt holes like those Swiss banks, where a man is only a number, and where the laws of a country can be used to protect his perfidy.

A Little Dog Named Butch "Writes" to Senator Thurmond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as we in the Congress read our daily mail, it is a great relief to discover correspondence of a purely human-interest nature, especially when it is in the lighter vein. I recently received a letter from one of my canine constituents which is so well expressed that I believe it is deserving of wide distribution. I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I received from a dog named Butch in Columbia, S.C., be printed in the appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 5, 1959.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a little dog about 7 months old. I am considered a mild-mannered dog. Well liked by my master and mistress, I am well cared for. I take my shots for rabies; I buy my city license each year. I try very hard to abide by the city laws, because I have been taught that way.

But the real reason I am writing you is, I believe the Government should make some provision whereby my master could use me as a dependent, because I am solely dependent on my master to provide me with food, shelter, and medical care; because I do my best to see that he is protected while he sleeps; I act as a doorman because when someone who is in trouble and wants to use my master's telephone, I always let him know that a stranger is near; and should a storm suddenly strike at night, I usually wake him and let him know. I am always mindful of fires, or prowlers at night; I watch and care for my mistress while my master is working.

I eat an awful lot; I am very seldom sick or need medical care, but I am confident should the need become apparent I can rest assured that I would be given the necessary treatment.

I do try very hard to protect my master's property from stray animals and persons who come for no good reason.

I am very polite to my master's friends; I romp with joy when I hear them brag about how well I look and how polite and considerate I am when they visit my master.

You know I was put here by God; I am a creature; I live and breathe like you; I have feelings that can be hurt; I must have food, water, and medical care; I cannot ask for it because I don't speak; I depend solely on my master because he understands me. He

knows when I am sick, and he knows when I should be fed. I provide many hours of happiness and joy for my master by romping and playing. I run many miles a day bringing back sticks which my master throws in the yard and creeks. I cannot live without my master. I do not have to sleep under bridges or houses at night and I do not have to turn over garbage cans for food. I do not have to beg or pretend to like someone to get a bone or food because my master provides me with everything I need. I realize it costs money to keep me, but my master never complains. He is kind and generous; he is ever mindful of my welfare. Please help me so I can help my master. He is Mr. (and Mrs.) G. H. Orr, 4329 Colonial Drive, Columbia, S.C.

Yours very truly,

BUTCH.

Support for a Needed Move To Preserve Padre Island in the Gulf of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the first bill which I introduced this session provided for the establishment of Padre Island, stretching along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico between Corpus Christi and Brownsville, Tex., as a national park.

This island features some of the finest beaches to be found anywhere in our United States. In addition, they are almost in the same State as they were when the Karankawa Indians lived on the island, when the Spanish explorer Alonso Alvarez de Pineda set foot on the shores in 1519, to be followed by Cabeza de Vaca, David Ingram, and others, and when a young lieutenant named George G. Meade sailed down Laguna Madre on the island's landward side to see if Gen. Zachary Taylor could take his artillery to Mexico by water.

It is an unfortunate truth that in many sections of our country the shoreline was vanished from public use. According to a national survey, only 240 miles of the 3,700 miles of shoreline constituting the Atlantic and Gulf coasts are in Federal and State ownership for public recreation use.

I believe a national park on Padre Island is sorely needed to preserve some of our coastline for the enjoyment of all. If it is made a park, I confidently predict Padre Island will become a winter playground for the Nation.

What better place could there be than this sandy island on which Texas longhorns once grazed and where one can still visit the wrecked hulls of fishing boats and pick up glass colored by the sun marking the sites of towns established here by early settlers? The story of the centuries lends flavor to this island, rich in legend of Indians, pirate treasure, explorers, soldiers, cowmen, and fishermen and sailors.

In addition, the island provides sanctuary for birds and wildlife and the water around it yields fine surf fishing.

Its unique combination of geographical formations, scenery, history, climate, and wildlife cannot be duplicated anywhere else in the Nation.

Mr. President, in further support of my reasons for wanting to preserve this last substantial strip of the American coastline which is still almost entirely in its natural State, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a resolution of the Guild of the Houston (Tex.) Museum of Natural History, of February 9, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF GUILD OF HOUSTON, TEX.,
MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, FEBRUARY 9,
1959

The Guild of the Houston Museum of Natural History recognizes that Padre Island is unique in that it is the longest sand barrier island in the world; that its dunes and sand beaches are the finest along the Gulf coast; that bird values are outstanding and its marine life fascinating; and that its historical and recreational values are important.

It recognizes also that the island is largely unspoiled but that easy accessibility, due to three causeways, will soon destroy its natural beauty and its value for public recreation and study: Therefore

Resolved, That this organization go on record as favoring the acquisition of Padre Island for public recreation and for conservation of its beauty and study values.

Resolved further, That this guild take whatever action seems expedient to bring about the perpetuity of the island in its natural state.

Bigness Gives Power, Not Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some time ago I had called to my attention an excellent article which appeared in the St. Petersburg Times of November 29, 1958, entitled "Bigness Gives Power, Not Efficiency" by Mr. Theodore K. Quinn.

The author is one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on problems of monopoly and bigness in business. He is the author of numerous books and articles on industry and labor and has been a frequent witness before congressional committees on problems of monopoly.

In order that Senators may have an opportunity to read this enlightening article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BIGNESS GIVES POWER, NOT EFFICIENCY

(By Theodore K. Quinn)

(The author of this guest column is one of the nation's outstanding authorities on problems of monopoly and bigness in business. Former chairman of the board of General Electric Finance Co., now president of the Monitor Equipment and of T. K. Quinn Co., Inc., business consultants in

New York, he has worked with Senators O'Mahoney and Kefauver on problems of monopoly, been a frequent witness before congressional committees, and is the author of numerous books and articles on industry and labor. He maintains a home in Largo as well as one in Roxbury, Conn.—The Editors.)

The distinguished physicist, Dr. Chauncey Starr, head of Atomics International, to whom you refer in your November 20 editorial "Bigness vs. Efficiency Problem," should not be taken seriously when he protests the governmental, economic policy of awarding nuclear power component contracts to small companies. His position is wholly self-serving whether or not he so intends it.

There is, to be sure, an optimum point of production efficiency—that is, lowest cost in relation to investment—in the production of every product. It runs into greater volume in the production of automobiles, for example, and is quite small in tool making, to use an opposite, extreme example. But there is no rule of thumb, and bigness is never efficient per se. On the contrary, the opposite is most likely to be true.

Unfortunately, efficiency in our society is dangerously confused with power. In this sense James Hoffa is efficient; so is Frank Costello. None of the 80 and more billion-dollar capital corporations need to be as immense as they are for any reason of efficiency. They swelled up through capital power, almost invariably by absorbing and combining other companies. Usually they have many separable departments and divisions not often related to any single product where concentration and the division of labor could produce efficiency.

General Motors, the world's largest manufacturing corporation, like the other giants, is huge because it combines dozens of formerly independent companies. Its production of Cadillacs does not make its production of Chevrolets, Buicks, Pontiacs, Oldsmobiles, etc., more efficient. It does not have also to be in the home appliance business, the bus line operating business, diesel engine business, insurance, finance, etc.—not for any reason of efficiency.

But, and this is the whole point, its tremendous size gives it proportionate power of a coercive kind, in purchasing influence over hundreds of banks it patronizes, over railroads handling its enormous shipping, over magazines, newspapers, and broadcast media—to which it pays over a hundred million dollars a year. All of this spells power, sheer might, not efficiency.

Less than 40 corporations the size of General Motors could handle our entire economy's output of goods and services, including nuclear components. Is this what America really wants? Wouldn't that be too much like Russia, where there is but a single, arbitrary, undemocratic authority?

The available evidence indicates that the biggest companies are not the most efficient producers. Neither United States Steel nor Bethlehem, the two largest, are the lowest cost operators or producers of steel. General Electric, with which I was associated for many years in official capacities, was never the lowest cost producer of any of its many, many lines, except where it was the only producer.

But it had the advantage of certain high profit, monopolistic lines, such as electric lamps and certain big generators, which enabled it to absorb losses on other lines until competitors realized they could not overcome their capital disadvantage, and joined, legally, of course, in livable profit margins and prices.

It makes little ultimate difference to the public from the purely dollars and cents standpoint whether essential independence in smaller companies is subsidized directly or whether, on the other hand, monopoly is

supported and encouraged by the Government favoring giant corporations, which eventually resort to administered prices and extort as much or more in high profit rates.

The vital difference is that we can, through smaller companies, maintain a measure of healthy competition and save our American system, or what remains of it, instead of encouraging more and more monopolistic, concentrated control in private hands with the deadly social suffocation to which it leads.

Ten-Percent Tax on the Transportation of Persons Should Be Repealed

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, I introduced H.R. 1364, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons.

During the 85th Congress, the 3-percent excise tax on the transportation of property was repealed but unfortunately its counterpart, the 10-percent tax on travelers, was retained.

All of us are familiar, I am sure, with the original purposes of this tax which was imposed in 1941 as a temporary measure to help fill revenue needs and to discourage the general public's use of the airlines, railroads, and buses during World War II. Despite the fact that the reasons for imposing this tax have disappeared, it is unfortunately still with us. We must rid ourselves of it now.

If we ever lose the ability to move quickly and safely from one place to another, either in this country or throughout the world, we as a nation will be as impotent as you and I would be if we lose our ability to walk or talk. There is no doubt about our transportation industry's essentiality and importance to the economy of the country. The general public needs adequate and modern travel facilities. Our transportation system must continue to move forward and expand not only to prepare for the predicted 60 million increase in our population by 1975 but in fact even to exist in this age of electronics and atomic energy. No deterrent should be allowed to stand in the way which might discourage the general public from using common carriers to the limit of their capacity. The 10 percent tax on travel is just such a deterrent and should be repealed as quickly as possible.

By discouraging travel on commercial carriers, the tax places a heavy burden upon one of the Nation's most vital industries. The American transportation system is the envy of the world. During the Korean conflict and World War II, it performed a tremendous job of speedily and efficiently transporting essential personnel and material. If another national emergency should develop, the industry would again be asked to perform miracles of transportation while the automobile would again be

curtailed as a luxury this Nation couldn't afford. Public carriers must be prepared.

To be ready for a national emergency requires the most efficient use of our economic resources. One of the most important ways to accomplish this is to fully utilize and properly maintain our commercial transportation system. The existence of such a system in periods of limited resources depends upon its being permitted to use its facilities economically in periods of abundant resources, a fact too often overlooked. We should therefore encourage the growth of a sound and healthy common carrier system rather than discourage, by tax, the use of such industry's facilities on the part of the traveling public.

Here is a tax that no one has testified is good, fair, or beneficial. It is equally disliked by all regulated carriers and the traveling public. Members of Congress, executives of our airlines, railroads, intercity buslines and shipping companies, trade association officials and the man of the street have all appeared at one time or another before congressional committees urging its repeal. I cannot understand why, if the income derived from the tax amounts to about \$200 million a year, Congress refuses to repeal it, particularly when many economists have stated that it is very probable that the Government stands to collect more revenue through increased use of our public carriers.

And do we realize that the effect of this tax on passengers adds to today's already high cost of living. Let me show you how. Since one-third of passenger transportation, it has been conservatively estimated, is for necessary business travel, the taxes on transportation will be included in operating expenses of the companies incurring them and passed on, at least partially, in the pricing of their products. The cost of collecting the tax is borne by the carriers and is included in operating expenses and thus affects the level of fares. And finally inadequate passenger revenues in the case of the railroads must be recovered from freight transportation by increases in rates. So here we have a tax which is not only unnecessary but also inflationary.

Another objectionable feature of the tax is that its burden is greater on the low-income families which spend most if not all of their income on the necessities of life. This group, consisting of about one-third of the families in the United States, it has been estimated, have no other means of travel than our common carriers. For them travel is not a luxury but a necessity and the travel tax which is collected by common carriers competes with the food and clothing dollar.

Not only does this 10 percent tax discriminate against the low income families but because it was imposed as a penalty surcharge, only on travel furnished by for-hire carriers, the tax is inherently discriminatory. As originally enacted, the tax applied to all amounts paid within the United States for transportation

by rail, motor vehicle, water or air. This was not unfair in the beginning because there was no discrimination between competing carriers although it did give an advantage to the automobiles which, however, during the war was practically nonexistent. If, as expected, the tax had been repealed at the end of World War II, the inherent discrimination of the tax could not have developed fully. Instead, gas rationing, the device used to discourage private travel, was terminated and the travel tax was and is still being continued.

To make the tax further discriminatory, Congress has amended the law on several occasions so that today only travel within the continental United States and a 225-mile buffer zone is subjected to the tax. International travel is thus encouraged at the expense of domestic travel. Millions of dollars have been spent on our national parks for the benefit of Americans, and they, with our foreign guests, must pay a penalty to visit these places by train, airline, or bus. This is a curious and unhealthy situation.

The effect of the tax in discouraging travel in the United States by commercial means is very visibly demonstrated by the change in the character of intercity travel between 1946, the first full postwar year, and 1958. In 1946 common carriers transported 27 percent of all intercity travelers. Today this figure has dropped to slightly more than 10 percent in spite of the fact that total intercity miles have almost doubled during the 12-year period. How are people getting from city to city? Almost 90 percent of them are traveling with their families in the automobile which is not subjected to the travel tax.

This drop in intercity mileage which our large common carriers have experienced is extremely detrimental to the future of our transportation industry. With the airlines trying valiantly to find the money to order new jet airplanes, with the railroads' passenger car fleet totally inadequate for an emergency according to the Department of the Army, and with revenue of the bus companies—about 80 percent of which are small business—inadequate to cope with rising costs, why does the Congress of the United States, by refusing to repeal the travel tax, not recognize that it is fostering unsound economic conditions in the transportation industry and inadequacy of the transportation plant to meet the needs of commerce and national defense? The travel tax is in derogation of the national transportation policy which is spelled out in the Interstate Commerce Act. How much longer can we go on talking out of both sides of our mouths at once? Let us let our right hand act in concert with our left. Let us keep our transportation system second to none—one that is ready at all times for anything that might come. Let us repeal immediately the 10 percent tax on the transportation of persons.

Mr. J. Francis Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, J. Francis Smith, of Waterbury, Conn., died on February 5, 1959. Mr. Smith was one of the most prominent men of his generation in Waterbury and in the State of Connecticut. He was active in the political field, in the business field, and in the field of community activities. He gave generously of himself in activities which benefited the public and brought him no return other than the satisfaction of knowing that he had contributed to the welfare of his fellow man. His death will be a great loss to his community and to the State of Connecticut.

Mr. Smith was chairman of the first Waterbury U.S. savings bond drive during World War II and also headed the first Waterbury Community Chest drive.

He was a member of the boards of directors of many companies, including Connecticut Light & Power, and First Federal Savings & Loan Association. He was chairman of the advisory board of the Waterbury Trust Office and honorary director of the Connecticut National Bank with which Waterbury Trust is affiliated.

Mr. Smith was also a director of the Small Tube Products, Inc., now of Altoona, Pa.; the United Corp. of New York; True-Temper Corp., Cleveland, Ohio; the old Waterbury Farrel Foundry & Machine Co.; now a division of Textron, Inc.; and a former director of the New Haven Railroad.

BUSINESS INTERESTS

In addition to heading the lumber company founded by his father, he was president of the Waterbury Ready Mixed Concrete Co., and Connecticut Wholesale Supply Co. He was president at one time of the Northwestern Lumber Dealers Association and the Connecticut Lumber Dealers Association.

A graduate of Driggs School, Crosby High School, and Dartmouth College, he developed an interest in tennis as a boy, and developed his skill in the sport to win many championships. He was on the Dartmouth tennis team, was winner of the Waterbury city tennis championship nine times, the State doubles championship three times, and also the southern New England championship. In recent years he had been rated as an excellent golf player. He was always considered the most outstanding tennis player developed in Waterbury.

ACTIVE IN POLITICS

Mr. Smith was elected secretary of the Democratic State central committee in 1932 and became chairman in 1934.

Gov. Abraham Ribicoff said of Mr. Smith:

The death of J. Francis Smith is a great loss to all of us. Throughout the years, he has been a close personal friend and adviser. Fran was an outstanding citizen of our State, who always gave of himself to the civic, religious, charitable, and political life of his community. He served the people well.

Mrs. Ribicoff joins me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Smith and the other members of his family. The State of Connecticut will mourn him and miss him throughout the coming years.

LAUDED BY FARLEY

Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee said of Mr. Smith:

News of the sudden death of Fran Smith shocks me, as I had recently talked with one of his brothers, who indicated some progress and imminent release from the hospital. For many years, I have had tremendous admiration and genuine affection for Fran Smith.

There never was any doubt as to his position on any issue. He was never a middle-of-the-roader, which convinced me more than ever, if the Democratic Party in every State had one leader like him, the party would be much stronger.

He had the admiration and respect of everyone with whom he came into contact. I've always enjoyed working with him and it was always a delight, in recent years to talk with him when he came to New York City, or by telephone at his office in Waterbury. My sincere condolences go to his brothers and his family.

U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD said of Mr. Smith:

Fran Smith was a great and dear friend of mine for 27 years. His untimely death comes as a great loss to me.

He was a brilliant man and always a clear thinker. He was a man dedicated to his country and the greatest State chairman either party ever had.

He was always a most charitable person and a man of the highest integrity.

His passing is a great loss to Waterbury and Connecticut, and I wish to express my sincere sympathy to his family.

U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH said of Mr. Smith:

I am saddened by the news of the death of J. Francis Smith. The State of Connecticut and the city of Waterbury have lost one of their most distinguished and public-spirited citizens. I extend the sympathy of Mrs. Bush and myself to members of his family at this most difficult time.

Hon. John M. Bailey, chairman of the Democratic State central committee, said of Mr. Smith:

J. Francis Smith's death was a shock to many of us. He had many friends throughout the State. I have lost a close personal friend of long standing, and also a man who was a valued adviser to me as chairman of the Democratic State central committee. The State has indeed lost a valued citizen in the passing of J. Francis Smith.

Former Mayor Edward D. Bergin, chairman of the Waterbury Democratic Town Committee, said of Mr. Smith:

The untimely death of Francis Smith is a real loss to the city of Waterbury. A man of keen intellect, sound judgment, and decisive, direct action, his influence, though little publicized, has been widely felt in all phases of our community life.

His firm adherence to the basic principles of our democratic system of government will be missed in the Democratic Party.

Mayor Raymond E. Snyder said of Mr. Smith:

Mrs. Snyder and I are deeply shocked to hear of the sudden death of J. Francis Smith. His passing has left a void that will be felt by all who have ever known or met him. J. Francis Smith's gentlemanly behavior and wise counsel have won the admiration and respect of all who have known him on the political scene, in civic matters, and in business. There have been few such dedicated men. It is a great loss.

Francis Smith was my dear friend. My interest in public service came solely from him. From my boyhood he advised and stimulated me. He was one person who had the stature to give disinterested advice. I admired his brilliant mind, his independence of thought, his courage, and his idealism.

He was a big man in a time of little men. He had the capacity to cut through any problem to its essentials and to make its solution come easy. He brought to political life an idealism and a concentration on the long views which have too often been obscured in these days of mass thinking. He gave generously of his time and energy in the effort to turn political movements in the direction of principle and away from expediency.

The success of our democratic system requires active participation by its citizens.

If all men gave as prodigally of their talents to the public welfare as did Francis Smith, the future security of our country would be much more certain.

The following is an editorial from the Waterbury Republican on February 6, 1959:

J. FRANCIS SMITH

Our city and the State are made poorer indeed by the untimely death of an outstanding businessman and citizen.

There is a sad irony in J. Francis Smith's death. He had apparently made a strong recovery a couple of years ago from a long, serious sickness, had resumed control of his business affairs, and, in managing Senator THOMAS DODD's campaign for the Democratic nomination, had shown last summer that he still possessed an old political warrior's skill. Then came the heart attack which, after weeks in the hospital, has claimed his life.

A hardheaded sense of what was practical guided him. His was a fierce competitive spirit, shown on the tennis court when he was younger, later on the links, and carried over into business, politics, community service. He had a shrewd, analytical mind. His success as president of J. E. Smith & Co. led to other business connections, to bank and corporation directorship and trade association honors. On the political side, his service as Democratic State chairman when the late Wilbur L. Cross was Governor was a very distinguished one, and the part he played over the whole political range from local to national was notable.

As drive chairman for community cases and worker for community betterment he had no superior and few peers. However much you might narrow down a list of pivotal local leaders in business, in politics, and in movements for civic improvement, his name would be bound to be there.

Such men are few, precious, hard to spare.

The following is an editorial from the Waterbury American of February 6, 1959:

J. FRANCIS SMITH

J. Francis Smith was an outstanding man in his generation in Waterbury. He had

varied interests, and he served in many capacities; and in practically everything in which he engaged he was successful.

In the business world he was known as a leader of men. The lumber industry nationally recognized him as a person of unusual attainments, and called on him to provide capable direction to many industrywide movements. In politics his record is unrivaled by any person in Waterbury in the past several decades.

Not only in Waterbury but in statewide politics he proved himself a master organizer. And even after ill health had forced him to retire from that field for a number of years, it took him only a few short months to demonstrate, through the nomination of THOMAS J. DODD for the Senate, that he still had the magic touch to win.

In public life, otherwise, Mr. Smith gave his talents willingly to forward projects that were for the common good. Two firsts tell the story. He was chairman of the first U.S. bond sale drive during World War II and first chairman of the community chest after that organization came into being. Of course both campaigns were outstanding successes. But in many instances Mr. Smith was happy to serve in a vigorous and able capacity behind the scenes. It was that way in politics, and it was that way again in aiding various agencies which worked for the community good.

Francis Smith was a man of positive character. In that virtue rested much of his success. He was a man for facts—getting facts and then appraising them in a most intelligent manner. Having done this, he mapped a campaign to attain his goal; and from then on he drove with powerful insistence toward a successful climax. Men in all walks of life valued his counsel. That his judgment was held high in financial circles was shown by the number of companies that invited him to serve as director.

Francis Smith was good for Waterbury. He gave a lot to the city. The city will suffer by his loss. Certainly he felt an example of public service that should be inspirational to all citizens.

The following is an editorial from the Naugatuck News of February 6, 1959:

J. FRANCIS SMITH

"The death of J. Francis Smith is a great loss to all of us."

Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff said that as part of his tribute to an astute Waterbury business executive and State political leader who succumbed yesterday to a heart attack, at a time he appeared to be recovering from a serious illness.

The Governor's words were representative of the sentiments expressed with deep sincerity by business and political leaders in high echelons, including James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and National Democratic chairman; U.S. Senators Thomas J. Dodd and Prescott Bush; Congressman John S. Monagan; Waterbury Mayor Raymond E. Snyder and former Mayor Edward Bergin; and Mayor Adam Mengacci of Naugatuck.

All who knew him, and they were countless, marveled at his keen analytical mind, his driving power and organizational ability.

As an athlete in his younger years, as a financier and businessman, and in government and politics, he was a leader who had the capacity to cut through any problem to its essentials and make its solution come easy.

He came most prominently to the foreground of public activity as Democratic State chairman when the late Wilbur L. Cross was Governor. After several years of comparative inactivity he reentered the political arena last year to demonstrate his masterful touch as he managed the successful campaign of THOMAS DODD for U.S. Senator.

But his abilities were neither confined nor limited to politics and government; his was the opinion sought on a wide range of activities extending beyond the boundaries of city and State.

In many respects, Fran Smith was a genius and he gave willingly of his talents in community causes, as well as in the other fields in which he was prominently identified.

Murdock's Little Colorado River Project Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Murdock, a former Member of the House from Arizona and a former chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has—after years of official study plus some 8 years of private study—developed a comprehensive plan for putting to beneficial use the waters of the Little Colorado River in Arizona.

In an earlier insertion in the RECORD, entitled "An Alternate Murdock Plan for Furnishing Water to the Western Portion of the Navajo Indian Reservation," a general view of his proposal was presented.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD at this point a more detailed explanation of Mr. Murdock's proposal so that it may be studied by interested persons:

MURDOCK'S LITTLE COLORADO RIVER PROJECT EXPLAINED

Because a foregoing installment in this series is entitled, "Murdock's Alternate Plan to Furnish Water for the Western Portion of the Navajo Reservation," it may be asked, "Why an alternate plan, if one already outlined is not only good but is the best?" Well, in mapping a complex plan it is well to have a choice. Practically all great water developments now in existence in our West have undergone more or less modifications from their original proposals and designs. Even the best of experienced engineers can only dimly see the end at the beginning. Not being an engineer myself, I should logically expect through the coming years that engineering skill would modify any detailed plan that even good engineers could design today, and such would be especially true of the proposals of a layman, however good a well-wisher he might be. In fact, the very purpose of these statements of mine, dealing with a Little Colorado River project, is to furnish future builders in Arizona these general proposals for their study, acceptance, rejection or necessary modification, in order to obtain the stated objectives of this suggested program.

Besides the engineer and the public works builder, the politician and the statesman will have a say if and when this proposal is considered. This is also because of controversial matters. One of the most controversial items for the Government officials to consider in this plan of mine is the placing of a low diversion dam immediately below the mouth of the Little Colorado River, which site is now within the Grand Canyon National Park. Both engineering and legal questions are involved. Although this

would be a low dam, as here proposed—it might even be a rock-filled dam, probably about 150 feet high, and for the purposes of this objective, need not be a power dam, but merely a diversion dam, or weir; even so, the bare suggestion of a dam in the National Park will raise a great cry of opposition. The question then arises, "To carry out this general objective would it be necessary to have this diversion dam on the main stream below the mouth of the Little Colorado?"

Well, no. To get main stream water touching the reservation, it would not be absolutely necessary to build such a diversion dam in the park. A change in the park boundary there could eliminate this site and improve the national park situation. This move I favor. Another alternate plan instead would call for the building of a multiple-purpose dam, which probably will eventually be built anyway, at the Red Walls Dam site in Marble Gorge. However, without such diversion dam, or weir, for the purpose of this objective, a multimillion-dollar tunnel would have to be built through the Navajo Reservation, bypassing the Grand Canyon National Park. Also, such other alternate plan than mine, including this expensive tunnel, would be far less efficient than the original Murdock proposal and of questionable economic feasibility. Naturally, I favor most the alternate plan discussed herein and I have no personal axe to grind.

NATIONAL PARKS MUST BE SANELY PRESERVED

No one has a higher regard for our national parks than have I. No one wants to save them from degradation and commercialization more than do I. By a simple readjustment of two sections of the boundary line of the Grand Canyon National Park, Congress could, under existing and modified law, preserve the principle of national park integrity, as Congress should, and at the same time better the park situation in Arizona while greatly benefiting thousands of Hopi and Navajo Indians who have no powerful lobby at Washington to speak for them.

All during my service on the Public Lands and Interior Committees during 16 years in Congress—and especially during the years that I was chairman of the House Interior Committee—I heard strong and rightful protests from nature lovers against the invasion of our parks and monuments by the engineers who want to build power dams for commercial purposes. I am heartily in sympathy with that attitude for park preservation, although I have known cases in which I have agreed with the engineers and their purposes of construction, if it seemed to me such work would do no harm to a national park, but would do great good to a vast community. Knowing how difficult it is to get Congress to authorize and appropriate a multimillion dollars or any other sum for any Indian tribe, I am reluctant to state this other alternative, without the low diversion dam at the mouth of the river, because of its greater cost and its lesser efficiency.

The favored plan proposes a low diversion dam of about 150 feet in height, more or less, in order to form a V-shaped lake at and below the mouth of the Little Colorado River in order to force the waters of the main Colorado up the Little Colorado several miles to a point east of the present boundary line between the Grand Canyon National Park and the Navajo Indian Reservation. It is only a matter of about 4 miles up to the reservation, and the waters from the main Colorado would have to be forced up the Little Colorado less than 8 miles to a good damsite where a 400-foot multiple-purpose dam could be built within the Indian reservation. By looking at the map it will be clearly seen that by such a diversion a given quantity of mainstream Colorado River water would be forced by its own flow to penetrate the Navajo Reservation several miles east-

ward merely by building this low diversion dam or weir below the mouth of the Little Colorado as I have here proposed. Knowing the attitude toward power dams in national parks, I want to distinguish such from my plan for furnishing water for biological purposes where so vitally needed.

A COSTLY ALTERNATIVE

Because I do not want to invade a national park with a power dam—nor even by low diversion dam or weir which would do the park no harm—I am also suggesting that this particular site for the low diversion dam be properly eliminated by law from the park. However, if the boundary line of the park is not changed and no construction of whatever kind or for whatever humane purpose is to be permitted in the Grand Canyon National Park at this point, then the other alternative, the long and deep tunnel, must be considered as another method of diversion, although very expensive.

Such a tunnel would run 20-odd miles from the Red Walls Dam site in Marble Canyon—which powerful political forces are determined shall eventually be built—to a point on the Little Colorado a few miles east of the park boundary. Such a tunnel would be very expensive but it would be the Government's price to pay to save deserving Indians—for whom the Government has an obligation and for whom humanity has an obligation—because of a persistent maintenance of an illogical boundary line of the Grand Canyon National Park at its northeast corner.

NORTHEAST BOUNDARY ILLOGICAL

Why do I say that the boundary line at this point is illogical? Because to maintain it unchanged is of little value to the park, and of a great cost, direct and indirect, to the Government and of an inestimable loss to many thousands of Hopi and Navajo Indians, not only who are alive today but many yet unborn. The future—yes, the fate—of the most unique Indians in the Nation is involved here.

Before discussing the change in the boundary line, where it now touches on the Little Colorado River, I must comment on the Indian needs for a long future. The Hopi Indians have made their home in this area for several thousand years. They were there long before Columbus discovered America. And they have accomplished a marvelous existence against harsh nature with only a minimum supply of water. Because they have existed on this barren land for many centuries it is not to be supposed that their children could continue, under modern and changing conditions, to exist there very much longer without a more adequate water supply. A few will move out, but most will refuse to do so, and I do not want to force them. Praying for rain in a ceremony involving handling live and poisonous rattlesnakes will not much longer suffice.

I have for several years felt that the Grand Canyon National Park should not extend northward entirely to the mouth of the Little Colorado. At present there is a little tongue of land in the park less than 4 miles wide extending to the south bank of the Little Colorado and lying east of the main Colorado River. In my judgment, a block of that land, smaller than one fourth of the District of Columbia, should be taken out of the Grand Canyon National Park and returned to the public domain or added to the Navajo Reservation. Thus the "water works" mentioned herein could be built on the Navajo Reservation mainly, and some on the Hopi Reservation, because the Hopi Reservation is within the Navajo Reservation and entirely surrounded by it.

FEW TOURISTS CAN SEE JUNCTION OF THESE RIVERS

My attention was again called and focused on this strategic area by the tragic happen-

ings there in the summer of 1956. It may be recalled that 2 giant airplanes collided high above the Grand Canyon on June 30 of that year and fell, carrying 128 human beings to their death. Although the planes collided, the crash sites of the two were about 1 mile apart. They fell very near the Colorado River, right opposite the mouth of the Little Colorado. The key site of this proposal is near where they fell. Being in Flagstaff at that time, I went to the Grand Canyon by way of Cameron, taking a pair of powerful binoculars with me. I went to the Indian watchtower which is at the farthest point northward in the Grand Canyon Park which can be reached by auto. I wondered whether the crash sites of this airplane tragedy could be seen from any point in the park which ordinary tourists might conveniently reach. I climbed the Indian tower for a better chance of observation, for it is only about 10 miles south from the scene of the tragedy at the mouth of the Little Colorado.

I knew that there were telescopes on the top of the watchtower which were more powerful than my binoculars. When I got up there, of course, I could not see the mouth of the Little Colorado with the aid of any of the glasses, for the canyon is not straight and winds and curves in those 10 miles between. So I found, as I had already surmised, that tourists, even atop the Indian watchtower cannot see anything within miles of the mouth of the Little Colorado on a horizontal line or within several thousand feet on a vertical line. All that I could see pertaining to the air tragedy from up there on the tower was a fleet of army helicopters circling a mighty hole in the ground and waving their ungainly arms as they descended into the canyon to bring out what they could. If I or any tourist had wished to examine the area of the crash or take a picture of it where each plane fell, we would have had to do what some of my friends did—fly over the area to take pictures. Tourists without air or water transport ordinarily do not get closer than 10 miles of the mouth of the Little Colorado River.

Do not assume for a moment that the building of a dam or weir at that point to divert and force water up the Little Colorado would be an unsightly thing to the millions of people who visit the Grand Canyon National Park in Arizona. It is safe to say that not one-tenth of 1 percent of those who have visited the Grand Canyon have ever seen the mouth of the Little Colorado River. To eliminate that site would do no harm. However, it may be said that since the Grand Canyon National Park extends north to the Little Colorado today it may be, in course of time, that the Park Service will build an automobile road up to a point where tourists will be above the mouth of the Little Colorado and thus may view that part of the Canyon country. I very much doubt it.

There is good reason why the park roads today extend north only to the Indian Watch Tower, 10 miles short of the Little Colorado. My offhand guess is that to build a park road 10 miles in length from the Indian Tower to a point above the Little Colorado and its mouth would call for bridge construction as expensive as bridging the Hudson River at New York City, and in addition the cost of first-class highway building as expensive as any 10 miles of the Alcan Highway. With all the hundreds of miles of very deep canyons now viewable in the park area, I do not believe it would be worth the money cost to make the point of land above the mouth of the Little Colorado accessible to the automobile of the tourist—certainly not without going a long, roundabout way across the Navajo Reservation. And for that and other reasons this area at the mouth of the Little Colorado should be available to the Indians to create a V-shaped lake about 100 feet deep at that point. My advice to those who

must see the mouth of the Little Colorado is to get a helicopter or an unsinkable boat, or fly high over it in a plane with no other plane near.

NARROW CANYONS IDEAL FOR STORAGE

The very narrow, winding, and deep canyons of the Little Colorado are of such a character that to fill any section of the river labyrinth with water to a depth of from 10 to 400 feet would make no significant change in the impression which the tourist gets in viewing it from the rim for 40 miles eastward. I am speaking now of the 40 miles of the lower portion of the Little Colorado but, of course, all of that section of the river excepting the last or lowest 4 miles is in the Navajo Reservation, and can be improved for their benefit. I would put this lowest 4 miles of the Little Colorado River along with the rest of it in the Navajo Reservation, or return it to public domain.

It requires some study of the relatively precipitous fall, the abrupt descent in its final length, of the Little Colorado to understand why I am proposing that several dams, from 12 to 20 miles apart, be built in that lower section of the river. No better surface storage in a hot climate, where evaporation is terrific, can be found than several man-made lakes at the bottom of the deepest Little Colorado canyons. The reason for this is obvious. When man stores water for future use in hot, dry country, he would like to minimize evaporation losses by having the reservoirs deep and narrow, and thus presenting a minimum of water surface exposed to the thirsty atmosphere. Certainly, the several winding reservoirs at the bottom of the lower end of the Little Colorado River canyons would be ideal for that purpose, large enough for the storage required, and deep enough throughout their narrow lengths to permit the very minimum of evaporation loss. Also their lake surfaces could be protected more easily by a film coating for the same purpose.

It must be apparent that this arrangement of the several storage sections is designed to step some water of the main Colorado River—say 50,000 acre-feet annually, at least—up 300 to 400 feet with each dam on the Little Colorado which will mean, of course, that some water from the main Colorado will have to be pumped up at each of those dams. Since this is a reversal of the usual procedure, considerable explanation is due on this point. It is true that each of these proposed dams down in the Little Colorado is to have a powerplant, but not the usual kind, not to produce electric power but to use windpower to pump water into the reservoir above.

MY COMMITTEE HEARD DR. PERCY THOMAS

After hearing Dr. Percy Thomas as a witness before my committee, and two other witnesses, one from the Bureau of Reclamation and the other from the Federal Power Commission with him testifying concerning the amazing possibilities of wind power, I introduced a bill on the subject in the 82d Congress, May 28, 1951. This was H.R. 4286 of that Congress. A second hearing was held September 19, 1951. Between the time of the preliminary hearing and before introducing the bill, I made a trip through Idaho along the Snake River from the Wyoming border to the Oregon boundary. As I stood on a mountain side in a narrow gorge which is the site for the Palisades Dam, I thought I had never felt such a terrific wind, other than hurricane, blowing naturally through that funnel between the mountains. Then it was that I recalled the lengthy and scientific testimony of Dr. Percy Thomas and the other two power witnesses, and then and there I resolved to introduce the bill.

I thought at the time I had never seen a better situation and locality for an engineering development to extract power from the wind as that site over the Palisades Dam on the Upper Snake River. But I did think

that there was a situation equalling the Palisades Gorge—and possibly exceeding it—on the lower reaches of the Little Colorado River in Arizona. Now, on further study, I am convinced of the latter.

I have read some of the testimony of aircraft navigators about the treacherous and terrific winds encountered in the Grand Canyon and it is branch canyons of which the Little Colorado River Canyon is one of the most noted. Air pilots would not think of attempting to fly a plane up the Little Colorado, low over it, between its walls from its mouth to a point 40 or 50 miles above, even before the recent tragic happening there. Before it was established that the two giant planes collided there at an altitude of 21,000 feet on June 30, 1956, when it seemed incredible that they could have done so, experienced airmen, knowing the turbulence of the air in those great canyons, expressed the opinion that those two planes were actually "tossed together" by the force of the winds which caused the disaster. Every explorer on foot, of which there are not many, in the lower part of the Little Colorado River Canyon, comments on the consistent and violent winds flowing through the winding, narrow gorge with almost as great a force as the blast through an experimental wind tunnel. In fact, I am convinced that in many places along the winding, narrow canyons of the Little Colorado, wind driven plants which Dr. Percy Thomas advocated could find a maximum source of wind power, even more than at the Palisades site in Idaho.

FAR CRY FROM WINDMILLS TO WIND-DRIVEN GENERATORS

Of course, when one talks about a powerplant deriving its power from the wind, one is apt to think of a small windmill pumping water from a well out on the plains. Now, that is not what Dr. Percy Thomas was talking about, and that is not what distinguished British and Dutch visitors who came from abroad to interview him regarding windpower were concerned about. They came from the very historic home of windmills to learn how to use windpower in a big way.

Has this windpower idea ever been tried out? Yes, in this lengthy hearing before my committee on September 19, 1951, Dr. Thomas and the other witnesses gave the history of such a trial in New England, where a great private utility built a huge wind-driven powerplant on trial and placed it on a nearby elevation, known as Grandpa Knob in Vermont, and connected it with their other regular powerlines where it functioned well until a storm destroyed it.

All of the engineers of the Vermont utility, trying this idea out under private enterprise, were greatly impressed with the tremendous electric power which it contributed to their electric system, with no cost for fuel. The variability of the winds was less of an argument against it. However, the blades of this private powerplant were nearly 100 feet in length, and were ripped off in a storm after efficiently producing power for its owners for more than a year. Since the powerplant towers we are discussing must be built at least 200 feet into the air above their base, the building of such Eiffel Towers is an engineering job. And engineers today, including Dr. Percy Thomas, say that a much better powerplant can be produced now than were built with the materials available for the Vermont experiment years ago. Recent improvements in metallurgy with light and strong metals make this possible.

In his testimony before the House Committee on September 19, 1951, Dr. Thomas was talking about a similar but improved air powerplant built on somewhat the same model as the Grandpa Knob power facility. However, that plant generated electricity—in

fact enough electricity on an average for a town of 2,000 inhabitants, but because the wind is so variable it needed numerous gadgets to protect it and to regulate it. Those gadgets were Dr. Thomas' inventions which the Grandpa Knob plant did not have. Since Dr. Thomas was a Federal employee, those patent rights belong to the Government. It is important to note that in answer to my questions, Dr. Thomas explained that, without producing electric power, but for merely pumping water, construction costs would be much less than for a wind-driven electric powerhouse. My thought here is that each of the proposed high dams should have such a pumping plant on it.

CANYON LAKES TO SERVE AS STAIRSTEPS

With the foregoing explanation it should be noted that the total natural flow of the Little Colorado will be collected in these several reservoirs in the lower reaches of the river. Also, let it be noted that from all these storage basins some of that Little Colorado River water may be pumped from lower to higher basins, thus reversing its march to the sea. So, these several reservoirs collect and conserve the waters of the lower 50 miles of the Little Colorado which are considerable, and which have not heretofore been much used by man. Why have they not been much used by man?

No water is diverted from the Little Colorado below the Grand Falls for irrigation purposes. It is known that the greater portion of the total drainage of the Little Colorado enters it below the lowest point of practical diversion. Yet, in more than 90 percent of the time, observers looking at the streambed of the Little Colorado will observe that it seems practically dry. It is like the main Colorado, a very variable stream. It is dry today in the state of nature between flash floods because the drainage of a vast area usually percolates into the streambed so slowly that it is largely returned to the atmosphere by evapotranspiration as it comes in. Take any given quantity of water in the river at Cameron, the chances are, in the state of nature, that practically all of it will return to the atmosphere before it can reach the power plant at Hoover Dam after a 350-mile journey under turbulent winds in a hot climate. What this proposal of mine is, is this: that we catch in these several reservoirs in the lower river all of this drainage which falls on the watershed of the Little Colorado, the silt as well, and make the water usable for the Indians, especially those near the Moencopi and higher areas. Let me now discuss a manmade means of minimizing evaporation losses so that there could be much less loss from surface exposure of water in the several basins than is now lost naturally from exposure in the streambed itself throughout the same length.

SILT PROTECTION BELOW OFFSETS WATER RETAINED

Without the manmade technique of minimizing evaporation losses, the natural evaporation losses are enormous. It is not too much to assume that for every 100,000 acre-feet of Little Colorado River total flow, less than 10,000 acre-feet ever reach the power plants at Boulder Dam. Since this is water which has fallen upon Arizona soil and most of it on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, it is logical that no other human use has a better claim than those Indians have to whatever amount of this drainage that can be conserved. Of course, there will be a "talking point" by the power users in Arizona, California, and Nevada, that this proposal of mine, mostly for the benefit of Indians, will keep some water from producing power hundreds of miles away in powerplants on the lower reaches of the Colorado River. When we consider the very small proportion of this drainage water reaching those distant lower powerplants under the

present natural conditions, it makes any complaint by power users in Los Angeles or Phoenix or Las Vegas seem picayunish. Any loss of hydropower production by this plan would be more than offset by silt retention to protect the lower river investments.

In general, I am assuming that when these numerous reservoirs are created on the Lower Little Colorado that more than two-thirds of the water gathered behind those dams will be water which has come from the watershed itself of that river. Now, because of the variability of the precipitation on that watershed the river's flow will vary in its contributions. If we wish those several reservoirs to have at all times some usable water it will be necessary, no doubt, to depend upon getting about a third or a fourth of that water in constant daily supply from the main Colorado, by pumping it out of the V-shaped lake at the mouth of the Little Colorado which extends up the Little Colorado a distance of 8 miles or so, where the first high dam is to be built. Thus, we see that the 50,000 acre-feet of main stream water, which I am assuming will be assigned to these Arizona Indians as "exchange water," will serve to regulate the volume in the reservoirs. This supply may be counted on consistently and regularly because it is "let down" at Lee Ferry by the upper basin States according to their compact.

DIFFERENT KIND OF "PUMP PRIMING"

The expression "pump priming" has come in the last 25 years to have a financial meaning with an economic effect. An older generation of citizens will recall that pump priming with water had a literal physical effect. All but the very youngest among us will remember that the original idea of "pump priming" was to pour a little water at hand into a dry pump in order to make it pump up and deliver in a steady volume many times the amount of water which was used for priming. My proposal on the Little Colorado is not exactly that, but there is considerable similarity to actual pump priming in water supply on the farm which we knew in childhood.

The 50,000 acre-feet of main stream water which may be had in constant supply of about 140 acre-feet daily will also serve as a regulator to even out the fluctuating supplies of the river drainage into the five reservoirs. Without this constant volume from the main river it is conceivable, really probable, that after the five dams are built and before any pumping is done on any of them, some of the five reservoirs in flood time would be filled several times to overflowing in flash floods, and some probably empty or almost empty during the dry season of the year. But with 50,000 acre-feet annually, diverted from the main Colorado into the Navajo Reservation it is assumed that that constant supply added to a fluctuated supply from drainage, totaling two or three times that amount, will always keep some water in the "pipeline" system. It is expected that more than 50,000 acre-feet annually can thus be delivered in daily portions for use on the reservations and still furnish water for diversion to the Verde.

Some will say these are violent assumptions. In the first place what is the authority for the 50,000 acre-feet annually out of the main Colorado River? I am assuming that the 50,000 acre-feet to be used here for regulatory purposes as well as partial supply is the same 50,000 acre-feet annually which the upper basin States' compact agrees to let down and furnish to Arizona. Does the upper basin compact apportion such water to those Indians? No, it apportions that amount of water to Arizona as her share of the upper basin apportionment of the 1922 compact because a part of Arizona is in the upper basin. What part of Arizona is in the upper basin? The Navajo Indian Reservation. It might logically be said that the

quota released from the upper basin should go legally in perpetuity to the Indians on that reservation. But the law does not say that. There is nothing in the law which says that that should be done but common-sense and justice logically assume that something short of that may be done. Congress is likely to see the logic and the justice of giving the Indians some use of that 50,000 acre-feet annually on an exchange basis and the Legislature of Arizona might reasonably be expected to support that move by resolution. As I view it, untold benefits from it to the entire State of Arizona would make it to her advantage to take this step.

If neither lawmaking body, at Washington or at Phoenix, saw fit to make this move for such a diversion, then this whole plan would be changed, and probably greatly reduced in efficiency. However, even if Congress and the Legislature of Arizona failed so to interpret the upper basin compact regarding the 50,000 acre-feet for Arizona, a series of four or five dams as heretofore explained might yet serve a useful purpose to these Indian reservations and be worth their cost.

Of course, if there can never be legislation at Phoenix and at Washington applying the 50,000 acre-feet from the upper basin to these Arizona Indian lands there would then be no need of a low diversion dam below the mouth of the Little Colorado. In such a case no multimillion-dollar tunnel from the Red Wall Dam site in Marble Gorge to a point on the little Colorado outside the national park would be needed. However, it might be that without this 50,000 acre-feet quota a part of this system heretofore described could be partially effective in supplying, say half as much water as the system otherwise would furnish. But anyone wishing to obstruct the fulfillment of this plan could do so by preventing the diversion of the 50,000 acre-feet into the Navajo Reservation for the use of those Indians, without realizing the vital connection between this highland water plan and the future of central Arizona.

To my mind, such obstruction policy would be a terrible mistake, with devastating effects upon an area half as large as the State of West Virginia and occupied by not less than 50,000 Indians today and which could be the home of hundreds of thousands in years to come. Moreover, to obstruct or destroy some such plan as herein contained for the Navajo and Hopi Indians would have adverse effects on the total growth of Arizona, reaching far beyond the Indian lands.

In the 60 miles of the Little Colorado streambed between Cameron and the main Colorado the evaporation losses now are enormous. Is it conceivable, if that entire distance should be converted into, say, five reservoirs with surfaces exposed to the strongest winds that blow in that canyon country, that the evaporation losses would be any less than they have been in a state of nature by evapotranspiration? Yes, they may be made less. We know that scientists have recently developed a relatively cheap and effective technique for minimizing evaporation losses from reservoir surfaces by a film covering. I believe with all of those reservoirs full of water, or partly full, they could be so treated at relative low cost so as to cut the present evaporation losses in the same stretch of river by at least 70 percent.

All through the West for the last half century we have built great dams and stored large bodies of water in surface storage, knowing full well that there would be evaporation losses from the flowing water in rivers and canals and from the surface of lakes and reservoirs. So long as we must use surface storage we should find a way to minimize such evaporation losses. I believe that an effective technique is now known to accomplish that. This technique is to

cover the surface of the water with a chemical film which largely prevents the drying winds from picking up the molecules of water. This could be one way to conserve water where it is so desperately needed.

Government water studies indicate an average flow of the Little Colorado River of several hundred thousand acre-feet annually, only a little of which is taken out above Grand Falls, and none below. It is conservative to estimate that less than one-tenth of the flow below Grand Falls ever reaches any existing powerplant hundreds of miles below. The large fraction now wasted, if conserved, could be the support of a larger population and a greater civilization. My purpose in courageously writing this is to beg engineers and true statesmen to give serious consideration to some such plan on the Little Colorado.

An Engineer's View of Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the many activities of the International Geophysical Year, an 18-month period of extensive, simultaneous studies, by scientists of 64 countries, of the earth, atmosphere, and sun, was a conference in Moscow in August 1958.

Attending as a delegate of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences at this meeting was Capt. Elliott B. Roberts, who is the distinguished Chief of the Geophysical Division of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce.

The report of his observations on this mission and conclusions, as published in the January-February 1959 issue of the *Military Engineer*, the journal of the Society of American Military Engineers with headquarters in the Nation's Capital, is most illuminating, timely, and constructive.

In order that Captain Roberts' contribution may have a wider circulation and be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress, under leave granted to extend, I quote its text at this point in the RECORD.

AN ENGINEER'S VIEW OF MOSCOW

(By Elliott B. Roberts, captain, U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey)

Attendance as a delegate to the recent Moscow conference on the International Geophysical Year provided an opportunity to meet Soviet scientists, visit research institutions, walk the streets, and see the display of scientific and industrial strength in the Soviet Union.

IMPRESSIONS AND CONTRASTS

On arrival at the vast Moscow airport one's first impression is likely to be unbelief at the number of large jet transport airplanes, TU-104A's, parked about the edges of the field. In turn they approach the landing area to load passengers for Tbilisi, Tashkent, Kiev, and other cities of the Union, and for Paris, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Helsinki, carrying on routine operations not matched in America. They climb quickly to 35,000 feet, and streak across the skies at 550 miles an hour. The planes have very sturdy seat belts and oxygen masks at every seat. They

are excellent aircraft, longtime holders of an international weight-carrying record. One cannot but muse that they comprise a formidable air fleet, capable of carrying large numbers of troops to practically any point on short notice. Russians build and use equipment of this kind because it is necessary to the plan.

By contrast, in stores or at a cashier's desk change is computed on the abacus, an archaic device, still used throughout the Union because the factories are kept busy producing equipment which is considered more necessary than cash registers.

Also, in contrast to the ultra-modern planes, the airport terminal building has all the appeal of a warehouse or a drab 19th century railway station—a fitting introduction to the shabbiness and dreariness of the whole city. Moscow produces a sense of profound and enduring depression which even the flowering parks in summer cannot relieve.

Stark contrasts are everywhere. There is a strange composite of dilapidated, century-old log houses, which the police do not want foreigners to photograph, plain apartment blocks, their walls spalling and pocked, and seven resplendent multistory buildings, the old-time grandeur of which can hardly be described. The architecture is 19th century in style, with star-tipped spires that gleam redly at night in glorification of the Soviet state.

The seven tall buildings include the Moscow State University, an aggregation of 6,000 rooms clustered about a central spire that reaches higher than any structure in Europe except the Eiffel Tower. The marble surfaces and ornate decorations of the vast halls and auditoriums of this showplace are fabulous. Facing a long, landscaped mall reaching down to the Moscow River bluff overlooking the city, this impressive edifice dominates the southwest section of Moscow.

Moscow's newest hotel, the 2-year-old Ukraine, is the latest, and reportedly final, one of the seven multistory buildings. Although it has marble foyers, oriental rugs on the floors, and original oil paintings on the bedroom walls, the parquetry floors were not planned smooth, the bathroom fixtures are falling from the walls, and the hot water is highly uncertain. A local whim of the management requires that stairway doors be locked, making it necessary to wait for elevators which may be 10 or 15 minutes in arriving.

Every taxi and bus has its clock, which actually runs on time. This minor marvel is matched by the city streets, perhaps the widest in the world, and certainly the cleanest, with old women swinging twig brooms relentlessly. Almost nothing, however, matches the sparkle of the 50-odd stations of the subway—marble palaces, resplendent with statuary, paintings, gold and mosaic decorations, and crystal chandeliers. Through such halls swarm Moscow's workers, going to and from squalid homes where families are crowded into single rooms, and community kitchens and bathrooms are often a block away. There is schooling for all and the state boasts a vanishing illiteracy rate. Yet the workers must buy their sleazy clothing and cheap necessities in state stores where the queues are always long and the smells sometimes overpowering.

As if cowed by the city, the people of Moscow plod through life, stolid and apathetic. Evenings and off-duty days are often spent swarming on the sidewalks, which are hardly more crowded and certainly more pleasant than their poor lodgings. Furtive glances are given passing foreigners, but there are few direct looks or words, except by young boys who have learned that Americans may have chewing gum—a highly negotiable commodity in Moscow.

Clothing generally is shapeless and ugly. Crowds of admiring women gather about the

store windows when such exotic items as high heels and stylish clothes are displayed. Women and girls, of all ages above childhood, work at digging, lugging bricks and mortar, operating trucks, buses, and construction cranes, or mowing with rusty shears the grass lawns of the seven tall buildings. A few wear coveralls, but most wear dresses. A prudish modesty prevails.

One wonders about the contrast between the dreary lives of the people and the grandiose buildings, ornate subway stations, and the fanciful pavilions, malls, gardens, pools, and fountains of the city's industrial exposition. Why, when the workers have so little, does the state make such lavish show? The U.S.S.R., straining for industrial supremacy, is in no mood to squander its resources on trifles. The reason cannot have been simple exhibitionism, produced by an inferiority complex and indulged for the amazement of foreign tourists, for there were none until recently. It must be a fulfillment of a need of the people—people who have nothing, yet must slave their lives away. They slave because the lavish displays, always before them, provide a vision of the future—a promise of future luxuries—to be theirs if they work hard enough to beat America.

HOUSING

Overriding the effect of the seven skyscrapers and the log huts in the visible aspect of Moscow is the mass of uncounted thousands of great apartment blocks, as dreary as the long rows of tenements in city slums. From the tower of the Hotel Ukraine the city is a mosaic of such blocks, ranging from dull grey to the ugly yellow-ochre of the newer buildings. This color, so characteristic of Moscow, extends as far as the eye can reach. It is appalling to think of all the rooms in these vast blocks, each jammed with one or more families, living without privacy, quiet, or dignity. There are nearly 8 million workers in greater Moscow, and the population is rapidly growing.

A housing program to meet the population problem is now in progress. Although it will fall far short of the need, it is a tremendous undertaking. Mile after mile of urban land is sprouting ochre-colored buildings of the Moscow style, 10-story warrens of several hundred apartments each. They rise up without framework or scaffolding, by assembly of precast concrete slabs and beams, like building blocks, hoisted by cranes and fitted together by men and women workers. Whatever the engineers' appraisal of this system may be, it is fast and economical, certainly an advantage when attempting to create 600,000 new family units at a rate of more than 50,000 a year.

The miles of cells and cubicles are the future homes of Muscovites who may think themselves lucky. However, style and beauty are sacrificed to utility, and deterioration is widely evident before such a building is even finished. One is told that the design is to provide 3- and 4-room apartments, but, in fact, it will be a highly favored family, perhaps that of a writer or scientist, who will get more than one room. Street floors contain food and clothing stores.

Narrow garden areas separate the blocks, and supervised playgrounds are provided for children, most of whose mothers must work. Wide boulevards, many with center parks, thread the new living areas, and trackless trolley wires promise transportation for the swarms of workers without cars. It is all so regimented that it is utterly dreary.

INDUSTRY

Newspapers and magazines remind the people incessantly of high production figures in the factories, the mileage of railways newly electrified, the size and weight of Russian

rockets and sputniks, and the glory of Russian achievement. The material is so profusely illustrated with diagrams and photographs that even the most stupid workers must understand it and realize the value of his labor.

There are wide industrial areas near Moscow. Workers flock to the factories marked by busy smokestacks. There is no unemployment. Underground trains run on 40-second headway. Tunnels are being extended. A new bridge is under construction across the Moscow River. Heavy construction equipment is seen about the city and on display at the industrial exposition.

Power production is rising rapidly. At Kuibyshev, on the Volga, is the world's largest hydroelectric power project, designed to produce 2 million kilowatts. At the other end of the scale, production of radio sets was 25 million in 1955 and nearly 1 million TV receivers were produced. It is assumed that the propaganda value of these items was not overlooked when such production quotas were set.

Schooling is rigorously disciplined, every child taking heavy courses of mathematics and physics under Kremlin-controlled curriculums designed to produce trained manpower—like a commodity—for industry. American experts report that the Soviet system as a whole is a very effective tool to achieve economic progress.

The regimentation of Soviet resources, efforts, and labors of the people has produced an industrial production which, while still far below that of America, is climbing at an annual increase of 11 percent.

TRANSPORT

Transportation, the life stream of industry, keeps in pace. Aeroflot, one of the largest airlines in the world, has introduced, in addition to the jets, the TU-114, a turboprop plane, capable of carrying 220 passengers, or of flying nonstop from Moscow to Peking or New York. The rail system wrecked by the retreating Germans in 1944 has been rebuilt, and the nation's 120,000 miles of lines are being extended. Diesel-electric and electric power are coming rapidly into use. The Moscow subway, comprising some 50 miles of tunnel nearly 300 feet below ground, is a well-run municipal railway.

Construction is being conducted in extending the canal system which connects the major rivers of European Russia from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea. Diesel ships carry vast tonnages on these waterways. For navigation in the Arctic, the atom-powered *Lenin*, a 16,000-ton icebreaker, has been built.

Motor trucks, widely used, comprise most of the street traffic in urban areas. Nearly 500,000 vehicles are built annually, of which a few are passenger cars for government officials and specialists. The cars resemble American automobiles of 10 or 15 years ago. They are light, simple, and economical—far different from the elaborate cars of the American highways.

The Soviet Academy of Sciences maintains more than 90 specialized institutes. The research stations contain equipment which, although perhaps not equal to that of America, is in some cases highly advanced. At Dubno, near Moscow, for instance, there is a proton synchrotron rated at 10 billion electron volts.

At conferences the delegates wear tiny transistor radio receivers, with selector switches for choice of languages. These are beautiful miniature instruments.

Russia is not a prostrate giant. Moscow and its factory-strewn suburbs are emerging almost explosively from their old lethargy. Russia's purpose and industry have given her the strength, in the few years since World War II, to toss her sputniks into space ahead of the world. Those people can and will sur-

pass America—unless, of course, an equal or greater determination is set against them.

As one watches the concentration upon labor and industry at the cost of so much human comfort and happiness, and sees the fanatical striving for superiority, one ponders the eventual outcome. The battle has, in a way, been joined. One wonders if America can afford to continue an economy based so largely on such wasteful luxuries as planned obsolescence of consumer products—annual models of automobiles outmoding their predecessors, for instance. Can America afford the economic loss of restrictive production rules in industry? Can America afford to continue expending three-quarters of her productive capacity on the manufacture of nondurable goods in the face of such regimented, determined competition?

Failure to heed the danger signs could mean loss of international markets, foreign allies and friends, and world position as well. America must not become hopelessly steeped in her luxury, as was Rome in her heyday, but with renewed determination must remain strong and alert to the needs of the world.

Mrs. Charles W. Gunn, National President of American Legion Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all of Oregon is proud of Mrs. Charles W. Gunn, national president of the American Legion Auxiliary. Mrs. Gunn has devoted her life to helping and working with people.

It was 33 years ago that Mrs. Gunn joined Hood River Unit 22, and she has been a member ever since. A graduate of Oregon College of Education, at Monmouth, Oreg., Mrs. Gunn has established an enviable record as a schoolteacher at Hood River, and later as principal of the Parkdale Grade School; as an executive of the Charles F. Berg women's wear store in Portland, and as national director of the Volunteer Hospital Workers program. Her election as national president of the American Legion Auxiliary is a well-deserved honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the fine biography of Mrs. Gunn, written by Edward W. Atkinson, which was published in the February 1959 issue of the American Legion magazine.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In Hood River, Oreg., in 1924, a young World War I veteran was attending a picnic when he was attracted by cries for help. He traced the cries to a nearby creek, where another picnicker, a young lady, had slipped and fallen into the water. He rushed to the stream and rescued her, and the two naturally became acquainted. Their friendship—so spectacularly begun—soon blossomed into a courtship.

That young veteran was Charles W. Gunn, who, as a young man, had come to Hood River from Illinois. The young lady was Cecelia J. Thompson, then a student at the

Oregon College of Education at Monmouth. When she was graduated from college 1 year later, she married the man she had met at what turned out to be the most important picnic of either of their lives. It was through Charles Gunn's service in the AEF and his membership in Hood River Post 22 that his bride became eligible for membership in the American Legion Auxiliary. She joined Hood River Unit 22 and has been a continuous member of that unit for 33 years.

Thirty-four years after her dramatic introduction to her husband, Mrs. Charles W. Gunn was elected National President of the American Legion Auxiliary at that body's 38th National Convention at Chicago last September. In the interim she had established an enviable record of accomplishment as a schoolteacher, retailing executive, and a leader in the auxiliary.

The brown-eyed, dark-haired woman, who now heads the Nation's largest organization of patriotic women, comes from a background that might well be described as "all American." She was born in New Tazewell, Tenn., the daughter of Nathaniel and Della (Standford) Thompson. Her mother was born in Iowa, her father in Virginia. Ce (short for Cecelia, pronounced "See") was the first of six children in the Thompson family. While she was still a small child, her family moved from Tennessee to a wheat ranch in central Oregon. They subsequently operated an apple ranch, and in both places, Ce Thompson was given ample opportunity to learn the meaning of responsibility and work.

She attended grade and high school in Madras, Oreg. After her graduation from College she taught school in Hood River and in Parkdale, a town at the foot of Mount Hood. She taught all grades (usually she had the fifth and sixth grades), and she was principal of the grade school in Parkdale.

When she joined the auxiliary, she became something more than just a "card carrying" member. She took an active part in her unit's affairs as her husband did in his Legion post. (After service in the 306th Butchery Company and as a corporal in the army of occupation, Charles Gunn had returned to Hood River and had become a charter member of post 22 on Armistice Day, 1919.) The Gunns have, in a sense made a family affair of their Legion and Auxiliary membership. Charles Gunn was commander of post 22 in 1927-28, and his wife was president of unit 22 that same year.

Mrs. Gunn has maintained her membership in unit 22 even after her husband's job made it necessary for them to move to Portland in 1942. Charles Gunn has always worked in the fruit business, either as a rancher or in some phase of food processing. He is presently plant superintendent of the Terminal Ice & Coal Storage Co. in Portland.

After Mrs. Gunn had served her unit as its president, she was district president, then department president (1934-35). In 1946 she was Oregon's representative to the auxiliary's volunteer hospital workers school in Detroit.

Upon completion of that course, she returned to Oregon and set up a department school for volunteer hospital workers. From 1949 through 1953 she was volunteer hospital director for the entire auxiliary.

When she was asked recently what auxiliary job she has found most rewarding, Ce Gunn said, without hesitation, "I enjoyed most the job of director of volunteer hospital workers. Work in this field has been the most rewarding to me because it is an activity which brings one in touch with people who need help."

"To illustrate what I mean," she went on, "let me tell you about a young World War II veteran whom I met in a VA hospital. This young man was in a neuropsychiatric ward, and had been there for some time when I first came to know him. He was, to put it frankly,

in a bad way then. He had been a professional musician before the war, but while he was in the hospital he would demonstrate no interest whatsoever in music. He would go to the piano, but he would not play.

"It was my good fortune to interest a volunteer hospital worker in this particular boy's case. She began to try to draw him out of himself, to attempt to find some way to make him rediscover himself. She worked with him patiently, and before long she met with some success. He began to take an interest in things. Soon, he began to play the piano. Before much time had elapsed, this veteran was well on the road to complete recovery. Eventually he returned to work as a violinist, and when I last heard of him he was doing fine."

Although the Auxiliary's new national president has personally found her richest experiences in the job of national director of the volunteer hospital workers program, the Auxiliary has seen fit to utilize her talents in many other national jobs as well. She has held a number of national chairmanships. Among them: Americanism, Publications, Girls State (for 2 years), Child Welfare, Rehabilitation. And she was chairman and director of Girls Nation for 2 years.

While serving as national Americanism chairman, she directed an Auxiliary program which aimed at placing Clarence Manion's "Key to Peace" in every high school and library in the United States. That project was so successful that it won a Freedoms Foundation citation for the Auxiliary.

The Auxiliary's vast and varied rehabilitation program prospered under her direction. In 1957-58 she was the Auxiliary's rehabilitation director, and the rehabilitation committee racked up an outstanding record of service to veterans under Ce Gunn's leadership. During that year, 11,847 volunteer hospital workers served an amazing total of 941,935½ hours in 171 Veterans' Administration and 236 non-VA hospitals. American Legion Auxiliary units and Departments furnished \$571,539.43 worth of Christmas gifts to 177,516 veterans in VA hospitals. The Auxiliary's outlay for its entire Christmas program was a whopping \$942,583.72. In all of its rehabilitation work in 1957-58 the Auxiliary spent, Mrs. Gunn was able to report to the organization's 38th National Convention, a total of \$2,784,348.84.

As the woman who directed this enormous benevolent enterprise, Ce Gunn added still more luster to her already long and impressive list of major accomplishments as one of the Auxiliary's top officers. Small wonder that the 834 delegates meeting in the Terrace Ballroom at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago last September 4, unanimously voted to pay her the highest honor they could—to elect her to the national presidency of the American Legion Auxiliary.

The Nation's No. 1 auxiliary joined the Auxiliary because, as she puts it, she is "interested in people." She was attracted by the Auxiliary's programs which "permit a person to work with people—veterans and their families—people who are here where the results of your work can be seen."

In the Auxiliary, she felt, she had found an organization tailor-made for a person who wants to help others. Correctly she perceived that this is an organization whose reason for existence and whose secret of success can be summed up in one word: "service."

Likewise in her business career Ce Gunn's work has been directly with and for people. The obvious personal aspects of the teaching profession are so well known that no comment on them is required here. But in Portland, where Mrs. Gunn worked for 10 years in a ladies specialty store (the Charles F. Berg Co.), she was also directly and closely associated with people in various capacities. Hers was not a cold, impersonal, paper-shuffling job.

She began as "Betty Buyer," a job in which she shopped for others, especially for men at Christmastime. Later she was floor manager of a department, and during World War II she was bond coordinator for the store. As such, she made radio addresses urging the purchase of bonds, and helped to run the store's bond program. The U.S. Treasury Department awarded her a citation for her bond-selling activity. In addition, Ce Gunn did other volunteer work in World War II. For the Red Cross, she made bandages and gave blood. For the USO she served food to servicemen and was hostess at dances.

Another facet of her business experience again brought her into close contact with people. While she was working at Berg's, she taught retail selling in the Portland public schools as part of that school system's vocational training program. She was also the store's club representative. In this capacity she served as the store's contact with professional and service organizations, such as the 50-50 Club (an organization similar to the Rotary) and the Business and Professional Women's Club.

But it was her assignment as the store's bridal consultant that was perhaps her most fascinating—and sometimes most nerve-racking—job. In this position she helped prospective brides to plan their weddings. It proved to be interesting work, and it gave Ce Gunn an opportunity to observe the wedding ceremonies of many different religions. "It was," she says today, "a very delightful experience." There were, however, aspects of the job that would have turned strong men weak.

For instance, one night Mrs. Gunn had three weddings. They were to take place in various parts of Portland, and the brides-to-be were every bit as desirous of looking their best as any girl would be at such an important time in her life. Everything went well until not long before the ceremonies were to begin. Then it became clear that two of the wedding gowns—a size 12 and a size 18—had been sent to the wrong addresses. The brides, as might be expected, were in a state of near panic.

"That," says Ce Gunn, "was my most hectic experience as a bridal consultant. For a while I had cabs going back and forth all over Portland, but finally the mixup was straightened out and the girls got the right gowns."

Later Ce Gunn worked as personnel and operating manager for a chain of five women's specialty stores.

The auxiliary's new national president has also been active in church work. She is a member of the Riverside Community Church. Shortly after she was graduated from high school, she was president of the Christian Endeavor in the northwestern United States. She originally joined that organization for much the same reason that she became an auxiliary: to, as she puts it, "help humanity if I can."

This background of dedicated service and solid accomplishment has made Ce Gunn well aware of the root purposes of the auxiliary and has acquainted her well with its program. It has also particularly fitted her for the important, always demanding, often difficult, sometimes trying job of national president of the auxiliary.

When she was elected to the auxiliary's highest office last September, she was, as any woman would be, tremendously flattered and enormously pleased. "To be elected national president is," she said, "a very exhilarating and happy experience." But it was also plain that Ce Gunn knew that a year's hard work lay waiting for her. No starry-eyed dreamer, she faced up to the fact that she had accepted a year of almost constant traveling, speechmaking, and grueling hard work.

That she was ready for it was clear in her acceptance speech at the auxiliary's national convention. She proposed no grandiose schemes; no cute gimmicks; no new, temporary projects. Instead she cast a practical eye over the auxiliary scene, sized up the state of the auxiliary and of the Nation, and matter-of-factly told the delegates:

"We do not have to search for new horizons, nor discover new ways to be of service. But what we do have to do is work and labor to keep what we already have. . . . We already have the firmest of foundations and the finest of programs. . . . But in this era of easy living and many pleasures and distractions, we are prone to lose sight of our goals, and to take the priceless heritage known as the American way of life too much for granted. There is no organization better qualified (than the auxiliary) to appreciate and to maintain these freedoms and this way of life."

She then issued a challenge to all auxiliaries, calling on them to examine and evaluate the situation she had described and urging them to join her in her efforts to maintain and to strengthen the auxiliary's basic programs.

A few weeks after she was elected national president, she stated her views once more with equal directness: "The task facing us today," she asserted, "is to fulfill the challenge to work to maintain and make stronger the auxiliary's basic programs. We must ask ourselves, 'Are we doing our best?' My answer to that question, is quite frankly, 'No.' I think that we can do better."

When she was asked, not long after she began her administration as national president, what she thought was the greatest problem facing the United States of America today, she unhesitatingly replied: "The apathy of the people, the widespread attitude of taking our blessings for granted. There is a great need for us to put less stress on material things. That, I believe sincerely."

The auxiliary, she feels, can help to correct this situation by telling America what the auxiliary believes in, stands for, and does. The place to begin, as Ce Gunn sees it, is the place where the work of the organization is really done, where its programs are actually put into effect. "The auxiliary—and the Legion—," she says, "can best help by improving their units, their posts, their hometowns. The auxiliary can be no stronger than the sum total of its units." The strength of both national organizations, she is convinced, lies in the local branches, in the units and posts.

Her administration, she stoutly avers, will be marked by an adherence to the fundamental principles of the United States of America, the auxiliary, and the Legion. "Every ounce of strength I have," she declared, "will be devoted to carrying out these principles."

The Rose, Our National Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to bring the attention of this body to a resolution adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, endorsing the rose as our national flower. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the United States of America has no national flower; and

Whereas the rose grows in profusion in all States and blooms in all seasons of the year and lends itself to multiple use; and

Whereas the rose by its beauty has won a place in the hearts of the American people; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Congress of the United States to designate the flower commonly known as the rose as the national flower of the United States.

Communism on the March in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over the past year we have observed many political events in the Caribbean area that have led to the overturn of two governments, Venezuela and Cuba. Accompanying these revolutionary upsets, influence of international communism, which likes to fish in troubled waters, has been present.

The story culminating in the present situation is complicated and long, but essential for properly understanding of the problems involved. An enlightening summary of this recent history by Harold Lord Varney was published in February 1959 issue of American Mercury and is extremely pertinent in connection with developments affecting the Panama-United States relations, about which I shall address the House in the near future.

Under leave to extend, I include the indicated article:

COMMUNISM ON THE MARCH IN THE CARIBBEAN

(By Harold Lord Varney)

If Soviet Russia is in search of America's Achilles heel, it will not be difficult to find it. Today, despite the \$60 billion anti-Communist ramparts which we have erected with our foreign aid, there is one spot where the United States stands perilously exposed. That danger spot is our own front yard, the Caribbean.

It is conceivable that America could still survive if all Asia and even Western Europe went down the drain. But it is difficult to imagine American survival if communism succeeded in entrenching itself powerfully within the 1,500 mile perimeter of the Caribbean. This is our part of the world—as truly a link in America's home defenses as Cape Canaveral or the Pentagon. Today, while we are preoccupied with our overseas efforts, the Caribbean area is offering an open opportunity, at numerous points, for Soviet Russia to infiltrate and enter our hemisphere.

Four and a half years ago, when Jacobo Arbenz and his Communist-ridden regime were tossed out of Guatemala, most Americans optimistically congratulated themselves that the fight against communism had been won in this area. We should have known communism better. Now we are making the painful discovery that communism was not wiped out, it was merely diffused. To-

day, 4 years later, there are at least four major Red danger points, and as many secondary ones, in the Caribbean region. Any one of these is capable of erupting overnight into an intolerable threat to American safety.

The frightening truth is that the political situation has been steadily worsening for the United States in the whole Caribbean area. Four years ago, after the cleanup of Guatemala, the Caribbean was ringed with a girdle of strong governments which, although differing sharply among themselves, had one thing in common. All were uncompromisingly anti-Communist. All were pro-American. As nearly as possible, in the fluid field of politics, America's back door was safe.

In Guatemala itself, the pro-American Castillo Armas had replaced the pro-Soviet Arbenz. In Nicaragua sat the elder Somoza, veteran of a hundred successful battles with the Communists. In Venezuela, power seemed firmly in the hands of Marcos Perez-Jimenez, backstopped by one of the sternest anti-Communist security officers in the hemisphere, Pedro Estrada. Cuba was under the experienced rule of Fulgencio Batista who had once tried coalition with the Communists and had learned his lesson. In the Dominican Republic was the granite figure of Rafael Trujillo. In Britain's Jamaica, anti-Communist Bustamante seemed to be a fixture.

The startling speed with which this comfortable situation reversed itself in 4 years should be an eye opener for Americans. Jamaica has turned out Bustamante and has replaced him with the Socialist Norman Manley. The elder Somoza was assassinated and succeeded by his son who, although pro-American, is more conciliatory. Guatemala's Castillo was assassinated by a Communist. Perez-Jimenez in Venezuela was deposed by a surprise revolution: his successor, Larrazabal, had been a pliant and unpredictable tool of the pro-Communist factions. Batista in Cuba has been plagued by a Castro revolution which is both anti-American and pro-Communist, and which today has spread over a part of Oriente Province. Only Trujillo remains with undiminished power, and he has endured the full fury of the Liberal smear-pot brigade in the United States during the last 2 years. A situation which was copper-riveted in favor of the United States 4 years ago now appears to be coming apart at all its seams.

In the face of such poisonous developments, it would be supposed that the United States would be reacting with alertness and with a realistic facing of the hard facts. Unfortunately, no such reaction has taken place. Aside from a few lonely voices, such as those of Senator Olin D. Johnson, Congressman Carroll E. Reece and Spruille Braden, most of the public comment on Latin America has actually been favorable to the forces which are working against America. The old American weakness for backing the wrong horse abroad is again manifesting itself, just as it did in China in the early 1940's when most of our writers went gaga over Mao Tse-tung. While Russia and its agents pursue a shrewd and unrelenting plan of subversion in the Caribbean countries, most of our so-called Latin American "experts" fail to see the pattern. With the same blindness that was shown in China, they are hailing potential enemies as friends and reviling proven friends as dictators or worse. No wonder Russia wins.

Take the appalling situation which is building up in Venezuela. Most of our national magazines and newspapers are completely misleading us concerning what is actually going on in that unhappy country.

Before this article is printed, Venezuela will have held a Presidential election. Whether the successful candidate is Romulo Betancourt, boss of the Leftist ACCION

Party, or the Communist-dominated Larrazabal, the result will be equally disastrous for America. It will be certain that Venezuela, for the next 5 years, will be in hands much more unfriendly to the United States than was the scorned Perez-Jimenez government.

And yet, to take a single example, the New York Herald Tribune on November 3, 1958 hailed the coming election as a "democratic landmark" and remarked foolishly that, whatever the outcome: "Venezuelans will not have to worry too much about the overthrow of their present democratic government." The implication was that what has been happening in Venezuela since the revolution of January 1958, should be applauded by Americans.

The bitter truth is that Venezuela will either elect the figurehead, Larrazabal, or else it will put in power a man, Romulo Betancourt, who has been described by Senator JOHNSTON (without denial) as the actual leader of all the Communists in Latin America. Any yet the Herald Tribune has the political naivete to describe such an impending election as a "democratic landmark."

Americans would be wise to keep their eyes steadily on this man Betancourt. He is bad news for the United States. A slippery, phrase-mongering demagogue who knows how to exploit the grievances of the voters, he is now posing in Caracas as an "anti-Communist." This is the same man who, while an exile from Venezuela, founded and led the Communist Party of Costa Rica for 5 years.

Betancourt is one of the Venezuelans who shed crocodile tears over the stoning of Dick Nixon in Caracas last May. And yet, with one of his ACCION Party henchmen then holding the office of Minister of the Interior under the present junta, and another serving as chief of the security police (Pedro Estrada's old office) he could have prevented the outrage by the mere lifting of his hand. The complete unreality of the coverage of the Nixon episode in the American press is shown by the fact that no one pointed out this overall responsibility of Betancourt, the man who gives the Communists their orders.

What is happening in Venezuela, since Perez-Jimenez's overthrow, is the projection onto the political stage of two Communist-manipulated parties—a small official Communist Party and a large ACCION Party. Publicly rivals, they actually are working toward the same power end. The Communist Party operates the Caracas street mob and controls some of the nation's key unions, but it has no hope of winning immediate power in its own name. The party which is being groomed to win is Betancourt's ACCION Party with its demagogic appeal to the non-Communists. It is a shrewd squeeze play, and a play whose far-reaching consequences have been almost completely ignored by the writers and publications which assumedly keep Americans informed about Latin America.

The blindness of American liberals to Latin American realities was shown on February 5, 1958, when a large group of prominent American writers and publicists staged a farewell dinner to Betancourt in New York on the eve of his return to Venezuela after the revolution. The dinner was held under the auspices of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom, which claims to be non-Communist.

If and when the Communists come to power in Venezuela, they will have their clutches on the richest prize in the Caribbean. Venezuela is vitally necessary to the United States as the world's second largest oil-producing area. Recently, it has become also an important iron-producing nation. Its geographical location gives it a key strategic importance in any scheme for the defense of the whole Caribbean region. The

first principle of a sound American defense plan should be to keep this fabulously rich area out of the hands of the Communists. There are no evidences that Washington has any such coherent plan. Since the fall of Perez-Jimenez, official America has been content to drift with the events.

The unfolding of the Communist pattern for the Caribbean has been speeded since the Venezuela revolution by what has happened in Cuba. That Venezuela and Cuba are now linked closely in Red plans is shown by the aid which junta-ruled Venezuela has given to the Castro revolution against President Batista.

Prior to the fall of Perez-Jimenez, Venezuela was a closed area to the leftist Cuban rebels trying to pull down the pro-American regime of Batista. Fidel Castro's remote mountain base in Oriente Province was supplied furtively by gunrunners, operating from the Florida coast, and by some irregular aid from Mexico and Costa Rican agents. No prorebel radio broadcast reached the Cuban people.

The success of the January revolution in Venezuela put the dwindling Castro rebellion back into business. Under the Communist-pampering Larrazabal regime, Venezuela has become the supply base for the Castro movement. Shortly after his return to Venezuela, Romulo Betancourt called a Caracas anti-Batista conference to aid Castro. A radio station in Venezuela began daily broadcasts to the Cuban people inciting them to rebellion against Batista. These broadcasts continued until the eve of the Venezuelan presidential election, when, to avoid campaign talk, they were halted.

While Washington shortsightedly pursues a policy of embargoing arms to Batista (how reminiscent this of General Marshall's embargo on arms to Chiang Kai-shek in 1946), Venezuela covertly supplies Castro's forces with Garands, howitzers, and other materiel. Steadily, an axis is being welded between the leftists of Cuba and those of Venezuela under the complacent eye of American "liberal" Latin American counselors. The Caribbean is slipping away from us by continued stages, and we are doing nothing about it.

The paradox of the situation is that the Castro revolt against Batista was largely hot-housed by a group of supposedly responsible American publications, including the New York Times, Life, Look, etc., and by the radio and TV commentator, Edward R. Murrow. Without the terrific buildup which these non-Communist publications have given him, Castro, with his initial 80 followers, would still remain a mountain-locked bandit. Although the pace of Castro heroization has slowed down since he and his brother began kidnaping Americans, it still continues fitfully. After one of Raul Castro's raids on Americans, the New York Times actually profiled him admiringly in its Man of the Day column. When it is recalled that Fidel Castro has a long record of both anti-Americanism and close association with Communists, all of which is documented in the files of the Police Department of Mexico City, his nomination by American liberals to be Batista's successor becomes all the more fantastic. And yet it is happening.

When we proceed further in our tour of the Caribbean, we find another smoldering danger point in the Dominican Republic. Under Rafael Trujillo, the Dominican Republic is the strongest bastion of anticommunism in the Americas. Repeatedly, the Moscow agents have attempted to precipitate revolution against him. Always, Trujillo has repelled them, and has forged sufficient strength to aid anti-Communist action in other parts of the area. Without passing upon the merits of his absolutist form of government, it would seem that Americans would welcome such a rugged ally in the life-and-death struggle against communism.

However, with an irresponsibility little short of suicidal, a large coterie of non-Communist Americans are devoting their energies to the fantastic task of driving Trujillo out of the Caribbean. In this mission, an important part of the Nation's press has approvingly publicized them. The Galindez disappearance, an obvious Leftist hoax, has been played up in the press ad nauseum and when even such a lifelong liberal as Morris L. Ernst palmstakingly exploded the myths which surrounded the case, his documented report was greeted with contempt and unbelief. The press, headed by the New York Times, continued to reiterate the lies.

The venom with which a group of American magazines and newspapers have pursued Trujillo's politics and even the private life of his family has little parallel in the history of Latin American relations. Were Trujillo an uncertain factor for America, the animus might be understandable. But behind him lies a record of 30 years of unwavering support of the United States in the Caribbean. His overthrow would usher in a reign of chaos in the Dominican Republic which would be an open invitation to the Communists. They would rush in to fill the vacuum. And yet this ghastly prospect does not have the slightest deterrent effect upon the vengeful Liberal Americans who are dedicated to the task of Trujillo destruction. No wonder Moscow laughs.

Meanwhile, in British Guiana, just beyond the Venezuela border, we have the obscene spectacle of a Communist government actually in power. Dr. Cheddi Jagan, a fanatical Communist, with a talent for exploiting race grievances, won a majority of the seats in the Legislative Council of British Guiana in 1953 when London incautiously granted the colony self-government. At that time the British were realistic enough to deny Jagan the Prime Ministership. But in the general softening of the West in this hemisphere, the British lacked the stamina to veto Jagan when he won a second election. He was elevated to the Premiership where he sits as the living symbol of Communist victory in the Caribbean.

The events in British Guiana have had a profound influence upon adjacent Trinidad where an anti-American Socialist, Dr. Eric E. Williams, has attained the Premiership. The whole British chain of Caribbean possessions has become an open gash upon the anti-Communist solidarity of the region.

Nothing is more self-evident than the fact that we are on the threshold of tragic events in the Caribbean. They may be events which will point a deadly knife at the political security of America in its own hemisphere. As almost happened in Guatemala, they may conceivably admit Russian-directed communism into our own backyard.

The Reds themselves have now reached the boasting stage. The Moscow Communist, the theoretical monthly of the Russian central committee, announced in its November issue that there are now 360,000 card-holding Communist members in Latin America—20,000 of them in Venezuela.

There is still hope that America can halt this dangerous drift before it goes too far. But if America does this, it must speedily change its strategy in the Caribbean. Its publicists and opinion leaders must stop crucifying the rulers in Latin America who are willing to back up the United States in its struggle with communism. They must stop pampering and heroizing America's enemies and Moscow's friends.

The State Department must stop playing footsie, as it is now reported to be doing in Venezuela, with such equivocal characters as Romulo Betancourt.

It may be hard for some Americans to abandon their enjoyable sport of needling

the strong men in the Caribbean. But if they don't execute a quick change in their attitude, we may see all the important nations in the area slipping away from us. Change, when it comes, comes quickly in the Americas. Time is definitely running out for the United States, even in this hemisphere, unless Americans quickly learn how to fight and more importantly, how not to fight the Communists.

A New Report on U.S. Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there appears in the U.S. News & World Report for February 20, 1959, an article entitled "From the Navy's Top Admiral: A New Report on U.S. Defenses." Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament on January 30, 1959. Among other things, he said, according to subheads preceding the article:

Don't rely on any arms agreement to ward off a first blow.

No controls can guarantee against a surprise attack by an aggressor.

Soviets can't be trusted, ever.

Polaris submarine is best United States weapon.

If atomic tests ended, Polaris and other weapons would suffer.

United States safeguard: ability to retaliate.

I ask unanimous consent that this particularly newsworthy article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FROM THE NAVY'S TOP ADMIRAL: A NEW REPORT ON U.S. DEFENSES

(Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, January 30, 1959. His answers are from the transcript.)

Can surprise attack be prevented?

There are certain fundamental aspects of this problem. Surprise attack is not limited to attacks only by ICBM's (intercontinental ballistic missiles) or long-range bombers, but can involve attack through rapid movement of sea or land forces as well. This is of particular concern to our allies.

No known control measures can guarantee the prevention of surprise attack by a determined aggressor.

The best that can be expected is that certain control measures may discourage an aggressor from launching a surprise attack by depriving him of the assurance of complete surprise.

We must be wary of proposals which would reduce or restrict our ability to deter general nuclear war through the maintenance of a diversified retaliatory force.

Also we must be wary of proposals which would reduce or restrict our ability to respond quickly with adequate military force to Soviet probes at the free world wherever they occur.

Can submarines launch surprise attacks?

The possibility of a surprise attack by submarines is very great, and it is causing us a great deal of concern. [Deleted.] But we

have forces at sea all the time, searching up and down both coasts. We have our various patrol squadrons that operate. [Deleted.]

Could the United States keep enough atomic weapons on submarines so that, if an attack were launched, the enemy could not possibly catch the submarines?

That is right.

Enough nuclear weapons could be stored at sea on submarines to retaliate with great destructive force?

That, of course, is the philosophy behind Polaris submarines, sir. It is difficult for us to find those submarines with all of our capability, and it will be equally difficult for them [the Soviets]. They cannot find all of them simultaneously, but they might find one. If they drop on one, that is an indication for all the rest.

Our strength now, our position of power now with these submarines is that, no matter what he [the enemy] does, he cannot avoid being destroyed. He cannot avoid it. So that is where we have retaliatory strength.

When we get significant numbers of these over the ocean, then he cannot do anything we cannot do.

How are Polaris submarines coming along?

The first one is scheduled to be in full operation in the fall of 1960, and then they will follow through at the rate of, under the present budget, about three a year.

When we get some of those submarines at sea, the Russians are not going to know which submarines are where. They are never going to know whether a submarine is a ballistic-missile submarine, an ordinary submarine, or how many there are or where they are or their condition, or anything about them. They will never know.

And if we have 10 submarines that are built, they will never know where 9 of them are; and every time they pick up a submarine contact, that might be a missile submarine, and the reverse is equally true.

Would submarines have a rather difficult time making much of a missile attack on the Soviet Union?

It would depend upon the number of submarines we wanted to place and where we wanted to place them. [Deleted.] The Arctic Ocean is a very good place because there are holes in the Arctic ice, and you can put a submarine into the holes and it launches through them or it can come up next to the coastline and it is very difficult to detect.

Major population centers of the Soviet Union are far from there, are they not?

Yes, sir. But you could hit Murmansk. * * * With 1,500 miles range you can cover all but a very small part of Russia from launching positions at sea.

Would you have missiles that shoot 1,500 miles?

Yes, sir; yes, sir.

What about this Polaris missile, have we really got one?

No, sir, we do not have one yet, but we started several years ago, sir, on this, and we are right on our schedule.

Does Russia have a considerable number of missile-carrying submarines already?

No, sir; I do not think they have a considerable number. I do think they have done considerable research in them, and I think they are probably doing most of their research based upon their land research data on ballistic missiles. So I think they could have ballistic submarines now. I do not think they have very many.

If the Soviets built a great many underground shelters, would there be any possibility that vast numbers of their people could survive an all-out hydrogen-bomb attack?

No, sir. If we were to launch a retaliatory attack against Russia, large numbers of their people would die, no matter how many shelters they had.

How many do you mean?

Twenty, thirty, forty percent. Of course, it depends on what they do, the direction which their wind blows, how good their facilities are, how long they stay in their underground shelters, but there is a limit on the amount of time they can stay under, and a large portion will die.

Recognizing that the date is approaching when the United States and Russia can each have at sea enough weapons almost to destroy the other, is the time near when neither side will dare to use hydrogen bombs on each other?

I think we have reached that already, sir. I think they are convinced that we will not start a general nuclear war. I believe they are convinced of that. I think they are also convinced that, if they start a general nuclear war, they have had it, they are destroyed, and both of us will have serious damage.

In effect, is there not already a tacit, unwritten agreement that there is not going to be a war with hydrogen bombs, by mutual recognition of the terrible consequences?

Yes, sir; except that an agreement has been made with a congenial liar.

Does that indicate the type of fighting most likely would be the conventional type?

It would be a limited war; yes, sir. We may use small nuclear weapons in limited wars on certain occasions, too.

If the United States gets into a position in which it is not able to fight a limited war, is that not when the enemy is going to attempt that kind of war?

Yes, sir; and he is about to probe, just as Mikoyan came over here probing, finding weak spots, looking for weak spots in our businessmen, finding any place at all where he thinks the United States is weak so he can drive a wedge in that would be military, political subversion, economic, every way possible. And when they find that weak spot, they are going to try to have the capability of taking advantage of it.

They haven't the capability now, perhaps, in all the ways—I mean in all aspects—but they will. I think they are going to try to get that capability. And when they do—they find a weak spot—they cash in.

Operation Nibble?

Operation Nibble; yes, sir.

Do you see any prospect of achieving something in the field of disarmament?

It is possible, sir. I do not see much prospect of it; no, sir. * * * If Russia wants to decrease tensions, the first thing she should know, and I think she does, is that she has got to create confidence in the rest of the world.

I think she is trying to. She is trying to put up a false front to create a situation in which we have confidence in her which is not deserved.

We have to watch that. That is the most dangerous thing there is.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Twining, said in U.S. News & World Report last April:

"Our defenses would be affected if atomic tests were to be stopped, as we would be unable to proceed with desired improvement." He meant in nuclear weapons. Would that statement be true today with respect to Navy defense requirements?

Yes, sir.

Why do you say that?

Because there are great prospects of increasing the yield and decreasing the size of weapons—smaller weapons, with greater yield. In Polaris, for example, we have a satisfactory warhead, but if the tests were to continue we could probably get a warhead weighing the same amount which will have two or three times the present yield.

Also, we would like to go into real small weapons. Take depth charges that could be fired from a [deleted] gun, for example.

Some day you will be able to achieve that if testing continues.

But if you do not have a test, you do know whether you have it or not.

Would you even want to consider an agreement with Russia limiting development of rocket engines?

No, sir; because we entered into a naval agreement, you know, and we got rooked.

Dr. Walter H. Hitchler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 6, 1959, upon the passing of Dr. Walter H. Hitchler, former dean of the Dickinson School of Law, and native of Plymouth, Pa.:

DR. WALTER H. HITCHLER

As an educator, public official, and citizen, Dr. Walter Harrison Hitchler, native of Plymouth and retired dean of Dickinson School of Law, easily qualified for a place among the distinguished Pennsylvanians of his generation. This was no mean achievement when the record of the past half century is examined. From the Nottingham mine, where he launched his career, to the eminence he attained in the profession and in public affairs is impressive progress by any yardstick.

Member of an old and respected family, Dr. Hitchler carved a remarkable career by combining law and education. He joined the law faculty of Dickinson in 1906 and was named dean in 1930, a post he held until his retirement in 1955, after 48 years of service. One of his pupils was former Gov. John S. Fine, and a boyhood friend was former Gov. Arthur H. James, with whom he worked in the mines. Scores of Luzerne County lawyers came under his supervision at the Carlisle institution with which his name was linked so long and intimately as an instructor and administrator.

Pennsylvania called on him repeatedly for a helping hand. He was a member of various commissions to revise the laws of the Commonwealth and he wrote extensively on criminal law. He served in the office of the secretary of the commonwealth and Governor James drafted him to chairman the State liquor control board. During the Second World War he headed the Alien Enemy Hearing Board in the middle district. He also added to his reputation nationally through his service on the National Panel of Arbitrators. But the law school was his principal interest and he served it with fidelity and distinction.

Many honors were heaped on him, including five doctorates from higher institutions of learning. Hitchler House on the Dickinson campus is one of the memorials a grateful college provided in acknowledgment of its indebtedness to him and as an expression of its appreciation. The profession paid tribute to him on a number of occasions for his dedication to the law and the public interest, as well as for his modesty and unselfishness.

With his passing, a useful life has come to an end.

The Catholic Church in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House the fact that Sunday was observed as a day of reparation and prayer for the people of China by Catholics throughout the world. This observance was asked by Pope John XXIII and special devotions were held to mark the day.

I request unanimous consent to enter in the Appendix to the RECORD a brief statement on the facts concerning the church in China. This statement was released by the National Catholic Welfare Conference to accompany remarks made by the four American cardinals urging that Catholics in Red China remain loyal to their faith.

I am troubled by the fact that we Americans often concentrate on the military and economic threat posed by the Soviet regime and fail to recognize the greater spiritual, moral and intellectual threat of communism, whether it is practiced in Moscow or Peking. Indeed, we tend to think of China in second place, while it remains a major threat to world peace.

The tragic effect of the tyrannical effort to force all people of China into one mold, the so-called rectifications of error that provides for the breaking up of families, forced labor, jail or worse, is not compatible with any idea of justice. China's behavior toward her obligations, her refusal to release American prisoners despite her promises, her eagerness to acquire an atomic capability while her military force increases, all must attract the constant concern of our people.

The record of Red China's treatment of her native Christians is a frightening one. I hope all of the Members will give it close attention.

WASHINGTON, February 13.—Ever since the Communists gained control of Red China in 1949, Chinese Catholics have been under relentless pressure to erect a schismatic church.

Schism would occur if the Catholic Church in China renounced the Pope's jurisdiction. Pope John XXIII warned last December that schism is now threatening the Catholic community of China.

"We cannot but beseech Almighty God that in His mercy He may avert such a calamity," the Pope said.

Within the last year about 20 Communist-sponsored priests have been consecrated bishops in defiance of the holy see.

Catholics in China have never been many, numbering some 4 million in a total population of over 500 million. But missionary influence has been far reaching and deep.

In 1949 there were 2,557 Chinese priests and 3,080 foreign ones. There were 5,112 Chinese and 2,351 foreign sisters. The hierarchy comprised 27 Chinese and about 100 foreign bishops.

The Catholic educational system consisted of 3 universities, over 150 high schools, 1,546 elementary schools, and 2,742 catechetical schools. Other institutions included 216 hospitals, 781 dispensaries, 5 leprosaria, and 254 orphanages.

None of the schools or institutions remain. The only exception is a Catholic school taught by European nuns in Peking for dependents of foreign diplomats.

The foreign missionaries have been expelled or killed, and four are in jail. Among them is Bishop James E. Walsh, of Cumberland, Md. The Communist Government confirmed his arrest last December. U.S. State Department efforts to secure his release have been so far unfruitful.

The Chinese clergy has not fared any better. More than 1,000 have been imprisoned or killed.

In 1951 the Communists launched a three-autonomy movement to end completely all foreign contact. Churches could not accept financial support nor missionaries from abroad. All relations with foreign countries, especially with the Holy See, were prohibited. Sermons on the Gospel had to support communism.

In 1954 the Government announced the formation of the patriotic association of Chinese Catholics to supplant the three-autonomy movement.

The late Pope Pius XII roundly condemned the association in an encyclical secretly circulated among Chinese Catholics last summer. The association aims "at making Catholics gradually embrace tenets of atheistic materialism by which God Himself is denied and the principles of religion rejected," the Pontiff declared.

Through the association the Communists wear down resistance. A steady diet of indoctrination is one of the Reds' most deadly weapons. In a letter smuggled from Red China to Hong Kong, a priest wrote:

"These indoctrination courses are deadly, there is no escape. You couldn't imagine how rapid, rabid talkers can force you to think, repeat, concede, admit, and at last get you on their side to prattle the same misleading, ambiguous statements as they spit out. . . . They insist, repeat, insist again and again always on the same statement—wearing us out, breaking us down—until unable to hold out any longer one is finally prepared to say, 'Well, have it your way.'"

News reports from the Communist press indicate that at least 32 Chinese priests have been elected bishops through the patriotic association. About 20 of the bishops have reportedly been consecrated. A decree of the Holy See provides automatic excommunication for clergymen who take an active part in unauthorized consecration ceremonies.

Church authorities, however, are reluctant to pass judgment on those who take part in illicit consecration ceremonies until more is known.

Rev. Frederick A. McGuire, C.M., organizer and former head of the Catholic Central Bureau in Shanghai, which coordinated missionary activities in China before the Reds took over, said he is optimistic that the majority of Chinese Catholics have remained loyal to the Holy See. He pointed out that tight censorship in Red China restricts what is learned to items from the Communist press and from indirect reports.

Father McGuire is now director of the mission secretariat at the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington.

A Communist newspaper recently indicated that Catholic opposition has not been shattered. The newspaper, Chieh-fang Jih-pao of Shanghai, denounced reactionary forces among Catholics who opposed the efforts to support Communist leadership as well as to get rid of the Vatican's reactionary controls.

Forced labor for sisters and priests leaves little time for religious duties. A Communist publication, the Review of Tientsin, published an enthusiastic account allegedly written by a sister superior:

"All the sisters as well as the bishops and priests are taking part in work in the fields. This lasts from 6 in the morning until 9 at

night. At midday we take our meals in turns so that work is not interrupted. Those who dig the ground change teams every 20 minutes and those who are breaking stones every 10 minutes. When wells are being dug supper is passed over and work continues on an empty stomach until 9:30 in the evening."

Protestantism, no less than Catholicism, has been the target of the Communists' intense campaign to eradicate God. The China Committee of the National Council of Churches of Christ recently reported that all church bodies have been merged into one. Ministers must register with a government group and are closely restricted. The more than 200 churches once in Shanghai have been reduced to 12.

"Attendance has much fallen off, partly because so many work on Sunday—one of the latest resolutions is that services on Sunday must not be allowed to interfere with work," a letter reaching the NCCC noted.

The pattern that has emerged in Red China is a deliberated methodical campaign to destroy the spiritual allegiance of the Chinese people. In its place the Red Government wants to substitute a national church subservient to the aims of the totalitarian regime.

Col. William P. Jones, Jr., a Superior Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, all too seldom are we given the opportunity to join in a special public expression of appreciation and esteem for the men and women who carry out the great public programs authorized by the Congress. One such rare instance is the recognition accorded Col. William P. Jones, Jr., Army District Engineer at Memphis, Tenn., since July 1957, upon his transfer to the Army War College.

Colonel Jones truly has rendered outstanding public service in carrying out the tremendous responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers in the lower Mississippi Valley. The corps' program for flood control, drainage, and navigation directly affects the lives and well-being of the millions of people served by this great waterway. Colonel Jones' exceptional professional ability, as well as his understanding of and sympathy with our needs, has contributed immeasurably to the solution of many difficult problems. His service at Memphis has been in the highest tradition of the Corps of Engineers.

I am sure that I speak not only for myself, but for all of our people, in paying tribute to Colonel Jones for his superior service at Memphis. Our regret at losing a district engineer of such qualities is tempered by sense of gratification that our judgment of this fine officer is confirmed by official recognition in his new assignment for training to undertake still higher responsibilities.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the following editorial

from the Commercial Appeal at Memphis for January 31, 1959, with respect to the services of Colonel Jones:

A SUPERIOR OFFICER

No Army district engineer who has served in Memphis has better fitted himself into the community's life or to that of the MidSouth he serves than Col. William E. Jones. His impending transfer to the War College must be, therefore, a cause for genuine regret. The only compensating factor lies in the Army's recognition that he is general officer material and for that reason must be given War College training.

If civilian authorities throughout the MidSouth had the power to make out an efficiency report for his personnel file they would use the designation superior for every rating classification. It would not be exaggeration of the quality of service Colonel Jones has given Memphis and the MidSouth.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is no aspect of human events so mighty in its consequences as militant revolution. Throughout history reformers and pseudoreformers have repeatedly raised the revolutionary banner, inciting insurrection against national governments in the name of liberty. The results have been many and varied, sometimes mighty in their beneficence, sometimes mighty only in their destructiveness, and sometimes productive not of liberty but only of a mightier tyranny than any that existed before.

The people of all nations have strong feelings about revolutionary leaders. To those who profess a love for liberty, yet actually seek only personal gain, the people accord nothing but scorn. Yet to those who actually fight for liberty, the people willingly pay eternal devotion. It is the distinction of the Polish people to honor as one of their revolutionary heroes a man regarded by the freedom-loving citizens of all nations as the outstanding democratic revolutionist of his age and one of the outstanding of all ages: Thaddeus Kosciuszko, universally acclaimed as the hero of two worlds.

Kosciuszko's breadth of vision and ability gave his career a fictional quality. Of noble birth he rose above the narrow outlook of the 18th century Polish nobility to espouse democratic reform. With no prospect of personal gain he crossed an ocean to aid a foreign people in overthrowing British tyranny. Hailed in the New World for his part in the American Revolution he forsook all honors to carry the spirit of revolutionary democracy back to Poland. Defying his own class, the Polish nobility, he campaigned politically in behalf of constitutional government in Poland and when Polish nobles and Russian and Prussian troops sought to thwart the popular will, he took up arms against them. Although achieving fame in the American Revolu-

tion as an engineering genius he now appeared in the role of military tactician, leading a minute Polish Army against the Russian horde in some of the most brilliant defensive military campaigns in history.

Triumphant as a democratic revolutionist in foreign parts, Kosciuszko was defeated in his efforts in Poland's behalf. But only physically and in the short-term sense. Actually, the classic heroism of his actions captured the imagination of the Polish people and of the world at large, and established him as a national symbol—a symbol which stands today, not only representative of Poland's past, but of Poland's future. The democratic dreams generated by Kosciuszko's actions and beliefs have taken permanent hold of the Polish spirit and no temporary tyranny, no foreign ideology is strong enough to snuff them out.

As we in America have seen, democracy is a hardy institution. It can withstand the rigors of devastation and deprivation, and ultimately come back from apparent defeat to overwhelm its enemies. This was the philosophy, the living philosophy, preached by Thaddeus Kosciuszko, and Polish patriots throughout the world have learned it well.

The man we honor on this occasion undoubtedly deserves our tribute for his political and military accomplishments, for in these respects he has few equals. But it is to Kosciuszko the philosopher, the father of democratic Polish thought, to whom we owe our greatest debt, for the fate of Poland's future is still, to this day, in the hands of his spiritual heirs.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the consistent admirers and constant supporters of our distinguished Secretary of State I can only contemplate with the deepest concern the prospects of his being immobilized at the moment in history when we need his strong hand at the diplomatic helm more than ever before.

The irony of the situation centers in the fact that many of his most violent critics are now wringing their hands as they desperately scan the horizon for some one to take his place. All of which points up the fact that most of his traducers took their positions for political reasons and show by their concern that they have never had a constructive alternative to Secretary Dulles' firm resistance to international communism.

In my book the only real test of a nation's foreign policy is the avoidance of war, and under John Foster Dulles' guiding hand we have weathered six crises—count them: Straits of Formosa, Suez, Syria-Turkey controversy, South-

east Asia, Lebanon, Quemoy—without firing a shot. And his policy of being able to take the Nation to the brink of war without plunging in has exhibited an adroitness which none of his more recent predecessors ever seemed to possess.

The alarm with which the Secretary's illness has been recorded abroad attests to the respect in which he is held by our allies and the satisfaction with which the Communists must be presumed to welcome his withdrawal from the active conducting of our affairs of state points up as nothing else can the vital necessity of securing in his successor, if and when a selection must be made, a man who will carry on his policies to the minutest detail.

In addition to being a great statesman and a great patriot, John Foster Dulles is a great churchman and we can only prayerfully petition the Almighty God upon Whom he has ever leaned that He will have His servant in His care and that in His good time this great and dedicated American will be restored to full health and strength and the resumption of his ceaseless efforts in the cause of peace.

The Unfolding Role of Russian Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to direct to the attention of my colleagues a speech made on February 7 by Mr. L. L. Huelsdonk, of Downieville, Calif., before the National Western Mining Congress in Denver. Mr. Huelsdonk is a member of the California State Mining Board and a recognized authority on gold. His observations make good sense and I hope his suggestions on setting the price of gold at a realistic value will be adopted. I have introduced a bill for that purpose.

His speech follows:

THE UNFOLDING ROLE OF RUSSIAN GOLD

I was glad to be asked to appear again before the National Western Mining Conference and talk about gold—even at the risk of being dubbed a crackpot on the subject. However, it is my intention to prove that the real crackpot is not the man with his feet on the ground, but rather, the long-haired dreamer who challenges the deeprooted credence of gold, then saddles up a puff of smoke to chase both ends of a rainbow. Today, because of these starry-eyed vendors of inflation, we are well able to say—with the help of Shakespeare—that gold "is a custom more honored in the breach than the observance."

During a Lions zone meeting shortly after the November 4 election, the president of the host club called upon me to substitute for their program which had failed to show. Knowing my political affiliation and convictions regarding gold, he set the stage in a spirit of good fellowship by satirically suggesting that perhaps the Democrat Party—since it had done about everything else—would now raise the price of gold. This

point of humor, of course, was well waxed with the usual witticism that such a meeting generates. However, in the remarks that followed, a rather serious vein developed when it was pointed out—with good reason—that neither the Democrat nor Republican Party, but rather the Communist Party, would be the first to raise the price of gold.

Today I intend to elaborate upon this danger by showing when, why, how, and where this will be done and the tremendous impact it will have upon the economy of the United States.

In the beginning, it will be necessary to briefly analyze a growth of developments which—over the years—have been undermining the very foundations and cornerstones of our Nation. First of all, we must recognize that inflation is not only our most dangerous foe—but it is also our most vulnerable spot. Many distinguished writers have recently pointed this out with emphasis. Inflation devours our uncommitted savings—which in the final analysis is the only firm basis for sound monetary reserves. It fosters uncontrolled repudiation of Government debt at the expense and misery of the people. It causes the debauchery of currency through the collapse of money value. It throws a serious burden upon fixed income of all types. It generates price-wage spirals which shifts its destructive force into high gear. Its unseen power can completely collapse civilized order. In short—the catastrophic malignancy of inflation, whether it continues to creep or strike rapidly, is more far-reaching and devastating than anything known to man. It is imperative that this cancer be killed—and in order to do this, its roots must be sought out and destroyed. Trying to hide these roots by spreading out the top of the bush is hypocritical, false and foolhardy.

If the real cause for the uncontrolled growth of inflation is to be unraveled, we must first distinguish between proper and improper money, because the roots of inflation are fertilized when an oversupply of improper money is dumped helter-skelter into an economy. Under such conditions, money—like anything else which is over-supplied—becomes cheap and easily available. As a result the banks become glutted and a surplus piles up beyond the needs for healthy economic growth. The cheap offering of this surplus is a natural incentive which induces everybody to spend and borrow until new and greater demands are created for goods and services beyond our normal productive capacities. This generates higher bidding in a race for things that become hard to get and in turn motivates the producers to increase their capacities in a skirmish to maintain their markets against competition. The resultant buildup of factories and the enlargement of auxiliary production facilities engenders still more demand and higher bidding for the materials and services that are necessary to further expand. With money as no object, because of its easy creation and oversupply through more borrowing—inflation takes over and a false prosperity rides high. However, industrial capability soon catches up to such a wayward economy and in time passes its false boom. Everyone has two cars and two refrigerators and they don't want any more. Conveyor belts continue to roll, but the goods pile up in inventories and warehouses because more has been produced than can be used. At this point deflation sets in. Factories are forced to curtail and lay off workers. Demand for raw materials ceases; the deferred payments on the fast-but-false money supply are called for, but cannot be met and mortgages are foreclosed. In short, this is the inevitable consequence of over-supplying an economy with improper money. And, unquestionably, the longer that corrective measures are deferred, the more severe is the backfire.

History has recorded this story many times and it is currently being somewhat demonstrated in France and Argentina where inflationary pressures have forced programs of austerity and currency devaluation as a retaliatory means against external trade competition. Such drastic moves could easily lead to international trade wars with realistic reevaluation of all inflated currencies through a general depression. The Western World is vulnerable to this type of pitfall because the supply of tangible or proper money has not been allowed to keep pace with the demands for the new amounts of money which its present rate of economic growth and population increase is requiring. As a result fractional reserves have been abused, excessive deficit spending has become the rule and government indebtedness has been outraged to provide these undeniable needs for money. In a race of this sort, improper money is easily and irrationally oversupplied and currencies are weakened by dilution and instability. This points to the importance of recognizing the difference between proper (or real money) and improper (or fiat money) if the explosive mirages of inflation are ever to be absorbed into the permanence of an honest prosperity.

Simply speaking, if a dollar is to be borrowed—someone must own a dollar to lend. However, if the owner of the dollar is able to lend it 10 times and still keep it, he has created \$9 of improper money or ghost money that is to be counted, but does not exist tangibly. Many world-renowned economists consider only gold as proper money because it must always be weighed before it can be counted—and because it is now and always has been, the guarantee of redemption throughout the world. It is the only universal measure of value and the standard for all currencies. Even our mighty dollar is used with gold and as gold in foreign monetary reserves only because we guarantee its redemption 100 percent in gold (through the Bretton Woods Agreement) upon demand by the foreigner. And, mind you, this guarantee holds good no matter how many ghost dollars we send abroad or how low their purchasing power may sink—so long as we have enough gold to pay off. This guarantee is the only reason that our dollar holds its high prestige in international exchange. The loss of our gold would result in the immediate loss of our dollar prestige and the Communists know this as well as anybody else. This fact alone lays the foundation for schemes which they do not intend to overlook.

Gold is different from the inflationary supplies of new money which can be created through the facilities of a commercial or central banking system, because it cannot be simply provided by a stroke of a pen. Gold cannot, in any sense, be considered as inflationary money for the simple reason that the cost of its production must be paid for before it can be used as payment. This is true no matter to what extent the demand for funds in an economy exceeds the supply of its savings. This makes gold proper money. This makes gold real and positive money and this is the reason why it holds disciplinary action over the inflationary expansion of fiat money when deficit spending ratios are not allowed to be abused or when reserve requirements are not indiscriminately changed.

On the other hand improper money can be briefly defined as a supply of fractional reserve paper in the form of private and public debt which has been dumped upon an economy to be honored in kind as specie. Although this obligatory paper is thrust into the world markets on a parity with proper money, the determination of its true value must necessarily wait until its liabilities have been liquidated in the uncertainty of future terms. In other words, the degree of inflation at the time of settlement determines the

worth of this money—and the amount of this money that has flooded the markets determines the degree of inflation.

The vulnerability of our money to any outside scheme for its debauchery is being augmented by the continual cheapening of our dollar through the undisciplined monetization of too much debt. This is true because distinction cannot be made between the proper and improper dollars that are held in foreign government account. They all command and collect 100 percent of their face value in gold from our Treasury Department on demand. They act with gold and as gold in foreign reserve accounts and therefore our debts do not only create and inflate our own money, but they do double duty by creating and inflating foreign money. The only difference being that in the final analysis, we are underwriting foreign inflation with our gold.

Under these conditions, continual pressure for more free trade, foreign aid and dollar investment abroad further impairs our position. Through the impact of our generosity in these fields it is already apparent that we can no longer be expected to compete with low foreign costs through high unit output alone. Mechanization is not an exclusive privilege; so from our point of view, certainly freer trade cannot be carried on with justice to our standard of living unless the same pay for like-services in the other nations can be reconciled to our level through the convertibility of sound currencies. The order of natural availability for the fair distribution and utilization of the world's resources is a commendable goal, but not for the United States so long as she is forced by international agreement to underwrite foreign currency through the sacrifice of her gold without provisions to compensate for the depreciation of her own dollar.

It can be readily seen that if our monetary authorities and Congress continue to fall in protecting the purchasing value of our dollar, it will—someday soon—be worth only one-tenth of the value which it contained when the Bretton Woods Agreement was ratified back in 1945. This simply means that in the near future foreign-held dollars will be in a position to demand—and proportionately take—10 times more gold from our Treasury than the original agreement called for.

This situation lays the door wide open to any eager design that the Communists might have to collapse our dollar in favor of ruble prestige. It points to the importance of immediately tying the dollar realistically to gold in order to forestall its further weakening by the calculated drainage of its last drop of blood.

Such a move would take congressional courage—but it would be action and not reaction against any economic manipulations that the Communists are planning. So far we have only reacted to their moves. In the Middle East they acted and we reacted by sending in the Marines. In Quemoy they acted and we reacted by sending in the 7th Fleet. In Berlin they acted and we are still reacting. They put a satellite in orbit and we reacted by outspitting them and now they have placed us in another secondary position by outmooing us.

They will no doubt be the first to raise the price of gold and force us again into reaction. This time it will be much more serious because, if we cannot immediately counteract to meet the consequences, it will lead to the complete degeneration of our dollar. An initiative on our part would take bold action because the opponents to the revaluation of gold are mostly powerful gentlemen of influence who self-seek by the collection of multifold interest on the expansion of the money supply through the debts of the people. The interest on the public debt alone is now over \$7 billion annually. Thus, American citizens must now dig up over 4

times the amount of money, just for the payment of this interest, that it cost to run the entire Government of the United States (including the armed services) when the power to create money was taken from Congress and given to these powerful interests, who are now—in essence—saying that if some of their power to create debt is regulated by an increase in the price of gold that inflation will be the consequence and Russia will be helped.

With all due respect for the feelings of these people, it is impossible to understand how an increase in the price of gold—which would be geared primarily for the control of inflation—could cause inflation. In fact the great shortage of gold for the safe coverage of our presently over-issued currency is the main reason for the inflated prices of today's goods and services. Certainly, inflation is here now and certainly the price of gold has not been raised. Inflation is consistently growing because the function of gold—which has been set up on an international basis as the controlling factor for the discipline of currency expansion—has been ignored usuriously through the abuse of fractional reserves for the sake of reaping multiple profits. This abuse hurts the United States more than any other nation because she is the only nation in the world obligated by international agreement to convert outside holdings of currency to gold. It simply means that in the long run our chances to gain gold without producing it are nil. We cannot possibly use our dollars to build up the gold reserves of the other nations without tearing down our own gold reserve—unless enough new production of gold or gold value can be furnished to keep pace with the issuance of our dollar. The growth of money must keep up with the growth of population and its economic needs if prosperity is to be maintained. However, this growth of money cannot be substituted by the dilution of money, if periods of depression are not to be expected. It must all grow from the increase of proper money (with reserve ratios static) if inflation is to be avoided.

There are many ways to adjust the issuance of money to a reevaluation of gold without inflationary effect. As one example—under existing law, the profits from an increase in the price of gold could be sterilized and held by the Treasury as a stabilizing fund to be fed back into the economy by the retirement of public debt in adequate amounts to supply enough money to stimulate and support the needs for normal economic growth. In such a case the purchasing value of the dollar would remain constant, if fractional reserves were not allowed to change. The creation of the main supply of money would be properly in the hands of Government with qualified backing for convertibility at home as well as abroad. The lending of money would be properly in the hands of the banks but limited to positive reserve ratios. This would not be inflationary.

Of course, an increase in the price of gold would definitely aid Russia, because she is a large producer of the metal. But, to say that an increase at this time would give her an advantage over the free world is ill-advised. Certainly, if a raise in the price were to her advantage now, she would not wait for someone else to make the move. She would do it herself. She is not a member of the international monetary fund. She is not bound by agreements of any kind to hold the price. She is currently supporting such an all-out gold production program that her physical facilities to produce are being taxed to the limit. So—at the present time—an increase in the price could not materially increase her volume of gold—whereas in the free world a revaluation upwards would result in the reopening of closed mines and the mining of marginal ores to such an extent that the volume of

its gold through new production would climb by many fold. Such a situation would be a definite disadvantage to Russia in fighting the economic war that was declared on America by Khrushchev in a recent speech where the challenge was made brutally clear in these words: "We declare a war we will win on the United States—in the peaceful field of trade." And then he added confidently, "We will bury you."

In order to enter into such a war with any assurance of reasonable success, the Russians know that they must first possess a fully convertible ruble that will be guaranteed on a sound exchange basis for world trade. Therefore, it is clearly evident that the main reason behind their all-out effort for the production of gold, is to build up their monetary gold reserves to a point where this can be safely accomplished as the when of the when, why, and how and where that the Communists will be the first to raise the price of gold. With the realization of such a reserve objective, their next move would be to disorganize confidence in the American dollar and capture its prestige with convertible trade rubles. And this is the why of our story—because if an increased price for gold in the term of our dollar was first offered by Russia in soundly convertible rubles, an immediate run would be created on our gold through the redemption of foreign-held dollars. This race would be made by the foreign owners of American dollars in order to gain gold to sell to Russia where more benefit in convertible currency could be received by them than by their retention of our dollars. The immediate effect of such action would be to place Russian rubles in a trade position among members of the International Monetary Fund and discredit the American dollar by sending it home for the unpleasant job of divesting not only itself of its own gold backing, but also that of three other dollars. A dollar shortage would once again develop abroad, but this time the gap would be bridged by Russian rubles. The how and where follow axiomatically. It will be simply by proclamation from Moscow. There need be no consent, no legislation, no red-tape.

We are now vulnerable to such an ambush, because we ratified the terms of the Bretton Woods Agreement without having first incorporated into it a protective provision for the depreciation of our dollar and then by immediately embracing the professional means of depreciating it through the hocus-pocus of mysterious money.

When Russia raises the price of gold, our Congress will be forced into immediate reaction by groping for fast legislative procedure to meet or beat the price she dictates—or stand resolved to gamble away the tangible backing of our dollar and be judged in history as the prize pigeons of the century. The only other alternative would be to scrap our agreement with foreign friends which guarantees gold redemption for the dollars they hold and thereby sacrifice our international prestige. Last year alone, without cause for a run on our gold, other than the inflationary sickness of our dollar, we lost over one-tenth of our reserve source at Fort Knox—and let us not forget that this amount is the direct backing for over \$3 billion of Federal Reserve notes. This drain has pulled our reserves down to \$20 billion and of this amount we legally need to hold about \$12 billion to cover Federal Reserve deposits and notes. This leaves only \$8 billion in gold for the redemption of nearly 16 billion foreign-held dollars. Foreign governments and central banks alone own about one-half of these holdings which can immediately draw on our gold. This means that we could be wiped clean before we could react through our legislative processes.

We can take but one sound step to halt this coming economic onslaught and that step is to set the price of gold to a realistic

value in terms of the dollar. But we must take the initiative and move first or else our leverage will be weakened against the weight of gold which we had been told was old fashioned.

In conclusion, I would like to warn Congress again of its responsibility. Under the influence of skillful propaganda, its majority of both parties have, for some time now, been suffering under the illusion that it has been elected for the purpose of giving away the assets of this Nation—and that by sending us to the poorhouse, it can make the whole world rich. Congress should understand that so long as we have our heads under a direct national debt of over \$280 billion—which we are apparently not capable of reducing—that we have no assets to spare. A nation should first learn the fundamentals of providing its own fiscal needs before embarking upon an experiment of furnishing money for a world.

Air Reservists at the University of Florida Are Being Educated to the Nth Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take great pride in inserting in the Record an article by Lt. Col. Franklin Hibel, which appeared in the February 1959 issue of the Air Reservist. I am proud of the accomplishments of this Air Force Reserve unit in Gainesville, Fla., in my congressional district, and I know my colleagues and the American people will feel, as I do, that they have reflected considerable credit upon themselves and their country.

The article follows:

AIR RESERVISTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA ARE BEING EDUCATED TO THE NTH DEGREE

(By Lt. Col. Franklin Hibel)

Not only can the Gainesville, Fla.'s 9886th Air Reserve Squadron be called ready, but they're ready made.

With over 75 percent of the squadron strength composed of students and professors at the University of Florida, it is only logical they meet on the school campus.

Half of the 100-plus reservists are students, while 18 are professors. Another 10 are university employees.

Lt. Col. C. J. "Pete" O'Connor, squadron commander, said it best: "The availability of specialists in the many fields of endeavor in which the university group is normally associated has made available to the 9886th a tremendous pool of top-flight professional instructors and speakers."

Since the population of Greater Gainesville is 44,500 and the University of Florida has 12,304 students this year, it can readily be noted that much of the city's civic life is centered around the university.

A progressive and cultural center, Gainesville points with pride to its university, the largest land-grant institution of higher learning in the Southeast. The city is justly proud, too, of the 9886's educator reservists, who have gained national, and in some instances, international renown.

TALENT GALORE

The available talent can best be observed through the following capsule comments

concerning four of the professors, selected at random:

Lt. Col. Frank E. Maloney, acting dean of the College of Law. Holds a bachelor of laws degree with high honors (University of Florida) and a bachelor of arts degree (University of Toronto, where he also did graduate work in philosophy). He became a professor in 1950.

Colonel Maloney has written many articles on law subjects. He has had such professional recognition as chairman, Equity Round Table Council, Association of American Law Schools, and adviser to the Florida bar.

Col. Robert B. Mautz, dean of academic affairs. Holds a bachelor of laws degree from Yale. Has a bachelor of arts degree (magna cum laude with honors, Miami University, Ohio). He has served on the advisory board of Journal of Legal Education, and has been chairman, Southern Law Review Conference. Incidentally, both Colonels Mautz and Maloney have completed their residence requirement for J.S.D.

Lt. Col. Manning J. Dauer, professor of political science. He has been with the university 25 years, with time out—1942–46—for military leave with the Army Air Force.

Colonel Dauer authored two books, "The Adams Federalists," and one covering political "Scope and Method." He has acted as consultant to congressional committees and is much in demand as a lecturer. The professor is also managing editor of the Journal of Politics, a leading political science journal circulating in the United States and in 50 foreign countries.

Lt. Col. Willard M. Fifield, provost for agriculture at the university. He holds a bachelor of science degree in agriculture (University of Florida) and a master of science degree. He is a past chairman of the Committee of Nine (nine State experiment station directors), adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture on regional agriculture research.

Colonel Fifield has been a committee member of the institutional projects abroad of the American Council on Education. Also indicative of his ability is the fact he was named Man of the Year in Florida Agriculture for 1955 by the Progressive Farmer.

A unit under the Jacksonville Air Reserve Center (2686th ARS), the Gainesville squadron was organized early in 1949. First commander was Lt. Col. James S. Lanham (USAF retired), now head professor of accounting.

The 9886th's legal detachment was the first in the 14th AF geographical area at the time and one of the pioneer flights in the Air Force Reserve. Officially organized on September 12, 1949, the legal unit has developed a mock court-martial which has earned considerable praise from higher echelon.

Called Operation Court-Martial, the trial put on by the legal reservists—professors and law students—is a model of military court procedure. So professionally proficient have the participants become in the mock court-martial, that they have presented their "show" on several occasions outside of Gainesville.

Regarding the squadron's degrees, take a reading of the following percentages: close to 30 percent hold bachelors; over 16 percent have masters; nearly 10 percent carry doctors of philosophy, while approximately 6 percent earned doctors of law.

What have all these degrees got to do with the squadron in general? Glad you asked that. The Gainesville reservists are benefiting by instruction from No. 1 instructors—instruction which would normally cost plenty of cash.

"In 26 years of military service," emphasized Colonel O'Connor, "including a varied number of assignments from squadron to theater command level, the responsibility of command of the 9886th has been one of the enjoyable tasks of my military career."

"It is my opinion that our squadron," he concluded, "with its vast resources in manpower drawn from the University of Florida, is one of the outstanding Air Reserve squadrons within the structure of the Air Force Reserve and has the potential to meet many of the specialized requirements that may be needed in times of emergency."

No one has to have a degree to absorb the significance of that statement.

Need for Economic Rehabilitation of Distressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, recently, a friend of mine had the unhappy experience of being on hand for the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities in one of the counties of the Fifth Congressional District.

It was truly a heartbreaking scene. Able-bodied men, eager and willing to work, had to line up and await their turn to receive a limited supply of food for their families. Defeat and resignation were written on the faces of these men.

"For goodness sake, do everything you possibly can to help provide jobs for these men," my friend told me after this experience. "They want to work. It is a crying same that jobs simply are not available."

Mr. Speaker, my primary job this year is to do everything I possibly can to help create new jobs in West Virginia. It is difficult at times to make people from other areas, which are not plagued by chronic unemployment, understand the gravity of the situation. Our two Senators—BYRD and RANDOLPH—are doing an excellent job of setting forth in the Senate the need for an economic rehabilitation program. I am convinced there is a much wider interest in the problem in the House now than there was last year.

A Federal program of loans and grants to enable areas such as West Virginia to attract new industries is an indispensable part of any overall coordinated program. But we must not overlook the fact that local initiative is another necessary ingredient.

Mr. Speaker, West Virginia has much to offer to industry. Our manpower supply is plentiful. The supply of coal for fuel is almost inexhaustible. Water is plentiful. Excellent transportation facilities bring the markets of the country within easy shipping distance of West Virginia.

These and other facts, which make our State an attractive location, must be made available to industry. The electric utilities and other industries, which realize that their progress is tied to that of the State as a whole, have done an outstanding job of industrial promotion. A number of counties have started industrial development committees.

Mr. Speaker, all of this activity, I believe, demonstrates a commendable resolve on the part of the people in my State to work ourselves out of the economic difficulty in which the State temporarily finds itself. I am sure these local groups would agree that a sensible, workable program of Federal assistance is essential. But I am sure they would further agree that to rely entirely upon the Federal Government would be a fatal mistake.

The bill which I am pushing in the House for the economic rehabilitation of distressed areas calls for a coordinated effort. No Federal handout is involved. Rather, it is a program that will help the States—and their subdivisions—to help themselves.

There can be no doubt that everyone would benefit from a program that would create new jobs for the thousands of men in West Virginia who cannot find gainful employment. Mr. Speaker, the investment in dollars would be repaid many times over. Just think of the tax revenue that would be generated by an additional 200,000 jobs in the State and how great the demand would be for new services. Each new dollar in wages thus created would circulate many times through the economy.

I am convinced that during the months ahead we will see much progress in West Virginia toward working our way out of our present economic difficulties. Eventually, we will build in West Virginia an economy based upon widely diversified industries, providing jobs for men who are now displaced by machines and technological advancements.

Don't Let Antarctic Go by Default

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent article by Jim Lucas, Scripps-Howard staff writer, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 13, 1959.

The article follows:

DON'T LET ANTARCTIC GO BY DEFAULT

(By Jim G. Lucas)

A former U.S. Pacific commander, Adm. Felix Stump, today urged the Nation not to let the Antarctic go by default.

Admiral Stump said it could become an important military asset to the nation or nations controlling it.

As U.S. Pacific commander, Admiral Stump was responsible for supplying American forces in the Antarctic during the recent International Geophysical Year. He now is with the Freedom Foundation in Gettysburg.

With the conclusion of the IGY, eight nations, including the United States and Russia, said they plan to maintain Antarctic bases indefinitely.

Meanwhile, representatives of 12 nations, which participated in the IGY, are meeting here in Washington in an attempt to insure

that it be used only for peaceful purposes and that it does not become a political football. There have been reports that the Russians have blocked the kind of treaty President Eisenhower proposed last May.

Admiral Stump noted that the United States takes the position it neither asserts nor recognizes territorial claims in the Antarctic. But he advocated the establishment of additional U.S. bases there, adding frankly his reason was to "keep it out of the hands of some of our so-called former allies."

He said we should put bases in all ice-free areas of the continent. "Possession is nine points of the law," he remarked.

Admiral Stump said the Antarctic could become a major space launching platform, a military staging area or be used for control stations on a great circle commercial air route between Europe and Australia.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial concerning John Foster Dulles from the Sunday Call-Chronicle, Allentown, Pa., February 15, 1959:

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles went to Walter Reed Hospital in Washington last week for what normally would be considered a routine operation. It was performed successfully, but doctors found an old intestinal cancer had become active. Suddenly his health became just about the most important matter in the world.

Even those who have been clamoring for his scalp, both in this country and abroad, for one reason or another, found it almost intolerable to consider the vacuum that would be created were this 70-year-old combination of an iron constitution and steel nerves to abruptly disappear from the scene.

He is almost universally considered the architect of the plans and policies by which the Western powers managed to keep the cold war from turning hot. His opinions have prevailed with few exceptions within the councils of the alliance, even when strongly opposed. There is an old saying that the best steel blade bends a little. This aptly describes Dulles. He might have bent a little on occasion, but never much and he has steadfastly refused to deviate far from his determined course.

A man of such stubbornness of will, a man who refuses to compromise when it would seem to be the easier thing to do, a man who holds the trump cards so forcefully that he can usually command others to do his bidding, is bound to create enemies. John Foster Dulles has done this in a big way. He is thoroughly disliked in the capitals of many friendly nations. He has been mercilessly lambasted by critics at home, within his own party and without. He is the No. 1 enemy of Moscow, for when others showed an inclination to listen to Russia's sweet talk, he managed to squelch any movement toward appeasement.

Yet, despite all this, he has somehow retained a deep and abiding respect on the part of those who love and those who hate him. And as the man who enjoys the complete confidence of President Eisenhower, he

is considered by many the most powerful individual in the world today. By the way of illustration, the story is told that when the Quemoy crisis developed last summer, Dulles flew to Newport where the President was vacationing and in the matter of a few hours had outlined the problem and secured Eisenhower's agreement to announce the defense of the offshore islands with American forces if that became necessary.

John Foster Dulles is unique in a number of other respects. No Secretary of State in American history has been so well prepared for the work he has been called upon to do. His was anything but a political appointment when Mr. Eisenhower first took office.

He was 65 when he got the job, but he had been getting himself ready since he was 19, when he attended the second Peace Conference at The Hague in 1907 as a secretary to his uncle, Robert Lansing, then Secretary of State to President Wilson. His maternal grandfather, John W. Foster, was Secretary of State under President Harrison.

Ten years later President Wilson sent Dulles to Central America to negotiate successfully for the protection of the Panama Canal after we had broken relations with Germany.

After the armistice of World War I, he was a member of the U.S. delegation to the Versailles Peace Conference, where he served as the chief of American counsel on reparations. Later he served in other important capacities relating to the peace treaty with Germany.

Between wars he conducted an outstanding practice in international affairs. In 1938 he wrote a book in which he pointed out the inevitability of war between this country and Japan.

As a Republican adviser, he accompanied Secretary of State James Byrnes to the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in 1945. In 1947 he went with Secretary of State George Marshall to Moscow, and in 1949 he accompanied Secretary of State Dean Acheson to Paris.

When, in the same year, President Truman needed someone especially able to deal with the Japanese, he picked John Foster Dulles as his personal envoy with authority to speak directly for the President in negotiating a peace treaty. This treaty he subsequently wrote. Earlier he had served under Franklin D. Roosevelt as an adviser to the American delegation in the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco.

If anyone ever was in a position to give American foreign policy continuity across several administrations, if anyone has had the opportunity to gain a broad perspective of its problems, it has been Secretary Dulles.

Dulles' many public statements, all made with typical candor, added to his reputation as a controversial character. Probably the most controversial is what is now known as his brink-of-war declaration. Made in the course of an interview with Life magazine, it said:

"You have to take chances for peace, just as you must take chances for war. Some say that we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art. If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost. We had to look it square in the face—the question of enlarging the Korean war, on the question of getting into the Indochina war, on the question of Formosa. We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face. We took strong action."

This paragraph pretty well sums up the man and his philosophy. History may prove his policies were what caused Russia to back up time after time when the chips were down.

Last week, as he underwent the surgeon's knife, the air was filled with rumors. Dulles

would never return. His convalescence would take many months. He would resign and Under Secretary Christian Herter or some other understudy would take his place. At his age and under all the accompanying circumstances, these rumors were accorded a certain degree of credibility. Yesterday the doctors confirmed that he has cancer and the worst fears were realized. The Secretary of State will not be on the job for a long time, if ever.

Is John Foster Dulles an indispensable man? Of course he isn't. Why then the deep concern so suddenly manifested in so many quarters, even by those who only a short while ago cried for his scalp?

The answer is that without him there is bound to be a period of grave uncertainty. The vacuum created by his withdrawal would immediately be filled with a mass of conflicting opinion. For awhile no one would know where the United States stood, or its allies either for that matter, a situation made to order for Moscow. With John Foster Dulles in charge there has never been any doubt.

Perhaps the world is just beginning to realize how much it owes this quiet, determined, unflinching man who prepared himself over more than threescore years for the most difficult job his country could ask him to perform—to walk to the brink and look it in the face.

Upping Airport Subsidies; or, Piling Pork on Pork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the February 14, 1959, issue of the Milwaukee Journal on the question of airport subsidies. The support of the Milwaukee Journal of the President's airport program is significant since this particular newspaper is antiadministration about 99 percent of the time:

UPPING AIRPORT SUBSIDIES; OR, PILING PORK ON PORK

The very first Senate bill introduced and reported out for action would more than double the amount which the administration had proposed for airport construction subsidy in the next 4 or 5 years.

Senator MONROE, Democrat of Oklahoma, the author, was sure of support from both sides of the aisle. State agencies and local governments have been clamoring for more Federal money—which has to be matched with State and local money—for airport expansion.

The chief justification offered has been that airlines are beginning to fly and that, to accommodate them safely, very large sums will have to be spent on extending and strengthening runways. (The airports aid bill does not cover safety and traffic control devices provided wholly at Federal expense.)

But the subsidy boosters are just as interested in tossing more thousands to hundreds of little airports back home which will not see a jet transport or provide a nationally necessary service in the foreseeable future. Millions, too, will subsidize terminal lounges, lobbies, outlook balconies, and the like at metropolitan airports. This for special benefit of air travelers and the commercial air-

lines, but adding nothing to the capacity to handle jet planes or any others.

The \$50 million a year the Eisenhower administration proposed should be ample to cover the Federal Government's proper responsibility in local airport improvements. It should be more than enough if spent only where and as needed for improvements essential to the national security and welfare.

The money will be allotted politically, however, as it has been in the past. A move to restrict Federal aid to field improvements (not terminal buildings, etc.) was turned down in committee. So this is, in other words, another pork-barrel proposition. The President is willing to go on doling out some pork. The Monroney bill backers just want a lot more.

All-American Athlete From All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, in these times when juvenile delinquency is so frequently mentioned on the front pages of our newspapers, I am happy to commend to your attention a young man of an entirely different sort, a young man whose courage, faith, and determination make him a living symbol of all that is decent in America's youth.

The young man is named Leo Byrd. At this time, he is climaxed a sterling scholastic and collegiate basketball career at Marshall College in my hometown of Huntington, W. Va.

As major colleges go, Marshall is not a very large one, and as collegiate basketball players go, Leo Byrd is rather on the small side. But in character, talent, and personality, Leo's stature is tall indeed.

When Leo Byrd was 12 years old, the dreams of basketball glory he had cherished since babyhood seemed turned to dust. He was a patient in a hospital, stricken with poliomyelitis and partially paralyzed.

Many a boy would have accepted defeat at this point, but Leo did not. As soon as he was able to get up, he started running and training to strengthen his weakened legs, although he says "This hurt me a lot, but I wouldn't let them know."

He recovered sufficiently to play junior high school and later high school basketball. His first 3 years of high school competition were comparatively undistinguished, and even as he played through his senior year, he did not enjoy the publicity accolades often accorded promising young players.

His star soared cometlike into the heavens, however, in the 1955 West Virginia High School tournament. Leading a lightly regarded Huntington High School team into the event, he broke the existing tournament record for scoring by making 48 points in a game that eliminated the school that had won 4 consecutive State championships. The following night he snapped his own rec-

ord with a 49-point performance, and proved to be the start of the tournament.

Later that spring, he was named "Mr. Basketball USA" after appearing in an intersectional high school all-star game.

Leo enrolled at Marshall College, only a few blocks from his home, after spurning the offers of glittering scholarships from other schools.

Here he has brought continuing credit to his family, his school, and his community. Under the tutelage of Jule Rivlin, Marshall's able basketball coach, he has blossomed into a universally respected college star. His basket-shooting ability is regarded as almost uncanny, and although he is only 6 feet, 1 inch tall, he relies on aggressiveness and remarkable coordination to outplay men far taller than he.

Last year, Leo Byrd teamed up with Hal Greer, the first Negro player in Marshall history, to give his squad an awesome scoring attack. With Greer gone, and winning fame as a professional player with Syracuse, Leo has done a remarkable job of carrying the offensive load for his team this year.

All season long, he has remained near the top among the Nation's scorers. As I speak today, he is second in the Nation only to Cincinnati's widely acclaimed Oscar Robertson. Leo never lets down. In fact, his scoring ability has improved as the season has progressed.

As glamorous as Leo Byrd's career has been, his personal life, however, is at least equal to it in stature.

He is modest and unassuming, yet talks about his basketball feats frankly and with great sincerity if asked.

He is the son of a Methodist minister, Rev. Joseph P. Byrd, who was himself a versatile college athlete. The Christian training of Byrd's early days have remained with him. He is universally saluted by his opponents for his clean play and good sportsmanship.

A former leader in the youth fellowship in his father's church, Leo has kept religion as his guide, and before each Marshall game, Leo leads his teammates in prayer.

The city of Huntington this year was one of the few American communities honored with an All America Award. The community is justly proud of its civic progress. And Huntingtonians also may take great pride in the fact that Leo Byrd, a native son who elected to stay in his hometown for a sparkling collegiate athletic career, seems a sure bet to collect some all-American honors himself at the close of the basketball season.

Israel and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1958, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, of

which the Dayton Jewish Community Council is a member, adopted a resolution entitled "Israel and the Middle East." The Council, which is a coordinating association of 213 local-central Jewish community organizations, represents more than 800 Jewish communities in the United States and Canada. Following is this resolution which should be of interest to all Members of Congress:

ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

This assembly records its strong support of the U.S. Government's economic aid to the Middle East, so fundamental to the welfare and progress of the peoples of those countries and to strengthening democratic institutions in that strategic and vital area.

The representatives of this Council have viewed at first hand the profound achievements made possible by this economic assistance to Israel.

We commend the President and the Congress for these enlightened programs, and we urge the continuation and the extension of such aid, in the interests of the humanitarian needs of these underdeveloped countries, the stability of the region, and the peace of the world.

Public Law 480

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, today I should like to add my voice to the voices of certain of my colleagues by introducing an amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development Assistance Act of 1954, commonly known as Public Law 480, which would permit this act to operate for 5 years without need of congressional action.

At a time when our farms are involved in the largest production in our history, we find nations all over the world in need of these products, while we at the same time are lamenting their existence. This law was enacted for the sole purpose of expediting this situation; it was enacted to permit our Nation to provide for those countries in need of our commodities. This is possible in a manner not calculated to upset or hinder their economies, but rather in a fashion which will enable them to purchase what they need, when they need it, in a sound economic and businesslike fashion. We, by the same token, as a nation are profiting in a bilateral capacity. We are able to sell our excess products for currency or credit on the international market, while reducing the surpluses presently costing the Government millions of dollars in storage.

Public Law 480 has provided this Nation with the opportunity of winning countless friends among the nations of the world where a food deficit is in existence. It has permitted disposal of approximately \$5 billion of surpluses on the world market from our markets. This program has served us well; it has stood the test of almost 5 years, and has proven itself to be one of the better laws passed

by the Congress when one evaluates its results on the domestic agricultural market and its benefits to our farm families.

I have introduced this amendment because I feel a program which has proved its worth in this manner should no longer be restricted by year-to-year operation. Effective as this provision has been in its present form, it stands to reason that long-range commitments by the Department of Agriculture could better be made and utilized if the Department could make assurances of delivery, as permitted by this amendment.

Because of the effect of Public Law 480 on our international policies and because of the advantageous effect it has on our farm economy, I urge the favorable consideration of this amendment.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of my newsletter which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Congress suspended its deliberations on Thursday, February 12, to observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Carl Sandburg, the famed poet and author of a monumental biography of the Civil War President, spoke at a joint session of the Senate and House.

Lincoln was the founder of the Republican Party. His birthday each year is the occasion for party dinners throughout the country, at which funds to finance future campaigns are raised. Democrats use the birthdays of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson for their fundraising events.

But Lincoln does not belong to the Republican Party, just as Jefferson and Jackson are not the exclusive property of the Democrats. These great Americans belong to the entire country and they are revered and remembered by all of us, regardless of party.

There can be no denying the fact that Lincoln was a great man. His was a tragic life and the sense of doom, of impending tragedy, which haunted him his entire adult life, became a reality when John Wilkes Booth put a bullet through his body in Ford's Theater in Washington. Lincoln had a devotion to the Union which guided his public life. He had to lead this Nation through a bloody and cruel Civil War in which 500,000 men on both sides fell, to prove the insolvency of the Union.

Lincoln was a vilified President. The cruel, bitter things which were said about him when he was President are almost beyond belief today. He was pictured in cartoons as an ape, a monster, and a maniac.

Lincoln was a noble soul. There was a touch of the poet about him. In an age of florid prose, he spoke and wrote in simple terms. He was preceded on the platform at Gettysburg by Charles Sumner who spoke for 2 hours. Lincoln spoke for 5 minutes. What Sumner said was forgotten; Lincoln's Gettysburg Address has attained immortality, a masterpiece of prose, a speech which every schoolchild has to learn by heart.

All of Lincoln's speeches were memorable. He coined phrases which are quoted as the epitome of wisdom. Yet he was a modest man. He had grave doubts of his ability to govern the country in its most trying hour.

Lincoln was a masterful politician. Surrounded by a hostile and disloyal Cabinet, imposed upon him by his party, he persevered, outmaneuvered and, in the end, had his way. He fought with Congress and firmly established the precedent of a strong President—the head of a coequal branch of the Government as the Constitution decreed.

Upon his death people forgot the cruel, unkind things said about Lincoln. Instead they remembered his nobility, his long suffering to hold the Union together. Men wept openly in the streets of Washington upon learning the sad news. They realized the Nation faced a period of adjustment, of binding up the Nation's wounds, as critical and dangerous as the war period. They were afraid of that future without the steady hand of Lincoln at the helm.

How the course of history might have been changed had this man been spared. He wanted to bring the South back into the Union. He sought no vengeance. Had he lived, the South would have escaped the indignities and humiliations which were forced upon her by radicals bent upon revenge. Had Lincoln lived, the South would not have turned to counterviolence. The Nation could well have been spared a legacy of hate and suspicion which is still with us today.

It is fitting and proper that the birthday of our great heroes be observed each year. Lincoln, Jefferson, Jackson—these and others who built this country—have much to teach us today. It is unfortunate that we have not learned better the lessons of the past.

Where Is the Money Coming From?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, an article in the February 1 edition of the Omaha World-Herald properly gives recognition to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for his fight against heavy Government spending, and I desire to include the article as part of my remarks:

For many years, the most vocal critic of heavy Government spending in the House of Representatives was former Representative Robert Rich (Republican, of Pennsylvania).

Mr. Rich's frequent query: "Where is the money coming from?" became famous.

He retired from Congress a few years ago, however—and now an Iowan appears to have taken over his role.

This is Representative H. R. Gross (Republican).

Mr. Gross is a man with little tolerance for a lot of the Government's spending and it makes no difference to him whether it is by agencies or by his brethren in the House.

His latest assault came when an effort was made to put a man on the Federal payroll at \$11,600 annually, to make plans for the visit to this country of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentarian's Conference.

The past 4 years these meetings have been held in Paris, attended by United States delegates from Senate and House. The next one will be here, and the employee—whom Mr. Gross described as a "funkey"—would make arrangements.

Not caring on whose toes he stepped, Mr. Gross called the conference a junketing organization. Members of Congress shudder when their inspection trips and the like are described as junkets.

Mr. Gross told one member of the Parliamentary Conference that he and his fellow junketeers had been traveling by military transport, and using the armed services to haul their baggage around Europe.

The Iowan succeeded in halting a vote on employment of the "funkey" until Monday.

Hero of Democracy: Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, to Polish people all over the world there is no date more worthy of note than February 12, the birthday of the great Polish statesman, military engineer extraordinary, democrat, and patriot of two continents, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Revolution in behalf of any cause is a perilous undertaking. Not only does it inflict suffering on the government it assaults, but on the revolutionary party as well, not to mention the thousands of persons not directly involved in the struggle. For this reason history looks with a critical eye upon all revolutionary leaders and observes closely their merits and shortcomings.

Professedly democratic revolutions are no exception to the rule. Far too often self-styled democrats have instigated revolution, overthrown tyranny and then, in a burst of postwar confusion or villainy, established a government as tyrannical as that which it replaced. The world owes nothing to such misguided zeal but contempt, reserving its respect only for the truly democratic result, an all-too-rare occurrence in revolutionary history.

In this country, following our War for Independence, we had the good fortune to come under the guidance of George Washington, a revolutionist of genuinely democratic spirit, and our progress as a Nation is to a large extent the result of that happy occurrence. But Washington was not the only great statesman to emerge from this struggle, nor his democratic outlook peculiar to him alone. Numerous leaders in the American Revolutionary Army were to become exponents of the democratic dream and one of the most remarkable of these was the man we honored on February 12, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

No one in history more deserves the title of democrat than Kosciuszko, whose sympathy for the oppressed carried him across the seas to fight for principle on a foreign shore. His participation in the Revolution was vital. A master in the art of fortification construction, he is credited with laying the groundwork for some of the Americans' most outstanding military achievements. And once the war was over and America was free, the

people of his adopted land poured honors on Kosciuszko and bid him remain, as a distinguished and respected citizen.

But the ideal of democracy is a moving force, and it would not let Kosciuszko rest. In a few years he was back in his native Poland, campaigning as an apostle of constitutional government. Long subjected to the presence of foreign troops on their soil, the Polish people grasped at the teachings of democracy, and in 1791 rose up to form a constitutional monarchy, in the hope of at last attaining political unity and repelling foreign domination. When the neighboring states of Russia and Prussia combined with certain Polish nobles to quell this democratic demonstration Kosciuszko met them on the battlefield and though initially defeated he returned in 1794 at the head of an insurrectionary army to revive the democratic cause.

For a moment, and for a moment only, Kosciuszko sat at the head of the councils of a free Poland. Temporarily triumphant, the Polish democrats foresaw a glorious future, such as that already spreading before the Americans, and in honor of Kosciuszko's leadership in battle they chose him as President. In this capacity Kosciuszko's attitude was the same as that of the American leader, George Washington. Despite his noble background and militaristic career, he gave to free Poland its first taste of genuine democracy, initiating democratic reforms that were immediately incorporated into the Polish tradition.

Although eventually overcome by the military might of their powerful neighbors, the followers of Kosciuszko realized that they had taken up a cause that could not be suppressed by armies alone or by any other force, and from that time to the present the democratic flame has burned brightly in the Polish heart. The result is directly attributable to Kosciuszko, whose love of democracy kindled that flame. Democratic people the world over have good reason to do him honor. His abilities, his deeds, his courage, and his foresight are unsurpassable. Indeed, among the many heroes of democracy, Thaddeus Kosciuszko ranks second to none.

The Governor Said It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in a news article datelined Harrisburg, Pa., February 11, Democrat Gov. David Lawrence came out firmly for less frills—and that should mean less expense—in our school construction program.

Frankly, I would have been happier to have such a forward-looking stand taken by a Republican official but perhaps the pronouncement coming from a topnotcher in the party that has always enjoyed a reputation for handouts and

spending will have a farther reaching effect.

The Governor displayed his annoyance over the fact that most of our school buildings stand idle a third of the year, a defect in our system which would not and could not be countenanced in industry. And the Governor has reopened the way for renewed consideration of round-the-year utilization of our schools through staggered enrollments.

The Governor then very properly vented most of his denunciation on deluxe, palacelike structures which have nothing whatever to do with the proper education of the youth of America. And as an aside he says that he will insist on a measure of standardization so as to eliminate the duplication of architectural fees.

The Governor's firm stand is undoubtedly predicated on the realization that we have reached a crisis in educational expense and that the heavily-burdened taxpayer can no longer be expected to supinely accept these country club, Taj Mahal-types of school buildings.

The news article to which I have referred appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on February 12, and is included in full as follows:

LAWRENCE URGES SCHOOL ECONOMIES

HARRISBURG.—Gov. David L. Lawrence today called for economies in school building construction and operation because there's just not enough money to meet the costs of elaborate structures for use on a part-time basis.

Attending his first meeting of the State Public School Building Authority, Lawrence, who was elected president of the agency, urged a reevaluation of school construction practices and the use of educational structures.

The Governor told the board he had been "annoyed for many years" by the long periods when school buildings remain empty and unused.

He added that when school buildings are used only 6 or 7 hours a day, 5 days a week and 9 months a year they represent a poor return on the investment.

His remarks were followed by a general discussion reviewing possible economies in the construction of school plants.

These include:

Standardized plans and specifications so the could be used for different buildings in a move to save architect's and engineers' fees.

A ban on the erection of deluxe buildings when State aid is involved, and requiring local districts, who insist on the palace-like structures, to assume a greater basic share of the costs.

Larger classrooms, particularly for the use of closed-circuit television, so a reduction could be made in perpetual teachers' salary expenses for smaller classes.

Employment of architects and engineers by the State in a move to save fee expenses, or use the same architects' plans a second time at a 2 percent fee, instead of paying 6 percent twice.

Another issue raised by the Governor centered on the control of the tremendous cafeterias and gymnasiums in school buildings.

Secretary of Property and Supplies Andrew M. Bradley said costs of planning new structures should be reduced as a result of a departmental ruling adopting standards for component parts of public buildings, such as window frames.

Meanwhile, Senate Minority Leader Charles

R. Weiner said that the authority was planning to ask the legislature to raise the \$925 million ceiling on school building construction, by possibly \$300 million or more, because the limit has already been reached, thus barring new construction. Applications for millions in new school construction are on file with the authority.

At the same time Weiner, also attending his first meeting as a member of the authority, challenged payment of \$850 to the Provident Traders Bank and Trust Co., Philadelphia, for transporting \$18 million in negotiable bonds from New York to Philadelphia.

Weiner claimed the job could have been done by the State police for a great deal less. Lawrence agreed the charge appeared to be excessive.

The bank, however, actually paid the \$850 to Brink's Inc., an armored car service which transported the bonds. It is agent for the authority.

Natural Gas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it appears that a national gas bill is due to be considered again. The following resolution adopted by the mayor and the Common Council of the City of Detroit expresses my views and the position I have consistently taken on natural gas bills.

RESOLUTION

Whereas our attention has been directed to the fact that certain bills have been introduced in the U.S. Congress to amend the Natural Gas Act by releasing producers of natural gas from effective regulation by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas we have voiced our strongest opposition to such measures in the past because of the extremely adverse effect they would have on the prices paid by consumers of natural gas in our community as well as throughout the country; and

Whereas in the absence of effective regulation of all segments of the natural gas industry—producers, pipeline and distributing companies alike—the consumer is at the mercy of those who will charge what the traffic will bear; and

Whereas it is our duty and obligation to do all that we can to protect the consumers of natural gas in the city of Detroit from being charged unreasonably high prices; and

Whereas we are unalterably opposed to any measures which would remove any of the safeguards presently afforded such consumers by the provisions of the Natural Gas Act; and

Whereas it is imperative that public hearings be conducted on any bill proposing an amendment to the Natural Gas Act in order that those representing the consumer's interests be given an opportunity to be heard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the corporation counsel be and he is hereby authorized and directed to take the appropriate action necessary to voice the city of Detroit's opposition to any proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act which would adversely affect the consumers in the city of Detroit; be it further

Resolved, That our Michigan Senators and Congressmen be advised of Detroit's position in this regard and urged to join with Detroit

in opposition to any such amendments and voice their strong protest to any attempt to avoid public hearings on the merits of such amendments; be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, the Honorable Paul Adams, attorney general of Michigan, and the chairman and members of the Michigan Public Service Commission be advised of Detroit's position herein and urged to do all in their power to obtain public hearings and to prevent the passage of new amendments to the Natural Gas Act deemed detrimental to the consumers in Michigan, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all the above-mentioned officials and officers. Adopted unanimously.

The Gleaner and Journal—50 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, if cities and communities are to progress they must be the recipients of up-to-date news coverage. The citizens of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky are fortunate in being served by newspapers whose editors and owners are men and women of exceptional ability and character, capable of disseminating the news in an interesting and unbiased manner. One of the outstanding newspapers in my district is the *Gleaner and Journal*, of Henderson, Ky. The *Gleaner and Journal* this month celebrated its 50th anniversary.

On February 9, 1909, Mr. Leigh Harris brought his family to Henderson, Ky., from the State of Illinois. Several weeks previously he had purchased a newspaper then called the *Journal*. Subsequently another newspaper in Henderson, known as the *Gleaner*, was consolidated with the *Journal*, and thus the *Gleaner and Journal* came into being. After arriving in Henderson, Mr. Harris' first editorial, now world famous, consisted of the following sentence:

I have come to Henderson to run a newspaper.

And until his retirement, in 1950, he ably edited and published the *Gleaner and Journal*. Mr. Harris possessed firm beliefs and convictions, but this fact did not deter him from imparting in his paper true facts and events as they actually transpired. He was a dedicated citizen, who gave of his talents, time, and efforts to the betterment of his community.

The two great interests in Mr. Harris' life were his newspaper and his family. Love for his work was only exceeded by devotion to his wife and children. And, fortunately, he has passed on to his children the freshness of the deep springs of life, a quality of imagination and vigor of emotions. His daughter, Francele Harris Armstrong, as editor of the *Gleaner and Journal*, is now guiding its policies with a firm and efficient hand.

Kentucky and the Second Congressional District owe a debt of gratitude to such gentlemen as the late Mr. Leigh Harris, who, in their journalistic capacities and through the medium of their newspapers, have made our communities and our entire Nation a better place in which to live.

Some Footnotes of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a form of negative sour grapes which is abroad in the world today—in which the man who does not succeed in any way in life calls the other fellow's success luck—received a real exposure in the *Flint Journal* of February 12. Using Abraham Lincoln, as the springboard for his remarks, the editor pointed out that while luck gave the first republican president opportunity, it did not give him his greatness. This is something a man chisels out in long chipping at the stone of wisdom. The great knowledge which Mr. Lincoln displayed in the White House he learned by living, reading, talking, and listening.

Young people today who believe that exposure to lectures in high schools and colleges will give them wisdom would do well to read this editorial and some of the less known facts of Lincoln's life and realize that these are only a first step to real learning.

I submit the attached editorial for inclusion in the Record.

SOME FOOTNOTES OF HISTORY

Three footnotes of history come to mind today as we observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

One is that Lincoln, although martyred by an assassin's bullet, was a special darling of fate. Another—most pertinent at this time because of our concern for education—is the way Honest Abe obtained his learning. Lastly, this date recalls the almost-forgotten fact that another man also gave an oration at Gettysburg.

Most Americans remember that Lincoln was elected President in 1860 and was re-elected 4 years later. But few history books tell us how important a part chance, or luck, played in his nomination in 1860.

Lincoln was known nationally in 1860 but he was not the foremost candidate. He had been runner-up for the vice-presidential nomination in 1856 but, luckily, he did not win. The word lucky applies because the GOP team was defeated in 1856 and a defeated vice-presidential nominee was no better a presidential prospect in 1860 than today.

The historic Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858 boosted Lincoln's standing with the party and made him the foremost Republican in Illinois. But he didn't carry a favorite-son label when his former campaign manager persuaded the party to hold its 1860 convention in Chicago because it was a neutral city in a State which did not have a candidate.

Lincoln later won the endorsement of the Illinois GOP convention. When the na-

tional convention got under way, his campaign managers were able to pack the galleries with Lincoln supporters, just as Franklin D. Roosevelt's backers did later.

Senator William H. Seward of New York was the front-runner in 1860. In another parallel with a recent convention, Seward's opponents sold GOP delegates on the idea that Seward can't win. The same thing happened to Senator Robert A. Taft in 1952.

The "can't win" label and the support of the galleries helped Lincoln win the nomination. The luck that was his in 1856, 1858, and 1860 helped him become President.

Luck did not make Lincoln a great President and a great humanitarian. But it opened the way for him to win election to the position in which he achieved greatness.

Lincoln was just about as short on formal education as he was long on luck in those years, but the lack of formal schooling did not prevent him from acquiring a great amount of useful knowledge.

Although Lincoln had to read by firelight, he developed to the utmost his learning potential. He drank up knowledge wherever and whenever he could. He learned by living, by reading, by talking, by listening. He had the desire to acquire knowledge and use it to the fullest.

Plenty of Lincoln's contemporaries were better educated, but it was Lincoln who became great. Lincoln had the talent to develop to the utmost the learning he gained from books and from just living.

No one is suggesting that Lincoln's method of education should be utilized in 1959. Extensive formal education is much more important now than in his time. But everyone can add to his knowledge and understanding by drinking eagerly from the sources of information which are available in everyday living.

The modern pooh-poohing of the other speech delivered at Gettysburg on November 19, 1863, is just one of the ways in which legend has eclipsed historical fact.

Almost every child who has memorized Lincoln's justly famous Gettysburg Address has done so with the idea that the day's main oration, by Edward Everett, was so poor and long that Lincoln's speech gained attention because of its brevity.

Lincoln's comments became a part of America's heritage because of greatness, not because Everett did so poorly.

Everett was one of the finest scholars and public speakers of his day. He spent 2 months preparing his address, which was a detailed analysis of the Battle of Gettysburg and its significance to the Union cause. Historians say it is a remarkably accurate and valuable account of the 3-day battle.

Lincoln's 2-minute speech is revered today, while Everett's 2-hour oration is ridiculed, because in those few words Lincoln painted a graphic picture of personal humility and devotion to the ideals of freedom.

Those characteristics are among the reasons Lincoln's greatness increases with each passing generation.

The Late Montgomery Phister

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish, first, to insert into the Record a resolution unanimously adopted on Jan-

uary 25, 1959, by the Assembly of the Legislature of the State of California, honoring the memory of the late Montgomery Phister, and in addition thereto, within a few words, to pay my own tribute to a great Californian and a great American, who passed away on last Christmas Day, December 25, 1958, at the age of 61, at the peak of his career.

Montgomery Phister was a lawyer, a banker, and an industrialist and a great civic worker, whose remarkable mental and physical energies were dedicated and expended primarily in the development and protection of American fisheries and the fishing interests of these United States. He served as vice president and secretary, as well as legal counsel, to the Van Camp Sea Food Co., Inc., formerly of San Pedro, Calif., and now of Long Beach, Calif.

Among many other posts, Mr. Phister served as a past president of the California Fish Cannery Association, chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Fisheries and Territorial Waters, member of the State Committee on Natural Resources, member of the advisory committees to the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission. He was a leader in obtaining the special assistant for fisheries in the Under Secretary of State's Office, and the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife in the Department of the Interior. He was active in the establishment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, the California Cooperative Oceanic Investigation, and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

He served as a member of the Fishery Products Committee of the National Cannery Association from its inception, and was its chairman in 1958. He was elected to the board of directors of the National Cannery Association in 1957.

It has been my privilege to know and work with Montgomery Phister here for the many years that I have been in public life. While not of the same political faith, I found him to be a great American and I can say that, in all my dealings, he was forthright, constructive, helpful, and cooperative in any matter which inured to the benefit of the public. On no occasion did he fear the truth nor did he withhold it. Nothing contributed more to his renowned trait of dependability nor to the highest esteem in which he was held by all who knew him. My district, the State of California, the Van Camp Sea Food Co., Inc., our Nation, and the fishing industry have lost a stalwart and substantial leader.

The resolution of the Assembly of the California Legislature is as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 45, RELATIVE TO THE PASSING OF MONTGOMERY PHISTER

Whereas the members of this house have, with profound sorrow and deepest regret, learned of the passing, on December 25, 1958, at the age of 61, of one of the most respected and loved leaders of the American fishing industry, Mr. Montgomery Phister; and

Whereas "Monty," as he was affectionately known by his host of friends and admirers, was born in Denver, Colo., on September 6, 1897, and it was California's good fortune that he came to this State in 1909; and

Whereas after receiving the degree of doctor of jurisprudence from the University of Southern California School of Law, he began the practice of law and rapidly developed a wide reputation, among fellow lawyers and the general public, as a competent, scholarly and fearless representative of his clients' interests; and

Whereas in 1937 he became associated with the Van Camp Sea Food Co., and thereafter advanced to the high office of vice president and secretary of that corporation; and

Whereas his accomplishments on behalf of the fishing industry were many, and some of his more noteworthy projects included the establishment of offices within the U.S. Department of State and the Department of Interior to deal with fisheries, the establishment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission and the founding of the Fishermen's and Merchants' Bank, now a branch of the California Bank; and

Whereas Mr. Phister was unstinting in giving his time and energy to the service of his profession, his Government and his beloved fishing industry, having served as president of the California Fish Cannery Association, chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Fisheries and Territorial Waters, member of the California State Committee on Natural Resources and other boards and commissions too numerous to mention; and

Whereas this man was active in civic affairs at the local level, having served on the San Pedro Y.M.C.A. Board, the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and the mayor's committee on transportation; and

Whereas "Monty" has been the living example of those famous words of Theodore Roosevelt, "I would rather wear out than rust out"; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that this house, as the representative of those people who have benefited from the services of this man, should honor him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the members of this house desire to express their deep regret at the loss of so outstanding a citizen and adopt this resolution of testimony to his great contributions to his Government, his industry and his fellow men; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to his widow, Helga Phister, his two children, Montgomery Phister, Jr., and Mrs. Susan Holt, and to his brother, Henry Phister.

Alabama Press Association Resolution Deploing Action by the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1959, in my remarks contained in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I called attention to the resolution adopted by the Alabama Press Association condemning the Washington Post and Times Herald for refusing to carry the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement.

So that the record will be complete, I

have obtained a copy of this excellently written resolution and I ask unanimous consent that it, too, be included in the RECORD.

The APA resolution follows:

Whereas it is a fundamental tenet of this association that the American people have an inherent right to know every side of the great debates that take place in our society; and

Whereas the Washington Post and Times Herald, published in the Capital City of this great country, has heretofore been a leader in the fight for journalism freedom; but

Whereas the said Washington Post did recently deviate from its longstanding policy of upholding freedom of expression by rejecting a paid advertisement known as the Putnam letter; and

Whereas that letter set forth a strong argument by a reputable author and business executive contrary to the present policy of said newspaper in favor of mixing the races in the common schools of this country: Therefore this association, in convention assembled, does deplore and condemn the betrayal of the freedom of the press, or the right of the people to know all sides of a public issue, by the Washington Post management; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be given to the press for the information and enlightenment of all the citizens of the United States.

Man of the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be full of wonderment at the greatness of Abraham Lincoln in inspiring for nearly 100 years some of the most effective editorials in our daily press. The genius of the first Republican President transmits itself to the pens of the men who write about him. I submit herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, a particularly effective editorial in the Lansing State Journal of February 12, in which "the man of the ages" is the springboard for some very excellent editorial writing.

MAN OF THE AGES

Lincoln's greatness was recognized in his lifetime, even by many who hated him. The Union had been saved and the war won before the assassin struck. But at his death few men would have believed that generation after generation would find absorbing interest in his life and words and deeds.

On the 150th anniversary of his birth the stream of books about Lincoln is unceasing. Every line of his writings, almost all of his speeches have been published. Many of his jokes, every anecdote about him, the details of his domestic life, and much fable and fiction may be found in the many shelves of Lincoln biographies.

Each year brings notable new works. His wife and associates continue to interest the public. Some of this interest can be accounted for simply by the fact that he was the principal figure in the Nation's most tragic ordeal. Any man who had carried the United States successfully through that fearful crisis would have achieved immortality.

But there is more to the Lincoln legend. There is Abraham Lincoln.

An earthy personality was combined with a subtle intellect and a spirituality that had overtones of mysticism. To this was added, despite an absence of formal education, rhetorical skill that produced some of the most memorable prose in the English tongue. Here was a paradox, and the paradox is ever fascinating.

It was natural that some should write with a warmth of admiration that amounts to adulation. By this uncritical school Lincoln has been elevated to political sainthood, enshrined as a folk god.

But responsible scholarship has preserved the perspective, discussing freely what they regard as his faults. This objective approach to a towering figure has saved Lincoln from turning into marble or bronze.

The research has strengthened popular understanding of Lincoln's problems and motives. It has not diminished, but enhanced, his stature. It has confirmed the judgment that rates him one of the great men of all time.

Every man, on his own birthday, must look back on his past and wonder, a little or much, at what has happened to him. President Abraham Lincoln, on his 56th birthday, February 12, 1865—2 months before he was assassinated—must have marveled at the circumstances that had entrusted to him the leadership of the young republic during a civil war that threatened to destroy it, and with it the American dream.

He could recall his youth in the backwoods—as railsplitter, raftsmen, store clerk, surveyor, volunteer soldier, student of law. He could live again through the events that made him a State legislator, member of the bar and rising trial lawyer, Representative in Congress, unsuccessful candidate for the U.S. Senate, and eventually the nominee of the new Republican Party for President.

Lincoln seemed to have had a mystic sense of being the instrument of a power too great and inscrutable for any man to understand. There was no pride in that feeling, only humility, but it was there. It is expressed in some measure in the second inaugural address, and it may be that Lincoln already had that great document well in mind on this day in the year 1865.

It is worth reading again, not only for the splendor of the passage beginning "With malice toward none" but for Lincoln's words on the causes of the conflict that he then knew to be ending. He also saw, that while the war was nearly over—and victory sure—the battle for freedom and justice is never fully won.

The Paragould, Ark., Kiwanis Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 9, Representative GEORGE P. MILLER placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most splendid report on the fine work of the Newark, Calif., Kiwanis Club. It was pointed out by Mr. MILLER that in the city of Newark the Kiwanis have devoted some 2,400 man-hours to civic and charitable endeavors.

This is characteristic of the Kiwanis Clubs of America. As indicative, may I call attention to the 2,983 man-hours of

community building by the Paragould, Ark., Kiwanis Club. Paragould, located in Greene County, Ark., has three active civic organizations, of which the Kiwanis is one. During 1958, working together, the members of the Paragould Kiwanis Club devoted themselves to the following activities:

BOYS' AND GIRLS' WORK

First. Sponsored local Explorer Scout Troop furnishing advisor, institutional representative, committeemen, and financial aid.

Second. Sponsored little league baseball team and Pee Wee basketball team, furnishing uniforms, manager, and coaches.

Third. Sponsored Key Club at Paragould High School.

Fourth. Donated over 50 percent of all foodstuffs, toys, and clothing used by Goodfellows, Inc., for Christmas baskets.

Fifth. Served as "newsboys" selling papers for Christmas baskets.

Sixth. Fifty new toys donated to Goodfellows, Inc., for use in baskets for the needy.

Seventh. Leased 40 acres of wooded land with stocked pond for use of the scouts.

Eighth. Sponsored representative at Boys and Girls State.

Ninth. Gave registered Duroc pigs to deserving 4-H students.

Tenth. Kiwanian served as chairman for city's annual Christmas parade.

Eleventh. The club was the recipient of Kiwanis Appreciation Day give by high school.

Twelfth. Assisted in manning concession stands at football games.

Thirteenth. Assisted in fund drive for Boy and Girl Scouts.

PUBLIC AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS

First. A Kiwanian was selected as Citizen of the Year.

Second. Worked with local chamber of commerce in all civic affairs.

Third. Assisted with securing full-time employment for physically handicapped and students during summer months.

Fourth. Members manned gates for county fair.

Fifth. Met with county RCI clubs furnishing speaker on farm safety, soil conservation, and international farm exchange student.

Sixth. Participation in 4-H contests and banquets.

Seventh. Awarded an additional prize for 4-H pigs shown at county fair.

Eighth. Participated in Dairy Day.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

First. Assisted school officials in setting up industrial tours.

Second. Presented club scholarship to outstanding student.

Third. Honored all local teachers with banquet, teachers appreciation.

Fourth. Recognized 10th-, 11th-, and 12th-grade honor students with scholastic achievement banquet.

Fifth. Furnished club counselors for students in selecting occupations.

SUPPORT OF CHURCHES

First. Furnished public eating places with prayer cards.

Second. Furnished hotels and motels with "Attend Church Regularly" signs.

Third. Members serve individual churches as officers, teachers, and lay speakers.

Fourth. Erected road signs urging church attendance.

The primary objective of the Kiwanians of Paragould is to serve underprivileged children. During 1958 the Kiwanis Club of Paragould bought shoes, clothing, groceries, school lunches, books, dental work, and glasses as a part of this program. The club paid graduation expenses for needy senior students as well as medical expenses of children and their transportation to the Crippled Childrens Hospital. Through the untiring efforts of the Kiwanis Club and with the assistance of a city noted for its generosity, 197 needy and indigent children received vital assistance.

And, what is the purpose behind all this work? I believe that President Walter J. "Bud" Branch, affable head of the Paragould Kiwanis Club, makes good answer:

We ask not for commendation or reward but rather to offer thanks that we are in a position to give assistance, realizing but for the grace of God we could very well be the recipients of these things we now give to others.

These are the men who make America great. Voluntarily, and because of their faith in a God who inspires them, they work in Paragould—in Newark—and in other communities of this land to make a better life for their fellows.

Vigorous Supporter of Reclamation Takes Chair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Nation as a whole and we in the Congress are fortunate to have WAYNE N. ASPINALL as chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Chairman ASPINALL has a broad knowledge and understanding of all the matters within the jurisdiction of this committee. In particular, he is an expert in water matters and problems relating to development of our water resources. Upon many occasions he has expressed the necessity for continuing the orderly development of our water resources as a means of expanding and strengthening our national economy. He has been one of the most vigorous supporters of the Federal reclamation program and it is a pleasure for me, as chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, to be associated with him in this field. Most reclamation areas and interests recognize their good fortune at having Mr. ASPINALL as committee chairman. As an example, I am including an editorial from the January 27, 1959, edition of the Yuma (Ariz.) Sun.

The editorial follows:

VIGOROUS SUPPORTER OF RECLAMATION TAKES CHAIR

Yuma farm and reclamation people will be interested in knowing more about the man who is the new chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. This is the committee which, among other items, deals with reclamation.

The new chairman is Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado Democrat. He succeeds CLAIR ENGLE of California, now a Senator. ASPINALL is an expert in water and mining law. He also is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

ASPINALL is a strong Democratic partisan. He frequently has been critical of the Republican administration's policies on natural resources. He has denounced the administration's ban on starting new water projects. Likewise he criticized Secretary Benson for his skepticism about bringing more land into cultivation while there are farm surpluses in this country. "Whenever this Nation refuses to take advantage of developing the frontier left in this country, then it is already showing signs of decay," he said.

ASPINALL is a strong believer in basin-wide development of water resources by the Federal Government. He startled a meeting of the National Reclamation Association in 1956 by calling the administration's "partnership" power program "partitionship." He said the private development of the Hells Canyon power sites dealt "a body blow" to the "maximum and comprehensive development of the Columbia basin."

ASPINALL is a veteran of many a legislative and legal fight over water. He is best known for his sponsorship of the law authorizing the \$760 million Colorado River storage project, largest reclamation project ever authorized by Congress.

He favors continuing the 160-acre limitation on reclamation projects "as a general policy." However, he would relax it when a larger tract of land is necessary to support a family-size farm.

He does not favor a change in the present pay-out period of 40 years for water and power users to reimburse the Government for the construction of reclamation projects.

ASPINALL sponsored a law creating a new \$10 million program to build five demonstration plants to desalt sea and brackish water—a program which some day can mean much to both California and Arizona.

This western Colorado Congressman presented to the House Appropriations Committee in 1958 a proposal for a long-range reclamation program to run at the rate of about \$300 annually. ASPINALL said it was "designed to meet a real need . . . for a consistent rate of construction of reclamation projects if we are to obtain maximum benefits from our expenditures."

At the time, he recommended the start of eight new reclamation projects. Congress approved money for seven of them, and two others as well.

With Representative WAYNE ASPINALL as chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, reclamation interests can be assured of vigorous and forthright leadership.

One Style of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Ap-

pendix, I include, as of possible interest to the many friends the Honorable James A. Farley has made and retained outside his home State, an editorial which appeared in the Syracuse, N.Y., Post-Standard of January 17, 1959:

THE JIM FARLEY EXAMPLE: PRIMARY ELECTION REFORM VITAL

If Jim Farley had been nominated for U.S. Senator last year, he undoubtedly would have been elected.

Further, there is a distinct possibility that his popularity would have carried the State ticket for the Democrats. Governor Harriman might have been reelected.

But Mr. Farley was not nominated, even though he was the favorite candidate of the people. A good man was picked to run in his place, but he was not widely known and went down to defeat.

The bosses picked the candidates—and lost. If the party's voters had been given a voice in choosing them, they would have won the senatorial office at least.

Mr. Farley is known in every city and hamlet in New York State. The people like his warmth and sincerity, his integrity and fine principles; he was the logical man for the office but was passed by.

This case is an example of the need for an open primary system in New York State, to replace the closed system of conventions which shuts the people out and gives the bosses sole control of selecting nominees for office.

Under the open primary system, Mr. Farley would have obtained the necessary petitions in at least half of the counties of the State and would have been placed on the primary lists as a candidate. His selection as the one candidate to represent the Democratic Party would have been a foregone conclusion.

Had his strength been added to the ticket, it would have fared far better than it did.

Mr. Farley unquestionably would have been elected.

The Farley example shows not only how the State's people are shut out when it comes to picking nominees, but how a major political party can lose, as well.

Under the open primary system, which we should have in the State, independent candidates would be able to place their names before the voters more easily.

The voters would have a direct voice in selecting them. The present failure of primary elections would be overcome.

The power of the smoke-filled hotel room would be cut down to size. Political dictation would be stopped.

No one can say a good word about the existing primary elections and make it stand up. The system is a failure.

If open primaries were established, every weakness in the primary situation would be overcome.

The power of the political clique in control to put rubberstamp members on political committees would be ended.

The lack of interest in primary elections would be overcome.

The invisible but nonetheless strong link between politics and the underworld would be severed, at least partially.

Legislators and officeholders would be more independent and good Government would be strengthened.

The State needs the reform. Existing bills in the legislature to assure it deserve the strong support of every legislator.

It's time to get rid of the mock primaries we have now and replace them with constructive, useful ones.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an editorial which appeared in the New York (N.Y.) Mirror of January 24, 1959.

WHOSE BOSSISM?

The grass roots crusade started on the sidewalks of New York to re-create the State's

Democrats more in the image of the New Deal-A.D.A. tradition is a fascinating development.

Former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and former Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter are the originators of this venture, which is known as the New York State Committee for Democratic Voters but is referred to in some quarters, perhaps uncharitably, as the youth movement.

At any rate, it is aimed directly at Carmine De Sapio, Tammany leader and national committeeman, and not quite so directly at Michael H. Prendergast, Democratic State chairman.

The liberals, as represented by the above-named trio, are still smarting over the fact that New York District Attorney Frank S. Hogan got the nomination for U.S. Senator, backed by De Sapio, over the man of their choice, Finletter.

Hogan, in the face of the Rockefeller whirlwind, ran beautifully—far ahead of his ticket, indeed—but was defeated by the Republican senatorial candidate, Representative KENNETH B. KEATING. Any political realist must wonder whether Finletter could have made a better showing.

It is significant that former Governor Harriman, importuned by Lehman and Finletter to join the anti-De Sapio rebellion, is reported to have given a firm no and to have called the venture "ridiculous."

Harriman, of course, may remember how his own presidential hopes were scuttled by the liberals in favor of Adlai Stevenson in 1956, and he may sense that these same people would like to give Stevenson another go at it in 1960.

We may point out, on our part, that the liberals joined gleefully in the brushoff of that grand Democrat, James A. Farley, who also sought the Senate nomination and might just have been the man to win the seat.

In this tumultuous picture, conservative and left wing Democrats are aligned against each other over what the latter calls the issue of bossism.

One can ask, Whose bossism?

Eric Sevareid Views Integration in Alexandria, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have inserted in the RECORD the very lucid and penetrating remarks of a most distinguished news analyst and well-recognized CBS commentator, Mr. Eric Sevareid. I am sure that many of my colleagues will agree with me that it is a tempting thought to place Mr. Sevareid's daily commentary in the RECORD on a regular basis.

On February 10, Eric Sevareid's radio broadcast brought to his listeners a close personal experience in the matter of school integration and a story far removed from the usually impersonal analysis of events of the day.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of that broadcast, as follows:

THE ERIC SEVAREID BROADCAST OF FEBRUARY 10, 1959

Good evening. This reporter has had his home, the last 13 years, in the Virginia city

of Alexandria; it is an old city, proud of its traditions and very southern; Washington laid out some of its streets as a young surveyor; its newspaper is the oldest daily paper in America. It can be hard for a community so imbued with and formed by the old and the past, to confront the new and the present.

But Alexandria did so this morning, because when the final test comes, the sharp wind of the here and the now generally prevails over the drifting mists of the past; three Alexandria public schools admitted Negro children to their classes. The adults kept their dignity; so did the white children, as far as is known; and so did the handful of Negro children, who walked, without trembling, through the early morning gantlet of officials, policemen and the staring knots of the curious.

One of the three schools is the new city high school, a quarter mile up the lane from my house. It was a lane; just a few years ago this was open country, outside the city limits; there was a scrub pine where the school now stands; a place for secret caves; a place the quail would fly into for refuge when you surprised them on the lane. If you knew the hidden path, as my boys did, it was a place to idle your pony and cool him off on the homeward stretch.

Schools take a time to build, country lanes a time to widen and pave; the change came gradually; and we have all been accustomed, for some time now, to the groups of children walking up the road in the morning frost, swinging their books, kicking an idle stone. I can remember no tension, no act of violence along that little road. This morning, there was the crowd, slightly tense; there were the policemen in their cars. There was trouble in the air and it was hard to bring back to mind the pine wood and the pony path. But the trouble did not erupt; and for selfish reasons also, one can be thankful for that; an ugly scene at that corner, I'm afraid, would have wiped out and forever replaced the more tender memories all of us there would prefer to keep.

So Negro children can walk along there, too, from now on, kicking an idle stone if the spirit so moves. I can remember when they had to ride a bus some 30 miles if they wished a high school education.

Perhaps it will be news to some in that old city if I say that this is not the first instance of racial integration in an Alexandria school. There is an elementary school there, a private, cooperative school, integrated now for several years; possibly the first integrated school of any kind in Virginia since Reconstruction days.

I know about this school because my wife and I were among the 12 families who founded it, the year after the war ended and the overcrowded public schools were in a bad way.

We decided at the start that if Negro kids wanted to come and their parents would pay and would work on the place like the rest of us—why, they could come. They have been coming for the last 9 years; about 20 of them, I year, as I recollect. When they started coming, there was no fuss; only 4 or 5 families dropped out; the school is bigger and better and more prosperous now than ever. We integrated that little school, not as a challenge to anybody, not as a precedent; just because it seemed a good thing to do, on behalf of our own children, who must learn to live, after all, in a country that doesn't belong to any particular group.

We had no trouble; those three public schools had no trouble today. Letting all little children go to the school nearest their homes doesn't have to bring the world to an end.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in my comments a letter I have received from one of my constituents in Indiana, since it contains a compelling argument bearing on an issue which will confront us shortly—the matter of statehood for Hawaii.

On three occasions in the past I have voted for Hawaiian statehood and it occurs to me that had this legislation been approved before now the situation about which my correspondent writes might well have never come to pass.

Having just returned from the district in Indiana it is my privilege to represent, I can attest to the accuracy with which the writer describes conditions there.

The letter follows:

VALPARAISO, IND., February 12, 1959.

Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK,
The Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It was gratifying to learn of your recent elevation in the party which to some of us was an overdue recognition of leadership long since evidenced.

I will come quickly to the point of this letter which is to urge you to use the influence of your high office to obtain statehood at the earliest possible moment for beautiful Hawaii.

Although you are enjoying the comparative protection of District of Columbia's geographical location, you must be aware by now that your fellow Hoosiers have been suffering untold hardships from severe cold, snow, and flood conditions ever since Alaska was admitted to the Union.

Although our inclination at first was to rejoice with our new countrymen, it cannot be denied that wave upon wave of cold and icy blasts have descended upon the Second Congressional District of Indiana and elsewhere.

And while we were prone to welcome the Alaskans with open arms and warm heart, a "chill" has overtaken us, and a (change of) heart condition may develop.

Please do not regard the calamities that now beset us as being just punishment for the way Hoosiers acted at the polls last November. Be assured the Alaskan reveler strikes without regard to party line.

One way streets are at an all time high. Icebergs outline the business districts of Indiana towns. Automobile graveyards are mushrooming. Pedestrian traffic may soon overtake mobile units. With humor running low, those not yet bitten by Jack Frost are being bit by fellow Hoosiers.

No doubt it will seem elementary for me to mention at this point that the one ray of hope for the relief of your people is the hope that emergency action will be taken by the Congress to quickly admit our greatest possession. And when the people of Hawaii are overcome by joy at this long awaited action, great waves of warm balmy air will emanate from their good will, the icy northern blasts will be dispelled, and the people of Indiana will once more be able to resume normal, useful lives.

CHARLEY, the people of the Second Congressional District, whom you have taken

such good care of for the past 20 years, are now looking to you to save them from the worst plight to afflict them since you first went to Washington. This may prove to be your finest achievement. Don't wait.

Cordially,

Ed JOHNSON.

Senator Morgan's Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, development of Alabama's vast potential of waterways is destined to become a reality. One of the greatest of these waterways, the Coosa-Alabama, is seeing some of this development at the present time. This was envisioned by an outstanding Alabamian, the late John Tyler Morgan, who served in the Congress as a distinguished Senator.

An editorial on this subject recently appeared in the Anniston (Ala.) Star, and I ask under unanimous consent for it to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

MORGAN'S DREAM IS COMING TRUE

Hardly had he doffed his uniform as a general in the Army of the Confederacy, before the great John Tyler Morgan, later to become U.S. Senator, hung up his shingle as an attorney at law on the square in Jacksonville and began to talk about the development of the Coosa-Alabama River.

That was before he had been to France and other European countries as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. But following his observations of the waterway uses in the Old World he became more interested than ever in the development of our own streams.

On one occasion during a political rally at Oxford Lake he made a rousing address and predicted the time would come when the waters of the Coosa would be brought to our doorstep here in Anniston by means of the canalization of the Choccolocco Creek, just as Houston, Tex., did later by tapping the waters of Galveston Bay.

But a cursory investigation a few years ago proved tentatively that the Choccolocco Creek project was geologically impracticable. Yet with the developments now taking place on the Coosa Dam sites, we will be near enough to take advantage of river traffic and industrial water.

This was called to our mind by reason of the Tennessee Dock having been authorized by the State at Decatur. It is of interest to note, too, that Memphis and Nashville river docks add greatly to their economy.

And in a progress edition of The Spokesman Review, published at Spokane, Wash., there are pictures in the magazine section that show ports on the Columbia-Snake Rivers now numbering 33, and they carry cargo that is valued in many millions every year.

We eventually will profit likewise and not only bring to pass the dream of our great Senator Morgan with respect to river traffic, but also realize his long battle for an inter-oceanic canal at Lake Nicaragua, as Panama is now becoming obsolete in several respects.

As is well known, the great project that Morgan conceived and fought for so many

years would have been consummated but for the ambitions of Teddy Roosevelt and New York lawyers who represented the French interests that attempted to build a canal at Panama but failed.

This paper happens to know that countries adjacent to or abutting Nicaragua are giving serious consideration to a revival of the project that Morgan formed. And it is not inconceivable that a sea-level canal could be constructed as a consequence of more modern imaginary genius.

Thirty Years Ago Today I Landed on the North Plains of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my dear and good friend, Mr. J. H. Nichols, of Spearman, Hansford County, Tex., is a gentleman of great heart. He is one of the pioneers of the Southwest and came to the great Panhandle of Texas 30 years ago this month. He has penned his worthwhile comments on the Panhandle scene in that period which are, at the same time, notable for their generality and their succinctness. These notes were published in the Spearman (Tex.) Reporter on January 22, 1959, and I insert them herein under unanimous consent:

THIRTY YEARS AGO TODAY I LANDED ON THE NORTH PLAINS OF TEXAS

(By J. H. Nichols)

There has been oceans of water run under the bridges, since I crossed the Mississippi River headed west. Thirty marks on the calendar, which means I have passed up 30 mile posts, and the time has flown by like a weaver's shuttle. As we look back over our past life, we wonder where it has gone and what we have done with it. What have we accomplished? Nothing of any worth as we look at it. The mountains stand still but Old Man River rolls on. We take up our pictures from childhood and look at them, and see the many changes there have been, then we are reminded we are living in a different world. You see the family together; now they are most of them gone over the river of Jordan. Some are scattered and we seldom ever see them. If we did not live in another world, from that we lived in as children, what would life be anyway? I could not have made it if I had not had a father and mother to take care of me when I was a little barefooted boy. Now I am on my own, and they have gone to their reward. This has changed the scenery around the old landmark as a boy, moving out in all directions of the United States has given me a different scenery on the beauties of this old world. The world has been better to me than I have been to the world. I have enjoyed every step of the way, some of it has been rough and rocky and uphill. These experiences make us enjoy the long stretched out road on the endless prairies in the western country. For the benefit of those who may read this span of thirty years I am going to only touch on some of the high places, time and space will not permit me to try to go into detail on some of the heartbreaking experiences I have had in the span of time when I arrived and now. This western country has

completely revolutionized its self here in three decades. There is no more nor less acres of land, but there has been such a change it is hard to recognize them.

History will bear me out on this statement, I have seen the same section of land bought and lost several times. Today you cannot get anyone to price his land. Real estate men were on every corner in these western towns begging you to buy this land. Now they are begging you to price your land.

Those who have it know it is sold, if they even price it at any price. Less than one-half of a century ago you could file on this land. The oil industry has revolutionized this country. Wagon trails across the open prairies then and paved highways now. The spring roundups with horses in the spring to brand the cattle has changed to cattle following jeeps and pickups to get their feed. They will follow their herds into the corral and there is where they are branded in the chute. With the good wheat pasture and the care of good cowmen they can put a good beef on the market as they take them off of the cows. They can put four beefs on the market in 1 year as large as they used to put a 4-year-old steer on the market. Things have been speeded up. Irrigation has whipped the drought years down when it comes to having crop failures. When I read in the Bible the desert shall blossom as the rose I have seen this prophecy come true in this short span I have been here. Towns and cities have sprung up overnight here in the West. We find gas wells furnishing our towns, where they once picked up cow chips for fuel. Kindling was a premium when I came here on a cold morning to start a fire. Today I cannot give away a truckload of kindling. Wood is as obsolete for fires here, where we have gas, as a double-shovel plow. There is no more market for oxen unless someone wants to hang one over his place of business as an old relic. Model T's are only used in parades on rodeo days to show the progress here in the West and for the best.

When a southern or an eastern man comes to this country on the North Plains of the Panhandle of Texas, and he looks in front of him and the earth and sky meets. He has gone his limit until he puts on some field glasses which will lengthen his vision. When he looks down the railroad and he sees the rails running together, his eyes have gone their limit. With all the progress in 30 years here in the west, it is unbelievable. Yes, we miss the hills, mountains, creeks and valleys back east and south. These bubbling springs always make us want to go back and get a cold drink out of them and refresh our boyhood days. I have had a drink of water from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific and from Canada to Old Mexico. God being my judge there is no better water in the world than this deep well water on the north plains. To see irrigation running like a creek when we are accustomed to dust storms over the same ditch, which has revolutionized farming industry here in the west. Would I be stretching my imagination to say this North Plains is the garden spot of the world? Water the plains down and turf it down we will not see it changing hands in a dust storm any more. This land is too valuable to blow away. The soil conservation has been doing all they can to stop erosion and they have done a capital job of it. Many a farmer who lost his land during the dust-bowl days. When he left his land looking like it was following him in a dust storm. This gave the Panhandle the name of the dust-bowl. Scientific farming will change it to the garden of Eden. There is not a healthier country in the world. The wind takes care of the heat in the summer time, and in the winter the blizzards are soon passed over. People are not eat up here with chiggers and ticks. It is a good saying you cannot get all the

coons up one tree for they will not all go up there. Very few of our southern people if they should arrive here during a dust storm would have this country. Some of the northern capitalist evidently saw great gain here and a great future for this country. They bought it in blocks. They believed this was the coming country of the United States. Others, all they saw was prairie dogs and jackrabbits and hearing the coyotes howl all night and they were willing to leave it to them. They saw the skeleton of the buffaloes lying in the sand and their bones bleached by the burning sun. They thought all of these wild animals starved to death and they better get out. This was only a testimony of the waste of the white man who robbed the Indians of their happy hunting ground. There are still signs of buffalo wallows and Indian battle grounds here. There is no country in the world which has made the progress since the turn of the century as this western country of the Panhandle of Texas, has made. The "headers" and the old threshing machines have been parked in the fence corners. The combines have taken their place. There is no more need for horses here, for the tractors have put them in the museum, when it comes to hauling loads and riding them to town. The automobile and good roads have kept the horses in the pasture, what are left here. This country has been one of the greatest opportunities for progressive people of any country in the world. This is still a coming country for men with vision and capital to put their vision in motion. There is not a doubt the opportunities here haven't scratched the surface on what is here. We all know the oil is here for it is being produced in abundance. God only knows how many more hidden treasures there are here which man knows nothing about. We read the stories about men getting lost in the west. Now you never get out of sight of a tall grain elevator which looks like they will punch a hole in the sky; with a light on them to bring any man home out of the dark they stand as a beacon light.

There is something majestic about an open country which gives elbowroom and man can reason and think and bring some of these thoughts to the hearts and minds of people. Laura V. Hamner is a living testimony of a woman who loves the history of the West, and she has always said, "light and hitch with me. The Panhandle is the grandest spot on earth." I believe she is right. We can always get our eyes full when we look toward the mountains. Our imagination will run on after our eyes have played out here on the endless prairies. Amen. This is the white spot of the world. Eastern industry and capital have their eyes on this section and they will move in and develop the natural resources God had deposited here for the advancement of the world. When some one said there would be 60,000 people here in the next 10 years, this is not prophecy for the people will come to develop the natural resources as they are discovered. This will naturally revolutionize the farming industry. All this country needs is water and it is here and they have learned how to lift it out of the ground and spread it on the dry ground, which has proven a great step up in production. When the real estate man would say they are not making any more land, we all knew they were right, but we have learned to make more on what is already made. The time may come when more people will live on 50 acres of land, and live better than they are living on a section now. Waste land is like dormant ability going to waste, no one is getting any benefit out of it. Waste water is destructive to both man and the community. Conserve the soil and the water for the coming generation. Leave it better than you found it. This country shows what it can do for the people. The people show the world what

they can do with this country where they have the opportunity. The golden opportunity has always been here. The Indians never did and they never would have developed the natural resources which are here today. They said the oil was here but if they took it out of the ground the world would go to creaking; it must stay there to grease the axle tree of the world. They might have been right for something has started this old world to creaking. This country could be layed underneath with uranium and other metals we know nothing about. The churches and good buildings, schools, and roads have made the greatest stride of any country I know anything about. Men with money and vision have never come from the dugout, which they owe their allegiance to, those who stayed here when only he-men and fearless women would stay and develop a country. They paved the way to prosperity. This town has some of the best residences in it of any town west of the Mississippi River and east of the Rockies. We have a cosmopolitan class of people who have the Anglo Saxon background in them who come from every nook and corner of the world. There are no finer people on earth than the people who moved out in the West to have elbowroom. They have developed a new country and this country had developed a class of people who have seen the dreams of their forefathers; saw when it was hard to settle up a new country. It is not bragging to be a Texan, it is good to be an adopted son or daughter of one of the grandest States in the United States. We will still hold to the old traditional thought, Texas is the largest State in the United States. We only think of Alaska as a foreign country which has been annexed to the United States. It is not bragging and boasting to say we are proud and glad to be a Texan. We can all say this and only stating facts, and not bragging and boasting. It is the people in other parts of the United States who are sailing under false colors; they think every man living in Texas has a ranch and oil wells. They think everybody is rich just because we have the natural resources here that makes this the richest State in the Union. Think of this. It is good to be here.

Forty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join many of my colleagues in marking this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Despite the tramp of the Soviet military boot which has echoed over Lithuania since 1939, the people of Lithuania, and of the other nations now ruled by Russia through force, live with hope and memory. Their hope is for the day when they and their children will have a second Lithuanian Independence Day to mark the day when the Soviet rule will be thrown off. Their memory is of the years of freedom from this day 41 years ago until the black day in 1939 when the Russians moved in to rule with steel.

I join my colleagues in sending greetings to the people of Lithuania wherever they are on this memorable anniversary.

May their ideals and memories stay alive, may their courage and hope never fail them. If there is right in this world, the people of Lithuania will someday be able to know freedom and independence again.

Even If They Die, We Make Our Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the American Cancer Society refuses to test Krebiozen alleging that the double blind test plan is not a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation.

What tommyrot. The American Cancer Society collects millions of dollars of public moneys to find a cure for the treatment of cancer; and if not a cure, a scientific area of a type of research to develop studied methods of the control of cancer. And presently, an avenue of study is open—a biologically active substance derived from the injection of a mold in animals—the effect of Krebiozen on the cancer victim is known to 500 medical men who used it on their patients, terminal cases; and several research scientists, Dr. Andrew Ivy, Dr. Stevan Durovic, the discoverer of Krebiozen, and others. Yet the American Cancer Institute knowing of the volcanic eruption in Illinois caused by the suppression of Krebiozen research over 7 years ago and the public hearings conducted by the Illinois Legislature joint committee and commission, broadcast all over the Nation by leading commentators; books written; debates on radio and television broadcasts.

And the American Cancer Society for some reason was not interested. And is not interested now. But on the other hand refuses to approve the test of Krebiozen advanced by Dr. Andrew Ivy because it might prove that the American Medical Association's report on Krebiozen was false, that certain officials of the American Medical Association had perpetrated a fraud on the public—and changed the results of successful scientific findings by forgery.

At the termination of the present negotiations between the National Cancer Institute that stepped in the breach, and Dr. Andrew Ivy representing the Krebiozen Research Foundation—if no agreement is reached and nothing is done; then by proper Federal enactment I shall ask for an investigation of this entire matter. It is a sad commentary on the American History of Research in Science that a handful of pseudo medics, politically appointed members of the official family of the American Medical Association; can "ham string" a whole nation with false and forged evidence; and by vicious pressures prevent the honest scientific research, for the evaluation of a drug, whose merit as a biologically active substance is conceded by hundreds of medical men. Also over 50

terminal case patients are living testimonials to the scientific results obtained in the use of this drug administered by brave God fearing doctors, members of the same society, working for humanity in the secret underground of the medical world.

STATEMENT OF KREBIOZEN RESEARCH FOUNDATION REGARDING AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY RELEASE OF REJECTION

The Krebiozen Research Foundation is astonished at the refusal of the American Cancer Society to test Krebiozen and the reasons given for their action.

The American Cancer Society based its refusal to test Krebiozen on the assertion that the double blind controlled experiment we proposed does not provide "a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation."

At the invitation of the American Cancer Society to submit a proposal for a fair evaluation of Krebiozen the Foundation and Dr. Ivy proposed that a committee of outstanding scientists be chosen half by the American Cancer Society and half by the Krebiozen Research Foundation and that the members thus chosen select a fifth member of the committee.

This committee was to select 200 terminal cancer patients and administer Krebiozen to 100 of them, while giving the other 100 plain mineral oil. Neither the doctors nor the patients were to know who were receiving Krebiozen. A comparison of the two groups of patients at the end of the period would determine whether or not Krebiozen had shown any effect. Such a double blind controlled test has historically been accepted by science as the best method to evaluate a treatment with a minimum of prejudice and subjective impressions by either the physician giving the drug or the patient receiving it.

Therefore, the American Cancer Society is not accurate in stating that "the proposal does not provide a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation." A double blind experiment is in reality a machine for the exclusion of prejudice, professional misjudgment and human error and records only the facts. Science has yet to devise a better or more accurate method of evaluating a new form of therapy.

Neither is the contention valid that "the proposal does not provide for the trial to be conducted by an independent group of clinical investigators recognized as being objective and competent by the scientific community at large."

When we proposed that half of the members of the evaluating committee be chosen by the American Cancer Society can it be supposed that the American Cancer Society would not select competent and objective investigators? Or does the American Cancer Society suggest the committee would lose its independence because of Dr. Ivy's presence? It is equally inaccurate that the proposed test provides no clear-cut standards for measuring either the results desired or defining or measuring the results obtained. Since we propose to measure the effects of the drug by comparing the patients who received it with the patients who did not, this method would not only show whether Krebiozen is active but would measure precisely in terms of relief of pain and diminution or disappearance of tumor, how great or small that activity might be.

The statement that the test does not permit an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results since it provides for the administration of the drug by the proponents only, is meaningless in this connection. The question at issue here is whether the drug is active or not. If it is active it will give the same results in every physician's hands when used

as prescribed. For the last 7 years physicians in all parts of the United States working independently of each other have uniformly obtained the same percentage of beneficial results.

We proposed that Dr. Ivy administer the drug because he has the widest experience with it and the most exact knowledge of the dosage required in different cases. Furthermore, we felt that it was proper to suggest Dr. Ivy since every scientist is entitled to the opportunity to demonstrate his scientific claims.

The American Cancer Society has stated that it is currently testing hundreds of different drugs merely on the possibility that they may be found to have some activity against cancer. It is difficult to understand why they should refuse to test this one alone which at least has the evidence of some hundreds of physicians as to its activity in the cancer patient. Furthermore, this evidence shows that out of 300 terminal cancer patients approximately 50 are now cancer-free by all known tests.

The reasons given by the American Cancer Society fall to justify its refusal to test Krebiozen and reveal an unwillingness to end the controversy over this drug.

The American Cancer Society has withheld its decision on our proposal for many months and gives it only now when we are already discussing with the National Cancer Institute arrangements to perform substantially the same test under Government auspices.

STEVAN DUROVIC, M.D.

(For the Krebiozen Research Foundation.)
CHICAGO, ILL., October 24, 1958.

Reporter Harold Hutchings, of the Chicago Tribune, gives the American Cancer Society's version of its position in the controversy—like the babbling brook—its opposition goes on forever; similar to the opposition of the American Medical Society. I wonder if their purposes are parallel:

REJECTS IVY'S PLAN FOR TEST OF KREBIOZEN—
CANCER SOCIETY GIVES THREE REASONS
(By Harold Hutchings)

NEW YORK, October 24.—The American Cancer Society's board of directors voted Friday against a proposal that it conduct a test of the drug Krebiozen. The proposal had been made, February 10, 1958, by Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, head of the department of clinical science at the University of Illinois, and the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

Krebiozen is a controversial substance claimed to have properties for the treatment of cancer patients. It was extracted from a horse blood serum by its owner, Dr. Stevan Durovic, a Yugoslav physician now residing in Chicago.

The American Cancer Society's board took action in its annual meeting here.

NO VALID EVALUATION PLAN

The decision was in effect an approval of a report by the society's medical and scientific committee on the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

The board held that the proposal for testing krebiozen does not provide a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation, according to an official press statement.

It was noted that full consideration had been given by the board not only to the krebiozen proposal, but also to the recommendation made in connection with it by the American Cancer Society's advisory committee on research on the therapy of cancer, the research advisory council and the committee on new or unproved methods of treatment of cancer.

THREE POINTS IN DECISION

Three points in support of its decision were cited by the board as showing how unsatisfactory the krebiozen proposal was:

1. The plan does not provide for the trial to be conducted by an independent group of clinical investigators recognized as being objective and competent by the scientific community at large.

2. It does not permit an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results since it provides for the administration of the drug by the proponent only.

3. It provides no clear standard for measuring either the result desired or the finding or measuring the results obtained.

New Bethlehem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress whose district or any part of it is plagued by unemployment will be vitally interested in an editorial broadcast February 1 by Jerome R. Reeves, general manager of KDKA-TV in Pittsburgh. It is the account of a courageous and determined community which—during an economic low point marked by joblessness, poverty, and frustration—found the necessary imagination and leadership to undertake an aggressive industrialization campaign that is inspiring all cities and towns within hearing distance of this success story.

New Bethlehem, population 1,604, is 75 miles northeast of Pittsburgh, with a good number of the residents of this community belonging to the 22d Congressional District. Mr. Reeves' editorial, though brief, describes the efforts of New Bethlehem's businessmen so expertly that I shall not attempt to supplement it. Needless to say, we are proud of what has been accomplished and of the attention that has come to this community.

Some of the approaches used in New Bethlehem to attract new business are original and unique, yet townsmen did not attempt to keep their ideas a secret. They are happy to have their strategy recounted for the benefit of other areas that have been stricken by shutdowns and idleness, and I invite my colleagues to relay this story to surplus labor areas in their own districts. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Reeves' editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

NEW BETHLEHEM POINTS THE WAY

(An editorial by Jerome R. Reeves, general manager, KDKA-TV, broadcast February 1, 1959)

Good afternoon and thank you for spending the afternoon with channel 2.

All of us know and realize the terrible tragedy much of western Pennsylvania and Ohio suffered in the recent flood, and although it will never seem so to the people whose homes were lost or damaged—it may

well be a blessing in disguise. It has established the need and urgency of upstate flood protection and there is little likelihood of further delays.

But the flood that we want to talk about for a few moments is the flood of unemployment that has literally chased thousands of families from their hometowns. The flood of unemployment is a sinister, creeping paralysis that has been with us for a long time and cannot be explained away by the 1958 recession, or for that matter, by any recession.

Governor Lawrence in his inauguration address labelled this as our major problem in the Commonwealth. Specifically, he said that Pennsylvania has a series of economic problems, many years in the making, that can bring us a grave crisis in the future if we don't learn to act together and act now.

Nearly 12 percent of our labor force of more than a million people were without jobs. In the last 25 years, the number of manufacturing plants in the four adjacent counties to Pittsburgh increased only half as much as similar areas throughout the Nation. Allegheny County actually lost manufacturing plants—500 plants, to be exact.

We are not keeping pace with the industrial growth of the Nation, nor are we diversifying and creating employment to soften the blows of the slumps in coal and railroading.

Many of you live in towns faced with severe economic troubles. A few of you live and work in towns that face a bright, prosperous future. When you look at communities which have solved their problems you find only one thing. The people and the town helped themselves.

How can you do it in your town? Well, let's take a look at a pretty good example. This is New Bethlehem, Pa., some 75 miles northeast of Pittsburgh—population 1604.

Over the years the town had only a small lumber company, a little peanut butter firm that wandered in after the war, and several modest tile and firebrick firms—and on the deficit side, a rapidly depleted strip mining industry. They had an unemployment problem, and were designated a surplus labor area. Their youngsters grew up and graduated from school and those who didn't migrate just didn't find jobs.

This is a pattern not unlike hundreds of other towns within the range of the channel 2 signal.

But in New Bethlehem businessmen became tired of singing the blues and wringing their hands, and in 1953 they set out to do something about their predicament.

Their first step was to form a "New Industry Committee" and they had every businessman include in the envelope of every bill paid to suppliers a note with a pointed question: "Is your firm thinking of expanding? If so, let us know about it." The committee button-holed every salesman who came to town and asked the same question.

In 1954, roughly 1 year later, Milo Palaggo and his partner Joseph Constable, who operated the J and M Furniture Co., popped the question to Joe Schaffer—a salesman for Crawford Furniture Co. Mr. Schaffer responded in the affirmative: "Yes; we are thinking of expanding."

Charley Leech, the town's industrial committee secretary, promptly arranged a meeting with Clyne Crawford, president and owner of the Crawford firm in Jamestown, N.Y.

Meetings were held. Crawford was impressed, impressed with the labor pool, the nearness of hardwood such as maple, cherry, and oak. Mr. Crawford was also a man of action and said if the town would build him a 70,000 square foot building they'd set up operations in New Bethlehem.

The town then formed the New Bethlehem Area Development Corporation, with W. C. Martin as president, Dean Bowersox as vice president, W. K. Millison as treasurer, and Charley Leech as secretary and moving force.

Their first move was to go to the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Boston, where they obtained a \$360,000 loan. Then they went to the townspeople to sell bonds, with each merchant urged to buy at least a thousand dollars worth, but no more than 10. One hundred and forty people bought \$292,000 worth of bonds. A 30-acre site on the edge of town was secured.

To finish the building the group went to the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority and obtained \$60,000.

On July 1, 1955, New Bethlehem celebrated the opening of the \$700,000 plant, the first hardwood manufacturing plant north of the Mason-Dixon line since the First World War.

It is now running in two shifts with jobs for close to 200 men.

Most towns would have been satisfied to slow down at this point, but whetted by their initial success, the committee threw itself into the development of 25 additional leads. One of them, turned up by the West Penn Power Co., was the Hawthorne Manufacturing Co. of Youngstown, Ohio, which was looking for a relocation site.

Well, you perhaps guess by now, Hawthorne did relocate. The development committee obtained an eight-acre site, the New Bethlehem Bank put up \$75,000 first mortgage money, the State Industrial development authority \$45,000, and the townspeople bought \$30,000 worth of bonds.

Did New Bethlehem stop here? They did not. They kept plugging away and New Bethlehem hit the jackpot as these things go by landing the Rola Co. of Cleveland—an electronics firm employing mostly women for intricate bench work. Four hundred and seventy people responded to the first employment ad.

Rola came to New Bethlehem for two important reasons: the labor pool of female workers, and a low interest loan for their building.

The First Seneca Bank & Trust Co. came up with a 4½-percent first mortgage loan for \$125,000. The local people secured this loan with the original Crawford Furniture plant, which freed the same amount of town money earning 2 percent when the Rola loan would average out a 3¼ return. The high finance isn't as complicated as it may sound. It's a simple process of the townspeople converting or shifting their resources to finance manufacturing plants in their area. Beside the employment and economic considerations of the actions, the money lent earns hard cash dividends in terms of interest.

And here we are. New Bethlehem, population 1,600, created 500 new jobs with an annual payroll of over \$2 million a year. And they did it in the last 5 years.

New homes have been built. Not so many people commute elsewhere for employment, and the high school graduate has a better opportunity of earning a living in his home town.

What's the formula? Well, you need cooperative property owners who are willing to sell land at a fair price. You need low real estate and occupational taxes to attract outside firms. You need a group of energetic people in your community to aggressively seek out potential industry. You have got to make decisions fast and not get trapped in your own red tape.

And as Charley Leech so aptly puts it, "and any community willing to put their money where their mouth is can do it."

To this, KDKA television says a solemn amen for every town in the channel 2 area.

If you think your town can use any of the material used in my remarks, along with additional research data pin-pointing the New Bethlehem story, kindly write me here

at KDKA Television, No. 1 Gateway Center, and we will be happy to supply it.

Thank you very much.

A few samples of immediate response from the towns:

FEBRUARY 1, 1959.

DEAR SIR: I heard your broadcast on community development this afternoon and I didn't even want to wait for tomorrow to write. It was quite an inspiration.

I was just elected president of the Dunbar Community Development Association just formed 2 days ago. We are or rather were a small town with an advanced case of ennui as far as progress was concerned. Now we have taken the first treatment toward recovery. But what a long, long convalescence ahead. How can you impress, inspire, drive a patient that appears happy being ill. . . . Please send us all you can that might help.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. ROCKWELL, Jr.

DUNBAR, PA.

EAST LIVERPOOL, OHIO, February 2, 1959.

MR. JEROME R. REEVES,
KDKA-TV, Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Please send information from your talk on Sunday's program about the small town (New Bethlehem) which located new industries.

I will be grateful for your help and will turn the information over to those who will make use of it. Thank you.

Mrs. ALICE BANKS.

BENTLEYVILLE, PA., February 1, 1959.

MR. JEROME R. REEVES,
KDKA-TV, Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR: I have heard part of your program on Channel 2 today and I would like to have the information on community development and how to get the town folks interested enough in their community.

Thank you.

Mrs. FRANK DOCHENETZ.

Y.E.L.P. SERVICE, INC.,

East Liverpool, Ohio, February 2, 1959.

KDKA-TV,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: Yesterday, February 1, at 5 p.m. on channel 2, I happened to catch the end of a program I believe entitled the "New Bethlehem" program. It was on the order of an editorial with respect to community development.

I believe it was noted that further information with respect to programs for community development could be obtained by writing to your station.

I am deeply interested in community development in this East Liverpool area and if you have any information that could be forwarded to me I would greatly appreciate it. If any cost is connected it will be taken care of promptly.

Thanks for your kind cooperation.

Very truly yours,

ALVIN T. BABB,
Vice President.

A Program To Retire the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am including under leave to extend my remarks two editorials which appeared in the Fort Worth Star Telegram last

Wednesday, February 11. One appeared in the Morning Star Telegram, and the other was published in the Evening Star Telegram.

These editorials relate to the proposal I advanced last week for a systematic program to retire the national debt in not more than 100 years.

This proposal has evoked favorable editorial comment generally throughout the country, but the thing which distresses me is that most such comments seem to proceed upon the assumption that Congress will do nothing about this. I am certain that the country would be glad to have this Congress dispell any such cynicism as to our intentions by taking affirmative action:

[From the Fort Worth Morning Star-Telegram, Feb. 11, 1959]

HUNDRED YEAR PLAN

Representative WRIGHT, sounding like a voice in the wilderness, has proposed a plan for retiring the huge national debt on a gradual and orderly basis. It calls for yearly repayment of not less than 1 percent of the present indebtedness. That would mean about \$2.8 billion annually, in addition to interest, but in 100 years "the debt would be completely paid and the slate wiped clean."

This plea must have brought a stunned silence in the halls of Congress, where cries of "spend, spend" echo constantly. For at the time, Representative WRIGHT's colleagues were preoccupied with discussions of further Federal spending, which inevitably would increase, not reduce, the monstrous national debt. There was talk of more money for housing, more for aid to airports, more for schools and education and more for defense.

Nearly all these projects have merit, though in most cases the proposed allocations are ridiculously extravagant, but none is more worthy than the national defense. And this was one on which the Fort Worth Congressman pinned his appeal. Now the country is struggling to buy each year from 30 to 40 B-58 bombers with the \$9.8 billion in interest the debt soon will cost annually, more than 700 of these super-weapon systems could be bought, he pointed out.

Of course, the interest still would have to be met even if regular payments on the principal were to be set up. But as the principal went down, the interest also would fall. Before many years, the savings in interest would offset the debt payments, and the benefits would be realized long before the final installment was paid a century from now. The psychological effect of a determined effort to remove this staggering load from the Nation's shoulders would be an immediate boon to the country's economic health.

The chatter over the various spending proposals no doubt was resumed in the Capitol, as soon as Congressmen had recuperated from their initial shock, but it can be hoped that Representative WRIGHT has planted a seed that may one day germinate and bear fruit. For if it should, the Nation's future could—despite any temporary inconvenience imposed by the payments—be pictured in a considerably less dismal light.

[From the Fort Worth Evening Star-Telegram, Feb. 11, 1959]

THE NATIONAL DEBT SHOULD BE PAID

What with Walter Reuther demanding increased Government spending and the proposed next Federal budget already thrown out of balance by Congress, the prospects for approval of Congressman WRIGHT's resolution for orderly retirement of the national debt do not seem very promising.

But even in introducing the proposal the Texas Representative has performed a public service, for he has reminded the American people of the tremendous weight of debt under which the National Government is attempting to operate and of the necessity of reducing it if ultimate bankruptcy is to be avoided.

Congressman WRIGHT's proposal, despite the poor light in which his colleagues are likely to regard it, is eminently practical. It calls for retirement of the \$285 billion debt over a period of 100 years at a rate of \$2.8 billion a year.

Before other Members of the Congress dismiss the suggestion as politically undesirable and a poor substitute for vote-wheeling spending programs they should reflect upon what the political situation may be if the debt continues to rise and repudiation becomes the only way out.

The fact that an entire century would be required under the Wright resolution to correct what war and governmental irresponsibility have brought about in a quarter of a century is a measure of the improvidence under which the national establishment has been operating.

A hundred years of paying back what is owed is a might long time, but we owe a mighty big debt, far beyond anything which any government ever owed before. The interest rate alone is costing the taxpayer more than \$8 billion a year.

The debt would be serious enough if it had no other effect upon the economy than that of the requirement to pay the heavy interest charge. But its presence, and the constant fact of budgetary deficits in the effort to keep political wheels turning, has profoundly disturbed American economics. The debt is a supercharger of inflation and inflation has so weakened the value of the U.S. dollar that it is worth less than half what it was worth 20 years ago.

Clearly no greater fallacy was ever uttered than that advanced when the great debt was in the early processes of creation, that it was of no moment because "we owe the money to ourselves." Debt is debt, whether it is public or private. The obligation has to be discharged some time, in some manner—by honest repayment, by erosion of the people's savings through inflation, or by outright repudiation.

We are far from the last, but we are engaging in the second under political euphemisms, and we are dodging the first. To undertake the honest and orderly repayment of the debt would produce great economic benefits long before the debt itself were fully repaid. Confidence in Federal fiscal integrity would return in a short time and a powerful influence would be brought to bear against the inflationary processes.

What is needed now is a start toward debt retirement under a program of budgeted annual repayments, instead of a program of annual budget deficits that are added to the sum already owed. This Nation, unless it returns to financial responsibility, can destroy itself as it destroys the people's money. There is no reason, except political cowardice, for postponing such a program as Congressman WRIGHT proposes.

Enterprise Versus Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the *Savanna Times-Journal*, *Savanna, Ill.*, entitled "Enterprise Versus Socialism":

ENTERPRISE VERSUS SOCIALISM

Near the end of January, the power-producing facilities were completed at a new, giant-sized hydroelectric dam. And this, in the light of past circumstances, was something of an historic occasion.

The dam's name is Brownlee, and it is situated on the nationally famous Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River, along the Idaho-Oregon border. It was built by the Idaho Power Co., one of the Nation's many publicly regulated, taxpaying private utilities. But, as everyone who has followed the news knows, every conceivable effort and device was used by the public power groups to prevent construction. They wanted Hells Canyon development to be undertaken as a tax-subsidized Federal monopoly.

These groups did delay the dam's building for years. But at last all the legal and administrative obstacles were cleared, and Idaho Power was permitted to go ahead. Brownlee, with its 360,000-kilowatt capacity, is the result.

And Brownlee is only the beginning. It is the first project in a three-dam program in which the company has already invested more than \$110 million—every nickel of it private money. The entire development is licensed by the Federal Power Commission, and the cost will be about \$164 million.

In addition to harnessing the full potential of the Hells Canyon reach, the development will provide benefits in the form of flood control, downstream navigation, fish conservation, recreation—and tax revenues totaling some \$10 million a year to local, State, and Federal governments.

And that's the United States idea of enterprise versus socialism.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the second-place Iowa winner of the 12th annual Voice of Democracy contest was Larry Phelps, the son of Dr. and Mrs. Gardner Phelps, of Waterloo, Iowa, and it is with pleasure that I include his contest paper as part of my remarks:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

The march of civilization may be compared to the march of science. As one looks over the various civilizations, he almost senses a supreme power, experimenting with man as a scientist experiments with the laws of nature. All of these civilizations seem to be attempts, on the part of this supreme power, toward a perfect society. These experiments date back to ancient times with such great attempts as the Babylonian and the Egyptian civilizations.

Sometimes in a scientific experiment, the most important aspect is overlooked. The same thing occurred when democracy first appeared in a civilization of man. It was first exposed in ancient Athens and reappeared in several more recent civilizations. However, not until 1776, when our Forefathers launched the type of society we know of as democracy was its full potential realized. In the minds of those men was the idea of a country in which all men are equal

in their own right. In this society each man would be free to guide himself and have the right to shape his own destiny. Today, 182 years later, this society still exists. Those men may be compared to a group of scientists standing around a test tube in a biological research laboratory. In this test tube is a tiny green specimen, the first artificial living thing. Before 1776, democracy, as we know it, was like that bit of life before it was created; it existed solely in the minds of men, waiting for the proper time to come into the world. As would the scientists who created artificial life be acclaimed, so were the men who created our democracy acclaimed by thinking men the world over.

The test-tube life would lead its creators to new and useful discoveries concerning the nature of things. Democracy has similarly led man to many great and wonderful discoveries concerning himself. It has exposed the most admirable traits in man and has served as the breeding place for many great social advances. Through a competitive society we have developed one of the highest standards of living known to man.

Another similarity is seen in the fact that as a blob of laboratory life would serve as a guide for future experiments, so has our democracy served as a proving ground for those who have followed. Our Constitution, which is the oldest in the world still in use, has seen many nations built around its basic concepts.

The imaginary laboratory specimen will lead its creators to new discoveries without the waste of time and money. In like manner, our democracy has prevented us from going astray in the most expensive directions; such as nazism, fascism, and communism. These would be paid for not only with time and money but with human lives and liberties. While democracy has guided us around these pitfalls, our liberties and freedom have remained.

The hypothetical creatures will change and react to changes in stimulus and environment caused by its creator. Likewise, our democracy, built on a wonderfully flexible basis, has changed and will continue to change in response to the needs and desires of its creators. This distinguishes it from other inferior forms of society.

Perhaps the greatest similarity which the manmade life has to democracy is that as this artificial creature is dependent on its creator, the scientist, and its every move is guided by him, so is our democracy guided by the only proper force. This force is its creator, the people. Other forms of society have failed because one man or small group has led millions of people according to his whims and ideas. We have attained a society in which each individual man is free to have his part in his government.

The successful scientist has always been free to guide himself and his creations. Our democracy has been successful because, in guiding ourselves and our Government, we, the people have always been free.

Man in the Middle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have gone into the *Record* in the past week with newspaper articles outlining in detail conditions which exist in West Virginia with regard to the economic plight of our people.

My colleague [Mr. SLACK] of the Sixth District has done a great and gracious service in touring his area in southern West Virginia with a newspaper reporter who has given a graphic and compelling description of the unemployment and the destitution which exists there.

I take the liberty today of letting the House know that this condition is not confined to southern West Virginia. It is widespread in our 55 counties. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include for reprinting an article from the edition of February 5 of the Fairmont West Virginian, one of our distinguished newspapers, which relates the plight of the man in the middle. As the newspaper account states, this man can be found all over the State; he is not alone. And while my distinguished colleague investigated conditions in southern West Virginia, the source of this story is 250 miles north of his district. I mention this to indicate that West Virginia's economic condition is extremely grave and widespread.

During the past week, there have been meetings with Secretary of Commerce, Lewis Strauss, and Gov. Leo Heogh, concerning imports of residual fuel oil. Our coal industry representatives and representatives of our great coal-carrying railroads are extremely interested in seeing that mandatory quotas are placed upon imports of this fuel. I mention this in passing, but my main concern is to have Mr. Herst's article printed for all to see:

MARION COUNTY HAS CLASSIC EXAMPLE: MAN IN THE MIDDLE SUFFERS
(By Ray Herst)

He is West Virginia's man in the middle—the employable who cannot get a job and who is not eligible for aid from the department of public assistance.

He lives next door to you or maybe in Wetzel County or in Taylor County. He can be found all over the State.

One such man in the middle and his family live here in Marion County. They are not alone—theirs is a typical case.

For breakfast last Sunday they had chicken gravy and bread; for lunch they had chicken gravy and bread, and for dinner they each had some of the meat—but how far does a chicken go for a family of 10?

The previous day there was nothing in the house to eat and no money to buy food. The family traded an old motor for a rooster. When that was gone, they had nothing again.

This man in the middle—let's call him Mr. Booth—has been out of work for the past 2 years. He was laid off from his job with the State road commission.

NO JOB

Like so many others, he has been unable to get another job. And because he is considered employable he cannot receive aid from the DPA. This is why he is the man in the middle—the man stranded in the middle of a no-man's land that is barren and bleak and surrounded by walls of frustration.

Mr. Booth is 58 years old and has arthritis of the spine—and he is beaten.

This family of 10 has an income of exactly \$2.50 a week—this comes from Mrs. Booth, who, every other week, cleans house for another woman. She gets paid \$5.

There is a story that seems impossible to believe, but it is a true story and one which hundreds of families in the State can also tell.

Their eyes would probably be empty of sparkle and life as Mrs. Booth's are and their voices would sound as desperate as hers when she said, "We can't keep our home together much longer and if something isn't done pretty soon, I don't know what will happen."

How Mr. and Mrs. Booth have kept their family together for the past 2 years, God only knows.

IN DARKNESS

For a year now, the family has lived in virtual darkness. Their electricity was shut off when they were unable to pay the bill. But they kept on as best they could.

Six of the eight children in the family are in school. Each night they gather in the living room, pull their chairs around in a semicircle and study by the weak light from two oil lanterns.

Yes that's right, oil lanterns. The lights dance and smoke and throw grotesque shadows over the walls but the children study and they study hard.

One of the girls—she is 19—is scheduled to graduate from high school in June. She may not. It's not that her grades are bad—they're good—it's because she and the other children do not have the necessary paper and pencils needed to carry on their school work.

The girl, a pretty lass, is thin from the meager diet of the past 2 years and pale with frustration. She is determined to finish high school and get a job as a secretary if possible.

"That will be the proudest day in our lives," her mother said.

GIRL OF COURAGE

It will indeed be a proud day—for here is a girl with courage seldom found in young women of her age. Her clothes were worn and sometimes too small and most of the time out of style and repaired hundreds of times; she couldn't participate in school activities because there was no money—but she stuck with it and soon she will be rewarded.

All of the family is in dire need of clothing—their coats are thin and worn and it seems as though the lightest breath could be felt through them. They don't have proper shoes and they are hungry.

And they and their parents face spring without a home. They haven't paid rent since they moved there. The landlord told them they could stay rent free if they would keep the property up, but now he has told them he wants to sell the house and they will have to move.

The only problem is they have no place to go. Moving the furniture would present no problem—if you could call the few pitiful sticks that they have in the house furniture. It's that they have no place to go.

Mrs. Booth said, "I love it here in this community. The people are wonderful and kind. I would like to stay here the rest of my life."

SOME ROOMS COLD

The six-room house is heated with gas—that is, in all but two of the rooms. In one of the rooms the Booths' 17-year-old son sleeps and in the other, two of the girls and one of the boys sleep. The kitchen is heated by the cooking stove. They have a gas bill of more than \$20 that needs to be paid.

They get some aid. The family received commodities which last them less than a week and during 1958 they received a total of \$100 from the emergency relief fund of the DPA.

For a year Mrs. Booth has washed the family's clothes as her grandmother did—with a washtub and a scrubboard; she ironed with an old-fashioned flatiron, heated on the stove.

But they are a family—a true family. They have stuck together and worked together. They know hunger and cold and

need and they remember the days when they laughed and had enough clothing to go around or dishes to eat on or when the baby had milk to drink.

IN THE MIDDLE

But they are in the middle—stuck fast in the middle and no matter which way they turn they find the slick, high walls of frustration. But through a small peephole in the wall comes a glimpse of sunlight and hope—hope that the children will be able to finish school and have enough to eat and perhaps, eventually find the gate to the wall and live a little better life than they are now.

Dr. Clyde J. Wright, county commissioner, who knows the family and has tried to help them and who took this reporter to visit the family made this statement:

"The health and welfare of every citizen should be first and foremost in the consideration of public officials. We are all proud we live in a free country, but we have some conditions in our county that none of us could be proud of.

"Every person should be free to earn a living for himself and family. The discharging of people from their jobs because of their political affiliation is un-American. Personally, I am opposed to such despotic methods of political tyranny. Pressuring people into starvation so that by force they must submit themselves to certain groups, is foreign to the principles and philosophy of our American way of life.

HELP NEEDED

"Those who are not physically able to earn their bread must be cared for. The little children who are victims of circumstances because of the lack of assistance will break the heart of anyone who hears their feeble cries for food. Our Saviour was so concerned about children when He said 'Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones, it is better for him that a millstone was hanged about his neck and he were cast into the depths of the sea.'"

Instead, this family and the hundreds of families like them—Virginia's Man in the Middle—has been cast into the depths of the sea and left to drown of frustration and hunger.

February 16 Marks 41st Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON. L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that today, February 16, is Lithuania Independence Day. But the plain fact is that this day, first celebrated 41 years ago, serves to remind us that Lithuania is no longer free to celebrate this proud day in its history.

The vast majority of freedom-loving American people, I am confident, join with me in a sincere hope that some day the efforts of the free world may result in bringing Lithuania and other freedom-loving countries out from behind the Iron Curtain.

The people of Lithuania have my profound sympathy, and I am sure efforts will continue to be made to bring about the freedom of Lithuania which the people of that country so ardently desire.

Nixon Can Unite GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith a very enlightening article by Gould Lincoln in Sunday's Washington Star regarding the Vice President and his ability to weld together all phases of the Republican Party. It is a good article—well put—and most convincing, about a man who is widely accepted to be the coming leader of his party:

NIXON CAN UNITE GOP

(By Gould Lincoln)

Dark horses for the Republican presidential nomination in 1960 are scarcer than hens' teeth. And by the same token, there are two outstanding Republicans who, according to insiders in the party councils, may make the race for the GOP nomination next year as keen as that between Mr. Eisenhower and Senator Taft in 1952. They are, of course, Vice President Nixon and Governor Rockefeller, of New York. The very fact that there is a dearth of dark-horse and favorite-son candidates will make the contest between the Californian and the New Yorker—if it comes—more interesting. It makes the race a real struggle.

Vice President Nixon, through his wide experience as Congressman, Senator, and 6 years in his present office, has a better grasp of Government affairs and the problems that confront the Nation than any other candidate, Republican or Democrat. And he has ability of a high order. Careful inquiry shows he is widely liked and highly regarded among the party leaders in many States.

Governor Rockefeller is an attractive new figure in elective politics. His victory last November in New York catapulted him into the presidential picture. He carried a New York Republican senatorial candidate along with him to victory.

COULD UNIFY FACTIONS

The 1958 elections, on the other hand, did Mr. Nixon no good. California voters defeated former Senator Knowland for Governor, and former Governor Knight for Senator (both Republicans)—and badly. Mr. Nixon himself was not a candidate, of course. The picture might have been vastly different had Senator Knowland been content to run again for Congress, leaving Governor Knight to seek reelection. Senator Knowland's insistence on the governorship nomination spilled the beans. When he also seized on the right-to-work issue and made it his own, the jig really was up.

As between Mr. Nixon and Governor Rockefeller today, the Vice President stands a far better chance to unite the two wings of the Republican Party. The conservative wing can go for him 100 percent. The strong and loyal support he has given President Eisenhower should certainly encourage the "modern" Eisenhower Republicans to go for him.

Governor Rockefeller, on the other hand, has been regarded as too far left of center by many of the conservative Republicans. He has yet to prove himself a good executive and Governor. His demand for higher taxes in order to balance New York's budget has not been popular with a lot of voters. The fact he has accompanied his high tax program with a spending program has not endeared him to many conservative Republicans. Further, no one yet knows how a

Rockefeller, as a presidential candidate, would sit with the Republicans of the Midwest, an area the GOP must carry if it is to win next year's national election.

If this is to be a race between Mr. Nixon and Governor Rockefeller, the presidential primaries offer a real field for tests of popular strength. Both men would be considered far more than favorite-son candidates—candidates who go to a national convention with their own State delegations lined up for them, and little else, hoping the lightning will strike. Each will have, however, his State's delegation all wrapped up. Senator Knowland, who had been a possible contender in California—and Knight—have been eliminated by their sorry showing last November.

OTHER GOP POSSIBILITIES

What Republican dark horses and favorite-son candidates are on the horizons? There is former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York, who likes Mr. Rockefeller and will not himself be a candidate. Senator Case of New Jersey, one of the modern group, is another possibility. Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, who has been described as an Eisenhower Republican from Texas (who now is from Greenwich, Conn.), has support in some circles. So has Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., our representative at the United Nations.

Republican governors of States have been reduced to a pitiful number, especially in the primary States. In Minnesota, where former Gov. Harold E. Stassen at one time could hold the State's delegation at the national convention, he no longer figures materially. Further, he has moved to Pennsylvania, where he would not have a chance against either Mr. Nixon or Governor Rockefeller in the presidential primary.

The argument has been urged against Mr. Nixon—as it was against the late Senator Bob Taft of Ohio—that he could not win if nominated. From the 1952 presidential results, it can well be argued that Senator Taft would have won, if he had defeated Mr. Eisenhower for the nomination. Mr. Nixon is a resourceful campaigner—wonderfully effective on television. Opponents say he would not get the independent vote and no Democratic votes. They could be far wrong. Further, a lot will depend on the Democrat who is nominated for President. None of the so-called candidates are politically flawless. A country at peace and reasonably prosperous could go for Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon should win the first primary in New Hampshire in a walk if he enters it. He is popular there, where thousands of Republicans took the trouble to write his name in for Vice President in the 1956 primary. Minnesota, Wisconsin, Ohio, Oregon, Nebraska, Pennsylvania and New Jersey all could provide Mr. Nixon and Mr. Rockefeller with real battlegrounds.

"Maine" Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in Connecticut, Governor Ribicoff proclaimed Sunday, February 15, as Maine Memorial Day to commemorate the sinking of the battleship *Maine* at Havana. Under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include Governor Ribicoff's proclamation:

We are soon to observe the 61st anniversary of the tragic event that was the immediate cause of the Spanish-American War, the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in the harbor at Havana, Cuba, on February 15, 1898.

There are comparatively few among us who have personal recollections of the time when the war cry "Remember the *Maine*" was heard throughout the Nation, but it is as meaningful today as it was then.

Today America is determined to stand firm when her security is threatened or attacked. America's sympathies for oppressed people, and her resolution to aid them in every way possible, are as strong as they were 61 years ago.

It is fitting, therefore, that we keep alive the memory of this episode in our history, and in accordance with our statutes I hereby proclaim Sunday, February 15 to be *Maine* Memorial Day.

It will be appropriate on this day for our public and private buildings to display our National and State flags. Fitting exercises may be held in our schools and other public places especially honoring the 268 officers and men who went down with the *Maine* and the some 3,400 Connecticut volunteers who served in the Spanish-American War.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, last week 12 Explorer Scouts made an official report to the Nation representing the 3½ million Boy Scouts of America. Naturally I was proud to have a Scout from my own district, Steven D. Peterson from Topeka, Kans. It was my privilege to attend a special breakfast honoring these Scouts on last Tuesday and I would like to observe that it is reassuring to see 12 such fine and capable young men representing the youth of America. The Nation owes a special tribute to the 125,000 volunteer leaders of the Scout organization. It is by virtue of the unselfish and tireless effort of these public-spirited citizens that we are able to attract our youth into the Boy Scout organization.

On Sunday, February 15 many churches throughout the Nation appropriately paid tribute and recognized the Boy Scouts of America. Many churches are counted among the 81,000 organizations sponsoring Boy Scout troops throughout the land. In many instances the church makes their facilities available to Scout troops for a place of meeting even though the troop may be sponsored by a nonsecular organization.

In recognizing the Boy Scouts of America it was a common practice for a Boy Scout to be selected to deliver what is described as the Patrick Henry address during one of the church services. Typical of the Scouts selected to make this address was Bob Singleton, of Bethesda,

Md., who spoke during the church service at the Bethesda Methodist Church. Bob was presented by the Reverend Marion S. Michael.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of February 14, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth Congressional District, Texas)

Capitol activity this week centered around a joint session of Congress on Thursday called to pay tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

In this week's newsletter, instead of talking about Lincoln, perhaps we might all benefit more by letting Mr. Lincoln talk to us about citizenship and government:

GOVERNMENT

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities.

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere" (July 1, 1854).

DUTY

"We hold the true republican position. In leaving the people's business in their hands we cannot be wrong" (Congress, July 27, 1848).

SOLVENCY

"As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with a government" (Whig circular, March 4, 1843).

ECONOMIC FREEDOM

"I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights" (Chicago, Ill., July 10, 1858).

"We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business," Congress, July 27, 1848.

"The primary cause of our great prosperity . . . is the principle of 'Liberty to all'—the principle that clears the path for all—gives hope to all—and, by consequence, enterprise and industry to all." Fragment on the Constitution and Union, January 1861.

LIBERTY AND SECURITY

"If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide," speech to Young Men's Lyceum, January 27, 1838.

CAPITAL/LABOR

"The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues, and kindreds. Nor should this lead to a war upon property, or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor—

property is desirable—is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another; but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built," to New York Workingmen's Democratic Republican Association, March 21, 1864.

"I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else. When one starts poor, as most do in the race of life, free society is such that he knows he can better his condition; he knows that there is no fixed condition of labor, for his whole life," March 6, 1860.

DEPENDENCE ON GOD

"The purposes of the Almighty are perfect, and must prevail, though we erring mortals may fail to accurately perceive them in advance. We hoped for a happy termination of this terrible war long before this but God knows best, and has ruled otherwise. We shall yet acknowledge His Wisdom and our own error therein," to Mrs. Gurney, September 4, 1864.

DUTY

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it," at Cooper Institute, New York City, February 27, 1860.

Administration's Farm Proposals a Confession of Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1959, the Wisconsin Farmers Union News printed an editorial which I feel neatly sums up the appalling farm price situation which would result if the administration's 1959 farm proposals were put into effect. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of that editorial in the Record:

PRESIDENT'S FARM PROPOSALS

Faced with the prospect of being buried under mountainous farm surpluses of its own making, the Eisenhower administration has proposed solutions of such a reckless nature that they are a sure sign of panic and a confession of failure.

The President has offered Congress two courses of action: (1) Abandon the parity concept and set price supports between 75 and 90 percent of the average market price for the immediate preceding years (probably three), or (2) retain the parity standard but give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to set price supports anywhere between zero and 90 percent of parity.

If either proposal were adopted, Secretary Benson would have the power to make "price supports" completely meaningless because the free market level would usually prevail.

Let us suppose that Congress would approve the President's first recommendation, giving Benson the authority to drop the price floor to 75 percent of the average mar-

ket price for the last 3 years. Manufacturing milk could then be supported as low as \$2.45 a hundred pounds as compared to \$3.06 for the present marketing year; butterfat at 47.8 cents a pound compared with this year's 59 cents; corn 96 cents a bushel compared with this year's prospective \$1.14; and wheat could go as low as \$1.43 a bushel compared with \$1.82 set for this year.

Both the President and Benson have made much of the argument that Government price support programs have been unrealistic. If the above farm prices are a sample of the new realism in Washington, then we'll take the dream world that farmers purportedly have been living in.

The Federal Penal System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, due to overcrowding in our Federal penal system, the U.S. Bureau of Prisons has submitted an urgent request to Congress for funds with which to construct a maximum security Federal penitentiary. The budget request submitted to Congress is not to exceed \$9,875,000.

In an effort to discredit the need for this maximum security penitentiary, the Wall Street Journal has printed an editorial listing the cost at \$110 million. This, of course, is grossly in error. In order to set the record straight, I have asked the Wall Street Journal for a correction of their editorial and have written the letter below concerning this matter, and with permission previously granted, request that it be printed herein.

Should a prison riot occur in one of our overcrowded Federal prisons, far more damage could be done in one prison riot than the cost of the new proposed maximum security institution. Therefore, I hope Congress will favorably consider this urgent request for funds and ignore such efforts to discredit the urgent need for this new institution.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 16, 1959.

Mr. JOSEPH E. EVANS,
Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. EVANS: I would like to take this opportunity to point out an error which appeared in your editorial comments in Review and Outlook of the February 12 edition of your publication. You stated, and I quote, "The prison will house 600 men and the estimated cost of the Illinois prison is set at \$110 million."

Mr. Evans, the figure of \$110 million is \$100 million in error. If you will check the printed budget request submitted by the President, on page 761 in the right column under the heading "Buildings and Facilities," you will find an item requesting moneys not to exceed \$9,875,000 for this proposed prison. I am quite sure that you will agree this figure is quite different from the figure you quote in your editorial of February 12. Naturally, with this error the further figure of \$183,333 per man used in your editorial is likewise in gross error.

I sincerely feel that, in justice to your readers who look to your publication and editorials for correct information, you will want to right this error at the earliest possible time. And, I might add, that the actual budget request for \$9,875,000 might also change your editorial thinking on this matter.

If I can be of any further help to you in getting the factual information on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to call on me.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH J. GRAY,

U.S. Congressman.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the attention of my colleagues to an address by Adm. James S. Russell, U.S. Navy, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, delivered recently in Seattle, Wash. This distinguished naval officer was the cowinner of the Collier Trophy in 1956 for his work in developing the supersonic F8U Crusader jet fighter. I believe Admiral Russell's remarks to be particularly timely as the Congress is called upon to assess the nature of the military threat our Nation now faces:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Address by Adm. James S. Russell, U.S. Navy, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Before the World Affairs Council of Seattle, Seattle, Wash., February 4, 1959)

It is a privilege to be asked to address the Council of World Affairs of Seattle and their many distinguished guests here today. It is particularly pleasant for me since the occasion is in the nature of a homecoming. As some of you may know, I grew up here in the Pacific Northwest and throughout my Navy career have maintained a home on the shore of American Lake just south of Tacoma.

So devoted is my family to the local deep water, the tall fir trees and the glacier-clad peaks that we have recently purchased a tract of land on the western shores of Puget Sound, and when the time comes to retire, it is our intention to return and there to build the house of our retirement.

I am especially happy to have this opportunity to discuss with you, my neighbors, a subject which is of great importance to all of us—national defense. While in my discussion I may understandably deal more with the affairs of the Navy, I do not for a minute minimize the vital roles of our brother services, the Army and the Air Force. All of the services have an important place in the defense of our country.

This country of ours is now in the greatest competition in its history, and the very survival of our way of life is going to depend in large measure upon the extent to which we, all of us, industrialists, businessmen, educators, clergymen, statesmen, labor leaders, and military men, recognize this competition and its very long-term implications.

National security is a goal which can be attained only by national effort, participated in by every citizen of this Nation. Its achievement in these perilous times is a

full-sized job and not one to underrate. This Nation can remain free only by a combination of political, economic, spiritual, psychological, and military strengths, including the will to apply appropriate military force when forced to by aggression. The price of security is high. It will probably go higher. The biggest single item of our security bill is our Military Establishment. The rising costs of everything make it mandatory that we make the most exacting appraisal of just what this overall establishment should contain. We must maintain adequate strength in all necessary areas, for, if we do not, the enemy will find and exploit our weaknesses. But by the same token, we must not overexpend in any one area, for, if we do, our resources in dollars, materials, and manpower simply won't be enough to provide for other equally vital forms of military strength.

Bear in mind, if you please, that the final decision as to our overall military posture is not made by the military, but by the civilian side of our Government—the Secretary of Defense, the President, and the Congress. The ultimate authority properly resides in the hands of our voting citizens, and so must the ultimate responsibility.

The Soviet sputniks brought our national security problems sharply into the focus of public attention. The comparative success of the Soviet lunar probe launched on January 2, 1959, again brought us face to face with the fact of Soviet technical progress. In whatever way we view this progress, its military implications are more long-term than immediate. What we do in response must look toward our long-term security. We are going to have to live with Communist imperialism for a long time. Our problem is an enduring one.

Bear in mind, also, that decisions we make today concerning our military posture require several years to implement. It takes years to build ships, airplanes, and missiles. Hence, what we plan now will take shape and be in service 3, 5, or 10 years from now.

Our national task—and that of the free world—is to establish a just and lasting peace in the world in which the rights and independence of all countries are safeguarded in conformity with the charter of the United Nations. To fulfill this national task we may be forced to go to war—and war may be of different kinds. General war may be defined as a war involving a massive nuclear exchange between the United States and the Sino-Soviet bloc. I know of no one who is not convinced that such an exchange would be something less than beneficial to both sides. It is therefore unlikely to happen, barring an insane and desperate choice on the part of the Communist leaders. Nevertheless, we must insure this unlikelihood by maintaining a deterrent to the deliberate initiation of all-out war by the Soviets. The overall deterrent, of course, is the collective strength of the free world, but a substantial part of the deterrence is a retaliatory atomic strike capability which the Soviets know will be capable of inflicting unacceptable damage to them, even if they deliver a surprise attack upon us.

Bearing in mind that this essential retaliatory capability is very expensive and in competition with other elements of our national strength, the country and our military planners must answer three questions:

1. How much do we need?
2. What form shall it take?
3. Does national security demand any other form of military power—and if so, what and how much?

To deal with the first question as to how much deterrent, we need enough so that the Communists know that if they attack us, they will be destroyed. Thus, deterrence is a state of mind; but, and this is important, sufficiency in this particular is

absolute, not relative; it bears no ratio, no relationship, to a like capability on the part of the Soviets. It specifically does not mean matching them bomber for bomber, or missile for missile.

As to what form it should take, you might decide to build up a huge force, highly vulnerable to surprise attack, but big enough so that its residual capability, which you calculate will survive a surprise attack, will still do the job. This is a very expensive and rather dangerous choice, because either you might miscalculate, or the enemy might. He might figure that a really good surprise attack would get enough of your force so that he could survive the residual attack, and he might be strongly tempted to try it.

On the other hand, a small but highly invulnerable force is not only attainable within reasonable financial limits, but by its very invulnerability it removes the temptation from the enemy to have a go at trying to wipe it out. This invulnerability to surprise attack can be achieved only by resorting to dispersal, concealment, movement, and hardening.

We must face the fact that as the number of long-range rockets in the enemy's arsenal increases, the capability of either manned bombers or missiles operating from unhardened fixed bases to provide the necessary residual retaliatory capacity becomes progressively less. Similarly, the capability of manned bombers to penetrate constantly improving air defenses declines. We shall, perforce, rely more and more on missiles for this task.

A truly effective retaliatory force should meet the following criteria:

1. The enemy should have a wholesome fear of it; and to this end, it should be able to reach, with requisite accuracy and effectiveness, any target in the Russian Communist bloc.
2. It should not be so located that attempts to destroy it before it is launched would collaterally wreak damage on nonmilitary targets.
3. It should be highly invulnerable to all forms of enemy military attack including ballistic missiles.
4. Its launching points should be such that it cannot be located accurately in advance by an enemy, and such that its most probable trajectories cannot be precalculated by an enemy.
5. After it is launched, it should be as invulnerable as possible to all forms of countermeasures.
6. It should be an invulnerable as possible to enemy efforts of sabotage, subversion and espionage.
7. It should have a minimum reaction time; that is, the time between the decision to fire, and actual launching, should be as small as possible.
8. It should so complicate the enemy's defense problems that absolute defense against it is either technically or financially infeasible.

It so happens, not by coincidence, but by intention, that the foregoing criteria are met by the system in which the ballistic missile, Polaris, is mounted in submarines.

The Polaris submarine system will be unique in that it is a weapons system which combines the advantages of attack by ballistic missile with the already established potential of concealment and mobility offered by the nuclear powered submarine. By moving about, remaining submerged for long periods, and constantly changing positions, the Polaris submarine is virtually invulnerable to surprise attack. Surrounding the potential aggressor are oceans and seas providing millions of miles of underwater concealment within missile range of vital targets. A relatively small fleet of these atomic powered submarines, each carrying

more than 10 ballistic missiles in its hold, and capable of firing them at distant targets while completely submerged, represents for this country the capability to retaliate, so quickly, and so inevitably, that the potential attacker has the certain knowledge that once his attack is launched, he will himself be destroyed.

Besides Polaris other comparatively invulnerable systems are now being developed, but to be effective they also must be mobile and concealable, or else they must be fired from bases so hardened as to be virtually indestructible.

However, I do not think we should go overboard, even on Polaris. Like all retaliatory weapons, it is one which paradoxically, if truly successful will never be used, and we should make every effort to tailor its number to an adequate minimum. Further, if you accept the premise that we must not overexpend in any one area of our military strength, then logically, funds devoted to Polaris should come from those allocated to the retaliatory forces—not from those so badly needed for other naval forces—as those in antisubmarine warfare, in amphibious employment, and in fleet air defense.

Despite all the military virtue one finds in the Polaris submarine system, I would not advocate having it as the only retaliatory system. A single system can be met with a single countermeasure, and although that countermeasure against Polaris is not now evident, in consideration of it we should have some variety in our retaliatory locker.

As to the third question: Do we need anything except the deterrent to general war.

The answer is an emphatic "yes." We need the forces to deter, or, if hostilities are forced upon us, to prosecute successfully limited or peripheral wars. The growing atomic parity makes all-out war increasingly unlikely. This means, not that the Communists will give up their imperialistic goal of world domination, but that they will seek other means to attain their ends. Wars of limited objectives will become increasingly more likely, efforts will be made to enslave free countries by subverted revolutionary uprisings from within and through limited offensives by puppet governments from without. Following this pattern was Greece in 1947, Korea in 1950, Vietnam in 1954, and this year we had our forces ashore in Lebanon to prevent such a move and we augmented the Seventh Fleet and forces ashore in the Taiwan area to counter the offensive against Quemoy. Unless we are equipped to deal promptly and effectively with such wars, we must choose between losing the free world a little at a time, or invoking the atomic holocaust.

It follows that all our armed services must maintain a strong limited war capability. But for a conflict to remain limited, there must be restraint in the selection of targets and in the size of weapons, and precision and discrimination in their delivery. These are qualities which the long-range rocket and the large nuclear weapon do not possess.

A limited war will not be fought in North America or necessarily in Russia. If limited war should be forced on a third country by an aggressor, to help that third country we must be prepared to exert power—limited and discriminating power—on the other side of some ocean. We must get that power there quickly and get it ashore quickly. We may have to keep it there, and keep it supplied, for protracted periods. To do this, we must have three capabilities. First, a capability to control the sea routes to the area of aggression, and any other sea routes along which we are threatened or harassed. Second, a capability to strike within the area of aggression,

precisely and with discrimination, using weapons appropriate to the scale of the war. Third, a capability to put forces ashore promptly in the objective area against whatever resistance there may be. In sum, naval forces, including their amphibious marines, can freely operate from international waters, to provide the spearhead and the shield to defeat limited aggression, and to do so without triggering unlimited catastrophe.

The forces for these purposes must be reasonably large to match the size of the enemy's forces and the extent of the oceans and their shorelines. Our forces must be in being and in a high state of readiness. We are not able to resort to megaton weapons to cover any quantitative weaknesses in this type of war.

The world situation which the popular writers like to describe as the balance of terror, the situation which Sir Winston Churchill dolefully calls the melancholy paradox, brings with it an increasing requirement for seapower.

Certainly seapower will play a vital role in any limited war. Upon reflection, to fight such a war without command of the sea on the part of the United States and its allies in the free world is unthinkable. And should the deterrent fail and general war ensue, the seas will give us the time and space factors we need for early warning and for defense in depth; as well as vast maneuver areas for dispersal and concealment of our striking forces. To me, one of the most telling arguments supporting the importance of command of the seas is the trouble and expense to which the Soviets have gone in their endeavor to be ready to take it away from us. Since World War II they have built a formidable surface and subsurface navy. Today they have more than a score of heavy and light cruisers, 140-odd destroyers and 450 submarines. Russia ranks today as the world's second largest seapower.

An essential ingredient of the Navy's limited war capability is the attack carrier and its complement of manned aircraft capable of applying precise striking power—precise as to degree and as to target. It is the most versatile single weapon system on the face of the earth. Its mobility permits it to reach most of the peripheral areas where limited aggression may threaten. There are many places in the world in which carriers, as mobile airbases in international waters, provide the only means of applying this precise airpower, and of doing it soon enough to keep the situation from getting out of control. The carrier force is a powerful instrument of national policy in a period of international tension, and a most effective stabilizer of cold war disturbances. Attack carriers are vital to the Navy's ability to control the seas, and hence to this Nation's ability to win a war of any kind—small, medium or large.

In summary: Over the long term, we must maintain an overall military force adequate to our security needs, and do it without wrecking our economy. The steadily increasing cost of weapons makes it mandatory that we make the most searching appraisal of what our military force should contain, to the end that it has enough of everything we do need, but not more than we need.

We must, of course, be ready to meet the ultimate threat—but not to the exclusion of being able to cope with lesser, more likely, threats. To this end all services must maintain a capability for limited wars, which although limited in area and in objectives, may not be small wars. Seapower—the ability to use the seas for our purposes and to prevent their use by the enemy—is vital to our security and an essential part of our overall military structure.

Wonders of the Universe: Safe Rocket for Young Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we need to develop promptly safe rocket and space equipment for the young people who are so deeply interested in outer space and flight problems.

Likewise our U.S. agencies and scientists should cooperate with our amateur and home-kit experimenters for the protection and the development of the legitimate interest of these part time and zealous pioneers on the rapidly widening space front at home.

To call attention to this need, I enclose an article that I believe to be a start or pointer in this direction of safety and adequate participation by the amateurs of all ages in the wonderful and exciting new space age:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Feb. 2, 1959]

WONDERS OF THE UNIVERSE: SAFE ROCKET FOR YOUNG SCIENTISTS (By Dr. I. M. Levitt)

Here's a tip for youngsters experimenting with homemade rockets.

In tinkering with explosive fuel mixtures you can avoid danger and also have an almost guaranteed successful series of flights by using a model rocket perfected by C. Harry Stine, a rocket expert who has spent most of his professional career at the White Sands Proving Grounds and with the Martin Co. in Denver.

To get first-hand experience with the Stine rocket, my son Peter and I spent an afternoon in a Philadelphia park launching the rocket many times to heights of hundreds of feet. Both of us had a wonderful time learning how well the rocket operates and planning further experiments.

OPERATES LIKE BIG BROTHER

The device is a small scale model of the Aerobee-Hi using a solid propellant of about a pound-second thrust. The model weighs but a few ounces but operates like its big brother on takeoff.

The thrust can carry it upward to 500 feet. Once it reaches this altitude the nose cone is blown off and out comes a thin plastic parachute carrying the outfit safely back to earth. Thus it can be used over and over again.

The rocket is completely safe. In talking to Stine at the annual meeting of the American Rocket Society in New York last November I learned there had been 10,000 models fired without a mishap.

An expert in full-scale rocketry, Stine developed the rocket knowing that countless youngsters in the United States, unable to get proper chemicals, were experimenting with dangerous materials—match heads, say. There has been a growing toll of injuries and even deaths from these experiments.

Stine's rockets give teenagers a motor unit with excellent thrust combined with the utmost in safety. But there is also another advantage.

The units can be combined to allow youngsters to learn at first hand the design requirements of multithrust rockets.

For instance, my son and I have designed a model of the Viking Rocket weighing con-

siderably more than the Aerobee-HI model. We plan to cluster four of the rocket motors together to power the model. Special wiring will be required and here we face the same problem professional rocket makers are confronted with in clustering Jupiter motors to achieve a thrust of 1½ million pounds.

Once the tiny motors ignite perfectly, Peter and I will watch our miniature Viking zip upward to a yet undetermined altitude. Yet the rocket will not be lost, because of the parachute device in the nose cone.

TEACHES ABSORBING SCIENCE

Parents should be grateful to engineers like Harry Stine who invest time and capital to work out the details for safe rockets.

While this rocket is a toy, in practice it teaches the teenager many facets of this most absorbing science.

He can, for example, use telescopes to find the height of the rocket and in so doing improve his knowledge of arithmetic and trigonometry. If he is a ham radio operator he can design a small transmitter to telemeter information to the launching site. He can exercise his ingenuity in designing various rocket shapes.

These are just several of the bonuses accruing from the use of Stine's toy.

Interested parents should get in touch with Mr. Stine at 1165 South Cherokee Street, Denver 23, Colo.

Forty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian independence proclamation, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my recent remarks to the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

The coming 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania on Monday, February 16, gives me this welcome opportunity to express my most sincere hopes for a renewal of that freedom that Lithuania experienced for the 22 years following 1918. Americans have not ceased to be horrified and angered by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic's forcible termination of Lithuanian independence in 1940, and will never recognize that attempt to subjugate a people who have historically demonstrated their love of freedom and their ability to flourish under a free system.

Yet, I know that the Soviet Union's blatant violation of the Law of Nations has not accomplished its purpose, in spite of the annexation of Lithuanian territory, for the Lithuanian peoples have demonstrated that they will not be enslaved in spirit. Their determined search for the support of the Western democracies, their continued listening to the Voice of America, and the very existence of your organization prove that in Lithuania are peoples of courage, fortitude, and devotion to belief in the dignity of man and the inherent value of free institutions.

Although the people of Lithuania in their own country are forbidden to celebrate the anniversary of the restoration, I join my fellow Americans in remembrance of that

day to wish for renewed Lithuanian freedom, to admire Lithuanian fortitude, and to praise the devoted work of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

Appreciation Dinner in Honor of Hon. William R. Williams, Former Member of House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the text of an address given by me February 10, 1959, at Oneida, N.Y., on the occasion of an appreciation dinner in honor of the long and devoted public service of the Honorable William R. Williams, formerly a Representative of this esteemed body, sponsored by his friends and associates of Madison County, N.Y.:

One hundred and fifty years will have passed on February 12, 1959 since Abraham Lincoln was born in a log cabin of backwoods Kentucky. There was little at the time to suggest that the event was of any great significance, even in Hardin County where it happened. There wasn't one, excepting possibly the courageous, saintly mother, who dreamed that life had been breathed into a soul that, in the short span of 56 years, would experience the heartaches of poverty, abuse, and disappointment, and yet the glory of high responsibilities, inspired leadership and supreme martyrdom. Yes, no great American ever was ushered into this world with so little promise—yet the story of his life is really the story of our country—an expression of all that is basic and true in our way of life. It is fitting, therefore, that all America pause on this special anniversary to glimpse once again the nobility of the man and the eternal wisdom of his philosophy. While the noble Lincoln made richer the heritage of all Americans, to those of us who continue the Republican Party which he founded, he passed on a torch of dedicated leadership. It does us a great honor but imposes upon us a heavy responsibility. Our task would be performed, our obligation fully met if we were to apply to the problems of this day, the simple honesty, the tolerant understanding and quiet courage of our great founder. He dared to do what he believed to be right—sometimes he felt only God approved what he was doing, and in his darkest hours maybe he wasn't so sure he had that approval, but he held fast against all the forces which would divide and destroy our country. It would confer a great blessing upon us all if we could relive the struggle of his 56 years so that we might more fully understand his sense of values, so that we might more readily appreciate the dangers of which he warned and so that we might rededicate ourselves to the task which is ahead. The party of Lincoln can and must remain faithful to its trust, worthy of its founder.

There is a symbolic adherence to that trust in the life and service of the great Republican we especially honor tonight, our own Bill Williams. Approximately 75 years ago this rugged stalwart breathed first the in-

vigorating air of Madison County. There was little in his early days to suggest the distinguished service which he was to render. He says he was so busy chasing Indians and panthers that he didn't have time for extensive schooling, but the truth is—Bill has attended school all his life—observing, thinking, and applying his commonsense to each situation as it arose. I'm reminded of what Robert Burns, the Scotch poet, so well said—"Give me a spark of nature's fire—it's all the learning I require." Surely Bill Williams had that spark which he kindled into a flame by hard work, rugged honesty and hearty friendliness. Speaking as I am to those who have followed his career, marked by over 25 years of public service as a State legislator, as sheriff and a Congressman, I need not remind you that he never lost an election, nor did he ever lose his head. Popularity and good fortune never gave him any false notions of grandeur—he remained jovial and approachable. He sensed that with added responsibilities came opportunities for greater service which he was proud and glad to render. Years of working for the people have brought countless friendships. During the past campaign, I had the privilege of seeing and hearing the expressions of those friendships. I will retain in my memory always that striding form, the friendly, lively countenance, the campaign hat which looked as though its wearer was going backward as he strode along the street, in and out of buildings, retracing campaign trails of former years, proud and happy that he was so enthusiastically remembered. I said then and I repeat it now—Bill Williams was reaping and enjoying the greatest reward of public service, the devoted appreciation of those whom you've tried to serve.

During the past few weeks I have been privileged to be with many of Bill's old friends in the Congress and, to a man, these former colleagues have spoken earnestly of his friendliness and dependability as he worked with them for sound Republican principles. He was a man of his word and applied common sense to the solution of many different problems. His unfailing good humor carried him through many a trying situation. It may interest you to hear the very words used by his colleague in describing their impressions of his character and services as set forth in letters I've just received.

(At this time communications from the Honorable CHARLES A. HALECK, the Honorable HAROLD OSTERTAG, the Honorable JOHN TABER, the Honorable CHARLES HOEVEN, and the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, were read and presented to Mr. Williams.)

There is still another chapter. When personal considerations dictated withdrawal from his Washington duties, all of us hoped he would remain an active force in our party and that he would continue his close associations on the local scene. The sad death of Oneida County's Republican chairman necessitated choice of a new leader and Bill became the unanimous choice for this very important job. With vigor and a sincere purpose he is on the way to new achievements.

So it is that Bill Williams has brought honor and distinction to his party. As Republicans and as Americans we are proud that the tradition of Lincoln has been so faithfully followed by him whom we honor. However, he would not want this event to be simply an occasion of praise. We will do him far greater honor if we accept his contribution as a strong and enduring link in the great chain of dedicated service which began with our great Lincoln and which we must continue so that this country may remain strong, united, and free.

Wabash River Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from my home in the Sixth District of Indiana, Terre Haute, where I surveyed the tragic amount of sheer waste and devastation caused by the rampaging floodwaters of the Wabash River.

The need for remedial flood-control construction in this area, Mr. Speaker, is desperately urgent. The annual human, agricultural, and property damage resulting from Wabash River floodings is incredible.

In the small town of Clinton, Ind., with a population slightly in excess of 5,000, where I witnessed that city's heroic flood-control efforts, the Wabash was being fought with 8,000 sandbags purchased by the local citizenry for 14 cents apiece. Those sandbags were not purchased this year, Mr. Speaker; they were bought several years ago, during a previous flood, and when the danger was past were emptied and stored so that they could be used again, when the Wabash River would inevitably threaten the area's people and their homes.

West Terre Haute has been flooded out 3 years running. Flood crestings are so frequent and so severe that Terre Haute no longer records flood levels at the 14-foot mark; the 20-foot level is now the only recorded level.

These few further word pictures, Mr. Speaker, can but only begin to describe the extent of the flood's devastation or to dramatize the urgent need for flood control planning and construction along the Wabash River. In Terre Haute, 80,000 sandbags have been used in an attempt to control the floodwaters, and the people of Terre Haute are still filling and using sandbags. In Attica, Ind., some 20 homes have been submerged. State Road 41, which is a national highway, is being swept by a 20-foot current. People in Williamsport, Ind., who travel but a mile and a half to 2 miles to work in Attica, are now being transported by helicopter, and should they be forced to drive, they would have to travel approximately 45 miles. People returning home from their working day find themselves looking for a place to sleep. The farmers of the area are currently uninterested in the question of price supports; they are more interested in looking for a piece of land to farm.

A copy of a telegram to the President, which I received this morning, I think graphically portrays the plight of the people along the Wabash. From Carra-Jean Baldwin, chairman, Parke County, Ind., chapter, and director of the Wabash Valley Association, the wire reads: The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.:

We are experiencing the third flood in this territory in 5 weeks. After devastating damage of 1957 and 1958, our farmers

cannot endure or gamble on planting 1959 crops without some assurance conditions will be corrected as soon as possible. All of this tragedy could have been averted with proper flood control in Wabash Valley. Implementation of funds for approved Mississinewa, Salomonie, and Huntington flood-control reservoirs with funds to expedite surveys and reports on Sugar Creek, Wildcat Creek, and Big Pine Creek would cost taxpayers millions less than flood damage costs year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House will fully appreciate the seriousness of the damaging flood conditions in the Wabash River area, and will lend their support to the efforts which I, and I feel sure, the other Members of the Indiana delegation, intend to make toward securing the appropriations necessary to start and hopefully complete flood-control construction along the Wabash River.

The Revere Journal—On Its 78th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech would mean little without freedom of the press. Even today, newspapers are the best medium for gathering factual reports about people and events; communicating this information to thousands of people; and pointing up important issues of the day with clear and concise editorials. The more we learn about censorship in other countries, the more we appreciate our independent and responsible press.

Outstanding among the hometown weeklies that have survived the competition and have prospered because of a loyal and appreciative reader following, is the Revere Journal, of Revere, Mass. It is a distinguished member of the American Press Half-Century Club.

In recognition of this sturdy weekly, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the Journal's editorial of February 5, 1959, entitled "78 Years Old Today":

SEVENTY-EIGHT YEARS OLD TODAY

The Revere Journal is 78 years old today. For more than three-quarters of a century, since February 5, 1881, this newspaper has served the residents and the community by presenting all the local news of interest, as well as offering advertising space to those with something to sell the public. And it has been proved through the years that both of these functions were of equal importance, for one could not exist without the other and still have the newspaper remain free and not subsidized by the Government or other interests.

The Revere Journal is proud of the part it has played in the growth of the city. It is proud of its effort to record current events, not only to enlighten the public at that moment but for history. And it is with a sense of accomplishment that the publisher and his staff can thumb through the back issues and trace the growth of this community from a section of another city to its present

independent status as a city today. And there is evidence of the Revere Journal's growth as it adjusted to meet the demands of the growing community.

But the pages of the present and of history are not closed. There is no doubt that Revere still has many unused potentials, more than most cities and towns in the area. It is expected that these potentials, coupled with the enterprise of the residents, will boost Revere still further both in size and prosperity. And the Revere Journal, on its 78th birthday, stands ready to do all it can to continue this progress by constantly examining its role in the community and making every effort to render the best possible service to both its readers and its advertisers.

Tribute to the Late Major General William J. Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, a great American, a dedicated citizen-soldier who had served his country well, was laid to rest with his comrades in arms at Arlington National Cemetery. I served under Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan during World War II, and I have the highest regard for what he accomplished for his country both in private and in public life.

He well deserved the tribute paid to him by so many hundreds of his friends at his last rites. He can go to his final reward well pleased with the accomplishment of a life's work.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Record a tribute paid by another soldier who served under General Donovan, Maj. Max Corvo, now editor of the Middletown Bulletin in my State:

Few in their lifetime are given the opportunity to serve their country in the manner that William J. Donovan served this Nation in a lifespan that inspired two generations and carved out a solid niche in the history of America.

Born in humble circumstances he worked his way through school and eventually earned a reputation as an outstanding lawyer; thrown into the maelstrom of battle during World War I he led the Fighting 69th to immortal glory and won for himself this Nation's three highest decorations for valor; called by five Presidents of this Nation to serve in various important capacities, he acquitted himself with distinction in each one of the tasks that he undertook; called by President Roosevelt at the inception of World War II to martial this Nation's intelligence forces he won fame as the head of the Office of Strategic Services, a huge collection of devil-may-care officers and men dedicated to advancing the cause of the Nation; appointed U.S. Ambassador to Thailand by President Eisenhower at a time when the Nation was being enfeebled by internal and external Communist pressures, he paved the way for the return of southeast Asia into the orbit of freedom.

This was William J. Donovan. A man born in humble circumstances who had achieved the pinnacle of success but who

had learned to walk with humility in his daily contacts with the world.

Always in the forefront when danger was ever present he asked of none that which he himself was not willing to do.

His passing from the mortal scene leaves a great void in a never-ending circle of friends but indelibly inscribed a page in the history of individual achievement and service dedicated to an enduring cause—the cause of freedom.

Lincoln Alone Saw Our Struggle as World's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, much has been written on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the birth of the great American President, Abraham Lincoln. One of the most interesting articles that I have read was written expressly for the Associated Press by the noted American historian and Pulitzer Prize winner, Allan Nevins. He quotes an Emancipation Proclamation editorial from one of the most eminent and well respected newspapers of that era, the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, which is still published as a Sunday newspaper in my home city.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have Professor Nevins' article, taken from the Springfield Union, printed with my remarks:

**LINCOLN ALONE SAW OUR STRUGGLE AS
WORLD'S—HISTORIAN NEVINS PAYS TRIBUTE
TO HIS GREATEST QUALITIES: SAGACITY, MAG-
NANIMITY, UNERRING FAITH, AND VISION**
(By Allan Nevins)

It is 150 years since Abraham Lincoln opened his eyes in a one-windowed, dirt-floored cabin near Hodgeville, Ky.; it is almost 94 years since Stanton broke the hush at his deathbed with words, "Now he belongs to the ages."

No statesman ever grew more sturdily than Lincoln grew between 1854 and 1865: grew from a prairie politician to be the beneficent dictator of a great Nation in its most terrible crisis.

No leader of modern times has grown more steadily in fame and worldwide influence since his death.

He is like the mountain peak that at near view seemed little more than equal with its fellows, but that as we recede and gain perspective rises higher and higher above their level.

The romance of his life furnishes part of his appeal. "This man," wrote his Springfield law partner Herndon, "this long, bony, wiry, sad man, floated into our country in 1831 in a frail canoe, down the north fork of the Sangamon River, friendless, penniless, powerless, and alone—ragged, struggling for the common necessities of life. This man, this peculiar man, left us in 1861, the President of the United States, backed by friends, power, fame, and all human force."

The self-taught rallsplitter reached Washington relatively unknown and untested. He died so trusted that the once-skeptical New York diarist, G. T. Strong wrote: "No prince, no leader of a people, was ever so lamented . . . his name is faithful and

true. He will stand in history beside Washington, perhaps higher."

What is the deeper secret of the hold this son of the prairies had taken on the imagination of the world? More books, foreign and domestic, are written on him than on any other civil ruler of the past.

His statue stands in many cities; his writings are in all collections of the classics of the English tongue; his sayings are alike the treasure of the humbler and the inspiration of the great.

The Hindu student, the South African Negro, the British statesman, the Latin American publicist, find his name what Lord Charnwood called it, "the greatest among those associated with the cause of popular government." He belongs equally to the masters of statecraft and to plain men and women. Just why is this so?

HE ACTUALLY OPPOSED ABRUPT EMANCIPATION

We would look in vain for the explanation merely in his principal public acts.

He was the great emancipator, but he was a reluctant emancipator, who for all his intense desire to free the slaves would have preferred gradual compensated emancipation to an abrupt liberation.

He was an unmatched war leader, but never a highly efficient administrator; two other wartime Presidents, Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, showed more skill in organizing the energies of the Nation.

He was a farsighted national chieftain, but never an astute planner with the many-sided talents of a Theodore Roosevelt.

We reach a partial understanding of his grip on succeeding generations when we turn from his acts to examine two underlying traits, his sagacity and his magnanimity.

The sagacity with which he was always correctly credited did not lie in a simple grasp of what was expedient. It lay in his ability to pierce to the heart of a complex problem, where right and wrong seem inextricably mingled, with unerring logic.

The supreme illustration of this wisdom is offered by his proposal for meeting the terrible national disease of slavery and sectional friction.

From 1854 onward he preached that the Nation could not endure half slave and half free; that a crisis must be reached and passed before it could be safe.

He was our first statesman to define that crisis without evasion.

What did passing the crisis mean? Not a decision to abolish slavery immediately. No, simply a decision to put bounds around slavery, to contain it, accepting the principle that within a reasonable time it must be gradually erased; and meanwhile to sit down and calmly consider ways and reasons for erasing it.

This was the one courageous, morally sound, and practical remedy ever proposed for the difficulties of racial readjustment, economic revolution, and regional strife bound up in slavery.

Its sagacity, had Americans adopted it, would have saved the country a million lives, a mountain of treasure, and a grievous retardation of growth.

His magnanimity, innate and unfeeling, matched his sagacity.

In the course of a long, bitter war he never once uttered an abusive word about the southern people.

Throughout that war he maintained his hope that it should end in no mere political reunion, but a reunion of hearts and purposes.

A young Frenchman, the Marquis de Chambrun, who was sometimes at the White House in 1865, tells us that whenever Lincoln heard men talk about putting the conquered South under iron controls, he exhibited an unconcealable "fatigue and weariness."

In the last weeks of the war, when the foe was plainly vanquished, he proposed to his

Cabinet a plan for giving the South, if it stopped fighting at once, a general amnesty, a release of all confiscated property, and a grant of \$400 million toward regaining its feet.

When he heard from Grant at the time of Lee's surrender that Union troops might capture Jefferson Davis, a radical northerner exclaimed, "He must be hanged." But Lincoln replied with a free quotation from the Bible: "Judge not, that we be not judged."

HE KNEW STRENGTH OF THE PLAIN PEOPLE

Lincoln's greatest qualities, however, lay deeper than sagacity and magnanimity. One was his passionate faith in the virtue and strength of the plain people.

God must have loved them, he said, or He would never have made so many of them; you could never fool all of the people all of the time; government of, by, and for the people was not only the best government, but the hope of the world.

As an expounder of democracy he had the same fervent faith as a poet he loved, Robert Burns.

Out of his passionate regard for common folk came his unerring instinct for popular sentiment; he knew just how far and fast he could go in leading the country without losing touch with the majority. Out of it came his consistent refusal to talk down to the people or appeal to their passions. As Lowell said, he never played the clown, the demagogue.

Instead, he presented the people with careful arguments, addressed to their reason and their best sentiments. "I beg of you a calm and enlarged consideration of them," he said of one set of reasons.

This instinct for the popular heart made his most memorable public act, the Emancipation Proclamation, seem to good judges just right. The Springfield Republican said:

"The President's action is timely—neither too soon nor too late. It is thorough—neither defeating itself by halfway measures nor by passionate excess. It is just and magnanimous, doing no wrong to any loyal man, and offering no exasperation to the disloyal. It will be sustained by the great mass of the loyal people, North and South; and thus, by the courage and prudence of the President, the greatest social and political revolution of the age will be triumphantly carried through in the midst of a civil war."

SAW IT AS STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

And out of his deep feeling for popular government was born Lincoln's crowning quality: his vision of the larger meaning of the grim struggle he had to conduct. It mine whether the Union should survive or perish.

It was an ordeal to determine whether democracy had sufficient strength to survive, whether America would repay the devotion of the hosts who died for it by seeking a new birth of freedom, and whether the Republic would serve the future of mankind.

From the Bible, from Shakespeare, from long reflection, Lincoln had gained an understanding of the meaning of history.

He knew that whatever is done in one part of the globe affects the lot of peoples in other parts.

He knew that the adventure of mankind has but begun, and that the course chosen by a continental power like the United States must have its influence on the long ages to come.

This conviction, expressed with his memorable eloquence, gave the struggle a spiritual significance, and made victory for union and freedom seem the opening of gates on a better world.

Five years after the Gettysburg Address, the British Parliament passed its new reform bill, partly because American democracy had vindicated itself.

Seven years after the address, France erected the Third Republic, partly because the

American Republic had survived its ordeal. These facts gave new significance to the letter to J. C. Conkling in which Lincoln had expressed the Nation's gratitude to the men who died for their ideals on all the fields—Shiloh, Antietam, Chancellorsville, Vicksburg.

"Thanks to all," he had written, "for the great Republic—for the principle it lives by and keeps alive—for man's vast future—thanks to all."

The truest tribute the American people can pay Lincoln on every celebration of his birthday is to try to share his earnest conviction that the Republic has a great world destiny; that in every crisis men must do their duty not for the country alone but for all countries, and not for the hour only, but for the long generations ahead.

The 41st Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and privilege, yesterday, to participate in exercises, commemorating the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which were held in Our Lady of Vilna Church Hall, Worcester, Mass.

The meeting and ceremonies were sponsored by the Committee for Commemoration of Lithuania's Independence, Joseph W. Glavickas, president; Olga A. Kersis, secretary. The assemblage, which overran the capacity of the hall, consisted of the members of the two great local Lithuanian parishes of St. Casimir's, and Our Lady of Vilna, together with representatives from 55 other Lithuanian groups within our community.

In connection with this eventful occasion I have been requested to include in the RECORD resolutions unanimously adopted by the assembly, and speeches delivered by myself and Anthony J. Miller, a prominent Worcester attorney of Lithuanian descent; the resolutions and speeches follow:

THE 41ST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, WORCESTER, MASS.

(Speech Delivered by the Honorable HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts)

I am very glad, as your Representative in the Federal Congress, to again take part in these ceremonies commemorating another anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

While this occasion necessarily and sorrowfully reminds us that Lithuania is still suffering under the cruel heel of Russian Communist imperialism, we are not gathered here in any atmosphere of casual surrender or regretful abandonment of the hope that Lithuania and her good people will eventually be freed.

We are, rather, assembled to voice our righteous protest of outrageous Communist conduct, and exert our best efforts to give heart to the courageous and long-suffering Lithuanian people for the continuation of their struggle against enslavement. Our confidence for the future of Lithuania is

based in great part upon our knowledge of her past history.

You know, and I know, that at one time, and for a number of centuries, the Lithuanian kingdom was a powerful force for good in the whole of eastern Europe. The Lithuanians not only had succeeded in repelling the barbarian invaders from the East, but they were also the gallant champions, and formed the advance guard of Christianity in that part of Europe. A high place of respect and admiration for Lithuania among the nations of the world seemed to be assured.

The Lithuanian state came into being as an independent unit in the year 1253, more than 700 years ago. I do not have to recount to you her glorious history through the following centuries up to the tragic time, late in the 18th century, when she was ruthlessly absorbed into the old Russian Empire.

However, when World War I ended, Lithuania regained her independence and succeeded in reestablishing an individual national state, and proclaimed themselves as such on February 16, 1918, after 123 years of Russian domination.

During the long period of subjugation, the devout and dedicated people of Lithuania had persevered in their resistance to tyranny and faithfully preserved the heritage of faith and freedom.

It does not surprise us then that modern history shows that following that fateful February day in 1918 there was an immediate resurgence of national culture and a prompt expansion of her free institutions.

The Lithuanian people established a democratic form of government. Under it they prospered, economically, socially, and religiously.

Suddenly, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union violated all of its treaty commitments with Lithuania, and the Red army moved in. Without provocation or justification, and in utter contempt of international law and morality, the Communist Kremlin overran Lithuania, and the other independent Baltic countries, and installed regimes deliberately designed to destroy the newborn freedoms of all the peoples within those brave states.

Since that time, Soviet Russia has purposely used the whole force of its overpowering totalitarian might to exterminate the Lithuanian sense of nationhood. The Soviet system has been imposed and Lithuania has actually been incorporated in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Thousands of Lithuanians have been executed and hundreds of thousands have been shipped to slavery in Siberia.

Every conceivable barbarian effort has been made to suffocate the patriotic independent sentiment of the Lithuanian people.

Today our hearts and our minds are moved with compassion by the suffering and the persecution we know the good people of Lithuania are undergoing this very hour. At the same time, our minds and our hearts are inspired by them and for them because we also know they have bravely and gloriously survived and conquered other and earlier periods of cruel foreign tyranny.

The people of Lithuania are neither broken nor discouraged by the stark and terrible realities of oppression under which they now, unfortunately, live. The burning fever of basic liberty and freedom is heightened within them, not diminished, by their current adversity.

We know that their courage and their indomitable will to resist subjugation grows stronger with every outrage committed against them by those who seek to become the atheistic masters of their spirits as well as their bodies.

We in America take courage from the valor of the Lithuanian people. They are sustaining us by their example of devotion to our common cause.

They inspire us here, and her countless friends throughout the still free world, to remain true in our struggle to relieve Lithuania, and the other oppressed nations, from the Communist yoke.

We will continue the struggle with every resource at our command to overcome the godless scourge which is trying to enslave the whole world and which presently has unfortunate and gallant Lithuania within its horrible grasp.

Today we specially remind ourselves that no people anywhere have been more heroic nor fought more bravely against countless odds for liberty and freedom than the Lithuanian people. We are reminded that the destiny of Lithuania and her freedom-loving neighbors is linked with the future of America. We cannot ourselves expect to remain free if we do not exert every possible effort to promote the freedom of Lithuania.

Let us then here pledge ourselves to work unceasingly for the liberation of Lithuania and the other captive nations, and may divine providence grant that that glorious and Christian objective be accomplished in the near future.

FORTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, WORCESTER, MASS.

(Speech delivered by Attorney Anthony J. Miller)

As an American of Lithuanian descent, it is an honor for me to join with Congressman DONOHUE in this program commemorating the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

I want to emphasize the word "independence" because, to my mind, and I am sure to yours, independence is not a matter to be dwelt upon or spoken about on only 1 day a year.

The history and tradition of Lithuanian independence is a living thing and a blessed thing within us and among us, except when we give sorrowful thought to our Lithuanian homeland and her unfortunate people.

On this occasion, we are reminded that the Russian Communists cannot stop or forbid this program, or any other similar exercises that are being held throughout the United States and in other free countries in honor and in respect to Lithuania.

Appreciating our own blessings as citizens of the United States, we should, therefore, not permit a day to pass without thinking and planning and praying for the time when our native land will be liberated from Communist tyranny.

As Americans, we know that the generous heart of this country has always welcomed and assisted exiles and refugees.

Because this Nation fought for its own independence, it encourages independence for others.

Because we, as Lithuanian descendants, have advanced in the United States, and because we have a part in the development of this country, we are thereby helping to sustain the strength of the Lithuanian homeland. I think that is a substantial hope and comfort to our friends and relatives there. They know that we have a voice, as good Americans, in the formation of American foreign policy so that it will never be permitted, by any possible subversives, to forget its moral obligation to work for the freedom of Lithuania and the other suppressed nations.

Some of our people appear to be worried about the development of American foreign policy. They feel that we may gradually forget Lithuania and the other Baltic victims of Red Russian conquests. They fear that we may be tempted to make a settlement with the Communists and that we may be fooled by an invitation to peacefully coexist.

Let me clearly state to you my opinion that so long as we have representatives like

Mr. Donohue, and other fine Americans in our Government, neither the Congress nor the executive department will ever be fooled into such a betrayal. No diplomatic arrangement, no matter how convenient for the moment, would be tolerated by the American people whose traditional rule of life and conduct is fair play.

If we, ourselves, ever entertained such a thought, we then would be betraying the traditions that have inspired every generation of Americans and we would be faithless to the historic devotion to freedom that has made America what it is today.

We, and all our fellow Americans, realize we have had sufficient experience with Communist promises, pledges, and treaties, to know that we can trust them only at our own peril.

We remember very well the peace treaty that was signed by Lithuania and Russia at Moscow on July 12, 1920. By this treaty, the Soviet Government recognized, and I quote, "the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory," end of the quote. On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations, becoming a full, free, and equal member of the international community. These are historical facts which the Russian Communists cannot change because they cannot burn or distort all of the history books in existence. Although they have since unjustly seized Lithuania and have done everything within their cruel power to communalize it, they cannot justify their action in front of the conscience of the world.

Every other still free nation, including our own, knows that we will suffer the same tragic fate of Lithuania if we allow ourselves to be compromised or become so foolish as to place any reliance upon mere Soviet promises. We, as good Americans, also know that if we do not stand up and testify for our friends, we may some day find ourselves alone and without friends.

That is why all our fellow Americans join with us in working for the liberation of Lithuania and all of the other unfortunate nations that have come under Communist Russian subjugation.

That is why we must unceasingly strive with our own united words and actions, and commemorations of this kind, to keep the historic spirit of liberty and freedom burning high within the minds and hearts of the people of our Lithuania homeland.

That is why we can hope, even on this sorrowful occasion, that with our help, the help of our fellow Americans, and with God's help, to live to see the bright day when the persecuted people of Lithuania, and the other suffering nations, will again be free and independent in a peaceful world.

Having assembled at Our Lady of Vilna Parish Hall, Worcester, Mass., on February 15, 1959, to commemorate the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day (February 16, 1918), the members of the committee, as well as the members of the two Lithuanian parishes in Worcester, St. Casimir's and Our Lady of Vilna, and of the Lithuanian-American community of Worcester, comprising in all 55 Lithuanian groups, unanimously adopted and passed the following resolutions:

"Whereas the Government of the United States has ever been a staunch defender of the inalienable right that all nations, both large and small, have to enjoy freedom and to determine for themselves the form of government under which they wish to live; and

"Whereas Soviet Russia has denied this right to Lithuania and, in violation of the

treaties of peace and nonaggression, with Lithuania in particular, and of various international agreements in general, has unjustly seized the territory of Lithuania and has subjected her people to the horrors of oppression, terrorization, dispossession, persecution, mass deportations and mass annihilations which, according to international law, constitutes the heinous crime of genocide; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a small freedom-loving nation, ardently desires to exercise her solemn right of self-government and has proven that she is capable of self-rule by a remarkable progress made in all fields of endeavor during the years in which she enjoyed independence (1253-1795 and particularly 1918-39); and

"Whereas, the Government of the United States since 1940 has steadfastly refused to recognize de jure the unjust absorption of Lithuania within the Soviet orbit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States continue to maintain and adhere to its present policy of recognizing the de jure independence of Lithuania despite her present unlawful and unprincipled occupation by Soviet Russia; be it further

Resolved, That Soviet Russia, having no sovereign rights over Lithuania or her territory, be forced to leave Lithuania immediately, thus restoring freedom to the nation, and to return at once to Lithuania all Lithuanian nationals, now exiled in Siberia and other foreign lands; be it further

Resolved, That the Republic of Lithuania be duly admitted and fully approved as a full-fledged member of the United Nations and that her appointed representatives be allowed to maintain with full privileges the status of duly-elected delegates of that Organization; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Jr.; to the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable John F. Kennedy and the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall; to the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable Harold D. Donohue, and to the press."

Mr. JOSEPH W. GLAVICKAS,
Chairman.

WORCESTER, MASS.
MISS OLGA O. KERSIS,
Secretary.

WORCESTER, MASS.

Gordon E. Dunn of the Miami Hurricane Forecast Center—Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is always pleasant to note recognition given to an outstanding public servant. Mr. Gordon E. Dunn, Weather Bureau meteorologist in charge of the Miami Hurricane Forecast Center, today received a Department of Commerce Gold Medal Citation for his outstanding contributions to the public service in the field of hurricane warnings.

We in the community have for some time considered his ability and experience in this field of great value to the areas served by the Miami center and are particularly pleased to see that the agency of which he is a part has presented to him this award.

The Germination of Religious Acknowledgments in Political Documents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and in connection with the introduction of a resolution proposing a Christian amendment to the United States Constitution, I hereby insert the fourth in a series of 13 radio programs delivered by Dr. R. J. G. McKnight delivered on the Christian Amendment Hour, entitled "The Termination of Religious Acknowledgments in Political Documents." Dr. McKnight, Pittsburgh, Pa., is a great student of history, philosophy and the Bible. A complete set of the 13 radio addresses can be secured by writing to the Christian Amendment Movement, Box 92, Pittsburgh, Pa. The address follows:

At the close of our last broadcast we quoted a statement made by Justice Story in his "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States." This is the quotation: "Every American colony, from its foundation down to the Revolution, did openly, by the whole course of its institutions, support and sustain, in some form, the Christian religion."

The evidence for this statement is abundant and available. It abounds in all the charters granted by kings of England from James I to George II. In every one of these charters: the charter of Virginia (April 10, 1606) granted by James I; the charters of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts Bay, Maryland, Connecticut, Carolina, Rhode Island, Georgia, and the colonial compacts of government.

The sentiment of all these charters may be summarized and exhibited in the oath taken by John Haynes who was elected Governor of Connecticut in 1639. This is the oath taken by Governor Haynes: "I, John Haynes, being now chosen to be Governor within this jurisdiction . . . do swear by the great and dreadful name of the ever-living God, to promote the public good and peace of the same according to the best of my skill . . . and will further the execution of justice according to the rule of God's word. So help me God, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Compare this oath, framed in the days of the colonies, with the feeble constitutional oath: "I do solemnly swear—solemnly (not in a religious sense)—that I will faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States," etc. No recognition of God by Whom men are commanded to swear; not even, "So help me God."

This oath of John Haynes has been quoted to show that the dominant sentiment of all the charters, colonial compacts, and civil documents of the pre-Revolution days was Christian—that in all of them God, Christ, and the Bible were recognized.

All of this continued "from the foundation of every colony down to the Revolution," as Justice Story says ("Down to the Revolution"). Justice Story's keen legal mind, in writing of the history of our Constitution, discerned the turning point.

Times passes on, May 17, 1776, was kept as "a day of humiliation, fasting and prayer, by appointment of the Continental Congress, that they, with the colonies, might confess and bewail sin, and by a sincere repentance and amendment of life, appease God's righteous displeasure, and through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, obtain His pardon and forgiveness."

On July 2, 1776, a resolution was passed dissolving all political connections with Great Britain. Then on July 4, 1776, was adopted that immortal instrument, in which, while asserting the Nation's independence of oppressive human authority, the Continental Congress acknowledged their own and the Nation's dependence on God, closing with these words: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

On October 31, 1777, a committee was appointed by Congress to prepare a recommendation to the States to set apart a Day of Thanksgiving for their signal success. On December 18, 1777, the Thanksgiving Day was observed. The closing words of that Thanksgiving Proclamation are as follows: "That the people may join in the penitent confession of their manifold sins, whereby they had forfeited every favor, and their humble and earnest supplication that it may please God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, mercifully to forgive and blot them out of remembrance * * * that it may please God to take schools and seminaries of education * * * under His nurturing hand and to prosper the means of religion for the promotion and enlargement of that Kingdom which consisteth in righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Time passes on. In September, 1783, the Definitive Treaty of Peace between Great Britain and the United States was drawn up and signed by representatives of both nations in Paris on September 3, 1783.

The Revolutionary War, with all its horrors and bloodshed was over. The United States of America was recognized by Great Britain as a free and independent sovereign nation. By December 1783, the British troops evacuated New York City, the Continental Army was dissolved, George Washington gave a farewell message, and there was peace.

You will remember that Justice Story said: "Down to the Revolution" every American Colony did openly, by the whole course of its institutions, support and sustain the Christian religion." The 6 years that followed were years of confusion and chaos in Government.

J. Fiske says in his book "Critical Period of American History" (p. 55): "It is not too much to say that the period of 5 years following the peace of 1783 was the most critical in all the history of the American people." Trade and industry declined to the lowest point. As we read the history of these 5 years, there were arguments, debates on matters concerning human rights, lines of territory, taxes, and a thousand other material problems. But in all this history you find no single line acknowledging the need for dependence upon Almighty God, no prayer for divine guidance.

The religious fervor of the early Colonists had evaporated. The confessed need, expressed in the Colonial Compacts, for pardon of sins and for reconciliation with God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, was entirely absent.

As H. C. Lodge says "Life and Letters of George Cabot": "Thomas Jefferson, arrived in

New York from France, filled with the wild democratic theories which his susceptible nature had readily imbibed in France (and) soon infused them into the minds of most of his followers."

It was at this point in history that "We the people" assumed the task of writing the Constitution of the United States. It was at this point that we the people of the United States undertook the colossal task of writing the Constitution of the United States which was to govern our people for generations to come without any recognition of the sovereign God who created all nations.

Murray-Metcalf Bill Strengthens Local and State Control Over Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 4, 1959, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] introduced into the House of Representatives a bill to provide money for educational purposes termed free from any Federal controls. The gentleman from Washington stated:

Therefore, I am introducing a no-strings-attached alternative bill to pay back some of their own money to the respective States and Hawaii for educational purposes free from any Federal controls. My bill would authorize an appropriation equal to 2 percent of all Federal income taxes collected in each State and Hawaii for education in the common or public schools. That is all. No standards or specifications of any sort are stipulated.

In introducing his bill, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] clearly recognizes that there is need for the Federal Government to take action in assisting local and State authorities in the financial support of schools. He said:

If some of our local school districts' financial affairs are critical, and I am convinced such is the case, let us give the local and State authorities help but refrain from dictating how they must solve their problems.

By some twist of the imagination the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] asserted in his speech that the Murray-Metcalf bill—H.R. 22—sets forth limitations and definitions of the State educational program that would make it unnecessary for State and local education agencies "to abdicate jurisdiction over educational process." Such a contention is incorrect. There is nothing in the Murray-Metcalf bill that would require even in the slightest any abdication of State and local jurisdiction over the educational process. On the contrary, the Murray-Metcalf bill was drawn up in such a way as to specifically strengthen the local and State control over education in this Nation.

In an attempt to document his contention that the Murray-Metcalf bill sets forth limitations on the States' education programs, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] cited section 4, subsection (b), of the bill, which he says

"spells out specifically that this money shall be used for school construction and teachers' salaries." It is impossible to see how anyone could consider that the Congress, through providing money to the States to be used for either school construction or teachers' salaries, could be accused of setting forth limitations on the States' education programs. Such a contention is somewhat analogous to the story of the father of a 12-year-old newspaper boy who was earning some of his own spending money. The father gave the boy \$20 to buy shoes and clothing that the boy needed badly. It would be absurd to argue that in giving the boy money to be used for these two purposes, the father was limiting his son's discretion over how he would spend his earnings from his paper route.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] stated that section 5 of the Murray-Metcalf bill, "by inference sets forth priorities for school buildings, removing from the State the latitude of determining its own needs." Actually, all section 5 of the bill does is say that the State education agency shall certify that the portion of its Murray-Metcalf funds that are allocated within the State for school construction shall be so distributed that "priority is given to school districts which have the greatest additional need for school facilities and which, in terms of the economic resources available to them are least able to finance the cost of need school facilities." This provision of the bill leaves the priorities that are to be developed wholly up to the State. The U.S. Commissioner of Education does not have the authority to say whether or not the priorities that the States set up are adequate or inadequate; he has neither the power to approve or to disapprove the States' priority methods. Hence, the gentleman's contention that these priorities would remove from the States the latitude of determining their own needs is completely false. Again, this is somewhat analogous to the case of the father of the 12-year-old newspaper boy giving his son the \$20 bill with which to buy needed clothing and saying:

Son, first sit down and draw up a list of the clothes you need and with this money buy the items you need most.

Such a specification by the father certainly could not be considered as removing from the son the latitude of determining his own clothing needs.

All the Murray-Metcalf bill does in section 5 is to say to the States that if they use for school construction some of the money provided under this bill, they must agree to send the money to those school districts that need it the most. Certainly such a specification could not be considered as causing the States "to abdicate local and State jurisdiction over educational process."

In his speech, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] stated:

If some of our local school districts' financial affairs are critical, and I am convinced such is the case, let us give the local and State authorities help.

Let us look for a moment at the type of help that the gentleman would give State and local school districts under his

proposed return of 2 percent of all the Federal income taxes collected in each State to be used for "education in the common or public schools." The Pelly bill introduced would provide \$71 per child of school age in New York but in his own State of Washington it would provide only \$25 per child of school age, while in the State of Mississippi it would provide only \$4. These figures are obtained by dividing the States' 2 percent of 1957 Federal income tax payments, given by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] in his speech, by the estimated school age population, 5-17 years, for 1957. It is most difficult to see how the Pelly bill would provide help to those school districts that have the most critical need for such support from the Federal Government. Actually, the gentleman's proposal would provide for equalization in reverse, for it would give proportionately the greatest amount of money to the States that had proportionately the least number of school age children. On the other hand, the Murray-Metcalf bill would collect the money from the States in which the wealth is located and distribute it to the States in which the children actually reside and are to be educated. Hence, there is a substantial equalizing effect in the collection and distribution of funds under the Murray-Metcalf bill.

Moreover, there would be hardly any more administrative costs involved in the Murray-Metcalf bill than there would be in Mr. Pelly's proposal. After all, it is the same revenue agency that would be collecting the taxes and the same Treasury Department that would be sending a check to each State. The only additional cost involved in the Murray-Metcalf bill would be a fraction of one person's time needed to determine the amount to be paid to each State under the formula provided in the bill and to receive reports from the States. These administrative costs should amount to not over \$10,000. Such an amount is infinitesimal in comparison with the \$4.7 billion that the Murray-Metcalf bill would annually make available to the States for the vital needs of school construction and teachers' salaries.

The College Student Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under the impact of Russian technological progress and the hard-driving educational system on which it is based, the United States is slowly waking up to the challenge.

Education—in the long run—will prove to be the decisive factor in the struggle between freedom and communism for world leadership.

Our attitude toward education must—and will—change.

No longer can we regard it as secondary to luxuries. If necessary, we must

make sacrifices to guarantee the development of the world's best educational system.

As evidence of this definite trend, I ask for unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the February 4 issue of the Lawrence Daily Eagle, entitled, "Federal Education Loan Plan Popular":

FEDERAL EDUCATION LOAN PLAN POPULAR

The college student loan plan written into the National Defense Education Act last year has turned up a major surprise in popularity.

It was substituted for a \$75 million scholarship program after an intellectual wrestling match in the closing weeks of the last Congress. The lawmakers in their infinite wisdom killed the scholarship plan and put a \$295 million, 4-year loan program in its place.

Few educators thought it would work. For, as Dr. Arthur Flemming, former president of Ohio Wesleyan and now secretary of Health Education and Welfare declares, up until recently, college loan funds had gone begging.

The most optimistic prediction was that not more than 800 of the 1,950 U.S. institutions of higher learning would take part in the new Government student loan program.

In the first 4 months, 1,230 colleges and universities have applied for participation, asking for \$62 million in Government money for this year.

This figure is double the amount Office of Education now has in sight. Congress appropriated \$6 million to get the program started this year. A supplemental \$25 million is being asked to run the program until June 30. Unless the colleges are being over-optimistic in estimating student demand, it won't be enough.

Loans applied for now are expected to be small, to run students short of cash through this college year. For the next college year beginning in September, it is believed that loan applications will be larger, to cover a full 9 months. But Office of Education has so far requested only another \$31 million for the year beginning July 1.

Congress originally authorized—but has not appropriated for the student loan program—\$47½ million the first year, \$75 million the second, \$82½ million the third and \$90 million the fourth. This \$295-million total would take care of 590,000 1-year loans of \$500 average.

No student will be permitted to borrow over \$1,000 a year, or \$5,000 over 5 or more years. Interest is 2 percent while the student is in college, and 1 year thereafter. Then the interest rates goes to 4 percent. The loan must be repaid in 10 years.

There is a 10 percent forgiveness every year for 5 years to students who go into grade or high school teaching. To this extent the loan program is a scholarship.

Also, the law offers fellowships to graduate students preparing for college teaching. They will provide grants of \$2,000 for the first year, \$2,200 the second, \$2,400 the third, plus \$400 a year for each dependent.

One thousand such fellowships were to be granted the first year. But in the first 4 months of the program, 6,000 applications have been received. This response is likewise far heavier than was anticipated. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick will make the first 160 grants early in February.

Last October DHEW Secretary Flemming declared that scholarships would still be needed, in addition to the loan and fellowship programs. The original plan was to give up to \$1,000 a year for 4 years to exceptional students who could not pay for a higher education.

Unexpected popularity of the loan program, however, has shelved the scholarship idea. It

is not mentioned in President Eisenhower's new budget. The administration's austerity program may have had something to do with killing it.

If the loan program turns out to be as good as it now looks, Secretary Flemming is of the opinion that corporations and private foundations which have granted most of the scholarships in the past may change their programs.

U.S. Money Troubles Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for many months, through the medium of my weekly newsletters and otherwise, I have warned the people of the Third Congressional District in Iowa that their Government is facing serious trouble in refinancing the huge Federal debt.

Early last August, I called attention to the fact that beginning in 1958 and running for 5 years, the U.S. Treasury would be confronted with the herculean job of refinancing some \$216 billion of the then existing Federal debt, plus any deficit spending during that period. It was obvious even then that investors were not enthusiastic about Government securities and subsequent developments have made that completely clear, despite almost unbelievable increases in interest rates.

Bringing the debt management situation up to date, I recommend the reading of an article by Sylvia Porter, a writer for the Hall Syndicate, Inc., which appeared in the Washington Star of February 15, 1959. The article follows:

MASS REFUSAL OF U.S. IOU'S

Something rather frightening is going on in Wall Street, involving the credit and financial reputation of the Government.

Administration policymakers are starting to talk in almost evangelistic tones of the urgent need for balancing the budget now. They insist it's imperative to squelch now the belief that inflation is inevitable in this country. They're stressing inflation dangers so much now—a time when prices are fairly stable, unemployment is disturbingly high, lots of industrial plants are idle. Here's the story:

Yesterday and today over \$9 billion of Treasury securities, held by institutions and wealthy individuals the Nation over, mature. Since the Treasury hasn't the cash on hand to pay off the securities, early last week it asked owners of the IOU's to extend them. And to induce the extensions, it offered close to the highest interest rates in a quarter century—3½ percent for a 1-year extension, 4 percent interest for a 3-year extension.

TWENTY-TWO PERCENT SAY "NO"

Holders of more than 22 percent—or \$2 billion—of the IOU's, said "No." They are demanding their cash this weekend.

This was one of the biggest mass refusals of Treasury securities on record. To meet the cash demands, the Treasury has been forced to borrow a large chunk of money against the taxes it will collect next September.

Why did these investors turn down the new Treasury securities?

Because many think that as today's economic advance progresses, they'll need the money for other, more profitable activities. They don't want to extend loans to the Treasury even for a year.

Because many have become increasingly disenchanted with buying Treasury securities during the past several months of a huge budget deficit and constant Treasury borrowings.

Because many are convinced that the combination of Government-business-labor policies will keep us in a long-term inflation cycle. They don't want to own fixed-income securities in a period of inflation.

Because many believe that as inflation accompanies the business upswing, interest rates will go even higher. They're waiting for some sort of climax in the market before they buy more Government securities.

Although prices on marketable Treasury obligations have sunk to the lowest levels in years and the market is highly nervous, a climax hasn't occurred and hopefully, it won't occur.

But financiers are beginning to shudder at the magnitude of the debt management problems facing the Treasury.

NEAR DEBT LIMIT

In its new borrowing the Treasury is bumping against the legal debt ceiling.

In its sale of securities the Treasury also is approaching the $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent interest rate ceiling on new bonds set up by Congress in the World War I era.

Now the evangelistic attitudes become understandable. Spokesmen for the White House, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve System are crying out that the budget must be balanced—so the Treasury can avoid borrowing more new money and the inflation feeding deficit can be erased.

Even as the Treasury was counting the refusals on its IOUs, its chief, Secretary Anderson, was standing before a joint House-Senate Economic Committee, solemnly warning that, "If we ever reach the point where people believe that to speculate is safe, but to save is to gamble, then we are indeed in trouble."

There is no simple way out of this one. Actually, I can't recall when experts in this field have been so lacking in solutions—except, "balance the budget, squelch inflation fears, convince investors that Treasury securities at these interest rates are sound buys." So easy to write, so hard to achieve.

No Enfant Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, an important facet of improving international relations is that which can be done by the people themselves. Improvement of international relationships and exchanges on a government-to-government basis through the usual means, such as treaties, diplomatic channels, memberships in international organizations, the mutual security program, cultural and student exchange programs, and others, are all excellent but limited in their impact upon the great mass of the people. It remains for the people themselves—individually and as a group—to act affirmatively to bring about better under-

standing among each other and to achieve world peace.

An extremely effective effort is being carried out under the people-to-people program. An excellent example of what can be done and of what is being done is the one of the "sister cities" of Coral Gables, Fla., and Cartagena, Colombia. Fifty-nine residents of the south Florida community have returned today from a 4-day visit to Cartagena as guests of Cartagena's mayor and people-to-people committee. Last November, some 15 visitors from Cartagena were the guests of Coral Gables on a similar 4-day visit. During their visit, many of the Cartagenans stayed in the homes of their hosts in order to see how Americans live and work. The success of this visit led to the return invitation.

Both groups of visitors were feted at social and civic functions attended by local dignitaries and enthusiastic residents of the host communities. The very important part of these exchanged hospitalities is the face-to-face contacts between civic, business, and educational leaders of both cities, about which the Coral Gables Times, a Knight publication, made the following appropriate remarks:

NO ENFANT TERRIBLE

Back in the twenties American tourists slapped French francs on the outside of their luggage, zipped through the Louvre and other venerable museums on the European continent in 10 minutes and carried away tons of souvenirs.

Thus was born the reputation of the American tourist as enfant terrible, a reputation that we bear to this day, regardless of the area where we set foot as sightseers and visitors.

That this stigma is one of the concerns of our Government is borne out by the fact that the U.S. Information Agency sent one of its executives to Coral Gables to instruct our local citizens about Colombia where a group of them will spend this weekend as exchange visitors in President Eisenhower's people-to-people program.

To our surprise he presented the audience with a pamphlet reassuring, and at the same time advising, them that they are not the vulgar tourists that is the stereotype of the American visitor which exists in the minds of natives of foreign countries.

But the fact that this advice had to be given at all is indicative of the responsibility that lies with every American in a foreign port.

That is why we believe so heartily in the people-to-people program. It will send to Latin American countries Americans who are the leaders and most respected members of their communities.

Coral Gables is proud of the delegation which will represent the United States in Cartagena, Colombia, this weekend. Their presence will show the Colombians that America is a land whose leaders on the municipal level are cultured, educated, and interested in the affairs of foreign neighbors.

Only the individual traveler can help to erase the idea, which is outmoded and unfair to our country, that our tourists are still roaring down on foreign cities out of the crazy heyday of the twenties.

I am proud that citizens in my district are playing such an important part in our international relations and have such a keen realization of what we as Americans must do to fight for freedom and understanding.

Right Place To Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal for Wednesday, February 11, 1959.

I not only welcome the letters that may come to me as a result of this thoughtful editorial, I congratulate the News-Journal for devoting editorials to the great issues that face our people.

As this alert editor so correctly implies, these matters relating to billions, and to Federal spending generally, are not matters that are divorced from the day-by-day activities of the people themselves. The people are the ones who must pay the bills, through their own work. They have a vital stake in the budget, not only their own, their city, county, and State, but of their Federal Government.

I have always been in favor of economy in local spending, in State spending, and in Federal spending, and I always will be. The more facts the people can learn about how their money is being spent, and the more they think on these vital matters, the better off we will all be.

The editorial follows:

RIGHT PLACE TO START

While it is difficult to go along with the Democratic leaders in Congress who want to whoop up virtually all of President Eisenhower's recommendations for funneling more taxes through Washington for housing, schools, airports, farm subsidies and the like, one thing must be said for the idea.

If the Government is going to continue to tax and tax and spend and spend, it's better for the money to stay at home among the folks who pay the taxes.

The Democratic leadership is eyeing foreign aid as a place to cut down the overall budget and maybe even balance it.

That is certainly the right place to start. The President has asked for \$3,900,000,000 for foreign aid this year.

What the American people have not been told is how much of their tax money is already appropriated for foreign aid but not yet spent.

A good guess, based on last year's figures, would be that the foreign aid spenders already have \$5 billion or \$6 billion at their disposal which Congress cannot touch. It was appropriated in past sessions of Congress and remains unspent.

Why not spend this first—if we must keep on with this monstrous folly which has already cost an estimated \$60 billion U.S. tax dollars—before the people are saddled with more foreign aid taxes?

Why not slash this year's appropriation drastically or take it out of the budget entirely?

The foreign aiders would still have billions to operate on, the budget might actually be brought into balance and something applied on the debt we have been piling up for our children to pay.

The Democrats definitely have the right idea in attacking this wasteful section of the budget. They can earn the gratitude of the

Nation by slashing this phase of Federal spending.

They need go no farther in other directions, but this would be a sound start. Let's encourage them. Write your Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE and STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Senate Office Building, and your Congressman, ROBERT W. LEVERING, 324 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

A 4-cent postage stamp could help save you literally hundreds of dollars in future taxes if you use it now.

I Can Hardly Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, here is a gem for the information of my colleagues:

LEGAL INFLUENCE

There are ways that you can influence your Congressmen—legally.

We've had a lot of mail on this subject from clients who are wondering whether it's safe for them to dabble in politics in view of such exposés as the Goldfine case.

The answer is: Yes, you can get into politics. You can get to know your Congressmen, and you can use many methods to influence their opinions and votes—without any danger of involvement or embarrassment.

How do you go about it? Arrange first to meet your Representatives and Senators either at home or in Washington, whichever is convenient. You'll find that nearly all of them are very approachable, very human. Don't limit your contact to a formal conference, explaining your views. It's better to talk about other things first, matters on which there is no controversy.

Find some fields of common interest—people back home, sports, hobbies, etc. Invite your Congressman to lunch or dinner, or to a social affair. Make him feel you think he's smart and important. Ask him questions about subjects on which he's expert. Be a good, agreeable listener.

Don't overspend on entertainment, but don't be afraid to order a sufficiency of the best. Very important: Don't give gifts of any kind.

Develop future personal contacts—an affair back home, a speech or visit by your Congressman at a trade meeting or convention, a fishing trip, golf game, visits to your home, etc. Gradually build a close personal friendship.

After you're on a first-name basis, casually ask him advice about a personal or business problem . . . let him develop a reputation as a problem solver. Praise him for his astuteness.

Very soon you'll find him wanting to live up to this developed reputation. At that stage, you'll be surprised at how open-minded he will become on issues on which you previously thought him bitterly opposed.

He'll give you a fair hearing . . . and will avoid arbitrary votes against your point of view. He'll be embarrassed if he cannot logically defend his oppositional vote.

To some, this procedure may sound like trickery. Actually, it is the type of public relations being practiced every day by those who are guiding the Nation down the road to socialism.

Unless fire is fought with fire, American businessmen may just as well sit back and await the inevitable.

What Lincoln Said

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of February 13, 1959, entitled "What Lincoln Said." It is a well-known fact, historically, that the problems of one generation vary from those of a preceding generation. The editorial of the Washington Post clearly recognizes this fact in connection with a statement recently made by President Eisenhower, where he went back nearly 100 years in making a quotation from a speech made by the late Abraham Lincoln while he was a Member of Congress. One could just as well make the argument that we should not today enter into any military pacts or agreements with any other nation because of what George Washington said in his Farewell Address relating to no "entangling alliances." To me, the answer to such a statement would clearly be that the problems of America in the world of today are entirely different than they were during the infant days of our Government, or 100 years ago.

Everyone with common sense wants a balanced budget but there are few persons in Washington, and objective minds throughout the country, who are not aware of the fact that the President's budget is not a balanced one. If the President really wanted to balance his budget, he would have recommended that new taxes be imposed. I have stated publicly that leadership on his part in the world of today would have called for more taxes in order to assure us greater national defense. The people of our country would willingly make the sacrifices of paying more taxes if they knew that the additional revenue was to be used for the security of our country through stronger military preparations. The responsibility of recommending such increased taxes for greater military strength rests with the President. For the Congress to increase taxes to make larger appropriations for military purposes might result in, first, taxes being imposed, and the additional revenue collected; and, second, greater appropriations being made for defense, and the President freezing the same. If recommendation came from the President for more taxes for stronger national defense, the Members of Congress, and the people, would know if new taxes are imposed, that the additional revenue would be used for the national interest in the defense of our country.

In any event, the editorial appearing in the Washington Post of February 13 shows that President Eisenhower's reference to President Lincoln has no application to the conditions of today:

WHAT LINCOLN SAID

President Eisenhower did little honor to Abraham Lincoln in attempting to suggest

that he would have supported the present Administration's retrenchment on Federal spending. It is, of course, a pretty thin tactic to begin with—to go back 111 years when Lincoln was a Member of Congress for even a general judgment on how present-day Federal finances should be managed. But if such guidance is to be sought from Lincoln, he ought to be read whole.

Lincoln did say, in the quotation attributed to him by Mr. Eisenhower, "The tendency to undue expansion is unquestionably the chief difficulty." But just before addressing those words to the House of Representatives on June 20, 1848, Lincoln said, "Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we shall find the way." His speech was in reply to President Polk's veto of an internal improvements bill. Throughout this speech Lincoln espoused the responsibility of the Federal Government to undertake the kind of "local" improvements which Mr. Eisenhower so often speaks of as being the primary responsibility of the localities involved.

We are not certain where Lincoln would stand in the present budget debate; but we suspect that if Mr. Eisenhower had been a party to the debates of the 1840's on the proper role of the Federal Government, he would have been arrayed against Lincoln.

Debt Refunding and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article written by Harold B. Dorsey in today's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The writer explains, in a very understandable fashion, exactly how the Government has come to experience unusual difficulties this month in the financing of its long-term securities.

It shows also how the new short-term issues of Government securities, purchased largely by the banks, are feeding the fires of inflation by having the exact effect of creating money for which there is no actual offsetting security.

It would be good, I believe, for all Members of the Congress to read and understand this article. It serves to point out that, in the interest of dollar stability, it would be an exceedingly good thing to begin some plan of systematic reduction of the national debt, as I proposed last week in the introduction of a resolution calling for such a plan.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 16, 1959]

DEBT REFUNDING AND INFLATION

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

It is most unfortunate so few people will understand the mechanics involved in an example last week of one of the dynamic consequences of current inflationary pressures. If the public—and if those well-meaning national leaders who have been generating the inflation pressures—understood this particular matter, there would be a better prospect that commonsense based on a more complete knowledge of the facts would dictate policies which are vital to the public welfare.

The instance concerns the refinancing of the Government's mid-February debt maturities totaling \$14.9 billion. At the risk of incurring the criticism of purists in the field of money and credit techniques, I would like to explain this refunding operation with the hope that it will promote a broader comprehension among average people of the way that circumstances are making it necessary to create money by the simple stroke of the pen.

Approximately \$9.2 billion of the total mid-February Federal debt maturities was held by the public, the remainder being held by the Federal Reserve banks and by Government investment accounts which almost invariably swap their maturing securities for the new securities in exchange. On the latter portion of the refinancing operation the matter of money supply was not involved, because savings of the economy that had formerly been loaned to the Government were merely transferred from one kind of security to another.

However, the holders of nearly \$2.1 billion (approximately 23 percent of the publicly held maturities) refused the offer to relend the Government their savings for 1 year at 3½ percent or for 3 years at 4 percent. They elected to have their savings paid back to them in the form of cash.

As a result of this unexpected cash requirement to pay off its creditors, the Treasury Department had to offer an even shorter-term issue (217-day maturity) for \$1.5 billion. To a greater and greater extent, the Government is finding it necessary to use such short-term issues to finance the Government deficit and to refinance its maturities. Usually, this kind of issue is purchased largely by banks. The savings that might otherwise have been absorbed by investment in Government securities—in the current instance some \$2.1 billion—thus becomes available to increase the demand for common stocks or for goods and services.

But let us see how the Government gets the money to pay off this \$2 billion. What takes place on the books of the banks, which probably will be buying a large portion of the \$1.5 billion of 217-day-maturity new certificates that were offered to raise the major-part of the necessary cash? It is this particular operation that is so broadly misunderstood.

A given bank will agree to take \$1 million of these certificates. It will receive a piece of paper signifying that the Government owes the bank a million dollars and will add this piece of paper to its assets under the heading of "Holdings of Government Securities." It then credits the deposit account of the Government with a million dollars. This latter credit represents money that the Government can spend. Presumably, in the current instance, the Government will draw a check against its deposit account and will deliver that check to some holder of the maturing Government debt issue. The recipient will then deposit the check in his checking account with some bank. Thus it becomes money that he can spend for whatever purpose he chooses.

Recognize then that the net result of the whole transaction is an increase in the indebtedness of the Government to the bank, and by the simple stroke of a pen—without even using a printing press to manufacture currency—there is created a million dollars of spendable funds. The latter increases the wherewithal to enlarge the demand for common stocks, or for all types of goods and services.

One does not have to be a professional economist to understand that the artificially created increase in demand, without an offsetting increase in supply, creates an inflationary pressure for higher prices.

It appears to be an unfortunate fact that the inflation situation has reached the dangerous breeding stage. The saver's fear of

inflation, concretely demonstrated by the foregoing incident, has made him unwilling to invest a normal proportion of his funds in longer term debt instruments. There is a very understandable hesitancy to lend money when there continues to be such a distinct threat that it will be repaid in dollars of lower purchasing power.

Herein, we can see the simple facts underpinning Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin's recent observation to the Joint Economic Committee that: "There can be no effective control of inflation if the banking system is made the major source of funds to finance Government deficits." We have just seen an incident wherein the banking system had to be an important source of funds to refinance a portion of the Government's old debt. By the way, the interest charges alone on the Government's accumulated deficit of past years are budgeted at \$185 per average family of four for the next fiscal year—which presumes that the Federal debt will not be increased further.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate Lithuanians are among the most stout-hearted and bravest fighters for liberty and freedom. Yet, freedom and independence have been denied to them for centuries.

Except for the short but happy interlude of interwar years, they have had the misfortune to suffer under the oppressive and at times almost unbearable alien yoke in their homeland for almost two centuries. During the First World War, it seemed that their woes had come to an end by the overthrow of the czarist Russian regime, when they regained their freedom by proclaiming their national independence on February 16, in 1918. For about two decades fate was kind to them, and they lived happily in their free country. But, as the clouds of war began to gather over eastern Europe in 1939, their situation became extremely precarious, and early in the war their independence was shattered by the forces of the Red army.

Since then the unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom, and have been held down by their Communist overlords. In their own country they lead the lives of prisoners in a vast prison camp, working as long as humanly possible, and under most wretched conditions, for their masters in the Kremlin. There is no trace of freedom, neither of speech, nor of movement, nor of correspondence; not even the freedom to lead a quiet life in any corner of the country.

But they have the satisfaction of knowing that they have friends and sympathizers in the free world, and particularly in America.

Today on the 41st anniversary celebration of the independence day I gladly join hosts of Americans of Lithuanian descent and echo their true liberty-loving sentiments.

That Old Gag That You Cannot Tell the Difference Between Republicans and Democrats Not True Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the February 4 issue of the *Sterling Daily Gazette*, Sterling, Ill., entitled "That Old Gag That You Cannot Tell the Difference Between Republicans and Democrats Not True Now."

THAT OLD GAG THAT YOU CANNOT TELL THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS NOT TRUE NOW

That old gag about it being impossible to tell the difference between Republicans and Democrats is no good any more.

In the first month of this new session of Congress, programs of the Eisenhower administration and the Democratic majorities on Capitol Hill have been spelled out so clearly that the differences are unmistakable.

The principal difference is in ideas about the amount of money the Federal Government should spend, and whether the budget shall be kept in balance or operated at a deficit.

In three areas alone—Federal aid to education, airport construction, and housing—Democrats now propose spending \$1½ billion more than the Republican administration proposes for the next fiscal year. Over the full 6 or 7 years of the conflicting programs, the Democrats would spend \$13 billion more.

These proposals do not cover national defense, aids to agriculture and public works, on which the Democrats are considered likely to increase heavily Eisenhower budget figures.

In campaign speeches at Pittsburgh and Charleston last October 27, President Eisenhower identified the Democrats as "the spendthrift league" and accused them of urging a raid on the taxpayers' dollars.

The charge was resolutely denied by Democratic orators. But from the way things are shaping up in the new session of Congress, the President's charge seems justified.

Take housing. The administration called for a \$1,660 million program, spread over 6 years. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, introduced a bill which would cost nearly \$3 billion, spread over 7 years.

For the fiscal year 1960, this bill as approved by the Senate would cost \$15 million more than the President requested. A bill passed by the House would cost \$300 million more. The differences would be for direct loans to veterans which the administration proposes.

House and Senate bills have to be compromised, with no telling what the outcome. President Eisenhower will give no hint on whether he will sign or veto a bill that goes so far beyond his recommendations. But this will bring to a head the question of whether the Government will unbalance its budget and embark on deficit financing.

Take aid to airports. The administration program calls for \$200 million spread over 4 years. The bill introduced by Senator A. S. MONROE, Democrat, of Oklahoma, calls for \$575 million spread over 5 years.

Take Federal aids to education. The administration called for nothing beyond last

year's National Defense Education Act. But Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, has introduced a bill for school construction and other benefits which would cost \$1.1 billion the first year and increase by that amount or more to \$4.7 billion the 4th year. The total cost would be \$11.3 billion.

In the field of Government lending programs, the administration proposed \$55 million for depressed areas suffering from chronic high unemployment. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, topped this with a \$375 million program. President Eisenhower vetoed a similar bill last year.

All the foregoing illustrate differences in approach to spending bills. In addition, there are wide differences in Republican administration and Democratic congressional bills on labor legislation, civil rights, social security, atomic energy power development, space exploration, missile development, and foreign policy.

The new Congress is already bogged down with legislative proposals not recommended by the administration. In the first month of the session, 820 new bills were introduced in the Senate and 3,833 in the House for a total of 4,653. This is a record for any first month.

Many of these bills call for increased Government expenditures. The challenge which they throw up to Democratic leaders is how they will curb inflation if they allow Government appropriations to keep on going up.

Smear of Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial concerning the FBI which appeared in the February 9, 1959, Los Angeles Examiner, entitled "Smear of Fear."

I believe this editorial, which discusses the reasons behind the various propaganda barrages against the FBI, is very timely and will be of interest to all Members of Congress and the public.

The editorial follows:

SMEAR OF FEAR

American leftwingers and political pinkos appear to be pressing another propaganda barrage against the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

An indication of this is the unusual emphasis given to a long-winded magazine article which purports to show the FBI as an ineffectual crime prevention agency and a menace to civil liberties.

The line is a familiar one to anyone who has given any study to the subject, and the motivation for this antagonism to the FBI isn't hard to understand.

It is precisely because the FBI, under Director J. Edgar Hoover, has been so successful in exposing saboteurs, traitors, and subversives, that it has incurred the enmity of their sympathizers and dupes.

The FBI's record as a law enforcement agency and as protector both of the Nation's security and of the legitimate rights of individual American citizens is one to be proud of.

No comparable agency in the world has been more zealous in its regard for legal propriety, nor more careful not to overstep

the bounds of its proper functions and jurisdiction.

As Hoover himself has emphasized time and again, the FBI is not a prosecuting agency but an investigative agency, constrained by, and observant of, the limits of the law.

Law abiding and patriotic Americans have no reason to fear the FBI and every reason to be grateful to it. The smear accusations that the FBI is a sort of a gestapo are generated by those who, because of their activities or associations, have reason to fear that the FBI will expose or apprehend them, and Hoover and the bureau are to be congratulated on the enemies they have made.

The 41st Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Emphasizes the Sad Plight of a Liberty-Loving Nation and Calls to Mind the Contribution of Lithuanian-Americans to American Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the roots of American strength and greatness have been the diversity of its population. It has been the transfusion of foreign cultures into the circulation of American life that makes our country what it is today. The reasons for immigration to our shores have been varied, but the most tragic of these has been the loss of freedom in the homeland. This was the case in Lithuania.

In the latter part of the 18th century, when Russia absorbed Lithuania, many oppressed Lithuanians, finding freedom and justice more precious than the ties of their native soil, fled to our free shores.

Once in this country, these brave Lithuanians never ceased in their struggle to achieve liberty for their persecuted homeland. Numerous Lithuanian organizations throughout the United States worked vigorously for Lithuanian freedom. This work was not to be in vain, for on February 16, 1918, independence was finally realized. Happily, many Lithuanians returned home, but many more decided to remain in their adopted country.

Lithuania's loss was to be America's gain. Despite the strangeness of our laws, customs, and language, these eager Lithuanians quickly adjusted to the American way of life. Although naturally concerned about the fate of their homeland, these people identified themselves completely with America. They became solid American citizens and have never ceased to be grateful for the opportunities that this country has provided.

On the other hand, Americans have been equally grateful for the contributions of these Lithuanians to the growth of their culture. Evidence of these contributions is shown by the success of Lithuanian-Americans in various fields of endeavor.

The list of their achievements is long. Such names as Mikas Petrauskas, Shirley White, and Ivan Lebedeff are familiar to music and theater lovers. Sport fans have cheered Jack Sharkey, Jack Goodman, and Vito Tamulis. In addition many more have served faithfully in public offices throughout the United States.

These few examples are indicative of the Lithuanian-American contributions to American life.

Nevertheless, although Americans first, these American citizens have a natural concern for the land of their ancestors which once again is not free. Ever since 1940, this helpless country has been incorporated into the Soviet Union. Although today is the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, Lithuanian-American hearts are sad, for today will not be one for rejoicing in the land of their forebears.

Consequently, I would like to take this opportunity, on the anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, to express with all Lithuanian-Americans their hope of freedom for their oppressed homeland. Moreover, all the free world should resolve on this February 16 to work unceasingly for conditions that will bring peace to the world, allowing all nations to live in an environment of self-government, peace, and justice.

Gallant Lithuanians Sustain Persecution Through Faith and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, just a few short weeks ago it was my privilege to participate in the observance of the 41st anniversary of Ukrainian freedom.

What I said then can be mirrored today in our commemoration of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Before the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania, along with her sister Baltic nations, Estonia and Latvia, was still an independent and democratic state.

But in June 1940 the cherished freedom of Lithuania evaporated with the cruel and unjust seizure of the country by Soviet Russia.

Within 2 days Soviet military troops invaded and tramped through the territory of Lithuania, as well as of Estonia and Latvia.

Lithuania has not been free since that time, but the spirit of freedom, hidden though it is behind the Iron Curtain, remains alive in the hearts and minds of Lithuanians.

Always a proud, virile nation which, through its long history, survived other oppressions, we of free America have little doubt that Lithuania will survive her present persecution and tyranny.

Ruling Lithuania, just as in other Soviet satellite nations, is a detested puppet regime that has stolen from the Lithua-

nian people all of their political and social rights and has forced them to vote for a single list of candidates designated by the Communist Party.

The people of Lithuania live in constant fear and terror. Their personal security is nonexistent. They are harassed every minute of every day by the agents of the secret police.

Without reason, without fair trials, they are imprisoned, investigated, executed, or deported for slave labor to remote areas of the Soviet Union.

Seven major waves of mass deportations, carried out under inhuman conditions, have diminished the total population of Lithuania by more than 350,000. Lithuania, a predominantly Roman Catholic population, has also seen her priests murdered, jailed, deported, or exiled. Of nearly 2,000 priests, we are told less than 750 remain free and alive.

Monasteries have been closed. Church property has been confiscated. Religious instruction has been forbidden.

What, then, keeps the faint, flickering hopes of the oppressed Lithuanian people alive?

What gives these gallant people the strength to sustain a persecution and a tyranny the like of which the world has not seen for centuries?

Two things, Mr. Speaker, just two things—an unrelenting faith in God and an indomitable courage born of tremendous hope.

And one day, I am confident, this great faith, this fantastic courage will be rewarded, and Lithuania will be delivered from enslavement, as will all the other oppressed peoples under the yoke of Soviet tyranny.

Commemoration of the 41st Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege for me to add my small voice to the growing demands for freedom on the part of millions of Lithuanians and other nationalistic groups who are being kept in a captive status under the Soviet Communist rule.

Although, Premier Nikita Khrushchev continues to boast of the military strength and the economic advances of the Soviet, he fails to recognize that this apparent strength is based upon a compulsive labor economy that is held together by fear, by military tanks and guns, and by the cloak, spy, and dagger machinations of the select Communist Party membership and leadership.

I am sure that the spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of the Lithuanian people cannot be quenched and will continue to grow. The nationalistic spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of millions of people under the domination of the Soviet Socialist Re-

publics will continue to be a fatal weakness in the miscalculations of Mr. Khrushchev and his Politburo Bureau.

I join with the Lithuanian American Council in today's celebration of the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania. I join with the millions of Americans of Lithuanian extraction in their aspirations for the liberation of the Lithuanian Nation.

Cooperation by the Bureau of Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our attention is often called to wrong-doing by Government departments. Too seldom do we give credit to a Government agency that does a good job.

I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter, dated February 6, 1959, which came to me unsolicited from my friend, Solomon Dimond, a practicing attorney in Washington, D.C.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: Members of Congress and the congressional committees have long been the traditional sounding boards for registering complaints concerning the various instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government. As representatives of the people, Congress has generally recognized its responsibility to sift grievances with a view to determining the need for remedial legislation.

It is very rare, and probably newsworthy, when the attention of Congress is directed to an unusual and outstanding accomplishment of a Government bureau in improving its relationships with an important national defense industry. It is highly important that Congress should be so informed for it indicates a sensible, practical solution to similar problems of other industries in their dealings with Government departments, bureaus, and agencies.

Due to the widespread dissatisfaction of the small ship and boat industry with the manner in which the Bureau of Ships was awarding and administering contracts for the construction of small ships and boats, with an attendant relatively large number of insolvencies of small ship and boat manufacturers as a result of undertaking Government contracts, the American Boat Builders and Repairers Association set up a Government contracts committee. This industry's grievances were aired in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of January 9, 1958, at page A-89. On March 6, 1958, a meeting was held at the Bureau of Ships between members of the committee, including me as counsel to the committee, and the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, his counsel and his top-level contract administrators.

Following the meeting, the Bureau of Ships decided to make a survey of the entire industry to determine its grievances as well as its suggested improvements in procedures. Letters were sent to over 500 shipyards, which shipyards included all companies that had expressed interest in undertaking Government contracts, inviting them to attend regional conferences. These conferences were held in Seattle, Philadelphia, Boston, New Orleans, Great Lakes, and Long Beach, California. Everyone present at the confer-

ences was given as much time as he desired to present his views. The suggestions made were analyzed by the Bureau of Ships and collated into 101 different categories that were then considered by a study group set up by the Bureau of Ships.

As stated in its report, the study group accepted almost two-thirds of the suggestions in whole or in part. In each instance in which the Bureau rejected a suggestion, a detailed explanation of its reasons for rejection was set forth. The report is divided into two sections, the first of which is dated November 25, 1958, and the second of which is dated January 30, 1959. Enclosed you will find copies of these reports. It is my understanding that the Bureau of Ships has already put many of the agreed changes in procedure into effect, and is expeditiously proceeding to put the others into operation.

The efficient, thorough and prompt manner in which the Bureau of Ships cooperated with the small ship and boat industry is highly commendable. While the individual members of the industry might not agree with all the conclusions reached by the Bureau of Ships, they certainly would have to concede that they had the opportunity to present their views, that the Bureau of Ships carefully considered those views and that the resultant changes in procedures will materially improve the award and administration of contracts. The general discontent of the industry would have warranted a very time consuming exhaustive survey by a congressional committee. This was avoided by prompt administrative action. It was a fine job of public relations for which the Bureau of Ships should be officially commended.

Sincerely,

SOLOMON DIMOND

Spending Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press of January 30, 1959:

SPENDING CRUSADE

Americans have their ears dinned with crusades for this, crusades for that, and in most cases respond with what they think they can afford.

But few seem to take any part in any crusade to halt congressional spending in Washington. Mr. Eisenhower submitted a \$77 billion budget to the lawmakers with the implication that if spending were kept within that limit, tax reform legislation would follow with the possibility Federal taxes could be reduced.

Yesterday he sent a bill to Congress on the farm program asking that the \$5 billion per year subsidy be brought within reasonable limits and something be done about surplus crops, that under present legislation, the U.S. Government is compelled to buy and store. Storage rental for the stuff costs millions of dollars per annum.

The farm bloc in Congress says Mr. Eisenhower's program has no chance of passing and American taxpayers will continue to pay high subsidy rates.

Some Members of Congress are not satisfied with the \$47 billion budgeted amount for national defense and want to go beyond that figure. Those who oppose the limita-

tion set by the White House, say United States must spend more to make up for what they call the "missile lag" between this country and the Soviet Union.

So the possibility of spending beyond the \$77 billion is quite apparent and all this spending means the dollar you get in salary or wages has less purchasing power. The dollar today buys less than 50 cents of its real value as compared with the dollar's worth prior to World War II, and the end does not seem in sight.

Many Members of Congress were elected last November on promises of spending more money on Government-sponsored projects, and they seem determined to live up to their campaign pledges unless more conservative heads hold the whip hand in both Houses of Congress.

The voice of Senator Byrd of Virginia, who has long been an advocate of less spending, is becoming weaker and weaker with each passing Congress, filled with some who seem to think spending American money is the first objective of their office. The free wheelers in Congress may ruin the value of American currency unless brought to the realization the money they spend comes out of the pockets of the folks back home, who today are pretty well fed up with the American system of taxation and its confiscatory clamping onto what the wage earner earns before he ever sees it, knowing only it has been taken from him, willingly or unwillingly by the deduction explanation attached to his pay voucher.

Patriotic Advertising—"Life Line"

Broadcast, December 3, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding radio programs of the present day is the "Life Line" broadcast, produced by Life Line Foundation, Inc., a religious and patriotic educational movement. This program, conducted 6 days a week by Mr. J. Wayne Poucher, radio minister for "Life Line," is broadcast from a large number of radio stations throughout the Nation.

Mr. Poucher's broadcast is unique in that the first half of each program is devoted to a forthright discussion of public affairs and the last half to a religious sermon.

The current affairs portion of a recent "Life Line" program dealt with a matter of vital concern to American business and its customers—the importance of adding patriotism to advertising. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text, slightly revised for publication, of this broadcast by Mr. J. Wayne Poucher:

PATRIOTIC ADVERTISING—"Life Line" BROADCAST, DECEMBER 3, 1958, DELIVERED BY MR. J. WAYNE POUCHER

American business today finds itself at the crossroads of its very existence. It must make a choice of following the mistaken lane to its destruction or the right lane to survival. Business has sought every possible customer in its effort to make every possible dollar. Business has carefully avoided any intentional offense toward any person or group for fear of losing a present or poten-

tial customer. Business has refused to participate in programs with a patriotic theme for fear of losing a few sales dollars and arousing threats of boycott from the mistaken. As further concessions, business spends fabulous sums in sponsoring some programs which sadly have a positive anti-American propaganda line. This is done on the true but terrifying premise that good Americans won't complain, and it will keep the vocally boisterous pinks in silent appeasement.

To date, business has not extended its vision beyond the next quarterly report to stockholders. In the zeal of business to avoid having red figures to explain away, business has not considered how it will explain its total demise under a Red regime. It has not realized that someday, just around the economic corner, stockholders are going to ask "What destroyed the capitalistic system that made our business possible? What caused the political and economic debacle that took our system, our company, and every other company built on the solid virtues of hard work, individual effort, courage to invest and to produce a better product under the goad of free competition?" They will also then be asking, "What happened to history's highest standard of living that all these things produced?"

Business will have no choice of explanation to make if the mistaken trend continues in America. It will be too late. And the only truthful reason for the destruction of the American free enterprise system will be obvious. Through its blind fear of losing a few customers, business will have lost them all. Through the fear of offending a piddling number of radicals who make loud splashes throwing rocks in the shallows of America's economic river, business will have permitted the great, but silent mainstream of America to flow unrestrained over the precipice of collectivism . . . never to be retrieved. Through fear of reprisal from some in Government, business has failed to take a stand in favor of the Constitution and what it guarantees . . . through fear, yes, through fear, business . . . well, that's all there was to it, fear.

But right now at this moment it is not too late. There is something wrong when management decrees the kind of advertising that praises the American way yet is overruled at lower levels. There is something wrong when men of lower rank in a business tell those above they can't afford to defend America. There is something wrong when the owner of the business is told by those on his payroll he can't spend his money to advocate the system that made his business, even their own jobs, possible. If this is happening in your business, don't look now, it might be embarrassing.

Whether business likes it or not, it has now reached the place where the road divides. It is not an unmarked trail like the proud pioneers pondered and then summoned courage to make a choice on which to stake their canteen contents and the only life they had. Rather, it is a well-marked crossroads that has been traveled many times by many people. The road signs are in large letters and are easy to read. The pages of history interpret them in clear and unmistakable language so all may understand. Many civilizations have been lulled by the sedatives of prosperity, apathy, and fear until the point of no return was reached down the wrong fork of the road. And its further stretches are strewn by their wreckage.

"Life Line" believes that the vast and overwhelming majority of the American people, the customers of business, if you please, would drive an extra mile to greet and extol a firm which uses its advertising to help keep America free. Business must make a choice, and soon, of saving itself and America with its mass of customers or business may elect to keep the vocal minority on its books and lose the books, business, and all.

People Want Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks a speech delivered by Mr. Harry Sears on gold before the National Western Mining Conference in Denver on February 7. Mr. Sears is president of the Calaveras Gold Mining Co., at Angels Camp, Calif., and is chairman of the Western States Gold Committee. I am sure that the Members of the House will be interested in his observations on this important subject, which follow herewith:

PEOPLE WANT GOLD

Three words describe a condition as old as civilization: People want gold.

They express human emotions, the desire for power, wealth, adornment, or merely personal satisfaction, plus some sense of safety.

For 25 years our people in this country have been denied the possession of gold, except in the form of manufactured products. The Government asserts complete control.

But we have reached the time when this Government, having failed to provide us with sound money and a sane and honest fiscal policy, find themselves deeply enmeshed in a rapidly growing inflation, with the greatest indebtedness in the history of the world, with an irredeemable paper currency, based only on debt, with no sound monetary reserves which can be used under their present system, and from all quarters come their confessions that they need some solution to their problems, but have not found it.

We still talk about dollars, but do not use them. The Federal Reserve notes which we use instead of money merely carry the insignia which has been familiar to us for years, but because of constantly shrinking purchasing power this paper currency is valued only in pennies, and when translated into an equivalent of what a dollar should be in value, for almost any transaction in our daily lives, we are met with high prices, but these are merely the result of multiplying our currency units, because of their constant loss of purchasing power, into the number required to bring their usefulness to the necessary amount demanded for goods and services in our daily transactions.

There is one outstanding exception to this perfect pattern. The price of gold, which was set by Government decree in 1934, and which the Treasury has refused to alter, has been steadily reduced since the originally proclaimed \$35 per ounce, so that, translated into the purchasing power of the paper currency which is paid for it by the Treasury, the price of gold becomes \$16.80 per ounce with a 48-cent dollar, \$11.55 per ounce with a 33-cent dollar, \$8.75 per ounce with a 25-cent dollar, \$3.50 per ounce with a 10-cent dollar, 35 cents per ounce with a 1-cent dollar.

And, by applying the same factual figures to the sales of gold by the Treasury, we find that during the past year between \$2 and \$3 billion in gold has been sold to foreign central banks and their governments and private customers, in addition to all the gold which was supplied by the Treasury for commercial use in this country and abroad, at the same reduced prices.

The proponents of this suicidal and fantastic stupidity have the audacity to call such results the "value of gold," and groups of economists and "monetary experts" are

constantly seeking to have conversion of this Federal Reserve currency into gold at the \$35 price, and a favorite slogan with them is that any increase in the price of gold would be inflationary.

The root cause of the inflation stems from the practices of the Federal Reserve System, their multiplication of printed currency based on debts, the removal of gold from all monetary use in the United States and the unlawful Treasury practices and propaganda regarding gold.

The inflation has been built by the Government because they wanted to build it, but it is getting beyond control and the people are searching for safety and a way out of the confusion. They are beginning to turn to gold.

We are at the date of an important anniversary. Twenty-five years ago the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 was passed by Congress. This is claimed as the authority for the gold regulations and practices of the Treasury; and that Congress acted under its constitutional power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, but Congress has used no such power with regard to this act, and the Treasury has been clothed with no authority.

That was some time ago, the details may be quite dim in your memories, but again please note the title, "The Gold Reserve Act of 1934." This very title is misleading and its interpretation has been appalling. Few people have read it and realize its actual powers and limitations and during this quarter of a century we have been taught fundamental errors and have been herded into mistaken understandings and have been taught false beliefs regarding gold. Our Government officials have promoted fictions and claimed powers which are outside the law and which they do not possess.

Our rights and the peoples' rights are fully supported by law and are directly contrary to the claims and practices of the Treasury.

So that there may be some order in this confusion we review provisions and purposes of the act.

The Government took title for the United States, to the gold coins and monetary gold bars which had been in the vaults of banks for many years or which had been turned in at the Treasury or Federal Reserve Banks by our citizens in accordance with Presidential demands.

We need not here determine the legality and morality of Congress in blindly following Presidential orders and stripping the American public of their gold, in 1933.

This was in the period when the President ordered Congress to pass laws and not to hesitate because of doubts as to their constitutionality, so acting under the assumption that possession denoted authority, title to this gold was declared by the act, to pass to the Government.

But it is extremely important that we know what was provided as to gold owned by the Government, we therefore quote from the act:

"No gold shall hereafter be coined, and no gold coin shall hereafter be paid out or delivered by the United States.

"All gold coin of the United States shall be withdrawn from circulation and together with all other gold owned by the United States, shall be formed into bars of such weight and degree of fineness as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct. No currency of the United States shall be redeemable in gold."

This is the important provision of the act and through improper interpretation of these words, or through intentional disregard of their meaning, the Treasury and other Government departments have indulged in a program of skulduggery toward gold which violated the basic property rights of all citizens and has almost entirely destroyed the

gold mines and gold producing districts in 13 Western States.

They have confiscated the gold which was taken from its owners, in defiance of law, and they have been parties to the imposition of frauds on our citizens generally, through misrepresentation to them that gold was the basis of a reserve to provide safety for users of the present irredeemable currency.

With gold clearly and completely removed from all monetary use in the United States it lost its former identity as money, and became a simple commodity and Congress then had no greater power over it than over any other commodity.

The fact that some of it is stored in Treasury or Federal Reserve vaults, or Fort Knox, gives it no monetary standing or character for the Gold Reserve Act specifically terminated any monetary use of gold in this country. The term "bullion" has no monetary significance. It merely means "metal in the mass" and the term has been in common use for centuries.

All gold owned by the United States thus became merely a commodity stored in Government warehouses in 1934, and the Secretary of the Treasury merely became the custodian of the warehouses. It is thus exactly the same as the commodity gold produced from the mines and is subject to all safeguards for property which our Constitution and laws provide.

The act gave no authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to set a price for gold and to maintain such a set price during the years of inflation when the purchasing power of irredeemable Federal Reserve currency dropped steadily so that now it is only accepted on the basis of from 25 cents to 33 cents on the face value of the so-called dollar. This means that in buying gold from a producer the Treasury pays for it with irredeemable paper currency of which the purchasing power has been so reduced that it pays only from \$8.75 to \$11.50 per ounce, and not the much touted \$35 which is publicly held forth as the rate the Treasury pays.

The Secretary has a set of regulations but owing to the fact that he is only dealing in commodity gold, just as any private citizen would deal in it, he has no authority to control or enforce them because Congress had no power to grant authority to control commodity gold. But in spite of this he compels gold producers to secure a license from him before they can melt their gold and place it in marketable form and he also demands that they contract to sell the gold to him, at his price, to avoid having this license cancelled.

Of course gold cannot be produced at these prices, except in a few special cases and as a byproduct from other metals.

There were about 4,000 operating gold mines in production when they were peremptorily closed as an asserted war necessity, in 1942. After years of idleness the great majority of these could not attempt reopening because economic difficulties of inflation and currency depreciation had made a higher gold price mandatory. A few mines attempted reopening but after heavy losses were forced to again close down. This is the condition of more than 95 percent of all gold mines in the country.

FRAUDS ON THE PEOPLE

Another provision of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 gave the Secretary of the Treasury authority to buy and sell gold, "at home and abroad." Sections 3699 and 3700 provide for his purchases and sales at varying prices, with no special price specified. As this was virtually a public trust it was his duty to see that these purchases and sales would be properly conducted and the laws respected, but this has never been done.

The gold policy of the Treasury was consciously stated by former Under Secretary

Randolph Burgess in testimony before a Senate Committee in 1954; when he said: "We buy and sell gold freely with other countries . . . at the price of 35 an ounce and we sell gold . . . to foreign banks and private owners as well."

There was a lot of loose language and fancy phrases in the act and in the proclamation of the President which announced it in 1934, but none of this could vary the essential fact which the act established.

When gold was completely removed from monetary use in the United States there could be:

No gold dollar.

No gold content of the dollar.

No gold monetary reserves.

In addition, there is a statute which declares that no obligation of the United States could be measured in gold, therefore no matter what the President said, surplus language describing unauthorized and non-existing facts have no effect and establish no rights, but in view of what has since happened one announcement by the President should be remembered. He said:

"In pure theory, of course, a government could issue mere tokens to serve as money—tokens which would be accepted at their face value if it were certain that the amount of these tokens were permanently limited and confined to the total amount necessary for the daily cash needs of the community."

This could well have been an advance description of managed currency and the present Federal Reserve notes. Since they have no ascertainable value they fit the description of a "mere token to serve as money." They are accepted far below face value for it is certain that the amount of these tokens is not limited, either permanently or temporarily, and they are not confined to the daily cash needs of the community but are contributed in fantastic amounts as gifts all over the world. Thus vast amounts accrue in the hands of "foreign banks and private owners as well," which are given the fancy title of foreign trade balances and the Treasury honors these by selling them gold at \$35 an ounce.

Nevertheless throughout the years, Government officials, bankers, business advisers, economists, teachers and Members of Congress continue to think and talk about these non-existent gold formulae and our currency as though they were real. They have been so effectively brain washed that they continue to delude themselves and others by repetition of untrue and wholly fallacious theories.

For years we have been conducting our lives under this irredeemable and constantly depreciating currency. In testifying before the Senate Finance Committee in 1957, retiring Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, who had just admitted that the purchasing power of the dollar had dropped to 48 cents, was asked:

"But you do think that as long as this inflation keeps up, the savers and pensioners and people who have paid on insurance for 20 to 30 years, are the forgotten people, are they not?"

To this Secretary Humphrey replied:

"They are definitely forgotten people who have been injured. . . . They are severely injured."

In these words was the confession of the Secretary of the Treasury regarding your bank balances and savings.

In spite of the contempt for the legal and property rights of our citizens and gold owners, as shown by the gold regulations and Treasury practices, gold is extremely important to the Treasury as a screen to conceal their real position.

If the depositors in our banks are injured by saving our shrinking currency, there could be no question that gold producers have a greater injury illegally forced upon them. Their gold is taken under coercion

by a Treasury acting without authority and they are forced to accept Federal Reserve currency in exchange for their gold. They are brazenly robbed.

In spite of the Treasury's repeated insistence that U.S. citizens cannot possess gold, they misrepresent gold to the people in order to mislead the public. In hearings before the Senate Finance Committee in 1957, former Treasury Under Secretary Randolph Burgess admitted:

"We have got a kind of gold standard and to the extent the people have confidence that we are going to keep the money nailed down to the value of gold, it is easier to sell the bonds."

THE TREASURY CAN NO LONGER EVADE THE LAW

We have had no gold money or monetary gold in this country for a quarter of a century. Gold held by our Government is merely metallic gold as a commodity.

It is in the same class as the gold which is owned in the thousands of gold mines and properties throughout our Western States.

The rights to produce this gold and sell it are on an equal footing with the rights of our citizens to purchase it and to hold it, or to sell it as they may choose.

Congress has no power to enact laws or to authorize regulations which abridge these rights of possession and when the Secretary of the Treasury attempts to enforce such regulations he is acting illegally and without authority.

A current case in the Federal court bears directly on this. It concerns possession of gold bullion by a man in the State of Washington, charging him with a criminal act for which he was arrested, tried and sentenced. During recent years there have been many instances where others have been treated in this fashion and in most cases they have not contested, having been overawed by the long standing propaganda and claims that the government had this power, or they could not afford the cost of an appeal.

This case was appealed, and after consideration by the Court of Appeals, has been remanded to the original court for corrective action or dismissal. The criminal charge for gold possession was based on original emergency orders of the President early in 1933 and upon subsequent Treasury regulations and the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, but it was found by the U.S. Court of Appeals that there are no criminal penalties provided in the Gold Reserve Act for possession of gold and no criminal statutes authorized by Congress.

Of course the conditions under which the original presidential emergency orders were issued, no longer exist. In 1933 they were used to force the people to turn their gold coins and bullion over to the Treasury and later, title to this gold was given to the United States in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. It all became commodity gold and gold coinage was wiped out.

In fact, even the Treasury has recently lifted bans on the possession of gold coins and they are now permissible to be held by the public and are classed as collectors' items. But the old criminal bogey, as to gold bullion, is still held over the heads of the people by the Treasury. It is interesting to note the language of the court of appeals in reversing this case:

"It seems vital as a matter of national policy that emergency regulations and almost dictatorial powers granted or conceded in the turmoil of war, cold war, economic revolution and the struggle to preserve a balanced democratic way of life, should be discarded upon return to normal conditions, lest we grow used to them as the fittings of ordinary existence. Executive regulations drafted and confirmed for an emergency should expire with the emergency."

Since the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 established the status of gold owned by the United States as merely commodity gold, and abolished any former status it may have had as money, or monetary gold, it had the effect of establishing all gold in the United States as commodity gold and as private property.

Neither Congress nor the Secretary has any power or authority to prevent U.S. citizens from buying, selling, or holding gold; or

To prevent the mining or processing of gold in the United States, or to make regulations which would interfere with the proper conduct of such business by the owners of this gold, or any mineral deposit containing same; or

To set a price limit on gold, or to compel its owners or producers to sell it in any manner, or at any price which does not conform to valid laws regarding private property; or

To require gold miners and producers to have any form of license in order to melt their gold, which is a necessary part of mining to change it from the form of a concentrate in which it is mingled with other metals, and to prepare it for sale; or

To confiscate privately owned gold or to assess any owner with a penalty or a threat of penalty, because of its possession; or

To appropriate or take possession of privately owned gold, in any manner which violates the property rights of the owners, or contrary to any valid law made to protect them; or

To misrepresent the status of gold owned by the United States and to state or imply that it is in any manner connected with the present irredeemable currency in common use.

In considering newly mined gold from properties in the United States and summarizing the laws which must be obeyed, by the Secretary of the Treasury, we find he is governed by the following well settled legal principles:

Price control of commodities and private property is unconstitutional;

Private property and property rights of all U.S. citizens are protected under our Constitution and must be so recognized and respected;

Private property of citizens is protected from seizure or confiscation;

Private property cannot be taken for public use without just compensation and this cannot be determined without a hearing.

It should come as a welcome breath of hope for the future of the gold-mining industry to consider that although in the past we have been singled out and made the victims of lawless treatment by our Government, we have well-settled rights which can be invoked and can reverse this condition for the future.

Gold producers have been an isolated industry with limited public contacts in the past but the drastic effects of the manufactured inflation has brought gold into fresh prominence and as the cycle of inflation continues the doubts and the growing resentment of the people can compel the Government to establish and use real reserves of gold, for there could be swift collapse of the multiplication of paper currency now being used.

PEOPLE WANT GOLD

In recent years there has been increased buying of gold in free countries abroad. Our substantial citizens have been adding to their holdings, but these had to be handled as bulk purchases since the sales were large and the storage abroad was expensive, so this was never a practical market for our modest citizens.

But there has been preparation underway for some months to bring the advantages of a free gold market to us close at home, and on such a scale that it could be a popular

market. With expenses cut to a minimum it can serve all classes. This is about ready to function in Canada and trading would be on the open commodity markets both there and here in the United States. The gold will remain in bank vaults in Canada and warehouse receipts will be traded on the market.

Even in its preliminary steps the volume of demand for gold is causing surprise in Canada and they see that here is a world market in the making. But we can foresee that it will not be necessary even to go to Canada or to trade there, for we now know that morally and legally there is a clear right for us to have a free gold market here in the United States, and to start the building of such a market, the growing fear and unrest in the minds of our own people can be a factor of great importance.

Among other steps, there is a carefully prepared case in progress in the Federal courts to terminate all control of newly-mined gold through Treasury regulations.

Our citizens have watched their bank accounts wither and fade in the purchasing power of their deposits and they have plunged into the stock market to multiply their shrinking dollars only to find that this is now even a bigger gamble than horse racing.

They want something tangible, that could be safe and dependable but whose value can grow as it attracts increased public demands for its possession.

Throughout history, this has always been the function of gold. It has not been permitted to register its value in this country during the past 25 years. That value should soon show at more than \$100 per ounce.

Let us therefore view this as a fresh start when we turn away from the past and foresee a far different future.

In Defense of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Barron's weekly recently published an article criticizing the operation of the Small Business Administration. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, immediately took exception to this criticism. Under date of February 9, 1959, he wrote to the editor of Barron's giving facts and figures which negate the conclusions contained in the article.

Let us continue to be critical of Government agencies when they are wrong. But let us always be fair and by all means constructive.

I commend Mr. Berger's letter to the attention of our colleagues.

FEBRUARY 9, 1959.

EDITOR, BARRON'S WEEKLY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: You take the cake for emphasizing the negative in your article, "Easy Mark", dealing with the Small Business Administration, which appears in your February issue.

If one's knowledge of this agency were limited to the facts and charges presented, he could reach only one conclusion: that the Small Business Administration and those it

serves as leeches on the body taxpayer. We believe this is just not an accurate picture.

For instance, you cite the need for a "long, hard look" at the agency. Why not advise your readers that the Small Business Administration is under constant scrutiny by Congress and congressional committees?

You refer to the agency's distribution of "largesse." Why did you not bother to inform your readers of the fact that the agency's lending functions are under constant policy control by a three-man board composed of the SBA Administrator and the Secretaries of Treasury and Commerce. Even if the SBA Administrator were a free-handed man with Government funds (we have heard him criticized frequently for being too stingy), certainly there are few who would charge this to the two Secretaries.

You talk about the rising rate of delinquencies and defaults. Why did you not advise your readers of the fact that out of \$364,981,000 in business loans disbursed to June 30, 1958, the agency had suffered a loss totaling only \$235,316.91, which amounts to 0.0007 percent of all moneys allocated to that date. Why did you not report that some 7,704 of the 8,135 businesses who actually received payments from the agency to June 30, 1958, were right on the button with their payments?

You cite some instances in which lending functions have been handled unwisely. May we ask if you have made any check to find if these questionable procedures are the rule, rather than the exception to the rule. Frankly, for the past 3 years I have been making trips across the country, making on-the-spot investigations of the agency's operations. From what I have seen I can say, without fear of contradiction, that by and large Small Business Administration personnel are doing as efficient and as honest a job in their lending activities as any of the private banks (ranging from the Chase of New York down to country banks) I have had the pleasure of doing business with in my 50 years experience in the business world. I say this as a person who owned and operated his own business for 35 of these 50 years.

Believe me, I do not hold, nor does the federation hold, that the Small Business Administration is perfect. There is room for improvement in it, just as there is in every last other organization in the world. The important thing, as we see it, is that the agency is rendering a necessary service to small businessmen, and that as it goes along it is taking steps to make its operations more efficient and effective. We believe it and its operations should be open always to inspection and criticism. However, in all fairness, we believe these should be of the balanced variety.

With all best wishes,
Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Economic Lifeline Severed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, while the subject of the following article from the Charleston Gazette is not located in my district, it is a parallel to similar conditions which exist in my district.

I am indebted beyond measure to my colleague [Mr. SLACK] from the Sixth West Virginia District who has undertaken the arduous task of touring his southern West Virginia area for a first-hand experience with the stark facts of hunger due to unemployment.

The community in point used to contain the operation of the coal mine, one of our Nation's major steel operations. It, thus, reflects a condition afflicting not only the coal industry, but other industries as well.

This town is located in a rather remote section of West Virginia. It is situated in Boone County, W. Va., and there is nothing by which industrious men may earn their daily bread, other than the coal-mining industry.

It is, as is quite common in southern West Virginia, a one-industry area and when a mine is exhausted or when a lack of markets shuts off production, unemployment results.

I will not confine my observations to the southern section of my State—which, as a whole, outproduces the world in soft coal—since there are many coal communities in my district which share a common burden of economic distress.

This is the third graphic newspaper account of our West Virginia situation which I have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD, and I respectfully call the House's attention to this article:

NELLIS' LIFELINE CUT BY SHUTDOWN IN 1956
(By John G. Morgan)

NELLIS.—The economic lifeline of the little community in Boone County coal country snapped 3 years ago.

One hundred and fifty men lost their jobs when the mine shut down.

They were the last on a payroll that at one time carried 400 names.

A closed theater and snack bar and a failing real estate venture under the fancy name of Acorn Village are evidence of the times that were.

Bethel Pauley, a small, meek, 40-year-old man with auburn hair, lives in a little yellow house on a hill in this oddly-situated town.

He is an unemployed coal miner. He and his wife have six children who are 6 to 18 years old.

Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., of West Virginia's Sixth Congressional District paused to visit the Pauleys during his tour of coal regions hit by unemployment.

In the neat little four-room house, the Congressman was given a word picture generally brighter than that for most families victimized by economic trends and mechanization in the mines.

Among other things, Pauley has clerical skills that have enabled him to land and hold the part-time job of recording secretary for the local union, which still carries on.

Pauley explained that he studied book-keeping at high school. As a soldier during World War II, he continued his studies in night school at the University of Hawaii.

His part-time job pays \$40 monthly, but all of that is earmarked as the precise amount of the monthly payment on his house. Original cost of the house was \$3,000. He has chopped it down to \$1,800.

The ex-miner has been out of a full-time job only a month. But this isn't the first time. His employment in small mines has been sporadic over a long period.

He's a man who likes to go by the record. When asked about his employment history, he consulted a book that he had stowed away in a small safe.

Pauley said he owns a 1947 car which he bought during a period of employment for \$150. He has a garden and a small amount of other land near the house.

His TV set works, and he has been subscribing to a newspaper.

Despite the fact that his living conditions are better than those of perhaps thousands of other unemployed miners, Pauley admitted:

"The future doesn't look too good."

SLACK asked him if he had thought about seeking employment in another State.

"I have studied about it, but I haven't found the answer," he said.

In Nellis, the Congressman also talked to Harold Javins, Earl Dodrill, Billy Joe Prichard, Russell T. Hoover, and Griff Abshire.

At least one of them has been unemployed since March, and most of the others are dependent on small punch mine operations for a substandard living.

While in a small restaurant within the lonely town, SLACK accommodately dropped a few coins into a juke box and chose selections to meet the tastes of two teenage couples.

They danced rather wildly but with a measure of grace across wavering boards, just as any teenagers will dance when so much of life is before them and when there is so little to worry about.

Proposed Amendment to the Constitution

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to the Constitution introduced by my good friend and colleague from my neighboring State of Florida, Mr. SIKES, has my wholehearted support and I fully concur in his remarks concerning the urgent necessity for the adoption of this amendment by this Congress.

I have read the report which was adopted by 36 State chief justices at their 1958 meeting, in which report these chief justices from 36 of our sovereign States declared that our Supreme Court has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without judicial restraint. I have had occasion to personally discuss this report with nearly half of these chief justices, and on many occasions before and since this report was issued I spent hours with many outstanding men, going over this matter, including a great and good American who we thought made one of the greatest speeches ever made on this issue, and I am referring to our own Judge J. Ed Livingston, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama, one of the most learned lawyers of all time.

I believe that all right-thinking Americans will support my good friend and colleague, Bob SIKES, in his proposed amendment.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence. Because of the many folks of Lithuanian descent in my Third District of Ohio, I feel that it is especially fitting to call attention to this day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In 1918 our country rejoiced with the Lithuanian people when they became a free nation. By decree in 1940 Soviet Russia cut short this independence by absorbing this little, freedom-loving nation. Nevertheless, this act of tyranny could not stamp out the steadily-burning flame of liberty which lives in the Lithuanian people.

We as citizens of a free, democratic nation join with these people and with those of Lithuanian descent in the United States in the fervent hope and prayer that freedom will one day be restored to this long-suffering nation.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semi-monthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Monday, February 16, 1959

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Life insurance company taxation bill cleared for floor action by Rules Committee.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 2063-2156

Bills Introduced: 34 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1041-1074; S.J. Res. 49; and S. Res. 79. Pages 2068-2069

Secretary of State Dulles: In accordance with provisions of S. Res. 79, adopted today, Senate stood in silent prayer for the early and complete recovery of Secretary of State Dulles. Page 2063

Nominations: The following nominations were received: 1 civilian; 4 judicial; 705 Foreign Service; 298 postmasters; 2 to be alternate representatives to 13th Session of General Assembly, U.N.; and 2 Army. Pages 2157-2162

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: Philip W. Bonsal, of D.C., to be Ambassador to Cuba; Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Union of South Africa; Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to Jordan; William C. Trimble, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Cambodia; and Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia (who is Ambassador to United Arab Republic), to serve concurrently as Minister to Yemen. Page 2162

Program for Tuesday: Senate met today at noon and adjourned at 4:54 p.m. until noon Tuesday, February 17. Pages 2121, 2156-2157

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

PRESIDENT'S FARM PROGRAM

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee heard Secretary of Agriculture Benson and his associates testify and answer questions with regard to the President's farm recommendations.

Mr. Benson will continue his testimony tomorrow.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Special subcommittee continued its executive consideration of the nomina-

tions of 22 Air Force colonels for promotion to temporary brigadier generals, but made no announcements, and adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

POWER MARKETING

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee continued its hearings on Federal power generation and marketing in relation to the Department of the Interior, with testimony from Governor Loveless, of Iowa; Representative Coad; Gus Norwood, Northwest Public Power Association; Alex Radin, American Public Power Association; and Lloyd Caulkins, of LeMars, Iowa.

On Saturday, February 14, testimony on this subject was heard from G. W. Cornog, KEM Electric Cooperative, Linton, N. Dak.; Ed Schlender, Snake River Power Association; Howard Scott, Upper Colorado Basin Preference Users Committee; Norton Davis, Plains Electric G. & T. Cooperative, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; William Fraser, Omaha Public Power District; W. P. Venable, Consumers Public Power District, Columbus, Nebr.; and Dewey J. DeBoer, Nebraska Public Power System, Columbus.

On Friday, February 13, committee began these hearings, with testimony from Senators Mansfield and Langer, the latter of whom introduced a North Dakota delegation; Charles Mahoney and Henry Swenson, both of the Upper Missouri G. & T. Cooperative; Kenneth Holum, A. S. Wendel, Robert St. Cyr, Eugene E. Hull, and Oscar Bergman, Jr., all of the Midwest Electric Consumers Association; J. W. Grimes, South Dakota Water Resources Commission; Virgil Hanlon, East River Power Cooperative, South Dakota; S. A. Forseth, Williams County Electric Cooperative, North Dakota; R. L. Potts, Burke-Divide Electric Cooperative, North Dakota; Teleford Anderson, North Dakota Statewide Association of REA Cooperatives; William E. Trommershausen, a utility engineer, Columbus, Nebr.; Max Stanley, Iowa Committee on Missouri Basin; E. C. Myrland, Northwest Iowa Municipal Power Group; A. L. Chantry, Cuming County Rural

Appendix

Asleep Under Spires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate and the Nation are indeed fortunate during these years of crisis to have in the post of Senate Chaplain so great a spiritual leader as Dr. Frederick Brown Harris.

Dr. Harris brings to the deliberations of the Senate each day a clear perception of the moral nature of the struggle between freedom and communism. He brings to us as well an informed and scholarly view of national and international affairs, and a determined courage to speak the truth as he sees it.

Not often do we find all these qualities so wonderfully combined in one man.

Fortunately, the good influence of Dr. Harris is not confined to the Senate. He is a nationally renowned churchman. His writings are widely read and his highly esteemed newspaper columns are syndicated and appear in many papers across the country.

We in Washington are particularly fortunate to have his column appear each Sunday in the Washington Star, and I earnestly recommend it as "must" reading.

We are living in a period when we hear a great deal about flexibility, accommodation, and mutual concessions. It is therefore vitally important that as wide a hearing as possible be given to Dr. Harris, who has such a clear understanding of the uncompromising evil of communism and the inflexibility of moral values.

I wish to join Dr. Harris in recommending to all Americans the book, "What We Must Know About Communism," by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet. And I also invite all to read Dr. Harris' fine column, "Asleep Under Spires," which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on February 15, 1959.

I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASLEEP UNDER SPIRES

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

Everything a spire symbolizes is now under the most formidable assault that Christianity has faced since the first spire was lifted against the sky. It is for the defense of the values at the heart of that faith that astronomical sums are being spent as a shield from the threatened massive attacks

of the goddess who scorn our Christ and assail His ways. The most vital debate now raging inside our Government has to do with making sure that we have the physical weapons to meet even surprise attempts to enslave us. Our standard of morals, the outgrowth of our religious faith, deters us from attacking first, no matter what the peril may be. Only the enemy's fear of our arms saves them and us from a world holocaust.

It is startlingly true that the next 2 or 3 years may determine the fate of the American Republic. We are now faced not by a secret but by an open conspiracy. The failure of America to preserve its promise and its life will not be due finally to America's weakness at decisive moments. It will be due to the refusal of the American people to see the obvious, to believe what the enemy has openly put on paper, to be so comfort-loving as to refuse to believe what the enemy disdains to deny.

Nothing could be more clear than that the present competitive coexistence drive is nothing but an invitation to assist in cutting our own throats. The recent smiling Soviet salesman in this as yet land of the free did not, in any of his applauded blandishments quote a recent declaration of his Kremlin master, "We must recognize that we cannot coexist eternally. One of us must go to his grave. We do not want to go to the grave. They do not want to go to their graves either. So what must be done? We must push them to their graves."

But what has this to do with spires? Answer: everything. Strange and unbelievable as it may be, some church leaders, especially members of denominational hierarchies, rather than pastors, are more concerned about the faults of democracy than they are about the ominous plottings of the sinister system constantly growing in strength, fantastically dedicated to the destruction of democracy, faults, and flaws and all. The results of the tranquilizers and sleeping tablets being concocted by doctors of divinity to lull the church to slumber in this fearful day of destiny are plainly indicated as exhibit 1 in the recent report of certain churchmen meeting in Cleveland. Their recommendations regarding communism are like lifting an umbrella with the funnel of a cyclone headed for those singing complacently "what can shake our sure repose."

History repeats itself. There were religious leaders during our American Revolution who made George Washington's almost impossible task harder. There were many of the best people in that day, including religious leaders, who were spiritually and morally asleep to the implications of the Revolution and agitated for negotiation and appeasement with the British forces. There are some in the present global conflict who might profit by reading the correspondence of George Washington with church people—especially with preachers who wanted nothing but peace, even if it was based on supine surrender to the English tyranny. Even in the struggle which brought our freedom there were those, as now, asleep under the spires.

Will Rogers once said that what Americans needed most was to have their speedometers taken away and exchanged for alarm clocks. An alarm clock is now available for America and for all the free world. Its bell tolls for all who remain asleep and perhaps

for the rest of us, too. It is a volume whose reading is a must for every intelligent American. Its authors are Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, whose ability to capture, in scintillating chapters, deep human insights, is already well known. Its arresting title is, "What We Must Know About Communism." And it is just that. What we must know before it is too late. When America knows the unvarnished truth about this diabolical conspiracy the battle will be half won. Our dedicated might will complete the conquest.

The clanging truth in this book transferred to the minds of the American people would be terrible as an army with banners. Between the covers of "What We Must Know About Communism" this foul thing stands revealed in all its horror and terror. Here it is with all masks off, its doubletalk made plain, its twisted duplicity, its seductive lullabies, its refuge of lies, its continuing revolution which can never end until this putrid despotism of freedom is dead.

To be sure, at times, this abomination of abominations may be like the smiling flower, but always it is like the serpent under it. What happened to Hungary and to the murdered millions in their own coerced lands as they continue to liquidate all opposition is the fate they decree for every people who defy the Marxist wave of the future.

In a dozen years this is the first time "Spires" have urged the reading of a modern book. It is done now at no one's suggestion or request, but because we verily believe that this stark revelation, accepted by our people, will go far to save all we hold dear. This book is a call to arms. If necessary, sell your coat or radio to get it, and then, when all the family has read it, loan it to neighbors. It is available at all bookstores. It is a must in this day of danger and of destiny—"What We Must Know About Communism." On its cover could well be emblazoned St. Paul's words to the ancient church, "Awake, O sleeper, arise and Christ shall give you light. Make the most of time, because the days are evil." And time is fast running out.

The Growing Horror of Lung Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the renewed illness of our illustrious Secretary of State has made us all conscious of the great questions of medical research, cancer, heart disease, and other serious illnesses.

It is particularly distressing when people punish themselves so deliberately that they may come down with one of these diseases. An article published in Today's Health, official periodical of the American Medical Association, on the whole question of cigarettes and lung cancer, raises just this burning and crucial question. The article from Today's

Health by J. D. Ratcliff, noted writer on medical problems, is reprinted in the March 1959 number of the Reader's Digest.

This article notes that deaths from lung cancer in the United States have risen from 2,500 in 1930 to an estimated 35,000 last year. The article claims that this is almost exactly proportionate to the increase in cigarette sales.

The article from Reader's Digest, entitled "The Growing Horror of Lung Cancer," is based on information from the internationally known chest surgeon, Dr. Alton Ochsner, of New Orleans, La. I believe all Members of the Senate and House should be informed as to the contents of this article and, therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWING HORROR OF LUNG CANCER

(Condensed from Today's Health, published by American Medical Association)

(By J. D. Ratcliff)

William Brown¹ is a successful businessman in a large southern city. Had he drawn up a personal balance sheet last spring, it would have shown that life had been good to him. At 55, he owned a thriving business and an attractive home. He was happily married and had two sons doing well in college. Except for minor ailments, he had enjoyed excellent health all his life.

True, in recent months Brown had been coughing with increasing frequency. But all smokers cough, and he paid little attention. An increasing shortness of breath he accepted as a normal part of the aging process. A small decrease in weight he put down on the good side of the ledger. Also, he had had a slight chest pain, but nothing serious enough to bother a doctor with. Then one morning last June while brushing his teeth he coughed deeply and brought up sputum slightly streaked with blood.

Brown, of course, had read about lung cancer and its apparent association with smoking. A two-pack-a-day man, he had even thought vaguely about cutting down. Now as he shaved he ran through the lung cancer symptoms he knew: bloody sputum, he remembered, was one. By the time he had finished he was frankly worried, and after breakfast, instead of driving to his office, he went to his doctor.

The physician's suspicions were immediately aroused by the symptoms. Yet a number of things could cause chest pain, cough, weight loss, bloody sputum—such things as lung abscess, inflammation, tuberculosis. Diagnostic step No. 1 was chest X-rays. When they revealed a suspicious shadow the doctor advised Brown to go to a chest surgeon.

Two days later Brown reported to the specialist. Another set of X-rays was taken. Then came a sputum test. Lung cancer frequently sheds cells which the pathologist can identify in specimens from the deep chest. This test gave a positive answer. To resolve all possible doubts, a bronchoscopic examination followed. A slender tube was slipped down Brown's throat. Through the barrel of this instrument the specialist can often see the suspicious mass and even take a pinch of it for examination by a pathologist. This test, too, said yes. Brown had lung cancer.

"Those two words, 'lung cancer,' are the ugliest in all medicine," says one physician.

But Brown had the emotional stability to face the facts, and was told the truth. He asked about his chances.

Of 100 people who get lung cancer today, the physician told him, 45 will be inoperable by the time they consult a doctor, their cancer so widespread that surgery would be futile. Chests of the remaining 55 will be opened. This is drastic surgery and as many as 11 of the 55 patients may die of it. Inspection of the chest cavity will often give clear evidence of cancer spread, possibly even to the heart itself. In such cases the surgeon may leave the lung untouched and simply close the wound. These patients—perhaps 12—will be dead in a few months.

By now the original 100 has dwindled to 32 patients who are operable. The surgeon removes all or part of the diseased lung and prays that no cancer seeds have been left behind. But in a distressingly large percentage of cases, clusters of these cells lurk in hidden recesses, to continue their growth. According to present statistics, only 5 of the 32 patients who survive the operation will be alive—and presumably cured—at the end of 5 years. Thus the score stands: 5 survivors out of 100 victims.

Brown accepted these grim statistics with outward calm. Advised that haste was all-important, he said a week would be sufficient to get his affairs in order. It was, understandably, a bad week.

When he reported to the hospital there was still much to be done. Before surgery, doctors have to decide whether the patient can get along with one lung, or will face gasping suffocation. The average healthy adult has about eight times as much lung function as needed in sedentary activity, but years of heavy smoking wreck lung tissue and erase the margin of safety. "Then," says Dr. Alton Ochsner, internationally known chest surgeon, "we have only the drugs to work with."

Brown's tests indicated that he would have barely enough reserve to get by. During the next 3 days he took a course of breathing exercises to prepare himself for life with one lung. On advice of the physician he had stopped smoking a week earlier, at the time of his first visit.

Finally, the day of surgery arrived.

In many kinds of surgery, one is impressed by the delicacy of the technique. In pneumonectomy—lung removal—the strongest impression is of the bloody massiveness of the operation.

Brown was propped on his side on the table, arm above head. A tube was slipped down his windpipe to give the anesthesiologist a clear airway. Then the surgeon made a great sweeping incision extending nearly halfway around Brown's body. It began under the nipple, dipped under the arm, ended just short of the spine.

Layers of skin, fat and muscle were parted, exposing the ribs. With heavy shears the fifth rib was removed and discarded. Spreaders were then applied to push other ribs apart. The resulting opening was vast, cavernous, to permit the surgeon to examine the entire chest cavity for signs of cancer's spread.

With Brown's chest cavity exposed, the first step was to sever the pulmonary artery. Two ties of cotton about an inch apart choked off the flow of blood. Then the artery was cut between the ties. The stump leading to the heart was curled back, delicately sutured.

Next the two pulmonary veins were similarly treated. That left one final point of attachment for the lung: the main bronchus, one of the Y forks from the windpipe. This too was clamped and cut, then the lung was lifted out of Brown's chest. Subsequent examination showed the cancer to be approximately the size of a goose egg.

Now the surgeon turned his attention again to the bronchus. It is vital that this be sealed off with absolute tightness, otherwise bacteria-laden air from the outside may seep into the chest cavity to cause devastating infection. To seal it, the tube was sutured tightly, and a bit of tissue borrowed from the chest wall was grafted over the end. The seal was then checked for leaks, much as an inner tube is checked: the chest cavity was filled with saline solution and the observers watched for telltale bubbles. In Brown's case the seal was tight.

A minute examination of the chest cavity came next. Often there are little pea- or grape-sized cancers, usually gray-pink in color, along lymphatic ducts. These are meticulously dissected away and so are any other bits of obviously cancerous tissue—a painstaking task that may take up to 6 hours. But Brown was fortunate. There was no indication that the cancer had spread beyond the lung.

There were still several final steps to be taken. Chest nerves were injected with pain-deadening drugs whose effect would persist for several days. The ribs were pulled back into place and wired together. Finally, the gaping wound was closed over the huge emptiness where the lung had been. In time the remaining lung will enlarge to fill part of the space, and the rest is soon filled in with fibrous tissue.

For a day after surgery Brown was in an oxygen tent, to ease the burden on his remaining lung. Despite the drugs he was beset by almost constant pain and racked by coughs. But gradually the pain subsided and wound healing began. After 10 days he left the hospital to convalesce at home.

His prospects? It is too early to say. If he survives, he will have to live with uncertainty for 5 years. Only at the expiration of that period will his cancer be considered cured.

A few years ago, lung cancer was a medical problem of no consequence. A survey of world medical literature in 1912 showed a total of only 347 cases reported. Today annual deaths are measured by the tens of thousands. Tomorrow?

"It frightens me to think of what is going to happen in another decade when our present smoking habits catch up with us," says Dr. Ochsner. "Already, lung cancer has achieved pandemic proportions. Holland had a twentyfold increase in deaths between 1924 and 1951. Death rates in England and Wales have climbed tenfold. In the United States the record is about the same—the toll rising from 2,500 in 1930 to an estimated 35,000 last year. It is significant that the sharp increase in lung cancer is almost exactly proportionate to the increase in cigarette sales. It is my firm conviction that every heavy smoker will develop lung cancer—unless heart disease or some other sickness claims him earlier."

Is there, then, any protection for the heavy smoker? Dr. Ochsner, a nonsmoker himself, believes there is. Most lung cancers appear to grow rapidly. It is therefore highly important to detect them at the earliest possible moment before they have spread to other organs or tissues. In sum, before they give any outward symptoms.

Only X-ray and sputum tests can discover cancer at this stage. Dr. Ochsner believes that after the age of 40 every pack-a-day smoker should have chest X-rays at least every 6 months, preferably every 3 months. A set of chest X-rays, front and side views, usually costs from \$15 to \$25—expensive, but no more so than the cigarettes themselves. If enough people took such precautions, Dr. Ochsner believes, lung cancer might become 50 percent curable, instead of 95 percent fatal.

¹ The name is fictitious for obvious reasons.

The Farmer's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three of the GTA Daily Radio Roundup Digests, for February 5, February 9, and February 12, 1959.

There being no objection, the digests were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF FEBRUARY 5, 1959

Here is a United Press news item that deserves the close attention of every consumer, farmer, and businessman. We'll read it to you: "The Agriculture Department says the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar dropped to 39 cents in the last quarter of 1958. The drop was caused by lower farm prices and higher costs of processing and distributing farm products. Despite the farm price decline, retail grocery prices in 1958 were three percent higher than the year before."

So you see, farm prices are down, retail food prices are up. An old story, familiar to both farmers and consumers. Nobody likes inflation, but it is doubly hard on farmers when they have inflation for what they buy, and deflation for what they sell.

Maybe you farmers noticed a big advertisement that ran in most of the Nation's daily papers a week or so ago. It had a headline that went like this: "Do You Want to Buy Even Less for a Buck." The large illustration showed two baskets of food, one full to represent what a dollar bought back in 1939, and the other almost empty to show what a dollar buys now in a grocery store. The ad ends up with a big boldface type line that says: "Inflation robs us all."

Who paid for the ad? The American Iron and Steel Institute. Maybe the steel industry ad writers didn't understand the farm and food price situation, which is shown so clearly in the news item we just read to you. No doubt, the farmers themselves could write some pretty good advertisements about inflation, because they know how much tractor prices, and the prices of other heavy machinery made mostly out of steel, have gone up.

Still, that is beside the point here. The unfortunate thing is that the millions of consumers in the big cities, who, undoubtedly, read that steel industry inflation ad, will tend to blame farmers.

And as every farmer knows, this is an unfair situation. Farm prices are down more than 20 percent from 1952 levels, and that's been a tremendous brake on inflation. This farm depression has held food prices down, because surely they would be considerably higher if farm prices were not way down. This has meant that consumers have more money left over, after buying all the food they can eat, for purchases of houses and cars and clothes and TV sets. That's been of direct benefit to businessmen, manufacturers, and consumers.

And it is fair to ask, are food prices really high? The Federal Government has done some research into this question. It says that a worker in an American factory buys—today—a loaf of bread, a quart of milk, a dozen eggs and a two-pound chuck roast with what he earns from 1 hour of labor.

That's pretty good eating. Back in 1940, he had to work an hour and one-half for enough pay to buy that much food.

So we wonder if it is fair to say, as the steel industry does in this big advertisement, that food prices are high and "inflation is robbing us all."

Maybe the steel industry, and all the rest of us, should be grateful to farmers for holding back inflation, and furnishing us with all the food and fiber we can use, with some left over.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF FEBRUARY 9, 1959

The experts are calling it VI now, but you'll recognize it as "vertical integration." It is becoming a familiar term in almost every farm household, as it becomes more and more a part of family farm living.

Just what is vertical integration? It is a concentration of business activities under one single management. Just for example, a chain of grocery supermarkets that owns processing plants, and distributing centers to gather and prepare the food. It may contract directly with farmers to raise crops or livestock. It may even own the farms, and hire the farmers.

A lot of people are concerned about what may happen to family farms and food prices as vertical integration expands. Farm, Government, religious leaders, and many businessmen, too. Your co-ops are very concerned, because your survival and theirs depends upon the direction vertical integration takes.

The Reverend Louis J. Miller, Catholic rural life director of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., diocese, writes about the problem in the diocese newspaper. He warns that if VI goes the wrong way, farmers may be forced to surrender their traditional management responsibilities—such as marketing, feeding, purchasing, breeding stock selection, and so forth.

In California, he says, 90 percent of the beef cattle are produced by 275 farmers, and they are not family farmers. "How would you like about 300 such operations fattening an average of 14,000 head in our fair State of South Dakota?" the Catholic leader asks.

And Reverend Miller gets right to the core of the vertical integration problem with these questions: "Who will control it? For whose benefit will it be operated?" That's what farmers all over are asking. They understand that vertical integration—is an invention of corporate business—because it was logical in the drive for more profits. That's fair enough, and good business, but the farmers don't want to lose control of their family operations, and they feel they are entitled to their share of the profits.

One cooperative leader put it this way: "It makes a great deal of difference whether contract farming (another form of vertical integration) originates with the farm, or cooperative on behalf of the farm, or whether it is started by outside interests, usually at the expense of the farmer."

And Reverend Miller has a direct message for farmers. He says: "Vertical integration is here in strength. You, the farmers, can control it. You cannot ignore it, except to lose farming as a way of life. You must study it through your farm organization, and find means of controlling it through your farmer's cooperative, so as to channel a just share of its benefits to your families on the land."

That's quite a challenge, of course. But your cooperatives are moving to meet it. And how can you help? How can the individual farmer help? First, buy and sell co-op all the way. It is your business that makes your co-ops strong enough to meet bigness with bigness. Build your co-ops to work for you.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF FEBRUARY 12, 1959

These are busy days for cooperatives, here at home, and in the State legislatures, and in Washington. President Eisenhower made news when he used interest-payments as an excuse to tell REA co-ops that they were being subsidized.

The President talked to 8,000 delegates, and got a cool reception when he told them, "REA co-ops do not need, do not deserve, and should not accept any special help from the Government."

Many delegates pointed out that it was Government policy and special help that boosted bank interest rates from 2 to 4 percent, and bankers did not complain.

And this approach by the President comes on top of the unpalatable recommendation by his Secretary of the Treasury that gives the impression co-ops do not pay taxes. The Secretary said, in effect, "We'll tell you how to run your business, and here's how: You must pay 4 percent interest on your savings. You must pay out everything after 3 years; liquidate your savings. And, if you do that," he said, "I'll recommend that you pay no income tax to Uncle Sam."

All self-respecting co-ops would turn down such a deal as undesirable, unsound, and in bad faith. But the reason there's so much confusion about co-ops is that the propaganda mills keep grinding away on half-truths, complete untruths, and outright lies.

And the erroneous statements in papers like the Wall Street Journal do not help, as it's sharp readers well know. For example, here is one letter the editors of this business and financial paper got. It is from C. H. Lishbough, a reader. Mr. Lishbough says: "Your editorial in the Wall Street Journal, 'Share and Share Alike,' contains several misleading and incorrect inferences regarding the business and taxation practices of cooperatives."

"Although you do not mention it by name, the patronage rebate to which you repeatedly refer is, of course, non-taxable to any type of business, whether legally organized as a cooperative or not."

"Thus, in that long-forgotten year when Henry Ford refunded \$50 to the purchaser of each new car he produced, he was paying a patronage rebate."

"Under today's tax laws, Ford Motor Co. could do the same thing with impunity fully equal to that enjoyed by the cooperatives. The much happier owners of new Fords would not have to pay income tax on the rebate either."

"But the interesting fact is that the issuance of stock dividends by noncooperative corporations is usually undertaken for much the same reason used by the cooperatives in establishing revolving funds for the delayed disbursement of patronage rebates: The conservation of working capital. In each case, such action must be taken with the support and approval of the stockholder owners."

"And this may be the crux of the matter, for while we hear a great deal, indeed, about the great tax advantages enjoyed by cooperatives, we see very few corporations taking advantage of the opportunity which is legally open to all, to organize themselves as cooperatives."

"Perchance, the basic reason for this is the very substantial difference in the exercise of controls by the stockholders in the cooperatives, as compared to ordinary corporations. The cooperative stockholder has one vote, regardless of the number of shares which he may own, while the owner of common voting stock in other corporations has one vote per share."

"Many corporate managers, born and bred in the world of proxy contests, would sincerely prefer to avoid confronting themselves

with such an utterly democratic group of stockholders—and no doubt many cooperative managers feverishly wish they didn't have to either. And so the practical disadvantages must outweigh the small tax advantages which certainly carefully defined types of cooperatives do enjoy."

And that is the view of a reader of the August Wall Street Journal, on co-ops. And, concludes reader Lishbough, "Alas, the cooperative society is not just around the corner."

Excerpts From Remarks Made by Governor Williams, of Michigan, at a Meeting of the Michigan Soil Conservation Districts, Michigan State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this week the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I am privileged to serve, has been hearing the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. It strikes me that the remarks of Hon. G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, at a meeting of the Michigan State University Soil Conservation District personnel on January 23, would be of help to all of us as we seek to improve our agricultural economy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the remarks was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS AT A MEETING OF THE MICHIGAN SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, KELLOGG CENTER, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH., JANUARY 23, 1959

It certainly is a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak to a group whose work is as important to the future of the State of Michigan as is the work you are engaged in.

It's not necessary for me, I am sure, to tell you how important soil conservation is, nor how we have progressed in this area over the years. As in many other programs, we've come a long way, but we still have a long way to go.

In 1938, there was one soil conservation district in Michigan. In 1949, there were 18. Now there are 75.

In other words, Michigan in the decade preceding 1949 added 17 soil conservation districts, and in the decade since 1949, we have added 57. This is a record of growth in which every citizen can take great pride.

Soil conservation districts now embrace more than 90 percent of the land area of Michigan. There are, I am told, more than 34,000 farmers actively cooperating with these districts, while uncounted thousands more have been persuaded to improve their farming practices through the varied activities sponsored by these districts.

It would be difficult to overemphasize the importance of this growth in soil conservation work. Sound conservation practices are among the most precious gifts one generation can pass on to the next. Truly you build a stronger Michigan for your children by the work that brings you here.

Among the activities related to soil conservation is reforestation, and in this area

Michigan has a bright record indeed. More than 54,000 acres of State land have been reforested in the last 10 years.

In the same period of time, the capacity of State nurseries to produce seedlings has been increased from 6 million a year to more than 25 million.

Ten years ago, the forest-planted areas of the State totaled 874,000 acres. Now the total is close to 1,300,000 acres.

It is worth noting that of this gain in forest acreage, more than one-half is in private plantings, and a great part of this was brought about through the use of State-grown seedlings made available at cost.

Tree farms, as against forest-planted areas, also show a steady growth in Michigan. Under the State's tree farm program, there are now close to 1,443,000 acres involved in the State's tree farm program, ranging in size from farmer's woodlots to sizable commercial holdings.

And we're saying what we're growing—as witness the sharp reduction in forest fire losses in the past 10 to 15 years. For example, one report shows 106,385 acres of forest lost through fires in the period 1945 through 1949, compared with 32,095 acres in the period 1950 to 1955.

Michigan's forest growth today exceeds the amount removed by harvesting and fires. We are therefore renewing a great resource, and at the same time realizing from that resource concurrent benefits in conservation, and in food for Michigan game animals. As you know, thousands of deer have been saved from starvation by the renewal of feeding areas.

Commercially, not including the Christmas tree business, the forest products industries in Michigan taken together are a \$300 million a year business, and show every promise of playing an increasingly important role in our economic growth over the next 25 years.

So much for figures. The evidence of progress in Michigan is heartening. This does not mean, however, that the job of conservation is finished. It is not finished. Every generation faces all over again the great struggle between those who would deplete the soil, either through ignorance, carelessness, or greed, and those who would conserve our soil, and other basic resources, as a gift from the past to be improved as it is turned over to the future.

This century has seen two eras of dramatic attention to conservation. The first era was opened by President Theodore Roosevelt. Natural resources, he told the Governors' Conference on Conservation in May 1908, are the final basis of national power and perpetuity. Almost a year before, he had signed the Forest Reserve Act, which was the beginning of the end of the American cycle of cut, slash, fire, and land abandonment, as one observer described it.

The other era came with President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The dark cloud of depression unemployment produced the silver lining of tremendous conservation projects through the famous Civilian Conservation Corps. People today are reaping the benefits of the work done by the CCC. Not only were idle men given useful work, but the land they renewed has benefited the people ever since.

This characteristic of conservation—the wise use of today's resources in order to provide tomorrow's growth—is a pretty good description of what your State government is trying to do to meet the challenges which face us.

During the next several months, it is likely that questions of taxation and appropriations will dominate most of the governmental news out of Lansing.

Debates over budgets for an enterprise the size of this great State, as well as discussions of how such budgets can be equitably financed, quite frequently become so involved that it is easy to lose sight of what the discussion is all about.

Fundamentally, the question is the level of State services. Are we going to increase our educational facilities in keeping with the increasing population of school-age children and youth, or are we going to hold off the tide of new pupils coming up each year?

Are we going to give proper treatment to the mentally ill and retarded children, or are we going to neglect them? Are we going to have better parks for our people? Adequate State police protection? Are we going to treat our senior citizens like human beings deserve to be treated, or are we going to discard them?

These are just some of the things the State budget means when it is translated into human terms.

Your State government is concerned both with the immediate needs of the people—public health and public safety measures, for example—and also with the longer range problems arising out of the revolutionary scientific changes in the world about us.

Michigan pioneered the age of the automobile, and put the whole world on wheels. We became the arsenal of democracy in World War II, dazzling the free world with prodigious feats of production. Well, now we've got to find our way into a new era—an era of electronics, automation, atomic energy, missiles, and the exploration of outer space.

We're going to master this new era as we have the other challenges in the past. It's going to take hard work and a lot of cooperation, but the rewards are well worth the effort.

Right now, 100 of Michigan's leading business and industrial leaders, along with labor and agricultural leaders, are working together as a Commission on Michigan's Economic Future—or COMEF. This group will blueprint workable plans for the future, based upon a realistic assessment of resources human and natural with which we are blessed.

Also at work is a science advisory board, composed of top scientists from our industries and our universities. They already have given a preliminary report which clearly shows how important science is in Michigan's economic future, and what we must do now to move ahead in the science-based industries of the future.

So let's not let the immediate crisis of State finances—serious as it is—obscure the fact that Michigan is rich in opportunities for growth. We have the resources, we have a dynamic population, we have great leaders in every kind of endeavor—if we put them together in the right combination, we'll build a new economy for the people of Michigan, bigger and better and stronger than any since our history began.

You who are in conservation know better than others how important it is to keep driving for long-range gains while you work through the immediate problems. So it is in State government today.

The immediate needs and the long-range problems are both being worked on. I think the results will be worthwhile both in resolving the financial distress of State government, and in providing an atmosphere for future growth.

School-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have read with considerable interest an editorial in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 10, 1959, concerning

the school-aid program in New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO HELP FOR US

The school-aid program proposed yesterday by President Eisenhower is not likely to have much effect on financing construction programs in New Jersey.

At a news conference on the President's bill, Welfare Secretary Flemming emphasized that it would apply only to those areas which lack the financial resources to do the job themselves.

New Jersey, with a high per capita income, is not likely to qualify as a distress area. But this leaves the delicate question of deciding just what constitutes a distress area.

Willingness to shoulder the burden of school costs also plays a part in determining how much an area will do to provide more and better schools. The voters in school districts where classrooms are badly overcrowded have been known to reject bond issues to pay for new school buildings. In these cases, would the districts be considered distress areas? The parents of children doubled up in overcrowded classrooms might think so. But their opinion might not be shared by authorities in Washington who will dispense the school-aid dollars.

Areas which do not have the resources to provide adequate schools merit aid. But some sound basis must be developed for determining just what qualifies an area for help.

Land Reform in Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times on Monday, January 26, 1959, dealing with the subject of "Land Reform in Pakistan." I recently had the pleasure of discussing this subject with the distinguished Ambassador from Pakistan to the United States, His Excellency Mohammed Ali. I want to take this occasion to wish the people of Pakistan and their President, General Ayub, the very best in their efforts to strengthen the stability of their nation. It is my sincere hope that the Government of Pakistan will, without unnecessary delay, act to restore constitutional democracy to the people of Pakistan so that both the spirit and the letter of representative government will reign. President Ayub has given every indication that he wishes these constitutional reforms to get underway expeditiously. The friends of Pakistan in the United States await this development.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAND REFORM IN PAKISTAN

When General Ayub took over sweeping powers in Pakistan last October, assumed the Presidency and set aside the previous constitutional structures for the time being, it

was remarked here that his action would ultimately have to be judged by the use to which he put those powers. He has now set into operation one of the sweeping reforms that he promised, a drastic revision of the land tenure system. Pakistan will have agrarian reform with a vengeance.

The pattern, however, is totally different from that of the agrarian reformers in Red China, where the program was simply to kill the landlord, take his land, give to the peasants with much fanfare and then systematically take it back. In Pakistan the large estates—about 6,000—will be broken up, but the landlords will receive just compensation in the form of interest-bearing bonds. Former tenants will have the opportunity to purchase on easy terms, and security of tenure will be guaranteed.

President Ayub insists that he is acting on scientific and economic grounds rather than on the basis of any doctrinaire emotion. In spite of the fact that West Pakistan is about the size of Texas there is enormous pressure on the land from its 40 million people, because relatively little is arable without massive irrigation.

Two problems have to be faced. The first is absentee landlordism, which has proved economically unsound and has also, according to President Ayub, built up undesirable concentrations of political power. The other problem is at the opposite end of the scale. This is fragmentation through inheritance customs. Thus, while some of the holdings are too large and will be reduced in size, many others are much too small and there must be a program of consolidation.

As the plans have been outlined there appears to be a high regard for both human and property rights and an attempt to safeguard them. The reform is needed, and the President is committed to it and has acted boldly. He is deserving of congratulation and of success.

Where Integrated Schools Break Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Integrated Schools Break Down," published in the Daily Press, of Newport News, Va., on February 16, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE INTEGRATED SCHOOLS BREAK DOWN

From time to time in this space, there has been an exploration into what has been called "the disintegration of the public school system under integration."

And, almost without exception, these observations are followed by letters from readers who deplore our pessimism about the continued operation of racially mixed schools.

We venture into the fray again, with our arsenal filled with reports supplied by Richmond Times-Dispatch researcher Larry Weekly. He reports that the classroom problems resulting from the integration of Washington schools, where Negroes outnumber whites by 3 to 1, were so severe that the Washington school officials immediately started a drastic regrouping program.

After a year of integration, for instance, Washington school officials found that two-thirds of the ninth-graders couldn't read as well as the national average; two-thirds were below the norm in arithmetic, and more than one-third of the retarded group were from 1 to 3 years behind their age group.

Furthermore, 90 percent of the retarded students, according to the national achievement tests, were Negro.

With these results, Washington school planners immediately tightened their standards of grading. Failure rates in the elementary schools have increased from 5.3 percent when integration was ordered started to 12.7 percent this past June.

Now the Nation's Capital is beginning to think about expanding its programs.

When integration began in 1954, there were the usual two tracks or preparatory programs, under which a student prepared himself for further study, or, in the general course, a student prepared himself for immediate entry into the commercial world.

Now, Washington officials have found it necessary to break up (or down) their school system into six different tracks in order to maintain their requirement for eventual promotion of the students. There is the usual preprofessional course, and a college preparatory course which does aim him at a general college. Then there's a general course for those who don't expect to attend college, and at the bottom is a fourth track for youngsters, most of them Negroes, who expect to need elementary reading, writing, and arithmetic to get self-sustaining jobs.

But in addition to these 4 tracks, there are 2 more. A fifth program is strictly vocational, in which the student is taught basic skills of the easier trades. And a sixth is for boys, mostly Negroes, who are severe behavior problems.

There is a wide gap existing between the dropout age of 18 and the working age of 18, filled mostly with Negroes. One police officer reported "most of them wouldn't work even if you gave him a job."

They blame this pool of idle youth for the sickening waves of crime that have made Washington streets almost bare after the early evening hours.

But it boils down to this:

Washington, the showcase of integration, is finding it cannot operate a successful, efficient school system on a racially mixed basis. Two-thirds of its ninth-graders are below the national average in reading and arithmetic, the two basic subjects for an elementary education. And in spite of some tightening of standards, the situation does not improve, in spite of the efforts being made to show the Nation integration will work.

It won't, and Washington and Harlem are showcasing the problem before the world.

Annual Report of Dr. A. J. Kreft, Oregon State Izaak Walton League President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most useful organizations in the Nation is the Izaak Walton League, which consists of sportsmen who are dedicated to the cause of wise use and preservation of our natural resources. The instances of its leadership in this field are too numerous to detail here.

On November 28, 1958, the State president of the Izaak Walton League in Oregon, delivered his annual report to the membership. Dr. Alfred J. Kreft's address is so full of valuable information on such topics as cleaning up our polluted rivers, enhancing safety in the woods during hunting season, safeguarding upland watersheds and encouraging young people in conservation education, that I believe it should be printed in the Appendix of the Record for the benefit of the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of Dr. A. J. Kreft, of Portland, to the State convention of the Izaak Walton League of Oregon, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF STATE PRESIDENT DR. A. J. KREFT AT THE STATE CONVENTION, NOVEMBER 28, 1958, EUGENE, OREG., UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AS DIVISION PRESIDENT

Fellow Waltonians and guests, I wish to thank each of you for coming to this convention and helping us mold our policy for next year and the future. As a president retires from office, he has an opportunity in his final report to place in the record the accomplishments of his regime.

There is much of which we may boast, but little of it is due to my personal efforts. In the 2 years that I was honored to serve you, I only called a few signals, the teamwork was yours.

During this period, you have added nine new chapters to the Oregon division. You have won national recognition and citation for your work, as two members of the Oregon division, Art Roberts and Irv Luiten, won national IWL honor awards at the Colorado Springs National Izaak Walton League Convention. The American National Cattlemen's Association and the Oregon Farm Bureau recognized your work in the two citations awarded to Jack Binford. In addition Mrs. Marion T. Weatherford and Ken McLeod—both members of the league, won coveted American Motors-Nash conservation awards the past year.

Several years ago we were in debt, now we have a sound bank balance. Part of this is due to the savings accomplished by the contribution of Art Roberts and his secretary, Mrs. Barbara Wood, and their organization in helping with the secretarial work. At this convention there will be distributed to each chapter president only a copy of the booklet, "So Now You're Program Chairman." This is the work of Kramer Adams. The booklet was printed by his company, the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., and the cover was done by Art Roberts and the West Coast Lumbermen's Association. This work, done in the name of the Oregon division, will surely gain more recognition for the division.

Four of our chapters—Waldport, Salem, Eugene, and the Portland Air Force—will be Gavel and Gong award winners in 1958. The Eugene chapter is pioneering in the formation of a youth chapter. I hope that each of you meet the members of McKenzie High School group and encourage them. We again are privileged to hold another Young Waltonian Conference—this is the fourth year that Jack Binford has been chairman; and as usual, he has an excellent committee to make for another successful youth conference.

On the national legislative front in 1958 you will hear this has been a very wonderful year in the passage of much excellent conservation legislation. The most important bill to win congressional approval, you will recall one of your resolutions of last

year, was the recently enacted amendment to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (Public Law 732). The act clearly authorized Federal construction agencies to include fish and wildlife conservation measures, for both mitigation of damage and for enhancement and improvement, regardless of the date of authorization of the water-use project. An existing backlog of 800 authorized projects, costing an estimated \$10 billion, are subject to this provision.

Fish and wildlife conservation can now have an equal place at the bar of public opinion and congressional decision in the development and disposition of water in related land resources. This has been basic in the Oregon water resources law from the beginning—thanks to those Waltonians who helped Governor Patterson and the 1953 legislators in formulating our model water resources board.

Congress also authorized the \$3 duck stamp law, to take effect next year. All of the income will be spent for wetlands acquisition and development—as it was intended in the original Duck Stamp Act.

The successful termination of the Klamath Indian Termination Act (Public Law 587) is history. For his efforts in this legislation, Senator NEUBERGER will be given special recognition by the division at Saturday's luncheon. We owe much also to Rollin Bowles for following closely the legislation and getting the South Dakota and California divisions alerted at a crucial time in the legislative proceedings. Again, the importance of belonging to and having a strong national organization is pointed out.

You are all familiar with the Outdoor Recreation Resources Act and the fact that Joe Penfold, our Washington league representative, was appointed by the President as one of seven citizens of the United States to the Commission. It will be up to the division to cooperate with this body and help in supplying the necessary information to help them make their report, which is due in 1961. We also are fortunate in having two of the Oregon congressional delegation selected to the 15-member Commission.

You have read of all the national legislative achievements in Outdoor America in Joe Penfold's column.

Again, this year as in 1957, the Waltonians in Oregon have erected a bronze plaque to the memory of highly deserving, pioneering conservationists. I refer to the tablet erected on October 25, 1958, at the Malheur Refuge in honor of William Finley and Stanley Jewett.

The past year saw the passing of two past State presidents; we lost Rex Sanford, State president in 1951 and Clark Bachman, president in 1945. These men may not be known to new members of the league, but let us never forget those conservation giants of yesterday who did so much—who gave of themselves so completely—when the conservation idea was not as well known as it is today. Both of these men did a lot for the Oregon division. It is up to all of us to carry on in the manner that they would want, so that the league will continue to grow in prestige and membership.

Today throughout Oregon, your chapters are a respected group of conservation leaders, whose influence goes far beyond your membership. Some of you have heard a lot from me about increasing your membership. However, we have not concentrated all of our energies in solicitation to show numerical gains. The league has to be judged on the basis of service to resource management; and membership, as such, is important only, as it contributes to this effectiveness. Since we don't have any fund-raising projects for the benefit of the division treasury, it is necessary that adequate funds be on hand to carry out the work in Oregon on the high level that we expect of all great organizations. And the amount of work is increasing so a higher membership is necessary.

The division's record of conservation achievement is a source of inspiration to the national organization and to other divisions. This fact was mentioned to me several times at the national convention at Colorado Springs, which I was privileged to attend as your representative.

I visited the new national office in October. It is a fine place, and I hope that each of you will have an opportunity to see it sometime. They are a busy group—trying to help you do a better job. The new Outdoor America is a magazine that I am proud to display in my office. I would like, however, to see a newspaper type of format used several times a year, so that all league activities could be printed. Their new share-the-league membership campaign is well conceived and well written. I hope that each chapter board of directors will carefully read the material and apply it to their community.

We are hopeful that each chapter and individuals will donate at least \$50 to help equip the library of the new national headquarters. I ask that you prayerfully consider this so that the Oregon division will be successful in this project. Let's show them that we are behind them in their program which is really our program. It is our organization also, not just that of the members of the Middle West.

I am particularly impressed with Frank Gregg, our national executive secretary. I hope that he can visit us at a future State convention. Ed Cooney is a consecrated Waltonian, struggling always with the membership problem. It is a big job.

Mr. Gregg Smith is the editor of Outdoor America. He asks that our chapters send in material for publication. He is very anxious to hear what you are doing.

The chapters of the Oregon division continue to work with others who do not always agree with us. We have discovered that we are a potent pressure group that can influence legislation and public opinion; but we have endeavored with humility and unselfishness to wield the influence for the public good.

The recent attempt by petition to make steelhead a game fish put this policy to a severe test. We Waltonians want our magnificent game fish, the steelhead, set aside entirely for recreational pursuit. The quandary is in the Columbia River where steelhead will inevitably be taken while there is a commercial fishery. It seems that the subject of a February closure could be more realistically reviewed by the Oregon Fish Commission. The bulk of that season's catch have been steelhead fish that support a great winter recreation, followed by thousands of ardent anglers in southwest Washington and on the Willamette and Sandy River watersheds in Oregon. The sportsmen of the two States will not be put off on assignment of those winter steelhead to recreational fishing. It can be done here with the least interference to the overall fishing industry on the lower Columbia River. The steelhead petitions will be back, if this is not done.

I wish to again commend the Oregon Game Commission and their employees for their participation in our affairs and the cooperation that they have given us.

I wish to commend John McKean for his studies on the Silver Lake deerherd. The league recognizes that this type of study should have been done years ago. They are now doing excellent research on the effect of heavy harvesting, studying hunter attitudes, range habitat, actual numbers of deer present and taken out by hunters, what numbers of bucks and does are harvested, the condition of the animals and other important items. I wait with great interest their continuing reports.

Our treasurer has reported on the dollars that have passed through his hands, but these figures will not reflect more than a

small portion of the money expended in league work.

Our national directors, Jack Binford, Rollin Bowles and Luhr Jensen, Jr., have made many trips to national meetings and on national business. Prior to them Bill Niskanen, Joe Smith and Dr. Charlton were our national directors. Dr. Charlton has been attending national meetings for over 20 years—when he was the only person present from the Pacific coast. We owe these men a great deal for their personal contribution in energy, time and funds.

We are indebted to Charles Hoonan for being editor of Outdoor Oregon. My wish is that we have an issue every 2 months or oftener. There is much material that could be sent out.

The convention folder lists our division committees. Some of the committee chairmen have put in a lot of time in league work for the division. I especially commend Carl Eling, Colonel Welland, Dave Dobbins, Dan Allen, John Benneth, and Hardy Glascock—just to name a few. You will hear from many of the committee chairmen at this meeting. Hardy Glascock has spoken to you on three occasions in 1958 on the wilderness bill. The State division, after months of deliberations and three meetings, presented a statement at the Bend hearings on November 7, according to your instructions. The statement was given by Vick Withrow, president of our Salem chapter. Senator Neuberger may touch on the wilderness bill tomorrow noon.

This year we again are presenting four Golden Beaver awards to very worthy recipients. You will enjoy meeting these fine men at the Saturday luncheon. Also, in line with the new national policy of recognizing deserving members of the league who have made outstanding contributions to the cause of conservation, the Oregon division is recognizing the work of a member of the Portland chapter. I mentioned the contribution of Senator NEUBERGER in the Klamath Indian Termination Act legislation. Each of you is eligible next year, so I hope that all will become more active and try to win this award. I hope that you will approve of the award appearance. It is being done by Irwin McFadden, a Portland artist.

I am asking the convention to approve a change in the bylaws to allow for more vice presidents, who can help the division president be of more service to the chapters. It is impossible for a few to visit all of our chapters at least twice a year to help them with their programs and meetings. (As we increase in numbers, so increases our bureaucracy.)

The Conservation Education Workshop at Hoodoo Ski Bowl was again a big success. Sixteen teachers had to be denied admission to the courses because the enrollment was full. So next year the school will run for three 1-week periods. The league has made a big contribution to the success of the workshop; but in my personal opinion, we are not getting the credit for it.

Now let me make some suggestions for the future work of the division.

Next year will be a legislative year. Get to know your legislators real well so that they will have confidence in you. Someone has said, "The man with the voters' mandate gets the job done best." It is going to be hard to replace Rollin Bowles now that he has become a member of the State Game Commission. Give your 1959 legislative chairman all the help possible. He will need your considered opinion and also your presence at legislative hearings.

Hunting safety courses should be a prerequisite before any juvenile 16 years of age or younger can obtain his first hunting license. We don't just give a child the keys to our car and tell him to go drive away. In the State of Washington anybody below the age of 17 must take such a course. To make this successful will require the help of

a lot of sportsmen. Some of you will have to give up some of your leisure time to make the program a success in order to qualify our youth for hunting licenses.

Tonight you will hear the report of the joint house-senate interim committee to investigate fish and game conditions and their recommendations for the 1959 legislature. I wish to thank the many chapters who made statements at the 33 hearings that this committee held throughout Oregon this summer.

One of their chief recommendations will be that of combining the game and fish commissions. In considering this, I urge you to consider what is best for the resource. Each of us has our own opinion on this. If proper safeguards are written into the bill, the sportsmen should approve this recommendation. Three of our chapters have already given their approval at hearings. Dan Allen, chairman of the Portland chapter committee which did a lot of careful work on this problem, will be glad to explain his report to you. Copies are available. The committee did an excellent job.

The antilitterbug campaign is at a standstill. Maybe we should develop a keep Oregon clean committee, as is functioning so well in Maryland. We have the red hat days committee to use as a guide in getting other organizations to work with us.

The red hat days committee did another excellent job. You will hear their reports tomorrow. This committee should be continued, but another method of selecting county chairmen is needed. We hope to remedy this in 1959. To continue to show success accidents by juvenile hunters must be reduced.

You will be asked to vote on a resolution concerning a more aggressive campaign of pollution abatement. One hundred and six Oregon communities require 186 projects to speed up the cleaning up of Oregon streams. The league has traditionally fought for cleaner streams and lakes. I urge that you give your help in the next legislature to get additional funds for the sanitary authority so that it can do the job that we expect of them.

Our division watershed usage committee has been doing a superlative job the past year. This committee should be encouraged to continue their research. I hope that the division publishes the findings of this committee and make it more effective, by asking other groups to have representation on it. I await tomorrow's panel with a great deal of interest.

There are a lot of problems connected with logging at the higher elevations that have not been entirely solved. There has been some discussion about the Windego Pass timber sale to the Diamond Lake Lumber Co. Concern has been expressed about the future of the Cascade Crest—the future of the snow water basins. We have been assured that the Forest Service will follow the cutting of the sub-alpine timber very closely. The slope is gentle. There will be small cutting units. From the water standpoint, there will be a possible increase in water yield as the snow pack will be increased. Slash disposal will be guarded.

In this connection we are having problems in the Siletz and Rogue River watersheds. The temperatures of those two great streams was quite high last summer so that concern for fish life was expressed. Chapters are urged to do more research to help our State and Federal agencies and private operators do a better job.

We could make better use of the soil bank plan in Oregon. The Eugene and Silverton chapters for the past few years have been working with farmers to improve wildlife habitat. Linn and Lane Counties are good examples of usage of this program.

More high school chapters should be encouraged. I hope that the present youth conference will be of great help to you in this regard. However, the chapters will need

the benefit of adults who know basic league policies and programs, or trouble will arise.

In regard to membership, the goal in Oregon is a healthy chapter in every county-seat town. There are many vacancies, so let's reach this goal.

I have had ready telephone access the past 2 years to our immediate past State presidents and have consulted them often. I appreciate very much the help of Rollin Bowles, Dan Allen, Jack Binford, Joe Smith, Dr. Charlton, and Merle Brown. I pledge to my successor the same cooperation that these gentlemen have given to me.

Your secretary and I have tried to keep the chapters informed of all developments through a monthly chapter bulletin and letters. In checking up I find that only 160 envelopes remain out of the 3,500 that we purchased, so your division officers have sent out 3,340 communications to league members and on other league business. A number of telegrams were sent, when needed; and many telephone calls were made. I like to use the telephone rather than write a letter. Telephone calls are a good business practice, so why not apply the principles of management to conservation?

The whole is greater than the sum of all its parts—due to organization. I hope that I leave the Oregon division with a better organization, due mainly to better training of chapter officers by you. My four vice presidents have had a great deal to do with improving our organization. I am very grateful to all of them and to our division treasurer and secretary for their prompt help.

To your new officers may I counsel them to make a great effort to get improvement in understanding with other groups. As our standard of living rises, more and more of our renewable and nonrenewable resources are being used up. Let us try to keep Oregon the place that we want to live in. We in Oregon are not crowded to death. We have so much to be thankful for. Let us appreciate what we have out here. Teach others also to be appreciative, and become league members.

So in the spirit of yesterday, when we gave thanks to God for our many bountiful blessings, let us pause occasionally and orientate ourselves. Let us attend frequent chapter meetings; read a lot about conservation; teach others to do likewise.

Let us be thankful that we live in a country where we can have a great organization like the Izaak Walton League and are permitted to hold meetings like this. The fact that I was State president is not important, but what is important is that an organization like the league exists.

It has been a great honor to me to have been your president. I am thankful for the opportunity of having been of some service to my State and country. It has been a very pleasant and enlightening experience, most especially for the wonderful people that I have met.

The Benson Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I have received from the Fargo City Commission, regarding the farm policy as administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout this general area people are keenly interested in the growth, progress and economic development of the city of Fargo and its inhabitants. Correspondingly, the people of Fargo are also keenly interested in economic conditions and the well-being of its friends and neighbors in surrounding rural areas.

It is universally recognized these days that our economy is an interdependent economy, and that which adversely affects agriculture sooner or later has an adverse effect on business, labor and the general public. It has now been clearly established that one vital segment of the economy such as agriculture cannot suffer without there being cumulative effects on the rest of the people. Therefore, the interdependence of agriculture, industry, business and labor must be recognized.

Fargo is the center of a great farm belt and our people depend upon agriculture for their sustenance and livelihood. Therefore, Fargo, like any agricultural community, cannot afford to stand back and permit the deterioration of our agricultural economy, and the continuing decline of farm income, accompanied by the general accelerated move away from the farm.

The news reported by the Associated Press as late as last Saturday, January 31, was headlined "Farm Income to Decrease by Many Millions—Benson Shakes Up Price Supports in Agriculture" and heralds the downward spiral of farm income and its ultimate effect on this area and our people.

Therefore, recognizing that the peril of agriculture is the peril of all citizens in this area, whether they live in villages, towns or cities, or on the farm, we call for the immediate resignation of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, whose policies have contributed to this unfortunate decline in our agricultural economy and farm income. We regret that Secretary Benson, by his policies appears to regard farmers and farms as just so many increments or statistics on a chart, and Secretary Benson also appears by his policies to lack feeling or concern for the plight of the individual farmer.

The Benson policy, as announced and administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, can only mean eventual ruin to many of our family farms and imposes a cumulative unfortunate effect on the rest of our economy.

In the event Mr. Benson does not submit his resignation, we respectfully call on the President of the United States to ask for Mr. Benson's resignation and to replace the Secretary of Agriculture with a new face and a new policy, based upon determined bipartisan attempts to help restore farm income and save the family sized farm.

FARGO CITY COMMISSION,
HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
J. W. MARKEY,
E. J. MCCANNELL,
FRED C. HAGEN,
PAUL K. LEWIS.

Meeting of February 3, 1959.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 15, it was my great privi-

lege to be the guest of the Detroit Lithuanian Organization Center in connection with the 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian independence commemorative ceremonies.

A magnificent program was presented by men and women who are faithful to their God and church, devotedly loyal to America, and strong in their contributions to the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan.

The organization adopted a resolution which reflects their firm convictions, and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix, along with the remarks I made, so that all may know the sentiments and plea of these fine Americans of Lithuanian origin.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

During the 41st commemoration of the reinstatement declaration of Lithuania's independence, sponsored by the Detroit Lithuanian Organization Center, held at Western High School, 1500 Scotten Avenue, Detroit, Mich., on February 15, 1959, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas in June 1940, Soviet Russia did invade the sovereign independent Republic of Lithuania with armed forces to protect Lithuanian independence and, against the will of the people, annex her to the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the armed forces of the Soviet Union are still presently residing in Lithuania in complete and total disregard of the agreements, policies, and treaties which existed between the Soviet Union and other allies of World War II; and

"Whereas Russian Communists are still currently perpetrating deportations and exterminations of whole ethnic groups, plundering people and institutions, and separating the members of family, one from another: Therefore be it

"Resolved—

"That, on this 41st anniversary, we express our deep gratitude to the Government of the United States for nonacknowledgement of the fabricated incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and for allowing the many thousands of refugees to find new homes in this country.

"That, we respectfully recommend that our U.S. Government abstain from entrance into any alliance, pact, or agreement which would in any way whatsoever recognize the present day Russian empire.

"That the Government of the United States be urged to use all possible means to protect enslaved peoples from genocidal destruction and preserve their hope of eventual liberation.

"Finally, that a copy of this resolution, signed by the presiding officers, be transmitted to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Michigan State Governor, and U.S. Senators and Congressmen from the State of Michigan."

DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATION
CENTER,

ALFONAS NAKAS, President,
JONAS GAIZUTIS, Secretary.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, DEMOCRAT, OF MICHIGAN, TO THE DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATION, DETROIT, MICH., HONORING LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Tomorrow, February 16, marks the 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. From 1918 to 1940 Lithuania stood among the family of free nations and made her contribution to the society of free peoples.

Thereafter, Lithuania was absorbed behind the Iron Curtain. There is no commerce, either commercial or cultural, between our shores and theirs. Not even newsmen are allowed to visit the occupied country.

And yet we have ways of knowing that the spirit of independence there has not been crushed. We have every reason to hope that one day it will again be a free and independent nation. Meanwhile it is noteworthy that our own country has never recognized the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and that our broadcasts in the Lithuanian language are providing a tangible evidence of our interest as well as a source of knowledge of the free world.

We are also fortunate that our own civilization is enriched by a million Lithuanian Americans who are making their special contribution to the growth of our Nation. In our own State of Michigan, they are counted among our most civic-minded, upstanding citizens.

It is my hope and belief that you can be counted upon to insist that our foreign policy be based on a realization that as the strongest free nation of the world we must cooperate with the peoples of the world who are aspiring to gain or regain the right to determine their fate and the opportunity to improve their standard of living. This may mean some sacrifice on our part; and there are some 4½ million in this country, unemployed, who are in no position to be sharing at this time. But I am confident that we have the resources and the ability, given the proper leadership, to solve these perplexing problems here at home and still be able to lend a helping hand to those in other lands temporarily less fortunate than ourselves.

With the best effort of us all, I'm sure we can do it.

Tribute to Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week we celebrate the birthday of a great American, Wendell Willkie. Mr. Willkie was born on February 18, 1892.

Upon the death of Mr. Willkie in 1944, a 16-year-old girl, Mary Taylor Pryor—now Mrs. Lowell Thomas, Jr.—set down her thoughts on this fine man. Mr. Willkie had been her parents' house guest for 2 weeks prior to his death.

His stature is fully reflected in what this young girl put down in writing. It was read at his funeral by the late Mayor Fiorello La Guardia.

In commemoration of the birth date of this great American, I ask unanimous consent that the inspired words written by Mary Pryor, as delivered at the funeral by Mayor La Guardia, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECHO

(By Mary Taylor Pryor)

The flames of the fire leapt upward piercing the blackness of the night. Seated on the sand around it, each of us stared hypnotically at the strange dancing shapes. The night was cold and clear, and millions of stars formed the roof over our heads. The rippling lake reflecting the starlight stretched from our feet to the purple mountains in the distance.

He seemed reoccupied that night. Sitting apart from us his thoughts were far away. Then the shrill cry of a loon pierced the stillness, and seemed to awaken him. He came forward by the fire. His face lit up and his eyes shone, and the soft night breezes ruffled his hair. Suddenly all was still, even the crackling of the fire seemed to cease. He was speaking, not only to us but to everything under that roof of stars; speaking in a strong, husky voice; speaking of something familiar to every element of nature, freedom. Everything listened, even the stately old pine trees seemed to be bending toward him so as to hear all of his philosophy. His words rang with sincerity and his unwavering convictions gave them amazing strength. They were words that reflected his warm, friendly personality, his determination and above all his honesty.

Then, as though some unseen force had beckoned to him, he withdrew into the shadows. The fire had suddenly died down and dark clouds hid the stars. But above the moaning of the pine trees his ringing voice still echoed over the silent lake and mountains. And today everyone everywhere hears the echo of those words of Wendell Willkie.

Advisory Council on Global Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the path ahead for the free world is beset by obstacles, obstacles which it is important for us to discern and to surmount. Mr. Goodhue Livingston, Jr., chairman of the Policy Committee of the Committee for Collective Security, has advanced a stimulating proposal as to how we can achieve effectiveness in planning and programming in the difficult days ahead. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record Mr. Livingston's suggestions, in the form of a letter to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, and invite the attention of my colleagues to it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOBAL STRATEGY

To the Christian Science Monitor: The major problem facing the free world is the steadily growing threat of Communist aggression. The relatively monolithic Communist bloc has a more dynamic and united leadership and is more effective in its propaganda and subversion because it is both ruthless and unscrupulous.

The basic principles motivating the free world can prevail if soundly expounded and forcefully prompted. However, the free world suffers from inept leadership, whether the Democratic or Republican Party or a conservative or labor government is in power in the two great countries to which the rest of the free world looks for direction.

Our foreign policy should be formulated on a sounder basis and should provide alternative policies to meet possible contingencies. For example, what will be our position on Germany when Chancellor Adenauer is no longer in power? What steps should we take to offset indirect aggression by Soviet

Russia if it continues its present policies? What would be our attitude if Yugoslavia rejoins the Communist bloc? What will we do concerning Formosa when Chiang Kai-shek is no longer president?

What will be our position if the growing industrialization of the People's Republic of China makes it an important factor in world trade? What disarmament plans will we propose if the smaller nations acquire the capacity to wage nuclear warfare? How should we mobilize pressure by the free world upon the Arab States and Israel to adjust their differences if the present efforts of the United Nations fail?

Our foreign policy, seeking universal peace and justice, should be based on global strategy rather than on tactical maneuvering. The Committee for Collective Security proposes the establishment by law of an advisory council for global strategy, to consist of private citizens, appointed by the President, qualified to advise the Department of State on matters of policy. This group, with a permanent secretariat and access to classified information, should include representatives of the natural and social sciences skilled in dealing with political, psychological, and economic problems.

Perhaps too frequently the State Department sees the trees but fails to see the forest, and a group of private citizens would help in broadening its vision. Our foreign policy should be determined on the basis of a balanced assessment of all the dimensions and approaches of the problems facing this country and the free world. We should initiate a course of action rather than seek to effectuate our aims only when action is forced upon us. The keynote of our efforts to attain our global strategic objectives should be action, not reaction.

GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Policy Committee, Com-
mittee for Collective Security.
New York, N.Y.

Boggs-Daniel Narcotic Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat of Louisiana, today released statistics on the results of the Boggs-Daniel Narcotic Control Act of 1956.

Congressman Boggs said:

"Since the Congress passed the Boggs-Daniel Narcotic Control Act of July 1956, with its severe minimum mandatory penalties against illegal sellers of narcotics, the improvement in the narcotic situation in the United States has been remarkable. One of the most realistic and accurate yardsticks to gauge this improvement is the number of addicts reported in 1958 as compared with the number reported in 1956.

"The District of Columbia shows that the count of new addicts dropped from 200 in 1956 to only 60 in the first 11 months of 1958. In Louisiana there was a decrease in the number of addicts reported from 142 in 1956 to 50 in the first 11 months of 1958."

Mr. Boggs also pointed out other States which show a significant overall improvement. These are as follows:

State	1956	1958 (1st 11 months)
Texas	523	175
Ohio	92	37
Michigan	543	264
New York	4,138	2,836
Illinois	908	681
Missouri	210	123
California	1,568	1,276

In considering the statistics given above for Ohio, it should be pointed out there had already been a decrease of 80 percent in 1956 from 1955, the year in which the Ohio State law providing for a 20-year minimum mandatory penalty for illegal sale of narcotics was enacted.

"I am tremendously gratified," the Congressman said, "by the figures which have now been compiled showing the operation of the Boggs-Daniel Narcotics Code. Despite the tremendously growing population, the number of addicts has decreased since the enactment of the act."

"I would hope that these figures would persuade some of the people both in the medical and legal profession who have been attempting to sabotage the Boggs-Daniel Narcotics Code. I do not question their good intentions, but it seems to me that these figures show that their approach providing narcotics for addicts is wrong."

Nixon Now Leads Rockefeller by 2 to 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach hereto an article from the Washington Sunday Star of February 15, which is a compilation of the Trendex News Poll. This poll indicates that Nixon now leads Rockefeller by more than 2 to 1 across the country.

The poll, showing NIXON a 2-to-1 favorite, is among all voters. Among Republicans Nixon leads Rockefeller by better than 5 to 1.

This is some indication of the impression which the Vice President has made not only upon Republicans, but on people generally throughout the country.

The article follows:

NIXON NOW LEADS ROCKEFELLER BY 2 TO 1
(By Jack Boyle)

NEW YORK.—Public opinion has dramatically switched from Nelson A. Rockefeller to RICHARD M. NIXON as Republican President nominee, last week's Trendex News Poll shows.

Governor Rockefeller's program for a \$277 million tax jump in New York was an important factor in his loss of popularity nationally.

Vice President Nixon now is almost a 2-to-1 favorite over Mr. Rockefeller. Among Republicans, he ranks better than 5 to 1.

Last November Mr. Rockefeller was a 5-to-4 favorite over Mr. Nixon.

Immediately after the last election, when Governor Rockefeller easily defeated Averell Harriman, Trendex interviewers asked a scientifically selected cross section of Americans: "As of right now, do you think RICHARD NIXON or Nelson Rockefeller would get

the most votes for the Presidency as the nominee of the Republican Party?"

Last week, while Governor Rockefeller was defending his budget and Vice President Nixon was in Venezuela for the inauguration of Romulo Betancourt as President, Trendex interviewers asked the same question of a similar, though not identical, cross section.

Here is a comparison of responses by regions and in percentages:

	East	West and Mid-west	South	Total
Rockefeller:				
November 1958.....	54.5	36.2	48.6	45.9
Now.....	23.1	33.4	27.8	27.9
Nixon:				
November 1958.....	30.3	44.0	37.1	37.6
Now.....	60.4	38.3	66.4	51.8
No opinion:				
November 1958.....	15.2	19.8	14.3	16.5
Now.....	16.5	28.3	5.8	20.3

The figures show that Mr. Rockefeller's greatest losses, and Mr. Nixon's greatest gains, were in the East, which includes Governor Rockefeller's own State, and in the South.

In the current poll, interviewers asked the party leanings of those interviewed. This was not done during the 1958 poll. When the preferences were divided by parties and independents, the current opinion was, in percent:

	Democrats	Republicans	Independents
Rockefeller.....	36.5	13.8	34.3
NIXON.....	44.3	76.4	29.8
No opinion.....	19.2	9.8	35.9

While independents seem to favor Mr. Rockefeller, more than a third of them have not yet made up their minds.

All interviewed were invited to explain their answers and the dislike of the Rockefeller tax plan appeared strongly in replies. Many favored either Mr. Rockefeller or Mr. Nixon because of their personality or "because he appeals to me most."

Some said they favored one or the other because he was younger. (Mr. Rockefeller is 50, Mr. Nixon, 45.) Some said they favored one or the other because he had greater experience in foreign affairs, or more experience in government. Mr. Nixon has made several trips out of the country; Mr. Rockefeller was coordinator of inter-American affairs during World War II.

Many of those who had no opinion said the question was academic because the Democrats would win the next election.

National Shoreline in Danger, but Oregon's Seacoast Preserved for Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the February 15, 1959, issue of Parade magazine entitled "What's Happening to Our Shoreline?" The issue of Parade was published with the Washington Post and Times Herald and with

the Oregonian in my own native city of Portland. Author of the article is Michael Frome.

Mr. Frome's article warns that the coastal and beach areas available for the recreation of 173 million people are becoming less in quantity and quality nearly every year. I am making this inclusion in the Appendix in tribute to one of Oregon's illustrious ex-Governors, Oswald West, who still lives in retirement in Portland at the age of 85.

Oswald West was Oregon's Governor from 1911 to 1915. During that period he kept one of the most beautiful seacoasts anywhere from being exploited for private greed and gain. He saw to it that the law of riparian rights safeguarded the 300-mile Oregon shoreline for perpetual public benefit, rather than permitting it to be gobbled up for dredging, wharfing, and similar commercial uses. Today a great State park on the seacoast is named Oswald West State Park in tribute to this deed.

Oregon's seacoast is praised as the most magnificent on earth in an article in the February issue of Holiday magazine by Robert Carson, noted novelist. He even calls it more lovely than that of his own California. That this shore of white, sandy beaches and timbered headlands has not been defiled or looted is due to the foresight, vision, and courage of ex-Gov. Oswald West. In his honor, I ask that Mr. Michael Frome's article from Parade about our national shoreline be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO OUR SHORELINE?

(By Michael Frome)

On sun-flecked sandspits like Miami Beach, Walkiki, Coronado, and others the winter season is in full cry. As you read this vacationers fleeing winter's bite lie on pool-side patios soaking up sunshine. Visitors in shirt sleeves promenade in grand hotels and talk about the temperatures back home.

Sunshine and warm weather have their appeal, but a few feet from the hotels laps the greatest appeal of all: the ocean. Winter or summer, in Miami, Cape Cod, or even Fargo, N. Dak., America's greatest natural resource is water. Water nourishes industry, feeds crops, and soothes parched throats. And water—and the land bordering it—provides almost boundless opportunities for fun.

Today both water and land—the Nation's thousands of miles of seacoast and major lakefront—have problems. They are under tremendous pressures from many different directions. And these pressures are steadily growing stronger.

One simple statistic measures some of this pressure:

In 1904 in the United States 15,000 boats were used for recreation. By 1947 the number had increased to 2,440,000. Last year the total was 7,330,000, and it probably will top 8 million this year.

Where will all these boats maneuver, dock, gas up? How will they compete against other demands for water and shorefront—for industry, irrigation, defense, wildlife preservation, navigation, home use?

While demands come from all sides, the supply of available shorefront is being eaten up. Recently, the National Park Service surveyed 3,700 miles of Atlantic and gulf coast, found only 240 miles used for public recrea-

tion, marked 640 miles more still available and worth saving.

A Park Service survey just completed of the 2,410-mile Pacific coast, which is due to be released soon, shows only 17 percent in public lands, recommends saving 75 areas. California's division of beaches and parks is conducting a similar survey of its shore. A third Park Service survey, on the 8,300-mile Great Lakes shore, will be released in June. It is expected to suggest preserving 65 acres, many in Michigan.

In the meantime, industry, attracted by bountiful water (the most-used industrial chemical), has been edging into the shore, particularly around the lakes. In its lake survey, the Park Service is expected to point out that recreational, primitive lakefront is fast losing ground to smokestacks. In a similar survey, the Michigan department of conservation said much the same thing.

Complicating matters on the coastline is that many beaches are being eaten away by wind and waves, narrowing the amount of space even more. Complicating the water-and-shore problem countrywide is the increasing use of water. Industrial, irrigation and domestic use is expected to double its 1955 consumption by 1975—with possibly severe effects on water levels for recreation and wildlife.

EVERYONE'S IN THE WATER

And recreational demands themselves increase by leaps and bounds. No one, for instance, can catch up with the statistics on skindiving and water skiing—two rapidly growing sports that virtually were unknown 10 years ago.

And every day some water lover seems to come up with a new water sport. In the last few years officials of the National Recreation Association have watched the rise of house-boating, "boating," underwater archeology, backyard swimming pools (now increasing at the rate of 30,000 a year), surfboarding, water "shoeing," even hunting for pirate gold.

Then there are 21 million fishermen, spending nearly \$100 a year apiece and asking that trout and mackerel be considered in all debates over water and shore. Their numbers are increasing steadily.

And there is the greatest success story of all: boating. Along with the increase in number of boats has come an increase in average horsepower of boats. The average outboard sold today has a beefy 20-plus horsepower engine. What this means is that boats are being used less for fishing, more for speedboating, cruising and water skiing, all of which require elbow room.

With these demands from all sides, conflicts are frequent and sometimes violent. Recently, recreation leaders have cast covetous eyes at Army installations on Sandy Hook, in New York Harbor. The Navy once discussed plans for expanding its Cape Hatteras installations at the expense of the National Seashore Recreation Area. (A compromise finally was worked out.) Inland, in Iowa, farmers, fishermen, and boat enthusiasts are wrangling over whether irrigation is ruining fishing and boating.

Is there any way to shoe-horn all these interests into the fixed amount of coastline and shorefront?

The offensive to ease the pressure on the shoreline is underway on all sides:

Beach erosion

The Army Corps of Engineers now has underway 69 projects, costing \$118 million, to keep beaches from crumbling. Included is construction of sand feeder beaches, concrete jetties, expensive seawalls. In addition, studies of erosion are being conducted by officials of New Jersey, San Diego, Calif., and Long Island, N.Y.

Stream pollution

Many experts believe a major answer to water and shorefront pressure is to clean up inland rivers and streams, thus offer industry clean water for its needs and recreation lovers beach resorts not now usable. This project is making headway; in the Ohio Valley alone, \$1 billion a year is being spent to clean up streams.

New lakes

Multipurpose dams are being thrown up rapidly around the country, answering needs for flood control, irrigation, water supply—and recreation. By one estimate, there are now 2,800 such new lakes. Even such unlikely places as Oklahoma and South Dakota are affected. In Chamberlain, S. Dak., site of an artificial lake, a car dealer now makes more money from outboards and boats than from car sales.

Government programs

The Park Service shoreline surveys point the way to preserving some beachfront for recreation. Other Federal agencies, such as the Reclamation Bureau, Corps of Engineers and Forest Service, now work to preserve land around artificial lakes. TVA led the way in the South 25 years ago, now has 12 State parks on its lake shores.

Better use

The country's greater new dams and lakes fill a comprehensive mission—providing power, water storage, wildlife refuge and recreation. Carefully planned Glen Canyon Dam, under construction in Arizona, will be a dramatic example of the true multipurpose concept.

More use

For more use of the shoreline, there is no organized program; it depends on water-lovers themselves. Often, while some shorefront areas are overrun, others are underpopulated.

Last month, the United States added 25,000 miles of virtually unused shoreline by admitting Alaska to the Union. But even in the other 48 States, sections of shoreline often are overlooked. In more extensive and more sensible use of all her shoreline may lie the solution to America's problem of her hard-pressed shores.

Public Law 480: Food in Democracy's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, democracy's arsenal is no mere armorer's shed; it is a library, it is a university, it is a newspaper, a radio transmitter, and a grain elevator. Golden grains combine with golden ores to fill the treasury houses of democracy. The over \$30 billion of annual American farm production comprise in great part democracy's sinews not only because of the intrinsic worth of this production as food products but also what these farm products can do for us.

Since Public Law 480 was first enacted in 1954, it has served as the catalyst to transform our vast agricultural production into an effective instrument of foreign policy. This program has been extended by the Congress several times and

expires this year—its continuation should be again authorized by the Congress.

I am submitting articles from *Foreign Agriculture*, Capper's Farmer, and the *Christian Science Monitor*, devoted to the Public Law 480 program. I insert this explanation and comment for the information that it conveys and in tribute to the public servants who operate it for the Public Law 480 program has not only been an operation in agriculture but also one in diplomacy, one in national and international economics, and one in the service of humanity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *Record* various articles on the extension of Public Law 480, to continue our farm export programs in 1959.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[From *Foreign Agriculture*, December 1958]

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 480 TO CONTINUE FARM EXPORT PROGRAMS THROUGH 1959

When Congress voted this fall to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) through 1959, it retained a basic export tool for U.S. agriculture. This law has accounted for a fourth of all U.S. farm exports in the last 4 years.

To cover sales for foreign currencies under title I of the act, Congress authorized \$2.25 billion. The previous authorization of \$4 billion, which expired June 30, 1958, was fully committed under agreements with 37 friendly countries, and about 90 percent of this program has already been shipped. Some products it covered are:

Wheat.....	million bushels..	617
Corn.....	do.....	66
Barley.....	do.....	64
Grain sorghums.....	do.....	21
Rice.....	million hundredweight..	28
Cotton.....	million bales..	3.2
Soybean and cottonseed oil.....	billion pounds..	2
Tobacco.....	million pounds..	208

Public Law 480 specifies the ways the foreign currencies received may be used. The agreements usually set aside a large share for economic development loans—both to the foreign government and to U.S. and foreign private companies. Other important uses include military procurement for the common defense, developing U.S. agricultural markets abroad, educational exchange, and paying U.S. Government expenses overseas. New uses now added include these: Financing scientific activities abroad; acquiring sites and buildings for U.S. Government use; purchasing and handling foreign publications of technical or cultural significance here; aiding U.S. sponsored educational institutions abroad; supporting foreign workshops and chairs in American studies.

The new law also extends the title II program of famine relief and other assistance. It does not, however, increase the previous \$800 million authorization, for more than \$300 million of that fund is still uncommitted. This program permits the President to make emergency grants of farm commodities from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to friendly governments, or to friendly peoples without regard to the friendliness of their governments. For instance, 65,000 tons of U.S. wheat went to Lebanon, to aid people affected by severe drought and crop failure, as well as by the recent disturbances. Also to relieve hardship from drought, 3,000 tons of U.S. wheat were programed for Libya. In Tunisia, U.S.

wheat is being supplied to help pay workers on public works projects designed to relieve unemployment and emergency famine conditions. Over \$9 million of wheat flour and rice went to Ceylon for those in need due to floods.

In title III, revised language instructs the Secretary of Agriculture to barter or exchange CCC commodities for strategic or other materials when he determines that such action is in the best interests of the United States. It also instructs him not to put restrictions on the free world countries into which barter deliveries may be made, except insofar as he finds it necessary in safeguarding usual U.S. marketings and assuring that these deliveries will not unduly disrupt world prices or replace cash sales for dollars. USDA recently reviewed its barter program in the light of this new language, to devise the best way of continuing the program as an important tool in disposing of CCC surpluses.

Title III also authorizes donations of surpluses to needy people at home and abroad. An amendment now permits distribution on the same basis in areas under U.S. jurisdiction, such as the trust islands of the Pacific and the Ryukyu Islands. It further authorizes CCC to purchase products of oilseeds and edible oils and fats, for donation to needy people outside the United States, and to purchase wheat flour and corn meal for donations instead of processing its own wheat and corn.

During the past year, all the Public Law 480 programs together—foreign currency sales, emergency grants and loans, and barter—accounted for more than half the volume of U.S. wheat, rice, and vegetable oil exports and for about a quarter of the corn and cotton.

[From Capper's Farmer, September 1958]

YANKEE FARM PRODUCTS M-M-M GOOD—WE'RE BOOSTING OUR EXPORT SALES WITH TASTY SAMPLES AND ATTRACTIVE EXHIBITS AT FOREIGN TRADE FAIRS

We are not just telling foreign buyers about U.S. farm products—we're showing them. And that means more dollars in your pocket. Our salesmen are carrying attractive samples of what we want to sell. They are going where they can meet the most customers—to the fairs.

Folks in foreign lands are seeing, sniffing, and tasting products of American farms. And they like 'em. Wheat-flour do-nuts, fried chicken, potato chips, recombined whole milk—all hit the spot, the world over.

Your products, ready for use, have been put on exhibit at 21 of these foreign trade fairs thus far. Grower groups, like the wheat and soybean associations, trade organizations, and the Foreign Agricultural Service of USDA are combining forces in this sales effort.

Our trade fair exhibits are a part of the growing effort to expand our export markets for a variety of foods.

Here's how important the foreign market is to U.S. farmers. Production from one crop acre in five moves abroad. Twelve cents of every U.S. farm income dollar comes from export sales, on the average. The figure is 51 cents for wheat, 37 cents for soybeans, 57 cents for cotton, 43 cents for dry milk, 85 cents for rice. About \$4.7 billion worth of U.S. farm products were shipped to other lands last year, a new high both in volume and value.

Besides selling for dollars, we have three other channels for maintaining our farm exports: (1) We trade some of our products for strategic goods like chrome ore and industrial diamonds; (2) we sell some for foreign money, which we in turn spend in those countries; (3) the Government gives from our surpluses to countries in need due to drought, disaster, poverty.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Sept. 13, 1956]

SALESMANSHIP FOR FARM SURPLUSES

(By Josephine Ripley)

Go almost anywhere in the world and you can buy American goods, from soft drinks and phonograph records to cameras and automobiles. That is because far-traveling, fast-talking American salesmen have been there before you.

That is the kind of salesmanship Agriculture Secretary Benson has envisaged for American farm products. To him it is the key to farm prosperity—a worldwide market for the bounty of the fields, a bigger market.

This is the kind of salesmanship which Congress also had in mind when it put up money in 1954, and recently increased it, for the purpose of underwriting a vigorous sales campaign abroad.

This sales drive has been the least publicized, but perhaps one of the most dramatic aspects of the entire farm program. Samples of milk and ice-cream cones made from powdered milk, sweet rolls and cake made from American surplus flour have been handed out in Japan.

In Rome, Italians swarmed to see a fabulous American-made supermarket exhibit, full-scale and complete in every major detail. In South America, salesmen have spearheaded a drive for the sale of American wheat flour in Colombia.

There is a campaign to work off some of the Government's tobacco surplus in Spain. Tobacco buyers from Thailand and Korea have been invited to the United States to inspect the supplies personally. Cotton buyers from Japan and France are also planning to come here to discuss business, at the invitation of the U.S. Government.

American soybean and poultry experts are now in Europe drumming up trade for these excess commodities. There is also a drive to interest Japan in American soybeans and tobacco.

American advertising and sales techniques figure prominently in all these activities. Cooperative programs to expand the use of cotton in France and Japan have been undertaken. A Japanese-American soybean council has been set up to promote the use of soybeans and soybean products.

Trade fairs featuring American products—machinery as well as food—have been held all over the world. These exhibits are organized in cooperation with private trade groups. The U.S. Government organizes and manages the exhibits, rents the space, provides for the design, construction, and operation of the exhibits, and ships exhibit material.

All in all, as of July 1, 1956, funds equivalent to approximately \$20,300,000 in foreign currencies have been tentatively planned in 26 countries for the development and expansion of foreign markets for American farm surpluses.

It has been a long pull. The work, up to this point, has been unspectacular. But at last, it is proceeding on a worldwide scale, although it is still in the early stages of what is seen as a long-range operation.

It is an effort in which the United States is competing with other nations also in the business of making sales, but at least this country is now better represented in the foreign field than previously. There was a time when Soviet Russia and its satellites dominated the international trade fairs.

American representatives abroad sent urgent pleas for more and better U.S. participation. The result has been a marked stepup in trade representation abroad, both in the interest of sales and as a weapon to counter Russian anti-American propaganda.

Meanwhile, under another phase of the farm program, the Government has been almost spectacularly successful in its effort to sell surplus farm products to foreign governments.

Up to date, the Government has disposed of some \$2,300 million worth of these surpluses. Largest single sale so far was the highly publicized deal with India involving some \$360,100,000.

All this does not furnish a basic solution to the problem of farm surpluses, but it does indicate that the surplus disposal program is now well off the ground.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today is an anniversary—the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. We in the United States have never known the haunting fear of having our independence physically threatened, let alone the reality of foreign occupation. We can speak of the plight and the bravery of the Lithuanian people, but for most of us we understand their plight only through our imagination. But, nevertheless, here are people—almost 3 million people—that are realistic symbols of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

The significance of Lithuania to those of us of Western culture is this: From a glorious and ancient past in which the Duchy of Lithuania stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea the Lithuanian people have again and again been bled by richer and more powerful neighbors. From 1385 until the end of the 18th century Lithuania was part of Poland; then when Poland was annexed by Czarist Russia in 1795 Lithuania shared the same fate. Finally, in 1918, taking dual advantage of President Wilson's 14 points and the Russian revolution, the Lithuanian people declared their independence. This was their first taste of freedom since the 14th century; it lasted 22 years. In June 1940 Soviet troops took over the country. Then almost immediately the land was overrun by the German Army. German occupation lasted from 1941 until 1944, when it was displaced once again by the death grip of the Russian Bear.

I give this thumbnail sketch of the woes of Lithuania not to prove that history can be cruel but, rather, to point a meaningful moral. The Lithuanian people have been relentlessly submerged by force. They are now the unwilling victims of a political religion that seeks converts by every means known. The people of Lithuania in their present political dilemma represent the very thing that America fights against in word and in deed the world over. As such, we honor the people of Lithuania and their friends, relatives, and countrymen that live in the United States as men who have upheld the tenets of western political culture. These men and women believe in the highest ideals of freedom, justice, and right. They have not been corrupted by Russian words but have seen and felt the sword of social

and political tyranny beneath the phrases.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence I am proud to be one of those Americans commemorating this day in hopes that Lithuanian independence will soon be the reality that so many have fought, died, and lived for.

State Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the Milwaukie (Oreg.) weekly Review for February 5, 1959, State Senator Monroe Sweetland, who is well versed in Oregon history, published a brief essay by Governor West himself regarding his theories of riparian rights.

In tribute to Governor West and Oregon's centennial year, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Sweetland's article from the Milwaukie Review to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE SOVEREIGNTY

(By Oswald West, former Governor of Oregon)

It was Governor Oswald West who, during his administration 1911-1915, secured for the people of Oregon the use and enjoyment of the beaches of the Pacific forever. In many States the beaches may be blocked to public access, and ownership is permitted out into the surf. But Oregon's matchless beaches, from the Columbia River to the California line, are freely available to all the public, thanks to Governor West's interest almost 50 years ago. Because of interest in making more firm and certain this policy of the State, Governor West has written us recently on the subject, and we are glad to publish his comments. The present session of the legislature may have this problem before it again.

The settlers of Oregon, like the colonists of the Atlantic States, coming from a country in which the common law prevailed to one that had no organized government, brought with them, as their birthright, the principles of that common law—insofar as suited to the conditions in their new home. The jurisprudence of Oregon, therefore, was based on that law.

The land laws adopted by the provisional government of Oregon regulated occupation only; the settlers acquired no title to the soil. The United States, on assuming dominion over the territory, became the owner of all the lands therein, but the provisions of the then general land laws were not applicable to Oregon Territory. Not before 1850 was there a statute (D.L.C.) under which anyone could acquire a legal title from the United States to lands in Oregon.

Public lands, as habitually used in legislation, are such lands as are subject to sale or disposal under the general laws of the United States. The seashores, and other lands under tidewater, being incapable of ordinary private occupation, cultivation, and improvement, become incident to sovereignty.

As the U.S. Supreme Court in the leading case of *Shively v. Bowlby* (152 U.S. 1) pointed out: As such lands are of great value to the public for the purpose of commerce, navigation, and fishery, title and control are vested in the sovereign power for the benefit of the whole people.

In the United States, all navigable water courses are a species of highway, and come under the control of the State (subject to the right of Congress to control commerce and navigation). A State has the same power to improve such waters as it has in the case of any highway—and collect tolls.

The riparian proprietor owns to high water mark only on all navigable rivers. The beds of such streams, between the lines of ordinary high water on their opposite sides, belong to the State, to be held and controlled by and for the public.

The navigability rule, as administered by the courts of this country, is that all rivers which are found of sufficient capacity to float the products of the mines, the forests, or the tillage of the country to market are regarded as navigable. On unnavigable streams the riparian owner owns to the center of the stream.

Problem of Federal Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun, which is universally recognized as one of our country's great daily newspapers has recently commented editorially on the Federal Treasury's refunding difficulties. This editorial graphically illustrates the seriousness of the situation which faces the Treasury. I believe the editorial is significant and worthy of the attention of the American public and of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial:

HAND TO MOUTH

Getting back to the Federal Treasury's refunding fiasco of last week.

The Treasury has to meet matured obligations of \$14.9 billion, but hasn't got the money. It sought to stall off its creditors by offering more attractive obligations (bearing a higher interest) in exchange. But Government securities aren't snatched up the way they used to be. The Treasury was unable to find takers to cover the maturing obligations. It fell short by about \$2 billion.

So what is the Government going to do now?

It is doing two things:

1. It is making heavy drafts on the accounts which it has in private banks, planning to scrape up about \$500 million in this way. These accounts consist of funds, such as accumulated withholding taxes, which under balanced-budget conditions would normally go to pay current Government expenses. This move is a form of robbing the piggy bank.

2. Today it is putting up for auction \$1.5 billion of 7-month tax anticipation bills, maturing on September 21 and acceptable for the payment of taxes due on September 15. On these tax anticipation bills it does not even venture to set an interest rate. It sells them at whatever discount the market will offer.

This is about as close to hand-to-mouth financing as a government can get. It is an

admission that faith in Government securities, and confidence in the stability of the dollar, has sunk to a point where orderly debt management is not possible. The Government is a little bit like a man being hounded by creditors, who first borrows to pay his bills, then borrows to pay that loan off, and is finally reduced to pledging the wages he needs for current expenses. Not a pretty picture. A very good argument for balancing the budget and not making the nightmare of debt management any worse.

The Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of February 9, 1959.

OFF THE RECORD

Congress is beginning to feel some alarm over the future of the American textile industry. It's about time. Congress signed a death warrant for the industry back in 1947 when the Trade Agreements Act was passed permitting the State Department and its economic advisers to participate in an international poker game organized at Geneva, Switzerland, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

At regular intervals the 35 nations belonging to GATT gather at Geneva to play for high stakes. This Nation's blue chips are American prosperity, our high standard of living, and our productive ability. We play against 10 O's. Other nations promise not to go Communist and to remain friendly to the United States in return for tariff concessions and a slice of our trade.

Cotton textiles, one of the big blue chips in the American economy, was tossed into the pot in 1955 to prevent Japan from being overinfluenced by trade opportunities with Communist nations. Although the State Department has steadfastly denied that the American textile industry was considered expendable, the effect was the same. Tariffs on Japanese imports were cut to the bone, American cotton was sold to Japanese mills at 10 cents per pound less than it could be bought by U.S. mills and the administration turned a deaf ear to the howls of anguish from domestic manufacturers.

The idea behind all this, stripped of its diplomatic and economic doubletalk, was somewhat Freudian. This Nation had a guilt complex because of its prosperity and high standard of living. The one-world idea was in its ascendancy. We would export our prosperity and standard of living.

The record of that experiment since 1955 has been one of mill closings, bankruptcy, and general deterioration in the American textile industry. Foreign manufacturers have taken over a large part of our world market and are shipping goods made of American cotton back into the United States at prices no domestic manufacturer can match.

Now Congress is alarmed. Last week the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee called for mandatory quotas on textile imports as an essential step in a program to save an industry vital to our national defense. This was based on a finding by the Defense Department that textile mill

products rated second only to steel in terms of military needs.

This reversal of attitude has been a long time in coming. While a committee report does not mean that favorable action will inevitably follow, it does present the issues clearly and in terms which Congress can hardly ignore.

Columbus Discovers Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Columbus Discovers Itself," which appeared in the December 1958 issue of the Kiwanis magazine.

The article tells how this progressive Montana community is successfully developing small industries. I place this article in the RECORD because I am proud of this Montana community's accomplishment, and because the example of Columbus may inspire and benefit civic leaders in other towns.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS DISCOVERS ITSELF

(By Lafayette Smith)

the town of Columbus, Mont., isn't considered large even by Montana standards. Its population barely exceeded 1,000 when the 1950 census was taken, and most of the residents seemed to feel that it had slipped since then. With the trend in agriculture going toward larger farms and fewer farmers, there didn't seem to be as much room for the little farmer any more—and Columbus was mainly a town of little farmers.

As Columbus was a small town, so was its Kiwanis club, averaging between 20 to 25 members. For its size, though, the club was active. It conducted a countywide 4-H Club fair and livestock sale every year. It also entertained the townspeople with a minstrel show, thus collecting some money, and built a park in the center of town, planting grass and providing benches. "If we didn't have faith in the town's future," claims Club President William B. Witt, "we never would have built that park."

That faith got its first practical expression one noon during the fall of 1956. Gene Davey, who sold and fixed automobiles and was the Kiwanis president too, showed up at the Liberty Cafe, where the club met every Tuesday, with clipping in hand. The clipping noted that the old building down by the railroad tracks was for sale.

The building, measuring 200 feet long and 115 feet wide, had been built during the war by the U.S. Government and was used as a service station for trucks coming out of the Beartooth Mountains 35 miles to the south, laden with chromite ore. After the war the Bureau of Reclamation used it for some time as a warehouse, but now it stood empty.

Following the Kiwanis meeting, 10 members stayed late to talk about the building. "Why don't we buy it, and use it as a lure to bring a new industry to our town?" said Gene Davey. The idea was discussed, accepted, and soon eight Kiwanians were pulling checkbooks out of their pockets, and two others were running home to get theirs.

Within a few hours \$10,000 had been pledged. Thus was Columbus Enterprises, Inc., formed—by men who were pledged to the preservation of their home town.

Bob Johnson, editor and publisher of the town's only newspaper, the Columbus News, journeyed to Seattle, Wash., to make a bid on the building. Gene Davey soon received a wire: "Purchased building for \$26,000 stop find us an industry."

Finding an industry, now that they had acquired a site for one, proved to be no easy task. Columbus Enterprises advertised in the Wall Street Journal and Business Week. A variety of answers soon flooded Gene Davey's desk. One man wanted to use the building as a cattle feed lot, but he didn't intend to employ anyone. His offer was respectfully declined. A company manufacturing trailers and busses applied. No prospects for future growth, decided the Kiwanians. Several obliging contractors offered to dismantle the building. They were politely thanked.

Then as chance might have it, Gene Davey and Bob Johnson heard of two men named Ralph Heiken and Thelma Mosdal, who during the lax winter season were building barn beams in a small corrugated steel shed in nearby Broadview, only 55 miles from Columbus. They needed more room. Soon they were invited to come to Columbus.

Also invited to come to Columbus was another Montana citizen named Ken Davenport. Ken had graduated from Montana State College of Engineering in 1950, had spent an inevitable 2 years in the service, then had sold Fords in Big Timber, Montana. Ken, however, wasn't quite certain that he wanted a Ford in his future, so when several of his friends in Columbus told him that a new industry was starting he offered his services. Another Montanan, Russell Wolfe, was hired as a sales expert, and these two, along with Mosdal and Heiken, left for the West Coast to observe and report on the beam manufacturing industry. They were particularly concerned with the prospects of glue lamination in beam construction.

"Today, 60-foot trees are a rarity," they reported on their return. "Within a dozen years or so, 30-foot trees will be just as rare. Yet with modern construction demands, structural beams of over 100 feet are needed, especially in the construction of modern schools, churches, and auditoriums."

With this favorable report, the construction of laminated wooden beams in Columbus began and the organization was officially titled Timberweld, Inc., with Ken Davenport, president and sales manager; Wolfe, secretary-treasurer; and Heiken and Gene Davey, vice presidents. The 15 members of Columbus Enterprises purchased \$50,000 worth of stock, while approximately 75 other Columbus citizens accounted for \$50,000 more. Very shortly that stock began to pay dividends, and has been doing so ever since.

Ken Davenport explains his company's success this way: "In Montana, it is very difficult to find types of industry that can be carried on economically for manufacturing and shipment of material to other points in the United States. There are many reasons for this: freight, the availability of raw materials, and concentration of markets. However, in the case of glu-lam material, we have found that it can be manufactured and shipped to virtually 75 percent of the United States on a very competitive basis with other glu-lam fabricators in other parts of the country. Presently we've shipped glue-laminated material for schools, churches, and industrial buildings to New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, and other Midwestern States. Our intended volume for the year 1958 has been doubled over our sales for 1957." With the country in the midst of a recession, these were encouraging words.

The increase in Timberweld's sales for 1958 was first reflected in the increase in manpower in their plant—later, in the pockets of Columbus citizens. At present, 30 men and women are employed by the company with an annual payroll of more than \$100,000. According to estimates made by the State planning board, for every additional four persons brought to a town, it takes one more person (such as a grocer, druggist, dentist, etc.) to service him. Conversely, when a town loses four residents through migration to another area, one of its shopowners might as well close up.

Kiwanis president William B. Witt has commented on this situation: "Already we notice a lot of new faces on the streets. Timberweld's payroll has stabilized the real estate market for one thing. Before, there wasn't enough demand for living quarters and prices were dropping. Now prices are remaining where they should be."

Shortly after Timberweld received its start in Columbus, Kiwanians and the townspeople in general began passing the word to their friends and business acquaintances that the welcome mat was out to new industry. In July of 1957, Sherman Lang, an engineer for Mout Industries, a chemical producing firm, appeared in Columbus to have a look at this town he had heard so much about. His company was leased 5 acres of land at tax cost and within a few months a pilot plant to process chrome had been established under his supervision. Eight men began carrying on daily experiments to determine whether or not to establish a larger factory. Should that occur, it would perhaps mean a payroll of 300 employees.

The fame of Columbus spread even further. The Montana State Planning Board in Helena issued a pamphlet called simply: "The Columbus Success Story." It was subtitled: "Community Action for Economic Development Pays Dividends." This pamphlet was distributed throughout the United States.

As for the town's future, Bob Johnson is glad to talk about it: "Mout Industries have been successful in producing their basic product (sodium chromate), and are enthusiastic about their future in this field. While no other industries have moved into Columbus to date, there have been several inquiries. The American Chrome Co. south of Columbus has received a go ahead on construction of a pilot smelter to test the feasibility of producing ferrochrome on a competitive basis with foreign ores. If successful, and they are reasonably confident that they will be, Columbus may become the railroad for movement of this ore to the steel mills."

At a recent meeting of the city council, three Kiwanians moved that a strip of land 1 mile long by 300 feet wide along the railroad tracks be set aside for potential industries. Their motion was unanimously carried. Columbus, as usual, was looking ahead.

Now, once again, despite the most ruthless suppression at home, Lithuanians everywhere keep alive the embers of liberty. The Soviet efforts to extinguish Lithuania's national identity are a sufficient answer to any who would relax our vigilance or our resistance to further efforts of Soviet expansion. Ultimately Lithuania's determination to regain independence must win out.

Remarks to Florida Division, Investors League, Inc., by Dr. J. W. Annis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the Appendix of the Record, the text of a speech delivered by Dr. J. W. Annis before the members of the Florida division, Investors League, Inc., at Winter Haven, Fla., on January 19, 1959. Dr. Annis is an eminent physician and a very prominent and capable civic leader at Lakeland, Fla. He is presently serving as president of the Florida Medical Association:

REMARKS TO FLORIDA DIVISION, INVESTORS LEAGUE, INC., BY J. W. ANNIS, M.D., PRESIDENT OF THE FLORIDA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, WINTER HAVEN, FLA., JANUARY 1959

When I received Dr. Odeneal's letter asking me to pinch-hit for Dr. Orr, president-elect of the AMA, in addressing this organization, I wondered why I should be asked to fulfill such an assignment. I am still wondering, gentlemen, why I am here to talk to you—the Florida division of the Investors League—certainly not to speak to you about an investment program. I am definitely not qualified in that respect. Nor was I, I am sure, asked to come before you—an organization of whose existence I have not even been aware until I received Dr. Odeneal's letter—to discuss reduction or repeal of any specific tax levies which might effect personal gain for you, or me, or any other individual. This would certainly be a very mean and personal motive which could in no way justify my taking my time from my practice, and you yours from your businesses.

Why, then, am I here? The reason I came, at least, was to bring to you, from another discipline, a discussion and a point of view of a much broader principle—of a fundamental concept on which our forefathers founded this country—the principle and concept of free enterprise—the privilege and right of unrestricted individual endeavor and achievement, just as long as we trespass against no other man. I mentioned our forefathers. We have inherited from them a certain free and reactionary approach to life—a revolutionary spirit, if you will, which molds our thinking and guides our actions—and should provide us with a kind of moral integrity by which we can conduct our daily life.

As you know, my profession is that of medicine. It stems from the earliest recorded history, indeed from legendary times. Perhaps the first real individual, of whom any actual record and objective proof exists, was a physician, Imhotep, personal physician to the ruler of Egypt, and designer of the Step pyramid, the oldest manmade structure in the world. Certainly this profession of ours,

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I consider it an honor and a duty to record my congratulations to the people of Lithuania, whose determination to achieve independence has set an example for all free people.

which is the oldest of all professions, has ever been one which has advocated and carried out a system of free enterprise—a system advocating a completely free and unrestrained search for truth—a system of freedom of action, thought, belief and enterprise, where the importance of opportunity and accomplishment replaces that of security. Physicians, like priests, have died for their beliefs and for the refusal to give even lip service to a lie or a liar—or a dictator. And physicians today resent and oppose regimentation in any form which will hamper their freedom of action—their freedom to practice their art.

We feel that a fundamental human right is this freedom of enterprise—this competitive spirit—this right to be wrong—that has made our country as great as it is. We feel that, through our daily contact with the human body and soul, in sickness and in health, we have come to know it fairly well, and we feel that its innate frailties must be as realistically viewed as its many virtues. We believe that competitive and unrestrained enterprise is essential for that sense of achievement—that sense of accomplishment—which is so necessary for our physical, mental, and moral growth. This is the reason that we feel so strongly that freedom of choice of a physician—and a physician of his patients—is so necessary to our way of life. A patient should select his physician carefully and without pressure of any sort, and should realize his obligation to him, just as the physician must accept this employment and realize his deep obligation to the patient. This right must remain inviolate if we are to continue providing the best possible medical care.

Let me now speak to you briefly about two subjects in which the Florida Medical Association has been extremely interested, and in which areas we have already taken decisive, and I hope, fruitful action. The first is the problem of indigent medical care within our State. This certainly is a very real problem, and a very real obligation; but, in our opinion, it is one which falls within the realm of responsibility of the local community and the State. It is our conviction that the care of these unfortunate individuals is, again, the obligation and the responsibility of the neighborhood, the community, the county, and lastly, the State. We feel that the Federal Government should not be called—nor should it insert itself—into the problem of financing this care. We feel that the local physicians should willingly give of their services here without charge, just as they have done in the past. We feel that the local community should provide part—if not all—of the ancillary care necessary to these patients. We can see no advantage in sending our dollars to Washington, only to get them back shrunk to less than half their original size, to be used in the case of these same patients. This is a luxury which we can ill afford. The responsibility of our indigent sick is our own. The responsibility of providing a livelihood for the personnel of a Washington office—to care for these sick folks—is definitely not ours.

Furthermore, we believe that the problem of the indigent sick, or the medically indigent, is the problem of the total medical care of the people in Florida—not a problem of the indigent care of Florida people by the U.S. Government. The health of us all—its standards, its criteria, and its performance—depends upon a properly balanced and administered program of medical education throughout the State. This involves teaching hospitals, universities, residencies, scholarships, and training programs. This is important if we are to develop and maintain proper standards of medical care—so that you and I, as individuals who can afford to pay for this care, may have it available.

This can be done only if the medically indigent are fitted into this program—particularly into its teaching facet—so that progress can be made and students can be taught. For this reason, as I have said before, we consider this problem of the medically indigent primarily a medical problem—not one of public assistance.

With this philosophy in mind, the Florida Medical Association, several years ago, approached Governor Collins with the suggestion that he appoint a committee to study the problem of indigent medical care throughout the State. He agreed, and this committee, after quite an exhaustive study, came up with a very concrete and workable recommendation. The State legislature, in turn, appropriated \$4 million for the last biennium to be used in the hospital care of these individuals. Briefly, the procedural technicalities are as follows:

State money is made available to the various counties as matching funds—that is, the county puts up a given amount of money, which the State then matches up to a limited and proportioned amount. This money is for the sole purpose of defraying hospital expense in already-existing institutions within the county, and is not to interfere in any way with any program which the county may have for the care of these indigent people. In other words, the county hospitals in the various areas are not eligible for these funds. The purpose of this is to use the already existing beds, rather than building additional beds, and to put the responsibility back where it belongs—on the county—so that it shall provide at least half of all funds necessary for the hospitalization of these people. No provision is made for the payment of the physician, it being felt by the profession that he should make no charge in the case of truly indigent people, unless some other member of the family or friend wishes to pay the bill. Practically all the counties of the State have participated in this program. I believe that there are only four—these all small counties in west Florida—which have not taken part in it. The program has worked well and has just about used up the funds at the scheduled rate.

In other words, about half a million dollars are being spent quarterly for this program. Unfortunately, hard times may be ahead for the program, inasmuch as the Federal Government has apportioned \$12 million for the State of Florida, which money can be obtained for the use of the sick in the State, provided the State itself supplies matching funds. This is a very tempting offer—an apparent something-for-nothing deal—and obviously is contrary to the principle about which we are talking; that is, the principle of the responsibility of each community for its own local problems. This paternalistic approach, which would strengthen the Federal Government immensely, is an extremely tempting and juicy plum to dangle before the coming legislature, inasmuch as it involves \$12 million. I hope that the legislature will resist this tempting offer and beware of the Greeks bringing gifts. Our problems—and this includes our successes and our failures—our losses, as well as our gains—should be our own and not the responsibility of our Federal Government. I am sure that our program of indigent care can be improved upon—and I am sure that it will be improved upon. The important thing to me is that we, as a State, have made a definite and sincere attempt to solve this problem for ourselves and not go running to Washington with it. Once this kind of initiative and enterprise ceases to exist, we will have forsworn our American type of democracy.

The second subject which I wish to discuss with you is that of the aging population within the State, particularly with regard to their medical care, since it is with this aspect

of the problem that I am best acquainted. It is no new problem, nor is it one which we in Florida are just beginning to investigate. For the past 4 to 5 years there has been a State committee studying it; and one of the members of our State association has been very active in its operation, as well as in the national program.

Just about 1 year ago, the Florida Medical Association's Committee on Legislation went to Washington to talk with our Representatives and Senators. We spent 1 day in a most profitable discussion of many problems with these gentlemen; and perhaps the most interesting talks which we had with them were in regard to H.R. 9467, with which I am sure you are familiar. It was surprising that several of our Representatives knew little or nothing of this bill, but all were most cooperative in looking into it and discussing it with us. Furthermore, all agreed that this was unsound legislation, and they individually and collectively stated that they would oppose it. We have followed this bill from its inception. Members of our State committee on aging have perused the many volumes of published hearings pertaining to it, and we of the medical association are well aware of the fact that there is no logical or scientific basis for the enactment of this type legislation. The idea of adding the medical, surgical, and hospital care of some 13 million Americans to a program which is already basically unsound and insolvent, as is the social security program, is so ridiculous as to be laughable, if the seriousness of the situation were not so apparent. Indeed, the only thing which outstrips the unsoundness and ridiculousness of this type legislation is its vote-getting ability. There can be no question of this, nor can there be any question that such legislation, if introduced on the floor of the House of Representatives, would, in this coming session of Congress, be passed. This is not my opinion, but that of each of the half dozen or so Representatives to whom I have talked. Florida, fortunately, has a conservative congressional delegation.

In Washington, a year ago, our group spent considerable time with Mr. Schottland, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, discussing our views on the care of the aging and the medically indigent. We were politely and respectfully received, but had the feeling that we had accomplished nothing insofar as changing the opinion of the bureaucracy which manages and manipulates this large department of the Government. Consequently, we appointed a committee within our association to study the problems of the aging in our own State, to determine, insofar as possible what these problems were, with particular regard to the ability of these people to meet their medical needs. In the first place, what are these medical needs? What is the average amount expended for medicines, physicians, hospitals, nursing homes, etc.? And how is the average family in Florida, beyond the age of 65, equipped to meet these needs? What sort of health insurance can they afford on a voluntary basis? What would they be willing to pay for health protection? How many of their problems could be handled in the nursing-home rather than in the hospital? How many by an attendant or companion within their homes? What is the place of meals-on-wheels in supplying these individuals with the proper diet and warm meals regularly at their homes? All these—and many other questions—remain unanswered. Of course, they are of little import to legislators who, not bothered with the problem, concern themselves merely with the remedy—knowing nothing of the magnitude of the difficulty which they are undertaking to correct.

As I have said, we of the medical profession in Florida, in cooperation with certain

other agencies, are in the process now of conducting such a thorough and complete investigation, so that we can definitely and scientifically outline the problem of supplying adequate medical care to the aging population, and then propound a reasonable solution. What that solution should be, certainly no one knows at the present time until the problem itself is more clearly outlined. Only then can we intelligently hope to evolve a workable corrective procedure.

We earnestly hope that the Congress will be good enough to postpone any hasty action in this regard until the results of our survey, and those of others, can present to them a clear and detailed picture of the ills which they are being asked to correct. It is certainly touching to see the deep concern that is expressed for the "poor old folks" of this country. These elderly people are as appealing a group as the little children—and they have the further advantage that each one of them has a vote. Here again we return to a fundamental divergence on the basis of principle between a group such as those of us who are gathered here today and those individuals in Washington who advocate a Strong Central or Federal Government. Here again we become involved as to whether the responsibility of this aging population is a Federal or a local and State obligation—whether we are dutybound and honorbound to take care of our own in sickness and in health, or whether we should pass on the responsibility of their care to an omnipotent and somewhat callous Federal Government.

These principles, gentlemen, can never be reconciled. We must accept the obligations implied in a Government based on the principle of States' and individual rights, if we are to reap its rewards. We must believe either in the competitive free enterprise system of our forefathers which has made America a great country—or we must believe in the strong, centralized anarchistic or fascist governments of Europe. We must make up our minds whether we wish to raise our families in a democracy or in a socialistic or communistic state. And, having made up our minds, we must act accordingly to see that the proper legislation is enacted in Washington which will support our views. There can be nothing mean, personal, or selfish in our approach. It must be independent of any personal gain or reward on our part as individuals. It must carry the banner of an ideal which will be for the betterment of our immediate community, our State, and our entire Nation.

Let us look ahead for a minute and anticipate, if we can, what the opponents of the philosophy which we are championing propose for the future. Let us try to understand the enemies' viewpoint and the ways and means by which they plan to promulgate it. Since everyone loves to make predictions, let me give you mine. Briefly, they are as follows:

I believe that one of the first items of business which will be introduced into the Senate at the beginning of the new Congress will be a resolution to change the rules of the Senate, so that new rules would be enacted with each new Congress, just as they are in the House. This is a complex and seemingly innocuous procedure. However, it does away with the continuity of the Senate as a body. As you know, Senators are elected on a staggered basis and the Senate is thought of as a continuing body—the majority of which are always held over from the previous sessions. The same rules govern it from one year to the next, and its personnel never completely changes at one time. This is in contradistinction to the House which is elected or reelected in its entirety every 2 years, and in which new rules are laid down for each separate group. The effect of such a change in the Senate

would be to periodically allow such things as the limitation of debate, etc., to come up and periodically jeopardize the rights and privileges of a minority group. If, for instance, debate were limited and the filibuster done away with, the South in particular would lose a great deal of its effective guardianship of the conservative principles of government. It would, I am sure, be an extremely bad thing for our kind of America—and I certainly hope that you will oppose any such change by all the means at your disposal. The effects of such a change would be extremely far reaching and deleterious.

The second thing that I predict will take place early in the 86th Congress is the introduction of legislation along the lines of H.R. 9467. As you know, the composition of the House of Representatives this year is such that passage of legislation of this type is a foregone conclusion. This type of legislation, however, is so palpably impractical and costly that, even in a favorable Congress, I predict that, when introduced, it will be considerably watered down; that it will take care, perhaps, only of hospital payments on individuals 70 years of age or over (instead of 65), and that it will not provide for younger people or for medical and surgical payments. This would sugarcoat the pill to the degree that it might be acceptable to Congress and would provide the wedge, or foot in the door, necessary so that next year, and the following years, additional benefits could be added to the existing skeleton program to make it as broad, or even broader, than the original. Any such legislation of this type must, of course, be resisted and resisted as vigorously as possible, if we are to preserve our democratic principles and keep from becoming an entirely socialistic state. I believe that the Senate will defeat it in this first session if we advise them of our opposition—but their action in an election year is an entirely different proposition. Between now and then, groups such as this throughout the country must make their voices heard—their will known—if we are not to be inundated by the threatening and all-engulfing wave of socialism.

Conventional Death or Unconventional Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the development and stockpiling of weapons whose power is so immense as to threaten the very existence of the human race has been a constant preoccupation of the major powers ever since the end of World War II. With a few notable exceptions, people in policymaking positions seem to have assumed that this treadmill to oblivion is the best and even the only possible way in which we can proceed. To suggest that weapons posing as grave a threat to the user as to the intended victim are not really contributions to defense has been assailed as soft and unrealistic thinking. But recently, at a meeting in Washington of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a paper was read which proposed some new, though perhaps unconventional, ideas in the

realm of defense. But, more significantly for our purposes, this paper made some very penetrating observations about the difficulties which are faced by the Congress in attempting to exercise our clear constitutional responsibility for the direction of the Nation's defense policy. The author's ideas have been described by the editors of the Saturday Review of Literature as "unsponsored, controversial, imaginative and, we hope, provocative of new ways to peace." Since every Member of the Congress would welcome suggestions, which might even indirectly lead to new and fresh thinking about ways to peace, I ask unanimous consent that the following article, by Lewis A. Dexter, from the Saturday Review of Literature of February 7, 1959, be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CONVENTIONAL DEATH OR UNCONVENTIONAL SURVIVAL?

(By Lewis A. Dexter)

The Constitution of the United States of America plainly says that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress." Among these powers are specifically included "power to provide for the common defense . . . to raise and support armies . . . to provide and maintain a navy . . . to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces" and further "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Yet the Congress does not in any very significant degree exercise these powers to check and balance the military or the Executive in shaping military policy. Indeed, in interviews I have conducted during the last 7 years (among others, under contract for the Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and for the Advisory Committee on Civil Defense of the National Research Council) several Members of Congress and congressional staff executives have expressed the belief that because the President is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces the Congress does not actually hold the same responsibility in military matters as it does in other affairs. My own contention is that scientific analysis of the role of Congress in military policy is not only proper but could aid in reducing the likelihood that we will suffer the worse consequences of modern warfare.

How has our constitutional system come to be modified in practice from the system intended by the men who wrote the basic document on which American government is built? The departure occurs through failure to distinguish military policy from war plans, tactics, weapons manufacture, and other aspects of warfare. By military policy I mean the grand strategy, or what has been called the politics of warfare underlying, guiding, and limiting strategic, tactical, and material decisions. Military policy is thus concerned with such questions as: What kind of war are we going to fight? What kind of military doctrine(s) are related to our overall political and long-range purposes as a people?

It is entirely possible for a nation to conduct a cold war or a hot one without a military policy. So far as the naked eye of this particular observer can discern, it is not clear that we have in this country at the present time a military policy. We do, of course, have a military doctrine, or perhaps several military doctrines, of which the best known is deterrence through the threat of massive retaliation. But it is not clear that this is related to political objectives. In fact, the doctrine of massive retaliation arose in very large measure from our prior and for some time unique possession of the A-bomb.

An overall military policy would commence not with weapons but with the question: What kind of weapons do we need for the kinds of wars—or deterrence—which empirically and ideologically are most likely to fit our political purposes? This question may be asked at the highest levels—by the National Security Council or the President—but if so it and the answers to it are classified or held *in petto* and not in the public domain. Similarly, military policy would determine such questions as unification of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in accordance with the answer to a larger question: What kinds of organization of the military services are likely to produce the kinds of military thinking and action which will best fit our overall political purposes? Although some discussion of unification and service missions purports to be in these terms, questions of military organization are tackled in general as though military organization and political purpose are autonomous, separable entities.

The idea of military policy just put forward will serve to reveal the writer's biases, the reasons why I am concerned with the position of the Congress in the formulation of military policy. Probably, a person largely satisfied with current military doctrine would be less likely to ask questions which at least suggest that policy could be formulated differently. However, those who do not share my doubts about our current approach to military problems may nevertheless find some interest in exploring how in a complex society do politicians legislate on technological issues where some element of crisis is involved and whether the suspicion of the expert and the specialist can be utilized in any sensible way to guide military policy decisions.

My interviews with Congressmen have brought me to five conclusions:

1. Most Congressmen believe that Congress has very little to say about military policy. They allege that the military matters it is concerned with are the peripheral matters of production, waste, living conditions, etc.

2. Most Congressmen are suspicious and distrustful of the military, its representations and claims. But they have no technique by which they can get at them except by leaks and differences of opinion arising from conflicts among the services, which they therefore welcome.

3. No Congressman interviewed claimed that he heard from constituents or persons of prominence about overall problems of military policy or about purposes of military organization—in the way in which Congressmen do hear overall economic views as well as arguments for or against specific economic proposals.

4. A number of Members interviewed would like to have some resource—they don't quite know what—in the field of military policy which would provide them with the stimulus and ammunition about overall purposes which they do get, for instance, on economic matters.

5. The legal background and experience of Members of Congress play a larger role in how testimony is sought, received, and evaluated than is always recognized. Again and again, members of committees refer to their quasi-judicial function. For instance, a member of an Appropriations Committee panel said, "We're like a grand jury; the plaintiff may ask \$50,000, the defendant offer nothing, and we say it should be \$22,350.08. We're like a grand jury . . . that goes out and investigates . . . that can walk into the homes of litigants . . . and haul people in, high and low."

A grand jury does investigate complaints; but the complaints usually have to be offered by someone. A judge even more clearly decides between litigants. But who are the litigants here? Except in cases of waste,

graft, local complaint, or personal injustice, there are on matters of military policy only one set of litigants—the armed services, struggling for prestige missions and a higher proportion of defense appropriations. This differs from political conflicts coming before Congressional committees over tariff protection and reciprocal trade, national fiscal policy, taxes, agricultural programs, conservation of natural resources—for in all these latter instances general arguments of national policy, national interest, and political philosophy are presented on both or several sides. It is quite possible that analysis of testimony on military matters during the 1930's would show far more concern with fundamental issues of military policy than is shown now, because in those days isolationists and pacifists were heard; their challenges of the military were expected and were considered.

It is not without relevance to free inquiry into military policy today that three or four senior civil servants in the Defense Department have objected to any notion of Congressional responsibility in this area. One of them whose responsibility and training orients him constantly towards civil-military legislative relationships told me vehemently that he thought it improper to even begin any such study as I was undertaking. Of what conceivable use could it be? When I replied that possibly my work might help crystallize awareness on Capitol Hill of how military policy is dealt with, he said "G . . . d . . . it, that's just it. That's downright unpatriotic; D . . . it, if a Congressman wants to know what he should think about such matters, all he has to do is ask us!"

Upon my refusing to give up the study, this man swore that he would see to it that the study was given up, and he did in fact write an extremely strong letter along that line to my supervisor at MIT. He is, I judge and presume, an aberrant case; but sometimes the explicit assertion of an extreme opinion helps shed some light on the drift of elements in the general point of view.

The critic of prevailing military doctrines is thus seen not engaged in a relatively innocuous intellectual disputation; he is threatening the status, the security, and in many cases the sense of dedication of a number of his colleagues and comrades. Because weapons systems, service missions, etc., are all dependent upon military doctrines, and weapons systems and service missions encyst the status, security, and aspirations of a good many men.

It would be at least worth exploring the part which the defense contractors play in determining military orthodoxy. If, as has been quoted in testimony before congressional committees, 70 percent of the weapons ideas come thence, it is likely that the ideas put forward will be selected according to a process which does not encourage radical revolutions in conception because radical changes are (a) expensive to a contractor with a given staff and way of doing things, and (b) dangerous in the sense that if they are rejected they may destroy the contractor's good relationships with the military.

So the Congress, practically speaking, finds itself forced to rely upon those whom it distrusts—distrusts because it knows or believes it knows they are speaking for vested interests. One Member epitomized the situation by saying perhaps a dozen times in the course of a 1-hour interview, "Who am I to say 'No' to the military? They say a certain thing should be done; who am I to say 'No'?"

He is right in one sense. Committees of Congress are not now properly staffed to analyze Executive recommendations on military matters. However, any committee which chose to do so could provide itself with an adequate staff of reasonably critical and imaginative natural and social scientists as free as possible of loyalties to current

military institutions and doctrines. The subcommittee members of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee who study the budget requests for the Defense Department and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization are more continuously in touch with military operations than any other group in Congress; and it is encouraging that one of these men, Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, has proposed that the House set up a select committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures by resolution, "for the purpose of strengthening congressional control over the public purse through the . . . strengthening of its review of the annual budget . . . enabling (the Congress) better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution." I showed Mr. Flood the first two paragraphs of this paper, and his reaction was that the precise reason why Congress "does not in any very significant degree exercise its power to check and balance the military" is that Congress lacks the tools to get behind budget requests or to determine their operational meaning. Whether a select committee is necessary, or whether his purpose could be achieved simply by a present Appropriations Committee decision to utilize politically sophisticated natural and social scientists routinely to study the meaning of the budgets that committee is asked to approve, may be open to discussion.

There are several other congressional committees which have or could have significant responsibilities along the same line. The Armed Services Committee comes to mind. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has a special responsibility in the field of military aid. And, in fact, as an experienced staff member once remarked to me, "In Congress, 9 times out of 10, assertion is jurisdiction." So almost any committee could—if its senior members wished it to do so—tackle the problem of a really new look at military policy.

Any committee approaching the problem along the lines here suggested could profitably start by raising a question posed earlier in this essay: What kinds of war would best fit into the political purposes which we have in mind?

Such an approach would demand at least one revision in the characteristic picture of war now drawn in this country—that war must be as destructive as possible, to the death, an unconditional surrender type of thing, with the corresponding mechanisms of savage threats and promises of retaliation. Such a war, and such an attitude toward cold war, does not involve policy at all. Policy implies consideration of the best and least hazardous way of achieving ends.

I would guess that consistent, significant concern by any congressional committee which would make military policy a subject of serious intellectual interest to civilians would very shortly lead to a questioning of premises. For instance, the theory of deterrence, as its very name implies, rests upon a psychologically unproven premise; the belief that a potential enemy will refrain from acting because he fears your capacity to injure him. There are times and circumstances, no doubt, when the belief is true, but the relative unsuccess of both American and Russian police in controlling hoodlums and juvenile delinquency leads one to doubt its universal applicability. The practice of deterrence may, in fact, provoke preventive or preemptive action.

There is another solution: The development of weapons to fit our purposes. It is apparently possible to develop giggle gases, sleep-inducing gases, sneezing gases, if need be gases producing the symptoms of dysentery for a couple of weeks, which have no lethal or long-range destructive effect on a civilization or a people. It is conceivable, indeed, that gases can be produced which merely have the effect of making people so

extremely happy, so euphoric, that they simply will not take the pains or bother to man attack or defense stations, launch missiles, or do any productive work. These gases would, in effect, intoxicate the whole population.

Whether such gases can in fact be delivered, nobody knows; but surely the whole atomic bomb would have seemed incredible in 1930, even to most atomic scientists of that date.

Suppose that, as a result of a reconsideration of national military policy of the sort which Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON has indicated he hopes to see the Congress undertake this session, the Congress should, by resolution, make some such announcement as the following:

"We have been devoting x billion dollars over the last 15 years to thermonuclear weapons and their delivery. This threatens the survival of the entire human species. We propose therefore that beginning tomorrow we reduce this sum by x dollars and that the x dollars which we save be devoted to the development and delivery of gases which cannot possibly exterminate the species.

"Since we know that in basic research, there are no secrets, we freely offer (a specified portion—perhaps one-quarter) of the whole sum to the United Nations to be spent and developed under United Nations auspices."

Our friends, and those who are not so sure of our good intentions as we like to think they are, would immediately see the advantages of happy gas over tactical nuclear weapons. Happy gas could be used by a U.N. police force, for example, to prevent aggression against Lebanon or Iran without fear that such police action might lead to destruction of the human race. If the idea were publicized to the people of Russia it could exert a considerable pressure on the regime itself. As publicized among the scientists of the world, it would recruit the full enthusiasm and capacity of many who in recent years have stayed away from defense work or dragged their feet on it; and it would give a period of hope, during which other matters of bitter dispute could be better negotiated.

During that period of hope, of course, both the U.S.S.R. and the United States would keep thermonuclear weapons; through aggression or miscalculation they might still go off. It is essential that our approach provide a basis for honorable disarmament and reconciliation. It must refocus the loci of terror in such terms that both major groups of powers will in their own self-interest work toward an early solution and that each will be convinced that the other is not going to engage in preventive war.

The elements of such a solution could include exchange of hostages. An exchange could be arranged between Russia and her satellites and the United States and Great Britain of 2-year visits by relatives and associates of the leading political, military, and perhaps economic figures in each country to the other. If, for instance, Maj. John Eisenhower were to be assigned to spend a year teaching literature or some other field in which he is qualified in some Russian city, not far removed from one of their major industrial complexes, and bring his family with him, the Russians surely would realize that President Eisenhower was not likely to launch planes or missiles against the U.S.S.R.

The strain on parental feelings and on the feelings of those involved must be considered. But if people realize that otherwise thermonuclear war might take place, I believe most of them would be willing to take the risk involved. Many families today send young children away to summer camp, partly to be hardened. Such an exchange as here proposed would be no more difficult than that—and it would have advantages for the individuals themselves, in most instances, far greater than the best summer camp.

While this experiment in restoration of good will was proceeding, pinpricks (or massive insults, however they are regarded) in connection with passports, trade barriers, and the like should be removed. The emphasis must be on what we can and shall share and exchange.

The key word here is emphasis and the spirit underlying it must be "accentuate the positive; underplay the negative." There will continue to be, presumably, developmental techniques in weaponry which it would be idiotic to share. But American policy, so far as the rest of the world knows it (with the exception of point 4 and the atoms-for-peace program) in recent years has frequently stressed what cannot or will not be done or what will be done in an unpleasant and bothersome manner. We have rarely proclaimed what we are trying to do.

There are always a great many people who would rather die by techniques which have come to seem familiar and natural than take the risk of the unfamiliar with its somewhat unconventional methods. Such people (doctrinaire Marxists in Russia, conventional military men in this country, enthusiastic nationalists in some other nations) may lead the world to disaster. Clearly we must go as far as it is possible to go to reassure them. Is there any stronger reassurance for them than the traditional, open working of the checks and balances in our own democratic system? Could we possibly do better than to resolve the conflict which many Congressmen feel between the technologically based Defense Department of today and the hope for civilian responsibility and civilian protection tomorrow? May it not be that the cure for science is more science—science in the Congress?

Poison in Your Water—No. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the RECORD an article appearing in the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer on March 2, 1958. The article describes how sanitary conditions of Lake Washington and Puget Sound are so bad that it is expected to shortly have a disastrous effect on real estate values in the area.

This is just another consequence of the dirty, foul water in this country. The water which was once pure and clear has become clouded with sewage, municipal waste and industrial waste so that it is no longer fit to drink or even swim in.

This is just another reason why the full appropriation of \$45 million under Public Law 660 should be made and why that law should be extended and liberalized so that our country may once again become a land of pure, clear water usable for drinking, industrial purposes, fishing, boating, and swimming.

The article follows:

POLLUTION SEEN AS THREAT TO PROPERTY VALUE

Continued pollution of Lake Washington and Puget Sound will have a disastrous effect upon real estate values. Seattle realtors

Henry Broderick and John L. Scott warned Saturday.

They estimated waterfront property values will drop at least 50 percent unless pollution is halted. They said such a situation would be a civic disaster.

Broderick said the Metro plan is the only solution proposed to halt pollution.

"I feel confident Metro can do the job," Broderick declared. "The important thing is that it must be done right now. If we wait, it will be too late."

Scott said the sanitary condition of Lake Washington is already so bad many lakeside residents are building swimming pools. He said waterfront property's chief asset comes from swimming facilities and that such property will greatly decline in value if it becomes merely view property.

Coal by Wire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years the gasoline-powered automobile has dominated the American road. The old steam-powered and electric-powered cars have long since vanished into limbo—or museums. At any rate, that is what we have been taught.

However, I would like to commend to your attention the following article which indicates the electric auto may be making a comeback. It relates how manufacture already has begun on a new type of electric car which is cheap to operate, has few complicated parts, and is ideally suited to certain types of business use.

This article, which was published in the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News and was written by a personal friend of mine, Marie Wood, details fully the description of this new car, which soon will be a familiar sight on the streets of Parkersburg, and soon may be in general use all over the country.

My interest in these cars, and my purpose in bringing them to your attention, is more than incidental. Because they are powered with electricity, I am particularly interested in their development. Electricity is cheap and plentiful in my home State of West Virginia, because of the abundance of coal, which powers the huge generators throughout the region. In fact, the utility companies boast that electricity is coal by wire.

I wish every success for the popularity of these new vehicles, which are another outstanding use of coal by wire:

NEW ELECTRIC AUTOS ARE COMING TO CITY

(By Marie Wood)

Electric automobiles with a 55-mile-an-hour speed, a driving range of 80 miles (enough for 1 day) and constructed of fiberglass and aluminum are about to make their appearance in Parkersburg with Monongahela Power to have one of the first, it was learned last night.

Fuel costs will be 8 cents a day if the cars are plugged in to 220 volts for recharging and 18 cents a day if plugged in to 110 volts.

A west coast company which formerly manufactured airplanes is turning out the

4-passenger small cars and Monongahela Power is one of a number of eastern utility companies which have ordered—and paid for—the first 100.

Cost will be around \$2,000.

The cars will weigh 1,875 pounds empty with the body accounting for 300 pounds and the batteries (1 to each rear wheel) another 528 pounds.

Utility companies plan to assign the electric cars to meter readers as speedily as they can get sufficient number.

The first electric car to go into production in approximately 40 years these "Volts Wagons," as they already have been nicknamed, will have a fiberglass body and measure 13½ feet long and five feet wide—with choice of black, blue, gray, or bronze.

Height will be 4 feet 9 inches. The electric motors and transmission will be in the rear (eliminating any floor tunnel) and the trunk will use all the space up forward under the hood.

The welded aluminum frame will be strong enough to prevent crushing in case the car should flip over.

There will be no exhaust—so no smog problem.

The only motor sound will be a slight whine when the car is in operation.

When it is halted for any reason—including traffic lights—the car will be silent. It won't be using any current.

To go backward there is a backward button on the dashboard.

The steering post will have a hand shift with two positions: low range for brisk take-offs or hills and driving range for average touring.

Hydraulic brakes will be equipped with 2-inch wide drums because an electrical braking system would have increased cost, complexity and weight.

There will be no oil or temperature gauges but a voltmeter with a face that reads like a gasoline gage will have two-thirds of the range painted green. The remaining one-third will be yellow and red.

When the needle hits red it's time to head for the nearest charging outlet.

If the car dies on the road manufacturers have arranged the batteries so they have a last-gasp recuperative power they promise—and the driver sits idle with power off for five minutes and then he can drive 6 more miles at 30 miles per hour.

Manufacturer is the Stinson Aircraft Tool & Engine Co., of San Diego, Calif., and the electric car has been christened the Charles-Town in honor of the financial godfather, Dr. Charles H. Graves, 40, a San Diego dentist, inventor and real estate man.

Congressman ELLIOTT, I came to appreciate his intense devotion to the welfare of America's youth and his earnest desire to strengthen American educational standards. I know that the Members of Congress and those interested in the future of our Nation's young people, join Parents' magazine in saluting CARL ELLIOTT for his remarkable record in the Congress on behalf of youth.

I include at this point a press statement from Parents' magazine together with the citation which appeared in the January 1959 issue of the magazine:

Congressman CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama's Seventh District, was today presented with an award by Parents' magazine for outstanding service to children in 1958.

The award was presented in Washington, D.C., by Robert Cramer vice president of Parents' Institute, publishers of the magazine.

Congressman ELLIOTT was cited as a staunch supporter of education, who has worked hard over the years to help America's schoolchildren. The passage of the National Defense Education Act in the closing days of the 85th Congress was hailed as "a singular achievement for Mr. ELLIOTT, who as chairman of the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House of Representatives took the lead in piloting the bill through rough legislative seas."

The award for outstanding service to children has been an annual event since 1928. In past years the award has gone to such persons as Senator Lister Hill, of Alabama, former Senator Charles Potter of Michigan, Dr. Jonas Salk, and Defense Secretary Neil McElroy.

A staunch champion of Federal aid to education, this distinguished legislator from Alabama has worked assiduously over the years to help America's school children. Passage last August of the National Defense Education Act—most important aid-to-education measure enacted by Congress in 40 years—was a singular achievement for Mr. ELLIOTT. As chairman of the House Education Subcommittee, he took the lead in piloting the bill through rough legislative seas. Today and in the future, this 45-year-old lawyer and father of four can be counted on to strive for what he believes—better education for all U.S. youngsters.

Loan Act Questions Our Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call your attention to student reaction to provisions of the National Defense Education Act as appears from the following editorial from the February 13 issue of the student paper, the Dakota Student, which is published on the campus of the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks:

LOAN ACT QUESTIONS OUR LOYALTY

In the last session of the United States Congress the National Defense Education Act was passed. This act provides \$826 million in Federal funds to help support education in the next 4 years.

During the hectic hours at the close of the session, Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, added to the bill a loyalty oath requirement which reads as follows: "No . . . funds . . . shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, is not a member of, and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The addition of this loyalty oath requirement has since raised a great deal of controversy. Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has noted publicly that the provision would do little or no good.

The University of North Dakota Chapter of the AAUP has also voiced its objections to the provisions of the bill. Princeton University has declined to apply for funds under the act, in part because of the loyalty oath requirement.

Why has this act raised such a furor? There are several reasons. First of these is the nature of an oath itself. It, by its very existence, implies a doubt and distrust of a certain group of people—the students and educators of America. When any group is singled out for a test such as this is, it indicates a general suspicion of the group.

Secondly, although the oath creates a general atmosphere of distrust in regard to these people, it will be ineffective in regard to its primary purposes. It will not uncover Communists in education, since any Communist would sign the oath with no scruples. It would be odd indeed if a movement aiming to swallow a whole country by force were to choke on an oath.

Third, it is a direct violation of civil rights, and it suppresses the necessary experimentalism of a person's college years. If certain groups are taboo, how is the student to know what they are? The end result is that students will join no groups. Can the oath be so construed that a student or professor studying Russian economics will be accused of supporting communism by subscribing to an economics journal? The very vagueness of the provision eats away at academic freedom and the right to know.

In the long run this loyalty oath provision will catch no Communists. It will create a distrust of students and their teachers as a group, it will stifle academic freedom, and in truth it strikes at the very core of the democratic philosophy.

If students cannot be trusted to sift truth from error, if indeed we fear that education is going to lead students astray from democracy, it will take a good deal more than loyalty oaths to help us.

Alaska: Salute to the 49th State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. Greta Drumm, Shuart Lane, Ramsey, N.J., recently composed a poem saluting the entrance of Alaska into statehood. It was published in the Ramsey Journal. I feel that the message it carries deserves a wider audience and I am pleased to in-

Congressman Carl Elliott Receives Parents' Magazine Award for Outstanding Service to Children in 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, Representative CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, who guided the National Defense Education Act of 1958 through the Congress, has recently been given a most coveted award—the Parents' Magazine Award for outstanding service to children in 1958. As one who served on the subcommittee chaired by

clude the fine tribute that it contains in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ALASKA

(Salute to the 49th State)

The Stars and Stripes forever
And every shining star
Flashes a welcome twinkle
To her sister from afar.

Now in the breezy weather
When the flag blows wild and free
We'll salute the forty-niners
Who are not here to see.

The grim men, the lost men,
The seekers after gold—
The pioneers who lingered
Through bitterness and cold.

The loud men, the rough men,
The dreamers, too, who saw
The future in the Northern Lights
Upon that barren shore.

The women, all the women,
The faithful and the gay,
Who lived in little shanties
And cheered men on their way.

The diggers and the builders,
The good and not so good,
Who laughed and cried and labored
For this day of proud statehood.

So dip your stars a moment
In wonder and in awe—
She's coming into statehood
As her sisters came before.

Forever, now, a forty-niner
In memory of her past,
May their spirit ever guide her,
And all they dreamed of last.

—Greta Drumm.

Surplus Food in a Hungry World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging paradoxes of our time is the accumulation of farm surpluses in a world where nearly 1 billion people are crying for food. Recently I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 60 expressing the sense of the Congress that the American people must more fully employ the plentiful resources of the American farmer to enhance the standard of living throughout the free world and to bolster the political and economic stability of those nations which have embarked upon programs of economic construction.

Writing for the McClure Newspaper Syndicate in a column dated October 15, 1958, Mr. Ray Tucker has effectively posed the No. 1 problem confronting a large share of the world's population—the painful and demoralizing problem of human hunger. I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Tucker's article which follows:

NEARLY BILLION PEOPLE IN WORLD WHO NEVER ENJOY A SQUARE MEAL

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—While Washington and Moscow wrangle over desert lands in the Middle East and the rocky islands of Quemoy and Matsu, the principal cause of war and the

world's greatest need today is food. It means more to millions in allied and neutral countries than even the American concepts of democracy and liberty.

With \$7 billion of surplus edibles in Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's granaries at a storage cost of a million dollars a day, it is almost impossible for Americans, including our highest officials and diplomats, to appreciate or seek to solve this basic problem.

Nevertheless, according to United Nations surveys recently released, there are a billion persons who, from their cradles to their graves, never enjoy a "square meal." There are more than 100 million babies who go to bed hungry nightly.

Millions die from starvation, although their deaths are attributed erroneously to tuberculosis, malaria, tropical diseases, Asian germs, etc. The real cause of this mortality is hunger.

WHERE HUNGER STALKS

Nor is it only coincidence that hunger stalks humanity most severely in the very areas which are current sources of international friction and possible war—the Far East, Asia, the Middle East, and north Africa. In Latin America, these conditions result in revolutions, popular unrest and outbreaks like those against Vice President Nixon.

The world's hungriest nations today are China, north Africa, Asia, and the countries which have joined Nasser's United Arab Republic. It is hardly necessary to emphasize the equation between want of food and envy of well-fed Western peoples, which can easily lead to war. It should also be noted that they do not eat too well within Khrushchev's Communist empire.

Fortunately, Western humanitarians have recently begun to move into areas where statesmen and politicians fear to tread.

NEW HOOVER GROUP

The United Nations Economic and Social Council has invited all interested countries to consider establishment of an international food reserve. Countries with surpluses would contribute or sell at low prices their unusable crops to a central distributing body.

When a similar project was proposed by Costa Rica in 1954, before the Middle and Far East flare-ups, it was opposed and blocked by the United States and Great Britain. They objected on the ground that the scheme would upset commodity prices and trading, and on the further fact that the U.N. was studying the question.

Under the auspices of Herbert Hoover, Columbia University has set up an international institute of nutrition science. With expert guidance, it will explore and try to solve the imbalance in world food supplies and production.

Philanthropic Giving by One American Corporation—Polish National Alliance Has Benefited American Education in the Amount of Nearly \$5 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, most leading statesmen of this country agree that furnishing opportunities for more education to a greater mass of our American youth is one of the most important problems facing our Nation to-

day. Many of us in Congress and Government have been urging that Federal action and aid be augmented to relieve the critical shortages. But this is not merely a Federal problem. State and local organizations, private corporations and individuals must also do their part.

It is, therefore, as a member of the Polish National Alliance that I take great pride in advising my colleagues what that one fraternal corporation has done and is continuing to do in that field. I submit herewith a statement made by Dr. Arthur P. Coleman, president of the Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa., of which I am proud to say that both I and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANK KOWALSKI] are alumni. I should add also that this educational institution is open to all students, regardless of racial or national origin, or sex, providing that they have the required educational qualifications.

Dr. Coleman's statement follows:

In connection with the recent interest on the part of many American corporations in supporting independent higher education I take pleasure in calling attention to the magnificent record of the Polish National Alliance, a fraternal benefit insurance corporation doing business in 32 States and the District of Columbia. Founded in 1880 in historic Philadelphia, this great American institution has long benefited independent higher education in America. When the first Poles landed in Jamestown in 1608 they little realized the impact of their successors on this continent.

Up to 1929 the Polish National Alliance (headquarters now in Chicago) had given to Alliance College alone the considerable sum of \$1,595,190.58. Annual gifts thereafter have amounted to:

1930.....	\$119,985.78
1931.....	124,498.23
1932.....	124,377.04
1933.....	116,149.79
1934.....	116,995.60
1935.....	110,946.84
1936.....	133,449.21
1937.....	126,229.58
1938.....	129,032.77
1939.....	122,814.03
1940.....	82,240.37
1941.....	76,497.72
1942.....	76,143.68
1943.....	80,511.33
1944.....	81,486.93
1945.....	83,894.03
1946.....	85,588.14
1947.....	83,816.48
1948.....	135,208.75
1949.....	78,650.07
1950.....	80,515.73
1951.....	92,249.08
1952.....	123,079.46
1953.....	119,069.70
1954.....	119,161.12
1955.....	115,732.92
1956.....	164,026.69
1957.....	113,713.40
1958.....	108,363.24

Total from 1912 through June 30, 1958, \$4,719,615.75.

This makes a grand total of nearly \$5 million already given to American higher education by this one American corporation, composed largely of the sons and daughters of immigrants from Poland, a land now suffering under a Communist dictatorship.

Alliance College, beneficiary of this generosity, is naturally grateful, but I submit that the general American community should be proud of the pioneer efforts on behalf of American education by this single corporation owned by some 340,000 Ameri-

cans of Polish or Slavic extraction. With the Polish National Alliance, corporate aid to education is not something new, rather it has been practiced for many years.

I should like, as an American educator, to express my admiration for this distinguished pioneer example of wise and long-range aid to independent American education.

I believe Americans of older stock will agree with me that if privately supported higher education is to survive, in the United States we need many more such corporations.

Bill Could Help Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Lexington Herald, of Lexington, Ky., under date of February 14, 1959, as follows:

BILL COULD HELP DEPRESSED AREAS

Opposition to the proposed bill of Representative EUGENE SILER, of the Eighth District, which would provide tax exemption to corporations setting up plants in depressed areas, was expressed recently by Representative FRANK BURKE, of the third, or Louisville district. The Louisville Democrat did not elaborate on his reasons for saying that the bill would not work.

The measure introduced by Representative SILER would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and set up some rather rigid conditions under which tax relief would be provided corporations moving into any depressed areas. The measure appears sound, and any defects, if such exist, easily could be ironed out through amendments while the measure is under study by the House Ways and Means Committee. Basically, the Siler bill would exempt from corporate income taxes corporations which would operate in economically depressed areas and where a minimum of 200 workers would be employed.

The exemptions would continue for a maximum of 5 years, after which the corporations would begin paying the regular taxes. There is a large reserve of employable labor in the depressed areas of this and other States, and more men will be thrown out of employment in Eastern Kentucky under the new coal contracts unless some concessions are made by the United Mine Workers of America. No new coal companies are expected to take advantage of such tax relief programs, however, because they will not have the question of profits to worry about if they try to operate under the new contract. But other industries could come into the coal fields of Eastern Kentucky, where many counties are listed as in the depressed areas.

The minimum employment specification of 200 workers would serve to attract big industries. The bill will not allow benefits where an industry decides to move from one depressed area to another, which is sound. It is to be hoped that the House committee entrusted with this measure will give it an early hearing so that defects, if any, may be brought to light and remedies provided. Tax exemption for 5 years may be just the thing that is needed to bring industry into an area where labor supplies are abundant and the people are ready for any program that will help restore the economy.

Needed: A Balanced Educational Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article written by Dr. Earl McGrath, former commissioner of education, who is presently executive officer of the Institute of Higher Education, Columbia University. The article, "Needed: A Balanced Educational Policy," follows:

NEEDED: A BALANCED EDUCATIONAL POLICY

(By Earl J. McGrath)

American citizens have properly been proud of their educational system, which they have considered superior to any other. It is not surprising, therefore, that in October 1957 we as a people were shocked to learn that in at least one field of intellectual endeavor we had been surpassed by another nation. For this very reason, the success of the Russians in space science will doubtless prove a boon to American education. What have been the consequences during the past 15 months?

The launching of the first satellite focused public attention on certain inadequacies. But the basic information about the deteriorating condition of American education has been available for years. Debate concerning needed action has, to be sure, been obfuscated by uninformed or prejudiced reactionaries, in the profession and outside, who have viewed the schools of today as in a state of decadence, as well as by some Mickey-cawber-like educators who have described our educational institutions as better than any we, or other nations, have ever known. Between these two extremes the realities lie.

Some of our educational institutions today are better than any of their predecessors and better than those in any other land. But, unfortunately, the percentage of schools with adequate educational programs and the essential facilities to carry them out is very small and, in the main, such schools are located in atypical wealthy school districts. And almost all colleges and universities are operating below their potential contribution. In many communities, schools are understaffed, physically inadequate, and manned by teachers with preparation below accepted professional standards. Many colleges and universities are likewise undermanned; short of buildings, laboratories, and library facilities, and operating on deficit spending.

The explosion of the space age has shocked thoughtful citizens into an awareness of this situation and the realization that education is our most important asset, the element in our society without which we cannot continue to prosper, nor even to endure as a first-class Nation.

Ever since this Nation became a highly developed society with rapid mobility and all-embracing social, economic, and cultural problems, education should have been a matter of national concern. But the tradition of State and local control has resulted in a lack of any real national educational planning. America has come of age in most other aspects of its national life, but in education it still exhibits the stumbling, halting, and insecure gait of childhood.

The mastering of our material and human resources in the effort to advance the cause of human freedom against the thoughtfully conceived and well-organized efforts of totalitarianism must be a national enterprise.

And since education is one of the most effective instruments in this effort, the lack of a comprehensive Federal policy and program for education weakens our international position and impairs our domestic well-being. The Federal Government has the responsibility of considering the whole of our educational effort in relation to the large purposes of American society, domestic, and international.

A SICKLY CONDITION

Why is the educational enterprise in a sickly condition when most other features of our economic and social life have been in such relative good health? Many factors are at work in this complex situation. One, however, not so obvious as others, is the general view that the doctrine of State and local control of education implies no studying, planning, or financing at the national level. The broad principle that education is a State and local matter, sound enough in its proper context, has actually become an obstruction to the necessary consideration of an adequate program for American education.

Indeed the thoughtless mouthing of this idea and its deliberate use as a bogey in public discussions of the responsibility of the Government for education largely explain the present halting efforts to come to grips with educational problems on a national scale. If there had been the same lack of governmental concern for the military, business, labor, agricultural, maritime, and aviation affairs of the Nation as there has been for education, our national posture would be weak indeed.

Logic does not require that he who believes in State and local control of education must also believe that the Federal Government should have no responsibility for examining the condition of education in the United States, for pressing educational authorities to correct inadequacies, and, if need be, as is now clearly the case, for providing the financial assistance needed to bring the total educational enterprise up to the working efficiency required in the national interest.

As a matter of fact, all the heated discussion about whether the Federal Government should take responsibility for education is merely rhetoric. The Government has played a part in education from the earliest days of the republic. The small initial grants have increased enormously through the years, to the point where the total now runs into billions of dollars scattered unnoticed through virtually every branch of the Federal structure. The national welfare now demands even greater expenditures. No one in Government or outside knows how much.

Before added subventions are provided for education, the present meaningless patchwork of Federal aid ought to be replaced by a design developed upon a clearly conceived philosophy. A comprehensive Federal policy on education is imperatively needed.

Millions of dollars have been appropriated for hearings, some in the most recent session of the Congress, on one or another educational program which the Government has been asked to support. Thousands of pages of congressional publications record these discussions. Even the casual reader will observe, however, that in the main these discussions have not dealt with fundamental matters—with policy—but rather with the relative merits of special projects under consideration.

The 86th Congress could do nothing more instrumental in advancing American education than to appropriate a sum of money for hearings and other appropriate activities concerned with the development of an unequivocal and firm Federal policy in respect to education.

These hearings should not be concerned with such matters as whether the Federal

Government should provide more or less support for vocational education, for education by television, for school lunch programs, for military education in the colleges. Instead such broad subjects should be considered as the condition of education in the United States and the responsibility which the Federal Government ought to assume in connection with current and future educational problems, so closely connected with our welfare and destiny as a people.

SPECIAL CONCERN LAST

Leaders in the educational profession and outside it should have an opportunity to express their views on public policy, views which under the present circumstances surrounding such hearings are often neglected, suppressed, or disguised in behalf of the special interests of the moment. With skillful direction, such public discussions should lead to the shaping of a comprehensive and stable Federal educational policy. A statement of such policy, unmistakable in intent and unequivocal in language, should serve as a guide to the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government and instruct our people generally in regard to the things which the Government should or should not be expected to do in the field of education.

If this were done, pressure groups for special educational projects would in the future be required to defend their requests in terms of large national policies rather than their own special concerns. And special interest lobby groups which oppose any Federal aid for any form of education would be required to face the larger implications of their position in terms of the general welfare of the Nation. They would be forced to raise the discussion above the type of debate on detailed figures which has been the refuge of those who will choose any alternative to that of increasing Federal expenditures for education.

The development of a national policy would also provide the basis for a reappraisal of the present large governmental expenditures for education as well as for evaluation of the many new proposals annually urged upon the administration and Congress. The present interest in education, excited by the launching of the satellites, guarantees a strong affirmative support for such an effort. As a byproduct, the responsibilities of State and local governments would simultaneously be clarified.

In addition, such hearings would highlight the further responsibilities which individuals, corporations, alumni groups, and professional organizations may be expected to assume if private interest and support of education, especially at the higher levels, is to continue to be a significant feature of American education. If these things could be accomplished, recent scientific developments in Russia would have assisted indirectly in the improvement of American education.

NOT AN UNMIXED BLESSING

The interest generated by orbiting artificial moons has not, however, been an un-mixed blessing. The very nature of the instruments which initiated the present preoccupation with educational matters has narrowly limited the thinking of many of our people with respect to what ought now to be done to restore our educational effectiveness and prestige.

Because the penetration of outer space was based on scientific and mathematical knowledge, many have proposed corrective measures which would excessively emphasize instruction in science and mathematics and thus upset the proper balance in our educational efforts. It has been proposed, for example, that all students be required to study more science and mathematics, that standards be set high in these subjects, and that all who cannot reach them be placed in

vocational programs, or sent to work; that larger salaries be paid to science teachers; that a special branch of the Government be established to deal with science education, and a host of other procedures and policies conceived in a moment of quick and unreflective reaction to an event in another country which hurt our national pride.

Most of these proposals to aggrandize science education at the expense of other forms of instruction are at best fruitless and at worst culturally damaging. They are futile, because recent observers of education in Russia, such as the U.S. Commission on Education, have reported that the Russians intend to surpass us in all branches of cultural endeavor.

INFINITE RANGE OF ABILITIES

The Russians are doubtless working on many other discoveries and inventions in no way related to space science. Trying to match them item by item, as their various developments are revealed, would place us behind them at every turn. And such a policy would introduce fitful changes of policy and practice which would eventually lead to chaos, or the domination of education in this country by the shifting events and policies of a totalitarian regime.

There is only one permanently sound plan for maintaining intellectual superiority in the world and simultaneously preserving the free society we cherish. The policies of all educational agencies—public and private, local, State, or national—must rest on the principle that all the infinite range of abilities and interests of all our people must be cultivated to the fullest extent. This is the plan which, in principle at least, has guided the development of our educational system from the beginning.

Except in time of great national danger, when customary policies and practices may temporarily have to be suspended for the more compelling purposes of the moment, any policy which imposes on any youth an intellectual activity, a curricular program, or a vocation repugnant to his basic interests, or uncongenial to his demonstrable abilities, is inconsistent with our democratic philosophy and with the national welfare.

Such a policy will lay the basis for later personal disgruntlement and social instability. It will wither the vital force without which no educational program can achieve lasting results. It will narrow the collective achievements of our people. And in the long run it will, perhaps imperceptibly, change the United States from a free into a controlled society—into the type of social order and political system we are now spending much of our personal and national wealth to combat. Few Americans would consciously embrace policies which involve Government dominance, or even policies among private educational agencies of the kind implied. Yet the same results could occur through forces operating indirectly to the same ends.

The U.S. Cultural Attaché

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, recently there has come to my attention an excellent article by Mr. George W. Oakes which appeared in the September 28, 1958, Washington Star in which the author discusses the difficult problem of securing qualified persons to serve as cul-

tural attachés with American embassies abroad. Recognizing the importance of our cultural relations with the other people of the globe, I believe that the Members of Congress will find the article by Mr. Oakes, which follows, of considerable interest:

HARDEST GOVERNMENT JOBS TO FILL

(By George W. Oakes)

The Government is having a hard time filling one very desirable kind of job because the intellectual standards are so high.

It's the job of cultural attaché in our embassies of important foreign countries. And the word "cultural" is not used loosely. The Government means what it says, for the man who fills the job must know: American history, literature, the social sciences, education, music, painting, philosophy, sports.

And what is more, he must know also what the foreign country is doing in cultural affairs so that he may compare our achievements.

In practice these are the things that the cultural attaché must know. In Government words this is what he is expected to do with this knowledge:

To act as consultant to the Ambassador on all cultural matters, to direct our Government's educational and cultural program in the foreign country, to address intellectual and educational organizations, and to conduct extensive personal contacts in academic and cultural circles.

It is the last named that, perhaps, contains the most pitfalls. A man can get by with knowing less in a formal speech than he can in the give-and-take of a fast conversation with a real intellectual. To mix on an equal footing with a country's top figures in education, literature, and the arts, the cultural attaché must be an individual of superior ability, reputation, and personality.

IMPORTANCE OF THE JOB

Americans abroad, aware of the fact that cultural relations provide one of the most lasting and least controversial ways to foster a truer understanding of the United States, especially in the minds of leaders of thought and opinion, have frequently observed that next to the ambassador the cultural attaché has perhaps the greatest single opportunity to reach a receptive audience and to make a favorable impression. From London to Tokyo there is a widespread and intense curiosity to learn more about American culture.

The cultural attaché can fulfill a special function in the emerging countries of Asia and Africa. These nations in transition, trying in a few years to bridge the gap from colonialism to independence, are desperately seeking advice and help in spreading literacy, developing their educational setup, and achieving scientific and technical competence. In this quest they turn to the best-qualified representative of a foreign country—American or Russian.

Educators, just back from consultations in southeast Asia, report that the United States is weak in cultural attachés who have proper acceptance, can assess local needs, and can assist the governments and peoples of these underdeveloped areas. Cultural foreign aid, they point out, is no less vital than economic in aligning these areas with the West.

The post of cultural attaché originated in 1941 when cultural officers were assigned to Latin America. In 1946 the program was expanded to nine countries outside the Western Hemisphere. Today there is a cultural attaché in 51 countries throughout the world, plus more than 100 cultural affairs officers in 58 countries.

MOST ARE U.S. EMPLOYEES

Although a few cultural attachés in the major capitals are university professors specially recruited for a short period, the

great preponderance of our cultural representatives are longtime government officials with a certain amount of academic background.

In a major European country, the recently appointed cultural attaché is a philosophy professor on 2 years' leave of absence. In a most important Asian country, the cultural attaché is a former provost of a State university. But, in a smaller European capital, the attaché is a former public-school official who has been in government educational programs abroad ever since the war. Some have had publishing experience before entering government.

Twenty-five foreign countries have diplomatic officers in Washington who devote at least part of their time to cultural activities. Germany, Spain, Indonesia, and some smaller countries consider the post sufficiently important to assign a special cultural counselor. Most are Foreign Service staff officers. However, the German cultural counselor is a former free-lance writer, art and drama critic. The French, who place great stress on their cultural tradition, are represented by a former public relations counselor who heads all their informational and cultural activities.

The British do not have an Embassy official designated as cultural attaché. Instead they arrange for distinguished educators and cultural leaders to lecture and travel in the United States under private auspices such as the English-Speaking Union.

THEY ARE HARD TO FIND

The USIA, which chooses the cultural attachés, has great difficulty in recruiting outstanding individuals, especially for the most important posts, who can adequately transmit the pulse of our cultural life. Nine men were approached before one could be found to serve as cultural attaché in a major Western European capital. In order to fill such a position it frequently is necessary to select men who are not up to their responsibilities and opportunities. Few of those now serving have a recognized reputation even in this country.

That too many of our cultural representatives are inadequately qualified for their important duties is being increasingly noticed by Americans prominent in the academic and cultural world in the course of their travels.

PROFESSORS PREFERRED

The search for suitable cultural attachés centers largely in the academic world. Experience indicates that university professors are most likely to have the breadth of knowledge, ability to speak well, and the personal quality of mixing easily in intellectual and cultural circles.

Yet the demands of academic life are most frequently given as major reasons why outstanding educators refuse to accept the job. First of all, it is essential that he serve at least 2 years in order to develop the minimum contacts and get himself known. Universities generally grant leaves of absence for only 1 year and considerable pressure is required for even another 12 months. Consequently, more use has been made of retired faculty members.

Many professors who would be eminently qualified are unwilling to interrupt their academic careers and postpone their research and writing commitments. They much prefer a 1-year visiting professorship, such as a Fulbright, during which they can concentrate on their own special fields of study.

It is generally agreed that salary consideration is not a major deterrent. In the top embassies the cultural attaché can be given in pay and living allowances as much financial compensation as he is likely to receive in his professional post—even in the best-paying universities.

DISCOURAGING ANGLES

Prominent educators feel that the present status of the cultural attaché in the embassy

discourages many outstanding prospects. Distinguished academic figures often instinctively distrust and shun any connection with a Government organization like USIA engaged in official propaganda and cold war activities. They feel that American culture is too vital and all-embracing an aspect of our national life to be tied to such an association which also is inimical to academic ideals of objective scholarship. Then, too, an eminent retired university president, for example, cannot be expected to serve, as do present cultural attachés, under the USIA's public affairs officer who is also the embassy's top press and public relations man.

Leaders in the cultural, educational and foundation world are convinced that if the cultural attaché were given equal status on the ambassador's staff with the military naval and air attachés and relieved of operating and administrative duties and USIA connections, top-flight prospects could be attracted.

As a State Department diplomatic officer, he would feel free to devote his entire time to personal contact work and public appearances which our most successful cultural attachés have found to be particularly effective. Then, too, the dignity of the position would encourage more pressure to be exerted, if necessary by the Secretary of State or even the President, to persuade reluctant universities and other organizations to forget about convenience and release outstanding individuals who can represent American culture abroad with distinction.

Peace on Earth Through World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the last meetings I attended in my hometown of Watertown, Wis., before leaving for Washington, D.C., to take up my duties in the 86th Congress was the December meeting of the Jefferson County Bar Association. The speaker was a distinguished member of the Wisconsin bar who now is serving as chairman of the State bar association's committee on world peace through law, Mr. Bruno V. Bitker.

Mr. Bitker has studied this timely topic with great erudition and with a real feeling of urgency. As men search for ways to establish peace and order in the world, I think that all of us must ponder the proposals made by Mr. Bitker and others in the bar association.

The United States has frequently turned to arbitration of international disputes when it suited our purposes. Do not the horrible prospects of thermonuclear warfare present us with the necessity for relying more and more on arbitration through the International Court of Justice as a means of averting the possible extinction of mankind?

The Milwaukee Journal has featured the substance of Mr. Bitker's speech in a special Sunday section article. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the Milwaukee Journal article:

PEACE ON EARTH THROUGH WORLD LAW

(By Bruno V. Bitker, chairman, committee on world peace through law, State bar of Wisconsin)

This is the age of science. It is science which through advances in transportation and communication has changed the phrase "It's a small world" from a bromide to an almost overwhelming fact. It is science which has devised weapons capable of destroying a civilization in a few seconds. It is science which is struggling to devise adequate defense.

As conditions exist today, we can only hope that our scientists can produce new and better armaments as fast or faster than our potential enemies.

But great as are the brains of these scientists, they alone cannot save us from the destruction which they have made possible. Unless we are to exist, if at all, in an endless, uneasy stalemate, some solution outside science must be found through which all the peoples of the world can live at ease and at peace together.

WHEN COURTS CAME, SHOOTING IRONS WENT

Peace will ultimately rest, as the late Judge John Parker said, not upon scientific achievement but upon the establishment of law in the world community.

Peace through law is not the same as peace through disarmament. The first is legal, the other political. We will deal here with the legal approach, which may be a necessary foundation for stable political arrangements.

There is long historical precedent for first creating a court system as a basis for political progress. Examples are to be found in ancient Greece and Rome, with their law codes extended into many lands.

In medieval England, it was only after the king's courts were established that the lords and barons gave up their armies and let the law resolve their disputes. And on our own western frontier it was only after the courts began to function that the settlers gradually gave up their shooting irons. This may also be the case in the world today.

If there were to be established a system of world courts, what law would the courts apply?

While there is already in operation a world court, the International Court of Justice at The Hague, it is true that there exists no worldwide legislative institution. The United Nations is a world organization but not a world government. It has no law-making powers.

Despite the lack of a universal parliament, there actually is universal law. When men deal with each other across international boundaries, rules and standards are devised which are enforced by the common consent of civilized peoples.

These rules and standards are frequently recognized by court decisions, by treaties between nations, by the writings of legal scholars. They become international law. If a peaceful world order is to exist, such law must be developed further.

THE ARBITRATION RECORD

There is also strong historical precedent for settling international disputes by such legal-like means as arbitration. This is the voluntary submission of differences to a third party other than a court.

The whole modern development in international arbitration stems from the Jay Treaty of 1794 between Britain and the United States after the Revolutionary War. The treaty provided for settling any remaining disputes between the two nations by arbitration.

The principal dispute concerned the boundary line between Maine and Nova Scotia. The treaty originally set the boundary at the St. Croix River, but it was discovered that there were two rivers by the same name. The arbitration commission

split it down the middle and set the boundary midway between the two rivers.

During the 100 years after the Jay arbitration, similar settlements of disputes between nations were used in over 177 cases. The United States was a party to 79 of these decisions.

Many of the disputes were of a highly controversial political nature.

In the presidential election of 1844 President Polk campaigned and won on the slogan "54-40 or fight." Despite intense nationalistic emotions against Britons, the dispute was peacefully settled by arbitration. The boundary was placed at the 49th parallel.

In 1872 the prestige of arbitration reached another high point in the *Alabama* claims case against Great Britain arising out of damage during the Civil War by English-built warships. The arbitration tribunal awarded the United States \$15,500,000, which Britain paid.

HAGUE COURT CREATED NEARLY 60 YEARS AGO

As relationships between nations grew more complex, the need for a real court grew with it. In 1899 leading nations created the Permanent Court of Arbitration for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes at The Hague, Netherlands. The Hague Court was not actually a court of law. It was a permanent panel from which the parties could select arbitrators to resolve disputes.

Before World War I, The Hague Court decided 15 cases between nations. One of these was a dispute of long standing between the United States and Great Britain over the fishing rights of Americans off the coast of Newfoundland. The arbitrators decided favorably to the United States, and Great Britain abided by the award.

During the early 1900's, various nations, including the United States, made treaties whereby they agreed to submit to arbitration any future disputes between them. Despite President Theodore Roosevelt's strenuous support of these treaties, the Senate in 1905 refused to ratify them without a reservation requiring the submission of each decision to the Senate for its advice and consent. This action was a major setback to this method of settling disputes between nations.

It was not until 1920 that there was created a real court. In that year, the League of Nations established the Permanent Court of International Justice, in The Hague. This was the first judicial body in history with worldwide jurisdiction over controversies between states. It was the greatest single advance in the judicial settlement of international disputes.

Though never a member of the League of Nations, the United States took a leading part in creating the new court. In 1923, President Harding asked the Senate to ratify the treaty establishing the Court, but the two-thirds majority required for ratification was never obtained.

NEW WORLD COURT

Although the United States failed to adhere to the permanent court, during its existence it rendered 32 judgments and 27 advisory opinions. It performed its duties fairly and competently and its decisions were never disregarded. When the League of Nations was dissolved in 1946, the Court was abolished.

The present International Court of Justice was established in 1946 as the judicial organ of the United Nations. Although 36 nations, including the United States, have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court, only some 20 have done so without significant reservations.

United States participation excludes from the Court's jurisdiction, disputes on matters within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United

States. This is a serious deterrent to the Court's power.

Great Britain, too, has reserved from the Court's jurisdiction, matters which in its opinion affect its national security. France has done likewise. Russia never has recognized the Court's jurisdiction.

SCHUMAN PLAN COURT SET UP

Meanwhile, there have been growing up procedures for the peaceful settlement of international disputes within specified regions.

In 1948 the International Conference of American States adopted the so-called Bogota pact, providing that controversies between the states of North and South America were to be referred to the world court. The United States attached to its acceptance of the Bogota pact also jurisdictional reservations. Our example unfortunately was followed by several other nations.

In Western Europe regional procedures have also developed since World War II. The so-called Schuman plan treaty of 1952 created a court open not only to the member states but to individuals as well. This court likewise serves the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community. The Council of Europe in 1957 named the World Court as the place of reference for all legal disputes under the treaty.

What is the situation at the end of 1958? While arbitration was a great success during the 19th century, in mid-20th century no major nation is willing to recognize, without strings attached, the jurisdiction of the World Court which it helped create.

Yet there are many encouraging developments. One is the increasing realization, particularly among lawyers and bar associations everywhere, that the same rule of law applying between individuals must be followed within the community of nations, if we are to survive.

The American Bar Association participated in the establishment of the present World Court. It favors the repeal of the U.S. reservation which allows the United States to determine whether a dispute is of domestic jurisdiction only. This article is based in part on material published by the association.

OBJECTIONS RAISED

Objections have been raised, of course, to expanding the use of law to settle international disputes. Some of these were outlined and answered by Charles S. Rhyne in a recent address to the American Bar Association:

"1. The plan is too idealistic. It is true that the rule of law among men is an ideal. But the basis of our own Government is the rule of law. Such a plan was pure idealism when adopted, but it has worked.

"2. The court might make some erroneous decisions adverse to us. It is true that the World Court system would be manned by human beings, who might decide cases contrary to our wishes. But no one would demand the abolition of the courts within nations simply because some decisions are questionable.

"3. An effective international judicial system will be too difficult to get going. Man has never let difficulties prevent him from accomplishing other seemingly impossible goals. A short time ago the manmade satellite was a fantasy.

"4. Russia will not cooperate. True, it is unlikely that Russia at the outset would recognize the rule of law in a worldwide court system. But that is no reason for the rest of us to refuse to try it. If it worked for the Western Nations it would be bound to attract the neutrals and thus grow toward wider use. Moreover, if Russia refused to use the courts while the free world did so, it would be one more blatant demonstration to the world that Russia prefers the law of the jungle to the law of civilized man."

SEVERAL RECENT HOPEFUL SIGNS

The prospect that attainment of world peace through law is no idle dream is based upon several practical considerations:

1. Man's new weapons. The destructive potential of the new nuclear weapons defies imagination.

2. Special pressure from smaller nations which come more and more directly under the threat of destruction by nuclear weapons, particularly ballistic missiles carrying nuclear bombs.

3. The money burden. As of 1957-58 the annual world cost of armaments is estimated at \$100 billion. This expense holds back the economic and social progress of many nations, even the richer countries.

4. Outer space. Recent achievements of both the United States and the Soviet Union is the firing of satellites and current programs of space exploration make urgent some agreement on the international law of outer space.

The ideal of turning to law instead of weapons will not be easy to achieve. There is formidable opposition to be overcome—fear and hatred, narrow nationalism and the fetish of sovereignty. But strong as these influences are, the desire of mankind to survive is stronger still.

The Arab Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is time we learned the down-to-earth truth about the Arab refugee problem. It is bad enough that our stagnant foreign policy is satisfied with the status quo—reluctant to take a single positive step to relieve the situation by insisting that refugee camps are no place for human beings. It is far worse that we allow the problem to be used to fraudulently mulct us of our money. We are the most generous people in the world, opening our heart and our pockets without hesitation to all needy, regardless of race, color or creed. Without changing that divinely inspired trait, let us refuse to be made to look like fools, because of our well-intentioned charity.

The following article by Joseph B. Schechtman which appeared in Congress Bi-Weekly of February 2, 1959, is most apropos.

A CENSUS OF ARAB REFUGEES

(By Joseph B. Schechtman)

At the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, the United States served notice that it did not favor the continuation of the UN Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) program of aid to the Arab refugees beyond June 30, 1960, when the Agency's mandate expires. George McGregor Harrison, the U.S. representative on the General Assembly's Political Committee, described the 10-year effort to solve the problem of Arab refugees as disappointing and said that it was not good enough to perpetuate relief. Some better system must be found, he declared. What the better system was to be Mr. Harrison was apparently not authorized to explain, and was thus not in a position to offer any definite alternative to the present mere relief. Yet the suggestion

of a revision of the absurd and patently bankrupt practice of international dole was in itself an important step in the right direction.

This valiant attempt at putting some sense of perspective into the UNWRA operations failed. The carefully worded U.S. resolution (cosponsored by Great Britain, New Zealand, and the Netherlands) proposing a U.N. study of what should be done for the Arab refugees after 1960, to be submitted to the next session in 1959, met with fierce resistance on the part of the Arab delegations. They unconditionally opposed any suggestion not only of discontinuing the relief operation but even of having the U.N. examine such an eventuality. And they had their way. The U.S. resolution contained a modest provision that U.N. Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjöld, makes a special study of the refugee problem and report back to the next assembly. But even such an innocent proposal proved objectionable to the Arabs and was dropped. Instead, the assembly took notice of a statement by the Secretary General that as part of his regular duties he would look into the technical operations of the Arab refugee aid program and make such proposals as he deemed helpful to the next assembly.

The outcome of the U.S. initiative is, of course, unsatisfactory and disappointing. It represents a clear victory for Arab immobilism. Although the 10 delegations of the Arab States abstained from voting even on the modified resolution, along with the Soviet bloc, they were, after the session, outspoken in interpreting it as endorsing the status quo and as being tantamount to an indefinite continuation of international aid.

Nevertheless, if Mr. Hammarskjöld earnestly intends to carry out his charge, or even if he only looks into the mere technical operations of the Arab refugee aid, there is one crucial aspect of these operations which he cannot, at the very least, avoid singling out and recommending for drastic change. He is duty bound to insist on conducting the first genuine census of the Arab refugees.

Incredible as it may seem, the actual number of Arab refugees has never been established by a really thorough count. All the figures—nearly a million, 900,000, 875,000—submitted with such assurance by UNWRA and accepted unquestioningly by the U.N. budgeting bodies, as well as by public opinion, are either guesswork or based on fraud.

The First Interim Report of the U.N. Economic Survey Mission for the Middle East, headed by Gordon R. Clapp, candidly stated on November 17, 1949, that no one knows exactly how many refugees there are. Testifying 3 months later before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Clapp admitted that his mission did not undertake to count the refugees and that population statistics in the Middle East are tricky. Years elapsed, and in 1955 Dr. Marguerite Cartwright, a sociology professor at New York's Hunter College, met Henry R. Labrousse, then head of UNWRA, in Lebanon and asked him, "How close do you feel that you have come to estimating the actual number of people in the camps?" "Not very close," he confided. "In fact, we really don't have any idea. . . . We just can't get in for accurate count."

The governments of the Arab countries, in which the sixty-odd refugee camps are located, have indeed refused permission to the relief agencies to get in for conducting a census of the camp inmates. As late as January 25, 1956, the Jordan daily *Falastin* reported smugly that the Amman Government had forbidden UNWRA to make a count of the newborn children among the refugees. A similar intransigent attitude was adopted by the Arab authorities in Syria, Lebanon, and the Egyptian-controlled Gaza strip. Obviously, the Arab Governments are not interested in establishing the actual number of refugees in their respective countries.

All the figures bandied about since 1948 are, therefore, based not on a census but on the number of applications for refugee ration cards registered by relief agencies operating under agreements with the U.N. bodies. How such registration has been handled from the very beginning can be seen from a report related by Associate Court Justice William O. Douglas in his book "Strange Lands and Friendly Peoples." On a visit to Amman, the Justice was told by a Franciscan monk, Father William, in the presence of Karl Reiser, head of the Red Cross in that area, of Reiser's experiences in registering a group of Bedouin refugees on the Red Cross roll: "The first day he enrolled 300. The next day he enrolled 500." Puzzled by these swollen figures, Reiser hired a local Arab to mingle with the Bedouins and determine the origin of the exaggeration. He learned that there were in actual fact barely 100 Bedouin refugees, but that those who had already registered "went off on their camels behind a hill about a mile distant, reorganized their group, and reappeared as new Bedouin refugees. . . . Some had registered 20 times under different names . . . all a Bedouin with a mustache had to do the second time was to cover it with his kaffiyah. They appear with different women and children. A man with a donkey would ride a camel the next time, and so on."

This technique was, however, not limited to the Bedouins of Transjordan. Dr. Marguerite Cartwright raised the question of an accurate count with one of the camp workers in Lebanon. His answer was: "We try to count them, but they are coming and going all the time; or we count them in Western clothes, then they return in aba and kaffiyah, and we count the same ones again." He admitted that "fingerprinting had never been tried, nor did it seem that the counting had been taken very seriously."

And, indeed, the U.N. relief agencies seem to have accepted this state of affairs complacently, almost fatalistically. The report of the U.N. Relief for Palestine Refugees (UNRPR—the precursor of UNWRA) for the period December 1, 1948-September 30, 1949, claimed that "considerable duplication in relief operations and registration was inevitable." The agency's director "did not consider it practicable for the operating agencies to impose any kind of eligibility test" and he himself "had no observers of his own for this purpose." Thus it appears that an accurate check was never intended nor carried out from the very start.

The slovenliness—and indeed the fraudulence—of the original registration has been perpetuated by every imaginable stratagem and subterfuge on the part of the refugees. The UNWRA report of October 19, 1950, admitted: "There is reason to believe that births are always registered for ration purposes, but deaths are often, if not usually, concealed so that the family may continue to collect rations for the deceased." At one time the refugees were offered a burial bonus of \$14, but this sum was weighed against the advantages of keeping their deceased on the ration rolls and the offer found no takers. A ration card is too precious an asset to be surrendered. Its holders, as *Time* magazine put it, "gradually found themselves better off materially than they had been at home: they have a higher daily calorie ration (1500-1600) than some of the fellahin in Nasser's Egypt, better health and sanitation services than they had ever known in Palestine." There is a thriving black market in ration cards, and in oil, sugar, flour, and clothing rations.

Ration cards have thus been accumulating incessantly, with relief rolls swelling accordingly. And since every ration card is supposed to stand for an Arab refugee, the inflated figures of alleged registered refugees have been mounting from year to year, unchecked and unverified. The Clapp Mission estimated that in the third quarter of 1950

about 492,000 relief rations would be needed monthly, but when UNWRA took over its field of duties on May 1, 1950, it distributed more than 860,000 rations—an increase of 75 percent over the Clapp estimates. By the end of 1950, there were already 960,000 refugees on the agency's roll. During the following 3 years (1951-53) sizable deletions from ration rolls were made, and in 1953 the total was reduced to 871,748. But soon thereafter the total again began to swell, and by the end of 1957 the number of registered refugees rose to 1,037,821—an average yearly increase of 41,000.

These numerical ups and downs testify to a complete absence of any reliable system of control for counting the refugee mass. The UNWRA personnel in charge of the camps are not at all eager to check the rolls scrupulously. It is little known that UNWRA field workers in the camps, on whose reports the agency's leadership are fully dependent, are almost to a man themselves Palestinian refugees. They are the least likely to care for the accuracy of the relief count, and prefer to keep the camps hermetically sealed to any outside control.

Not all refugees, however, live in the camps. Hundreds of thousands who are classified as refugees and receive relief live elsewhere, in cities and villages. In Jordan, this outside category even constitutes an overwhelming majority—357,000 as against some 177,000 living in 25 camps. Many among them have in the meantime established themselves in business or trade, in government service, and have grown quite prosperous. But they jealously hold on to their ration cards and their refugee status. Recent reports relate that thousands of well-to-do families—merchants, artisans, civil servants, members of liberal professions—were sending their domestic servants once a month to relief stores to collect their rations.

This state of affairs makes no sense and should not be allowed to continue. The international community, which in the last ten years has spent \$300 million for Arab refugee relief, is entitled to know the exact number of genuine, not faked, Arab refugees. The prerequisite for a realistic approach to, and solution of, their problem is a general census of the refugees, both inside and outside the camps. The falsely magnified figures frustrate any sober discussion. It is therefore to be hoped that the Secretary General of the United Nations will earnestly look into this technical aspect, and that his investigation will lead to a census of the Arab refugees.

People-to-People Contacts To Promote International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, as the cold war continues, with both sides separated by the wide gulf of suspicion, fear, and stubborn refusal to consider new approaches, it behooves the peoples of the various countries to take matters into their own hands in an effort to thaw the rigidities of government-to-government contacts.

The American people, because they are free, are in the best position to extend the hand of friendship.

The cultivation of this program can do much to ease international misunderstandings.

When the people of Russia get to know us, I am sure it will be mutually beneficial.

Pointing up this need is a hopeful editorial of much substance titled "People-to-People," that appeared in the February 8 editorial of the *Lawrence Sunday Sun*. Under unanimous consent I include this editorial for reprinting in the *RECORD*:

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE

In September 1956 President Eisenhower called a group of some 50 leaders in American life to the White House and presented a plan. Its aim, he said, was to build a massive system of communications between Americans and the peoples of other countries. This marked the official launching of the people-to-people program.

The thought behind it was a compelling one. Governments operate on high levels of political, military, economic and diplomatic affairs. But governments are remote and impersonal. So, the President emphasized, Americans outside of government must work out thousands of methods by which people can gradually learn a little bit more of each other. People-to-people, in sum, involves a sort of grassroots approach to better knowledge and understanding. Additionally, as Secretary Dulles told the original White House group, "You have got the job, and others like you, of making it clear throughout the world that freedom is the preferable form of society."

People-to-people has come a long way since that original meeting. Some 40 committees were formed to reach into virtually every phase of American life and activity. These committees have more than 1,100 members, of which 700 represent organizations, associations, clubs, and other groups. Their geographical spread blankets the nation, and practically all vocations and professions are represented.

Prior to this, other groups—such as the Lions International and the 4-H Clubs—had been conducting comparable activities on a person-to-person or group-to-group basis. The formal people-to-people-program, however, brought these groups into closer contact with each other, and sharpened the focus on the objective of greater international understanding through a multitude of contacts between Americans and other peoples.

The success of such a program, in which all Americans in every walk of life can participate, is largely measured by the multiplicity of the projects which are undertaken. Judged by such a yardstick, people-to-people has compiled an impressive record. To select a few examples, the public relations committee drafted a pamphlet entitled "Make a Friend This Trip" for Americans preparing to visit other countries, and a million copies were distributed. To meet a specific request from the Sudan, another committee collected 16,000 books and sent them overseas. More than 70 American communities in this country are now affiliated with communities of comparable size and kindred interests abroad, and a like number are in the planning stage. A sports committee sponsored the American tour of the Pakistan Cricket team. A 50-member American rifle team was sent abroad to compete in Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, and the Soviet Union. There are committees of the handicapped, of cartoonists, of people concerned with hobbies and the arts, and so on and on. The internationally publicized achievement of the Texas pianist Van Cliburn in winning the great Tchaikovsky competition in Moscow was an end result of one committee's work.

In Senator HUMPHREY's words: "People-to-people efforts at building friendship are not bound by the restrictions and handicaps which encumber official government-to-government dealings and can often be more effective." And the program is and must be a two-way street. As the chairman of its Foreign Affairs Committee phrases the matter: "If it is important that the peoples of foreign lands understand the American position, American policies and American way of life, it is equally important that we have similar understanding with respect to other countries."

Equalization of Pay for Retired Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 14, I was privileged to join the members of the New London, Conn., Chapter of the Retired Officers' Association for luncheon and to address the group on a subject most vital to them—that is, legislation necessary to correct the discrimination and injustices of Public Law 85-422.

A distinguished gentleman and soldier, Raymond T. J. Higgins, captain, U.S. Army, retired, made the opening presentation. I shall always remember the stirring picture of Captain Higgins seated in his wheelchair, proud and dignified, appealing to the 86th Congress through me to restore equality in retired pay for the "inferiors" who retired prior to May 31, 1958, with the "elites" who are now on active duty.

To experience the full emotional impact of Captain Higgins' presentation, one would have to hear and see him. However, because what he said was so significant, I should like here to record his presentation in full:

SPEECH BY RAYMOND T. J. HIGGINS, CAPTAIN, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

Our chapter president, Admiral Moseley, has given me the assignment of presenting to our honored guest, Col. FRANK KOWALSKI, U.S. Army, retired, Congressman at large from the State of Connecticut, a résumé of the feelings of retired officers about Public Law 85-422, known as the military pay bill of 1958. Colonel, because you, yourself, are a retired officer, and in addition are a member of the House Armed Service Committee, I know that you know a great deal more about the feeling of officers, both active and retired, concerning the 1958 pay bill than do I. But, if you will permit me, I will try to sum up the effects of Public Law 85-422 on the uniformed services in an attempt to explore the possibility of finding a cure for the ills resulting from that legislation.

One of the greatest defects of Public Law 85-422 is the discrimination made in the pay of retired officers. The effect of this discrimination has been to create the so-called elite list and the so-called inferior list of retired personnel. The elites are those retired after June 1, 1958, and their retired pay is computed on the basis of their active duty pay, which was considerably increased by the new law which was effective after June 1, 1958. The inferiors are those retired before June 1, 1958, and

their retired pay continues to be computed on the basis of active duty pay prior to the new law.

Included among the inferiors are many distinguished officers—officers who, on active duty, held high commands in war and in peace. The cruelty of this discriminatory legislation may be illustrated by the fact that a major general of 30 years' service who retired prior to June 1, 1958, receives, I am told, \$2,125 less annually than a major general of 30 years' service who retired after June 1, 1958.

Since the inception of the present military retirement system, it had been practically the undeviating policy that the pay of a retired officer be directly geared to the active duty pay of an officer of the same rank and length of service. In the past, whenever the pay of the active duty officer was increased, the pay of the retired officer was automatically increased correspondingly. Public Law 85-422, however, scrapped this cardinal principle in the military retirement system.

The action of the Congress in departing from this long established principle upsets the traditional relationship between active duty and retired pay and creates unwarranted and unjust disparities between the pay rates of retired officers of similar rank and terms of service. The establishment of two pay scales for equal merit and equal service is not consistent with a policy based on fairness.

Perhaps the greatest defect in Public Law 85-422 is that the breaking of faith with previously retired officers will have an adverse effect upon the retention rates of personnel currently on active duty, thereby destroying the principal objective of the law in question. This pay bill was primarily intended to provide material incentives for service careers and, hence, to reduce the tremendous turnover of personnel and the loss of skilled men. The increase in pay would indeed be a stimulus to men in uniform—but the act defeats itself by breaking the traditional relationship between active duty and retired pay. For years, one of the chief attractions of a service career was the provision made for retirement. Young officers who might make the service a career will not be blind to the discrimination made in retired pay rates. If officers already retired can be discriminated against, this can happen again now that the tradition has been broken and a precedent established.

Now, Colonel, here is a situation that many retired officers cannot understand. The establishment of two pay scales for retired officers was not proposed by the Congress but it was recommended to the Congress and insisted upon by the Defense Department. Even the 6-percent increase eventually given by the Congress to the retired officers was vigorously opposed by the Defense Department. It is a fact that it was common gossip last spring in Washington, and the service journals published that if the Defense Department policies prevailed never again would retired officers receive a raise in pay.

The Secretary of Defense, his deputies, and the secretaries of the subdivisions of the Department are civilians. But, is it not true that a very large part of Defense Department personnel is made up of active duty officers of the uniformed services? How shortsighted can these officers be? True, they recommended that Congress feather their own nests, so to speak, but in so doing they have broken the tradition and have established the precedent for discriminatory legislation against themselves by a new crop of Defense personnel sometime in the future. It is the feeling of some retired officers that the knife of discrimination was plunged into our backs by our own flesh and blood—our brother officers pres-

ently on active duty with the Defense Department.

I once heard the retiring president of an organization say, "There is nothing so past as a past president." But he is wrong, there is nothing so past as an officer who days of active duty are past.

What can be done to correct these injustices?

Retired officers can expect no help from the Defense Department.

Retired officers have no might political power organization. There are about 300,000 officers on active duty and about 115,000 retired officers. Out of a potential strength of 415,000 there are only 35,000 of us banded together in the Retired Officers Association, of which this group here assembled is the Connecticut chapter. If we hope to right the wrong done retired officers, our only salvation is to urge the 86th Congress, in its mature and broad judgment, to reestablish the time honored national policy with reference to the computation of retired pay, and restore the inferiors to full retired pay percentages, to equality with the elites.

Colonel, this is our story, we place our reliance in the fairmindedness of the 86th Congress. If you find merit in our cause, will you help us?

American Farm Bureau Declaration Enunciates Important Fundamentals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau, representing over a million and a half member families in 48 States, has just presented Members of Congress with that organization's philosophy of government, and I commend its study to all of my colleagues.

There is a tendency in many areas today to drift away from the concept of government enunciated by the original framers and this declaration focuses the spotlight on the fundamental principles of our Government, and we must protect and respect these principles if our land is to continue as the government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The Farm Bureau declaration follows:

FARM BUREAU PHILOSOPHY OF GOVERNMENT

The Constitution of the United States of America was conceived and purposely designed to make secure the God-given liberties of each individual against the domination of government. This provision was made by a division of authority among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Federal Republic, the diffusion of government powers, and the retention by the people of those powers not specifically delegated to government.

America's unparalleled progress is based on the freedom and dignity of the individual, initiative, and equal opportunity, sustained by our faith in God and our basic moral and ethical values.

The principles of our competitive enterprise system derive from, and are consistent with, our religious values and the highest goals that mankind seeks. Through this system the American people have produced abundant goods and services and provided widespread educational advantages and religious opportunities.

The full realization of man's dreams as envisioned by our Founding Fathers can only be achieved if each individual assumes active responsibility for maintaining and strengthening of the principles upon which our Republic was founded and vigorously opposes all programs and policies which erode the very foundation of our American system.

We, as Farm Bureau members, believe:

In our constitutional form of government and its division of powers.

In freedom of speech, press, and peaceful assembly.

In separation of church and State and in the right of each individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.

That self-government is a precious heritage which can be preserved only by the active, intelligent assumption of basic citizenship responsibilities by all people.

In the American competitive enterprise system, in which property is privately owned, privately managed, and operated for profit and individual satisfaction, and in which supply and demand are the ultimate determinants of market price.

That efficiency of production and maximum per capita production are primary elements in determining standards of living.

That property rights cannot be separated from human rights and are essential to the preservation of individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

That the exercise of free will, rather than force, is consistent with the maintenance of liberty.

In the right of every man to choose his own occupation; to be rewarded according to his productive contribution to society; and to save, invest, and spend, or convey to his heirs, his earnings as he chooses.

That the centralization of power and authority in the Federal Government, the movement to socialize America, the apathy of the American people toward this trend, and the apparent lack of responsibility on the part of individual citizens are among the greatest dangers threatening our Republic and our system of competitive enterprise.

That the Constitution is the basic law of the land and that it should be interpreted in accordance with the intent of its authors.

That the trend toward increased centralization of power in the Federal Government, if left unchecked, will lead to socialism and thus to communism.

That such "planned economy" concepts as socialism, fascism, communism, and other forms of totalitarianism should be opposed wherever and in whatever form they may be found.

That their personal beliefs with respect to private capitalism, socialism, and communism should be stated by candidates for public office and employees of governments at all levels.

That, in his quest for "security," the individual must oppose policies leading to the curtailment of individual freedom and opportunity.

That monopoly in any form—whether by government, industry, labor, or agriculture—jeopardizes freedom and self-government.

In government by law, impartially administered, without special privilege.

That government propagandizing of the electorate threatens the maintenance of self-government.

That establishment by the government of organizations of citizens which may in any way remain under its political influence or control threatens the continuation of self-government.

That secrecy in government affairs should not be tolerated except as actually essential to national security.

In strong and responsible State and local units of government and in protection of State laws against Federal preemption.

That farm people have the right and the responsibility to speak for themselves

through organizations of their choice without government coercion or intervention.

That the powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution are reserved to the States or to the people and that such powers cannot be preempted by Federal statutes and must not be preempted by the courts.

Alexander Hamilton, His Spirit Is Alive Today—An Address by J. Harvie Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected, influential, and patriotic of our forebears was an immortal American, Alexander Hamilton. His ability, influence, and foresight played one of the most important parts, if not the most, in the defense, establishment, and future of the United States of America.

There recently appeared in the February issue of the American Bar Association Journal an article based on a speech made by a very dear and close friend and a most outstanding American, the Honorable J. Harvie Williams, during the bicentennial celebration of his birth. Mr. Williams was at that time the director of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission. He served that body well and devotedly.

This discourse by Mr. Williams has attained national recognition, and its reproduction in the Journal is a great distinction. I am proud that such attention has been paid both to a great student and to his subject of such import.

Alexander Hamilton was the incomparable man of the American revolutionary period and of the following era that brought about the Constitution of the United States and its adoption by the States. Mr. Williams has pointed out many of the pertinent and important facts of his reasoning and foresight to apply them to the problems of today. I think it advisable that this body attend the sound thinking and modern views of Alexander Hamilton and ask that the remarks of Mr. Williams be included in the RECORD at this time.

On Saturday, October 19, 1781, the decisive battle of the American War for Independence took place at Yorktown, Va. In 1957, the celebration of the 176th anniversary of this battle was a major event in the bicentennial years of Alexander Hamilton and the Marquis de Lafayette, and in the celebration of the 350th anniversary of the establishment of the first permanent English colony on this continent.

Alexander Hamilton led the American troops in the successful bayonet assault at night on Redoubt 10, which made Lord Cornwallis' position untenable.

Alexander Hamilton should be a subject of extraordinary interest to young people. He did so much while so young. His career is a challenge to every young man and woman on every college campus in the United States.

At 19, before he had finished Kings College (now Columbia University), he was given command, as captain, of the Provincial Company of Artillery of New York. Hamilton and his company were engaged in the Battle of Long Island, at White Plains, at Trenton and at Princeton. His growing reputation brought him to the attention of General Washington.

At 20, Hamilton was appointed aide-de-camp to General Washington, with the rank of lieutenant colonel. During the 4 years he served on Washington's staff, Alexander Hamilton was at the center of events. Washington entrusted him with the most delicate missions—missions on which hung the success of the war and his own reputation. Hamilton also handled Washington's correspondence with the Continental Congress.

Even during these busy years Hamilton found time to broaden his knowledge and indulge in extracurricular activities. At 20 he was writing to Robert Morris about what a constitution should include for adequate administration of government and using the doctrine of separation of powers.

The next year he published his first *Publius* letters, deploring the feebleness and laxity of the Continental Congress. Two years later, May 1780, Hamilton submitted anonymously to Robert Morris, Superintendent of Finance, his first plan for a national bank to stabilize public funds. That same year, at the age of 23, Hamilton wrote to James Duane the first of his great treatises on constitutional government and called for a convention to establish a general confederation with adequate power.

In the midst of all this activity, being a normal young man, Hamilton found time for the successful courtship of Elizabeth Schuyler, whom he married in December 1780.

On the 1st day of April 1781 Alexander Hamilton resigned from General Washington's staff. It was not until July 31 that he was given command of a battalion of light infantry and ordered to Virginia. During these 4 months of military inactivity he began the publication of a series of six papers entitled "The Federalist." The final number, published on July 4, 1782, 8 months after Yorktown, ended with these tremendously significant paragraphs:

"There is something noble and magnificent in the perspective of a great Federal Republic, closely linked in the pursuit of a common interest, tranquil, and prosperous at home, respectable abroad; but there is something proportionably diminutive and contemptible in the prospect of a number of petty States with the appearance only of union, jarring, jealous, and perverse, without any determined direction, fluctuating and unhappy at home, weak and insignificant by their dissensions in the eyes of other nations.

"Happy America, if those to whom thou hast intrusted the guardianship of thy infancy know how to provide for thy future repose, but miserable and undone, if their negligence or ignorance permits the spirit of discord to erect her banner on the ruins of thy tranquility."

Thus, at the age of 25, 5 years before the Constitutional Convention, Alexander Hamilton had a clear vision of the great Federal Republic he wished to see established on this continent. For the next 2 decades he worked unremittingly toward that objective.

In this world of 1959, it is not easy to realize the one-time nonexistence of the United States. Nor is it any less difficult to realize that the United States of today began in 1789 with only 11 States and less than 4 million people—about one-half as many as now live in New York City.

Nevertheless, in order to understand and appreciate what was done for us by those now long gone, we must educe in our mind's

eye a clear picture of those early days for comparison with what we see today.

Today the political and economic growth of the United States is unprecedented in the annals of mankind. This unique position was achieved in only one and two-thirds centuries (1789-1959).

To students of history and government who have inquiring minds and possess the gift of wonder and power of analysis, the why and how of the United States must always be an absorbing subject.

Shortly after Yorktown, Hamilton was relieved from active Army service and returned to his family at Albany. Here, the following spring he began to read law in the office of his old friend, Robert Troup. After three months' study, Hamilton was admitted to the Bar as attorney-at-law. During that brief time, however, he wrote a legal handbook, *Practical Proceedings in the Supreme Court of the State of New York*, which became the groundwork for subsequent treatises by others. This item is the prize possession of the library of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

That same month, July 1782, Alexander Hamilton persuaded the New York Legislature to pass a resolution calling for a general convention of the states to amend the Articles of Confederation, and the following day that legislature appointed him a delegate to the Continental Congress. There he had wider opportunity to work for a general convention to provide for a closer union of the States.

Four years later, as a member of the 1786 Annapolis Convention, Alexander Hamilton wrote the report which set in motion the events which brought on the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, of which he was also a member.

Alexander Hamilton has rarely been given credit for his achievements at the Philadelphia convention. Most historians, reading the dry records, conclude that he was without influence because his two colleagues from New York decided the vote of that State. The fact is that his great speech on June 18, 1787, was designed to defeat—and did defeat—the New Jersey plan and brought success to the Virginia plan as the basis of the convention's work. Thus, the notion of a continuing league of sovereign States was put aside in favor of a National Government under a limited Constitution.

THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, A UNIQUE DOCUMENT

The Constitution signed on September 17, 1787, was unique in all time:

1. It created a limited constitution of government—a national sovereignty limited to its proper objects, and by certain specified exceptions to legislative authority; and State sovereignty limited to its proper sphere. This divided sovereignty was seen as reconcilable.
2. It established the formal separation of the national sovereign powers into three functional categories: legislative, executive, and judicial.
3. It established a representative Federal union of States on the basis of unequal representation in the House of Representatives, according to the unequal populations of the States, and equal representation in the Senate as coequal political societies regardless of populations. These two different principles of representation were combined to give each State the exact numerical representation in the electoral college, which underpins the executive branch, that it has in a joint session of the Congress.
4. It provided for an independent judiciary under the Constitution.

Although the proposed Constitution was a mere rearrangement of familiar things, it was sufficiently different to arouse substantial opposition in many quarters, especially from officeholders whose prestige would be di-

minished under the new system. While the campaign for ratification was the most important campaign ever waged in this country, it was also one of the most intense. In this campaign Alexander Hamilton, who had done more than any other man to prepare the way and bring on the Constitutional Convention, rose to new heights. He was 30 years old.

Some 172 years ago there appeared in *The Independent Journal*, a New York City newspaper, an article addressed: "To the People of the State of New York." This article by Alexander Hamilton, over the nom de plume "Publius," the first of 85 *Federalist Papers*, raised a question that remains unanswered. It was, and is:

"Whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force."

As crucial as the question was then, it is equally crucial now. And we can say now, as Hamilton said then, "A wrong election of the part we shall act may, in this view, deserve to be considered as the general misfortune of mankind."

"The Federalist" is universally regarded as the classic work on government, especially on the Constitution of the United States. Thomas Jefferson said it is "in my opinion, the best commentary on the principles of government which was ever written." On two occasions, the Supreme Court, in opinions by Chief Justice John Marshall, gave it unstinted praise.

In *McCulloch v. Maryland* the Court said in 1819:

"In the course of the argument, 'The Federalist' has been quoted; and the opinions expressed by the authors of that work have been justly supposed to be entitled to great respect in expounding the Constitution. No tribute can be paid to them which exceeds their merit."

Two years later the Court said in *Cohens v. Virginia*:

"The opinion of 'The Federalist' has always been considered as of great authority. It is a complete commentary on our Constitution; and is appealed to by all parties in the questions to which that instrument has given birth. Its intrinsic merit entitles it to this high rank; and the part two of its authors performed in framing the Constitution put it very much in their power to explain the views with which it was framed."

In addition to the many editions of "The Federalist" published in this country and in England, it has been translated into French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, lately into Italian, and, I am told, into Russian.

Here I should like to be personal for a moment. For the good of the future of the United States I should like to see "The Federalist" a required textbook in a required course in government in every college and university in the land. My reason is, understanding of the nature, structure, and scope of the Constitution of the United States, the capstone of the American political system, is constantly narrowing. Formal study of "The Federalist," as I suggest, would broaden and deepen that understanding and give a new lease on life to the greatest constitution of government ever written and established.

When publication of "The Federalist" was completed, Alexander Hamilton was well prepared for the New York convention to consider ratification. In the membership of the convention, which met at Poughkeepsie, Hamilton's forces were outnumbered by more than 2 to 1. But before the debate was concluded, after 44 days, Hamilton carried the day by the vote of 30 to 27, including the vote of Melancthon Smith, leader of the opposition. This result, which brought New York into the Union, is regarded as one of the greatest forensic achievements of all time.

With the Constitution adopted by the necessary nine States—New Hampshire was 9th and Virginia 10th—and with New York in the Union, the Continental Congress resolved that the Presidential electors meet in their State capitals on February 4, 1789, and that the new Government become effective 1 month later.

George Washington was unanimously elected President and was inaugurated on April 30 in New York City. At the President's request, Hamilton prepared a detailed plan of Presidential protocol for entertaining and receiving public officials.

President Washington's first Cabinet appointment on September 11, was Alexander Hamilton to be Secretary of the Treasury. Ten days later the House of Representatives requested a report on a plan for the support of the public credit. On January 9, 1790, Hamilton submitted to the Congress the first of his great state papers, the "First Report on the Public Credit."

The next of Hamilton's great state papers was the "Report on a National Bank," which was followed by his even more important letter to the President on the constitutionality of the bank, more important because of his criteria of objects for the constitutionality of measures, and because of his development of the doctrine of implied powers.

These reports were followed by the "Report on Manufactures" at the end of 1791, and the "Second Report on the Public Credit" in January 1795, just before his resignation from public office.

During his 5½ years as Secretary of the Treasury in Washington's administration—during which the new Government of the United States was organized and set in motion—Alexander Hamilton became, in effect, Washington's "prime minister." No other Cabinet member in any administration has wielded such influence and power. Hamilton's hand was active in every aspect of government.

After returning to the private practice of law in New York City, Hamilton continued to be President Washington's principal adviser and the administration's number one publicist. After leaving office, Hamilton not only drafted the President's messages to Congress on the state of the Union, but he wrote at length for publication on questions which were agitating the public mind. His "Camillus Letters," 38 in number, in defense of the second treaty with Great Britain, rank with, if not above, his contributions to "The Federalist." In them he discusses and exhausts the question of relations between nations and the constitutionality of treaties, and reconciles the treaty power with the legislative power under the Constitution. It is ironic that these writings were not even referred to during the recent Senate debate on the treaty power.

In a letter to Rufus King, then Minister to Great Britain, Hamilton wrote:

"The object of the legislative power is to prescribe a rule of action for our own Nation, which includes foreigners among us.

"The object of the treaty power is to prescribe a rule of action between two nations, binding on both.

"These objects are essentially different, and in a constitutional sense, cannot interfere.

"This construction reconciles the two powers and assigns them distinguishable spheres of action.

"[Thus] whatever is a proper subject of a compact between nation and nation, may be embraced in a treaty between the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the correspondent organ of a foreign state."

Alexander Hamilton's last great literary service to President Washington and the United States was Washington's Farewell Ad-

dress, in describing which I would join Vice President John A. Krout of Columbia University who says that if any paper deserved to be called "coauthored" this was it—coauthored by George Washington and Alexander Hamilton.

One cannot briefly describe all of Alexander Hamilton's contributions to the United States. To become familiar with them requires a good deal of reading time. To understand them requires actual study, which means rereading until the whole of it comes into balance, proportion and clear focus.

I hope I have touched upon enough to justify my assertion that Alexander Hamilton was the architect of American Union; and that his understanding of the structure he built will serve us mightily today if we but recur to his own work, passing over what so many others—friends and foes—have said about him.

Before coming down to specific contemporary problems for which Alexander Hamilton has clear solutions, may I bring on two supporting witnesses. The first is the late Prof. Ansel Daniel Morse, of Amherst, who wrote:

"Any just estimate of Hamilton's work must take into the account what he did for the education of the public. His usual method of seeking support was through appeals to the reason of thoughtful and patriotic citizens. In this his success was phenomenal. Friends and foes testified that in the qualities which enable a writer to convince, Hamilton was without a rival. In what he wrote there was rarely a trace of the partisan, never of the demagog. Much of his work was done while questions relating to the Constitution engaged the attention of the public. For the treatment of such themes he had a singular aptitude. The extent of his writings is as remarkable as their solidarity. He wrote, often at considerable length, on every important public question which arose during the Federalist period. The result was a collection of writings which embody the best political thought of the time. Indeed, considering both range and quality, it is scarcely venturesome to say that Hamilton's works exceed in value those of any other American statesman."

The second witness is Chief Judge Ambrose Spencer of the State of New York, who had this to say:

"Alexander Hamilton was the greatest man this country ever produced. I knew him well. I was in situations often to observe and study him. I saw him at the bar and at home. He argued cases before me while I sat as judge on the bench. Webster has done the same. In power of reasoning Hamilton was the equal of Webster; and more than this can be said of no man. In creative power Hamilton was infinitely Webster's superior. . . . It was he, more than any other man, who thought out the Constitution of the United States and the details of the Government of the Union; and, out of the chaos that existed after the Revolution, raised a fabric every part of which is instinct with his thought. I can truly say that hundreds of politicians and statesmen of the day get both the web and the woof of their thoughts from Hamilton's brains. He, more than any other man, did the thinking of the time."

I agree with Judge Spencer that Alexander Hamilton did the thinking of the time. But I would add that Alexander Hamilton has done much of the fundamental thinking for our own time. As a leader, as youthful as he was, Hamilton saw clearly what his followers and supporters saw only dimly.

In fiscal policy the detail of every Hamilton proposal was grounded in honor and integrity. For these are the bases of credit, public or private, in any political system.

In foreign policy the missionary complex was as alien to Alexander Hamilton as the

devil is to holy water. To him the long-term interests of the Nation were paramount to every other consideration. With him international prestige was based on national strength, honor, integrity and fair dealing. Anything else was illusory, and therefore dangerous.

To Alexander Hamilton the treaty power of the United States is limited to proper objects of treaty—things over which the United States lacks complete jurisdiction and can only gain such jurisdiction by agreement with the other nation or nations concerned. By that token, objects over which we have complete jurisdiction are outside the limits of the treaty power.

Alexander Hamilton was ever clear on the principle that public officials were bound by the Constitution. Of public officials and their powers he stated:

"If they exceed them it is a treasonable usurpation upon the power and majesty of the people, and by the same rule that they may take away from a single individual the rights he claims under the Constitution, they may erect themselves into perpetual dictators."

Of courts, including the Supreme Court, Hamilton wrote: They "must declare the sense of the law; and if they should be disposed to exercise will instead of judgement, the consequence would equally be the substitution of their pleasure to that of the legislative body."

To Hamilton the exercise of will by a court was outside the scope of judicial power and an invasion of the field of legislative power. To him judges were bound, by their oaths to uphold the Constitution, to exercise judgment only, on the intent of the Constitution and the laws pursuant thereto, in deciding cases at the bar.

Recalling the case in ancient Macedonia where the condemned man appealed from Philip drunk to Philip sober, we must give consideration to situations in which appeals can be taken from the will of a court to its judgment. The historic rules for judgments by judges are clear enough.

To Alexander Hamilton, will was the prerogative of the legislator. But judgment was the sworn duty of the judges. It follows that the exercise of will by a high court results in a spurious edict pretending to be law but not law at all, and not binding on any other judge mindful of his own oath to the Constitution and not to the higher court.

Alexander Hamilton well knew that law long antedated the Constitution. He knew well that law was the eternal sense of justice of the community; that law is because law was, unwritten and unfolding as man moved slowly toward civilization. He knew all too well that spurious edicts of kings, courts and parliaments were struck down when the law was restored.

But Hamilton knew even better that constitutions, once adopted by the people, were fixed permanently, were unalterable by government, or by any branch of Government, legislative, executive or judicial; and were alterable only by the people in the manner they had ordained for the making of such changes.

I suggest that Alexander Hamilton is as alive today as he was when he was laying and clarifying the foundations of the Government of the United States. Many among us are unhappy—some, even bitter—about the direction of the drift in American public affairs. I must confess that I, too, am uneasy in the great constitutional crisis in which we are enmeshed.

Nevertheless, I am confident that if we recur to the hard and clear thinking of Alexander Hamilton, and spurn the sentimentality of nonsensical phrases that abort liberty and the Republic, this Nation will live forever.

Slichter Says "Need To Raise Productivity and Per Capita Income Comes First"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Sumner H. Slichter, the distinguished economist at Harvard University, disagrees with President Eisenhower. In Slichter's opinion, inflation is a secondary problem.

This substantiates the current policies of the Democratic Party in the Congress of the United States that are aimed at an expansion of production, an increase of per capita income, and the removal of color barriers in employment.

The excessive caution of the administration is endangering national defense, and is restricting the economic development of the Nation. Isolated from the mainstream of American thought and action, and depending more and more upon the advice of those who lack confidence in our people's determination and in their capacity for progress, the administration is thinking in terms of holding the line instead of going forward.

As Professor Slichter observes:

The misunderstanding [about inflation] is attributable to the spreading of fallacies by many distinguished businessmen, Government officials, and economists who discuss inflation without having informed themselves of the facts.

In support of the Democratic Party's insistence on the vigorous leadership that reflects our past, and is even more necessary for our future, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following article titled "Slichter Holds Inflation Is Not Chief Problem," that appeared in the February 8, 1959, edition of the Boston Sunday Herald.

SLICHTER HOLDS INFLATION IS NOT CHIEF PROBLEM—HARVARD ECONOMIST SEES PRODUCTIVITY, JOB RACE BIAS FIRST

(By Juan Cameron)

Is the chief economic problem of the United States today that of halting inflation? President Eisenhower believes it is, and said so in his recent Economic Report to Congress.

HE DISAGREES

But one of the Nation's eminent economists, Sumner H. Slichter, Lamont University professor at Harvard, contends that inflation is a secondary problem. Far more important, he says, is the need to raise the Nation's productivity and per capita income and to remove color barriers in employment.

In deliberate overstatement to emphasize his point, the economist, in an interview with the Herald last week said:

"The only people who talk about inflation are the President and a few well-heeled businessmen, who by no stretch of the imagination are hurt by rising prices. They are honest, but don't understand conditions in America. They are, in fact, a group of spokesmen without followers."

Slichter does not think inflation is a good thing. But slowly rising prices are infinitely preferable to price controls, restrictive use of the Federal Reserve's credit weapon, or wage controls that might be used uncertainly to control inflation, he argues.

SEES EXAGGERATION

And, he adds, at any rate the evil effects of inflation on people with fixed incomes; on the foundations of our society; on the integrity of our dollar are exaggerated.

Suggestions, such as that put forth by the President in his economic report, that labor must limit its demand for higher wages without increasing productivity correspondingly, Slichter characterizes wishful thinking.

He adds:

"The misunderstanding (about inflation) is attributable to the spreading of fallacies by many distinguished businessmen, Government officials and economists who discuss inflation without having informed themselves of the facts."

Some misunderstandings Slichter points to and refutes:

1. Creeping inflation becomes galloping: No country outside the Iron Curtain in Europe, Canada, and the United States, all of which have had creeping inflation (1 to 2 percent a year), have experienced a faster rate of inflation in the past 10 years. Generally on the contrary, the rise in consumer prices has slowed between 1953 and 1957, as compared to 1948-53. (In the United States, for instance, from 11.1 to 5 percent in these two periods.)

2. Inflation discourages production: When unions are strong, as in the United States, inflation tends to encourage production. Inflation adjusts the price level to rising labor costs that accompany strong unionism. If prices didn't rise, much productive capacity could not be profitably operated.

3. Inflation discourages savings: The opposite is often true. Investment determines the rate of savings. Inflation encourages investment, therefore savings also. Remember investment is the cause, savings the result in this cause-effect relationship.

4. Creeping inflation causes injustice, but does not avert it: It does both. The alternative to creeping inflation is creeping unemployment. Who can say whether creeping unemployment (brought about, for instance, by Federal Reserve credit stringency) is a worse evil than the slow decline in purchasing power of pensions, life insurance, and fixed-dollar assets? (Slichter says these types of income can be adjusted various ways to adopt them to an age of inflation.)

Prices, the labor economist admits, can be stabilized if U.S. unemployment is kept around 5 or 6 percent of the labor force (unemployment was 6.1 percent in December 1958 when 4.1 million people were out of work). But the cost of this unemployment would be about \$9 to \$14 billion annually in lost gross national product, the Nation's total output of goods and services. This is intolerable, Slichter believes.

Wage and price controls, found by the Nation during wartime to distort production, are both alien and too objectionable in peacetime, the economist adds. (Slichter points out manufacturers find ways to bring out new goods—sport shirts, for example, instead of white shirts—to get away from price ceilings.)

Sovereignty in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the problem of how outer space is to be controlled is facing us today in the 86th Congress. We all agree that the rule of law must prevail if world peace is to be insured.

The problem is, what law shall apply to outer space? My good friend, Prof. John C. Cooper of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and McGill Universities, one of the world's most eminent authorities on air law has written a brilliant article on this topic. I commend its careful study by my colleagues.

SOVEREIGNTY IN SPACE

(By John C. Cooper)

Airpower, as I have long insisted, is the ability of a nation to use controlled flight. Such airpower is indivisible, used at times for civil air transport and at times for military striking force. A major limitation, however, of the Nation's airpower springs from basic political and legal considerations which may be thus summarized:

Every sovereign state in time of peace, and every neutral state in time of war, has the complete, unilateral, and exclusive right to control all foreign movement in its territory, unless such movement is authorized by its prior consent or accepted rules of international law.

The territory of a state is three dimensional, including the airspace above its lands, internal waters, and national marginal seas.

Each state may, therefore, at will determine which, if any, flight instrumentalities of foreign origin, are permitted to enter or pass through its national airspace, either in transit or for the purpose of landing.

The doctrine of freedom of innocent passage, applicable to the passage of foreign vessels through national marginal seas, has never been accepted as part of the law of international flight.

The principles thus stated are implicit in certain treaties to which the United States is a party and in our own statutes. For example, article I, entitled "Sovereignty," of the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944, which the United States signed and ratified says "The contracting states recognize that every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory."

And section 1108(a) of the recently adopted Federal Aviation Act of 1958, reenacting similar provisions in the Air Commerce Act of 1926 and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, reads as follows: "The United States of America is hereby declared to possess and exercise complete and exclusive national sovereignty in the airspace of the United States, including the airspace above all inland waters and the airspace above those portions of the adjacent marginal high seas, bays, and lakes over which by international law or treaty or convention the United States exercises national jurisdiction."

Every state in the international community claims similar airspace sovereignty. But neither the Chicago Convention nor our statutes define airspace, nor do they fix the status of usable space beyond. Obviously the extent of our national airspace will determine, in many cases, the measure of our right to control foreign flight above us. Similarly the extent upward of the national airspace of other states will limit our rights to high-altitude flight. Both of these factors will affect our ultimate airpower. What is meant by "airspace" is an airpower factor which must not be pushed aside.

INTERNATIONAL USE OF TERM "AIR SPACE"

Article I of the Paris Convention of 1919 on the Regulation of Aerial Navigation signed but not ratified by the United States, said: "The high contracting parties recognize that every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the air space above its territory."

The background of this acceptance of a prior existing rule of international law was, briefly, as follows:

From 1911 various states asserted a unilateral right by statute, decree, and other-

wise, to regulate flight and admit or deny aircraft entry above their surface territory. At the outbreak of World War I, belligerent and neutral states closed their air boundaries.

During the 1919 Paris Peace Conference, an Aeronautical Commission was organized for the purpose, among others, of drafting a convention on international air navigation in time of peace. A draft was submitted by Great Britain which opened with the statement that "The high contracting parties recognize the full and absolute sovereignty of every state over the air above its territories and territorial waters. . . ."

At an early session, the Commission, on the motion of an American delegate, Rear Admiral Knapp, adopted the following principle: "Recognition: (1) of the principle of the full and absolute sovereignty of each State over the air above its territories and territorial waters carrying with it the right of exclusion of foreign aircraft; (2) of the right of each state to impose its jurisdiction over the air above its territory and territorial waters."

The legal subcommittee, in its report to the commission, submitting the text of the eventual convention, referred to the accepted position of the "full and exclusive subjection of the air space to the sovereignty of the territory underlying it," adding that "it is only when the column of air rests upon a res nullius or communis, the sea, that freedom becomes the rule of the air"; and, "It follows that in consequence of its sovereignty the underlying state within the limits of its frontiers may forbid flight over, and a fortiori, landing upon its territory."

The Paris Convention was signed officially in French and Italian as well as in English. The words "air space" in the English text appear in the French version as "espace atmosphérique" and in the Italian as "spazio atmosferico." No distinction was made between air space and atmospheric space as designating the area above the earth's surface characterized by the presence of "the column of air." This area was declared to be under exclusive territorial sovereignty of the subjacent state.

In many articles of this 1919 Paris Convention the flight instrumentalities to be regulated are described as "aircraft" and their nationality is recognized. Certain subsequently adopted annexes, part of the convention itself, provide that the word "aircraft" shall "comprise all machines which can derive support in the atmosphere from reactions of the air." Included in the classes of aircraft were balloons, airships, land planes, and helicopters. The term "atmosphere" was certainly here used as meaning the same area called in article I of the convention "air space," and "air" was the gaseous substance providing aerodynamic lift.

Article I was nothing more than a declaration of the law as it already existed. The article referred to every power as having airspace sovereignty, whether such power was or was not a party to the convention. States had, in fact, by their acts before and during World War I, asserted rights to control flight in the superjacent airspace then used by aircraft. Taking the declaration in article I with the definition of aircraft, it may be argued that the 1919 Paris Convention did nothing more than state customary existing international law recognized by all states accepting, as part of the territory of the state below, those areas of space where sufficient gaseous air was present to lift and support balloons, airships, airplanes, and any other type of flight instrumentality which could derive support in the atmosphere from reactions of the air. Man had not yet conceived of the possibility of any other type of flight instrumentality, nor had he had occasion to regulate areas of

space, other than those used by aircraft. Consequently, no customary international law existed as to the use of areas above the airspace, and the airspace meant, as pointed out by the legal subcommittee which drafted the convention, the area characterized by a column of air.

Nothing, however, in the Paris Convention limited the territorial sovereignty of a state by the technical ability of that state to control the upper areas of the airspace. This would have resulted in strong states having sovereign rights to great heights and weak states having practically no such rights. The preamble of the Paris Convention recognized that "the establishment of regulations of universal application will be the interest of all." Any construction of the convention providing unequal airspace sovereignty between states based on power to control the superjacent airspace would have been inconsistent with this objective.

As improved types of aircraft were produced, the sovereignty of each state in the international community became equally applicable and effective up to the limits of aerodynamic lift then scientifically available to any state. The existence of this sovereignty was recognized as a right inherent in each state, just as the international community recognizes the sovereign territorial rights of such comparatively weak states as Nepal, which includes Mount Everest within its boundaries, even though Nepal cannot make its laws effective up to the vast heights of the Himalayas.

At the same time the Paris Convention cannot be construed as recognizing state sovereignty upward without limit into space. As said earlier, no flight existed nor was considered in the area beyond the column of air.

The Paris Convention was followed by the less important Ibero-American Convention and the Havana Convention. Both asserted the same doctrine of national airspace sovereignty. Nor did the legal situation otherwise change prior to the outbreak of World War II.

THE CHICAGO CONVENTION

The Chicago Convention of 1944 reasserted in article I practically the same statement as to national airspace sovereignty found in article I of the Paris Convention. The fact that rockets of the V-2 type had been in actual combat use for a few months before the Chicago Convention was drafted was not discussed or taken into consideration. The Chicago Conference recommended a definition for the term aircraft in approximately the language of the Paris Convention Annex, limiting the term to those instrumentalities "which can derive support in the atmosphere from reactions of the air."

Article I of the Chicago convention was, like the Paris sovereignty article, a restatement of existing customary international law. International practice by which each State recognized the right of every other State to control then existing types of flight instrumentalities in areas then used had matured into a principle of law. At the same time, nothing in the Chicago convention sought to limit claims of any individual State to additional sovereignty, nor did the convention directly or indirectly deal with areas of space not then used.

With this background, various definitions of the term air space have been suggested seeking to fix the upper limit of the right of a State to admit or refuse the entry of flight instrumentalities in space above its lands and waters. Since sputnik I was launched, these discussions have left the academic area and become both practical and important. On the height of the upper air space boundary hinges the answer to the question whether the satellites launched during the past year have passed through the sovereign territorial air space of many States.

The minimum height above the earth of their orbits have been as follows:

	Miles
Sputnik I.....	142
Sputnik II.....	140
Explorer I.....	224
Vanguard I.....	404
Explorer III.....	118
Sputnik III.....	130
Explorer IV.....	178

An examination of the suggested definitions is in order. It has been authoritatively stated that the United States has in no way committed itself as to the height of its sovereign claims.

UPPER AIRSPACE BOUNDARY IN CERTAIN PROPOSED DEFINITIONS

- Height up to which aircraft (instrumentalities requiring aerodynamic lift) can ascend.
- Height at which aerodynamic lift ceases and Kepler force takes over.
- Height at which a satellite may be put in orbit.
- Height at which atmosphere is found in space.
- Height without limit.
- Height to which a state may exercise effective control.

PROPOSAL FOR NEW INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

A. Agreements fixing upper airspace boundary

Jurists are not in entire accord as to whether it is possible legally, or practical politically, to enter into new agreements to fix the upper air space boundary. Some believe that a solution such as (a), (b), or (c) above should be reached as to the present extent upward of territorial airspace, and that when this is done, astronomical and other factors prevent any agreement extending sovereignty farther upward into space.

Others feel that nothing in the Chicago Convention, or in general customary international law, or in the physical status of space, prevents an agreement fixing an upper limit of sovereignty for the protection of the state below at heights above those suggested in (a), (b), or (c) proposals have been made for possible agreement to include in the air space of each state areas up to a limit which would include all flight except completely free satellite flight where drag is practically nonexistent, or even higher so as to include areas of guided missile flight, thus preventing belligerent guided missile flight over neutral states without violating the neutrality of the latter. If any such new agreement is to be made, all possible physical data must be considered dealing with flight problems in areas both within and beyond the atmosphere. No new agreement should be made until all needed data as to the areas concerned is available.

B. Agreements for control of high altitude flight without fixing boundary between airspace and outer space

Many jurists are convinced that it is impossible, or at least impractical to agree on any definition of airspace, or to fix an outer boundary by new international agreement. They feel that it is much more practical to leave the legal situation as it stands insofar as the technical legal status of different areas of space is concerned, and to direct efforts toward international understanding as to the conduct of high altitude flight generally, or as to particular flights or categories of flight generally, or as to particular flights or categories of flight instrumentalities. For example, it has been suggested that as an early step, each state about to launch a satellite could register its intent to do so with an international agency and furnish technical data. Agreement might be reached to refrain from using certain instrumentalities, or use them only under international

inspection. If a gradual approach toward international control is thus developed, it is argued that no need exists to fix a definite upper boundary or state sovereignty.

These views have been ably argued. They impel the jurist as well as the statesman to proceed with caution. A mistake made now in fixing an upper airspace boundary might lead to grave future difficulties.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this memorandum has been to state the problem—not to suggest an answer. It is hoped, however, that the analysis of the difficulties may assist in a final policy solution.

A Budget Also More Meaningful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following editorial, "A Budget Also More Meaningful," which appeared in the February 2, 1959, issue of Life magazine:

A BUDGET ALSO MORE MEANINGFUL

Any effort to draw clean political lines around a U.S. budget has one drawback: our budget system, in the words of Dr. Gabriel Hague, is "nearly obsolete and meaningless." The U.S. Government does not even have a budget in the sense that a responsible household, or most State governments, or the British government has a budget. At no point in the fiscal year does Congress, which votes both the income and outgo sides of the Federal ledger, take a bifocal look at what it is doing and adjust either side to the other.

This procedural defect has been a scandal for years. It got a lot of attention from the Hoover Commission. Congress in 1946 experimented with a joint budget committee to set ceilings on spending, but it never established its authority and the budget remains a mere ritual admonition. Already the Democrats have introduced expensive new bills (housing, airports, etc.) without having any plan for where the money is coming from.

Besides aiming at a balance, it is an additional virtue of Eisenhower's 1960 budget that it takes several steps toward checking this nonsense and making the budgetary process more meaningful. First, it urges Congress to have another try at enabling itself to "look at the fiscal situation as a whole." More important, it implements one of the few major budget reforms since the war, which Congress with a great effort of will authorized last year. This is the accrual system of accounting long urged by the Hoover Commission. It means that instead of letting past appropriations pile up as carryovers, Congress can annually reconsider these old appropriations which the executive has not managed (or managed not) to spend. Thus Congress regains some say in the actual rate of Government spending. But a third and still more important reform will be necessary before our system of divided powers is really capable of keeping these huge budgets under rational control.

This reform is the item veto. President Eisenhower, like Presidents Grant, Hayes, Arthur, Taft, Wilson, F. D. Roosevelt, and Truman before him, has repeatedly asked Congress to give him this power. It would enable him to veto the obviously wasteful parts of an appropriation bill without killing

the whole. It would stop those logrolling and pork-barrel appropriations of which President Arthur said: "As the bill becomes more objectionable it secures more support." Most State governors enjoy the item veto, as did the Presidency in the Confederate constitution. It is the commonsense way to check a built-in thriftlessness of the democratic process. But because it would jiggle the balance of budgetary power between Congress and the Executive, Congress has refused to consider it seriously. When he came to this recommendation in his state of the Union address to Congress, Ike was greeted by a hearty and rather sinister laugh.

It's easy for a Congressman to make headlines these days by attacking the administration. Members should first look at Congress' own defects. The many technical flaws in our system of government can be corrected, even those most hallowed by tradition. Democracy to stay alive must keep its own procedures up to date. The whole idea of a formal budget dates only from 1921. With modern budgets taking a fifth of the Nation's income, the item veto has become essential to good housekeeping. Any Congressman or Senator who wants to defy his colleagues' laughter and espouse this reform now will earn the Nation's gratitude in the long run.

Greater Phoenix Must Tap the Highlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD the third of three articles by the Honorable John Murdock, of Arizona, a former Member of the House, in which he sets forth his proposal for the development of the waters of the Little Colorado River in Arizona.

The two previous installments dealt with the details of his proposal for furnishing water to the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations. Mr. Murdock's comprehensive plan also contemplates the supply of municipal water for the rapidly growing city of Phoenix. Under the Murdock plan water would be transported from the Little Colorado River to the Verde River for use by the Greater Phoenix and central Arizona areas by use of the principle of exchange of water, a principle which has long been established in the semiarid regions of the West.

Mr. Murdock's article follows:

GREATER PHOENIX MUST TAP THE HIGHLANDS (By John R. Murdock)

Phoenix, the capital city of Arizona, is the largest of Arizona cities and growing most rapidly. It is in the heart of the largest agricultural area of Arizona, and its urban water supply is inextricably mixed, physically and legally, with the irrigation waters of the valley. Several times already in recent decades Greater Phoenix has had to go far beyond the limits of the valley to augment its city water supply. At the rate at which the metropolitan area of Phoenix is growing, including more than a half dozen surrounding cities, it could rival Los Angeles or San Francisco in frantically reaching out for a dependable source of water.

Of course, it should do this without totally depriving the 250,000 acres of the richest and most productive lands in the West in our big reclamation project in the valley of all irrigation water. Only to the extent that the farmland is being paved and turned into urban areas may the city transfer irrigation water into its mains for municipal use. And although this transfer is taking place, and will continue to take place, the time will soon come when Greater Phoenix must depend upon distant sources of water in the northern highlands. Her outside sources now, other than the Salt River, are the Verde River and its tributaries which have their heads in northern Arizona not far from the Little Colorado River. And while I believe that much additional water can be developed on the Verde watershed, I believe that some water will have to be imported for the city of Phoenix into the Verde watershed from another river or rivers. The other river or rivers could be the Little Colorado at a point near Williams, or it could be the main Colorado River at a point near Peach Springs and Diamond Creek, or from both. My preference would be the former, if engineering and economic data will permit. My plan for the Little Colorado River project fits in well here.

LONGEST TUNNEL NOT FAVORED

At this point I must most emphatically say that I am not proposing the long tunnel—140-odd miles—from the Grand Canyon to Oak Creek Canyon in the vicinity of Flagstaff which has so often been suggested. Several engineers and planners have proposed such a long and deep tunnel to bring the waters of the Colorado River by gravity to Oak Creek Canyon or into one of the other tributaries of the Verde. I am not here now passing judgment upon such a tunnel, whether I think it feasible or not, but it has been so long and so often discussed that I want it clearly understood such a tunnel is not a part of my proposal. There is little similarity between that proposal and mine except the exchange of the same water involved.

Central Arizona, including Salt River Valley, is the heart of the State, and any water development of great importance to Arizona, must have a vital relationship to the central Arizona area. In an earlier statement I said that the development of my Little Colorado River project would have a vital bearing, not only upon northern Arizona Indians, but upon the entire State as well. That vital connection I want to make clear now in this statement. Naturally I am concerned here with municipal water supply. Of course, the agricultural supply for irrigation is tremendously important, too, but I expect to deal separately with that later.

PHOENIX HAS LESSON IN LOS ANGELES

Phoenix has already spent millions in dollars to bring water from the Verde into her city reservoirs, but such is only a beginning. Greater Phoenix, including more than a half dozen small cities which have heretofore relied upon well water, is now making a heavy pull upon the Verde River, and it is a question how much more water there is in the Verde River watershed for Greater Phoenix. Obviously there could be some more water coming down from the north by development, but to get it is going to require expensive engineering.

Phoenix is already larger now than Los Angeles was five decades ago when Los Angeles reached out hundreds of miles up into the high Sierras to supplement her municipal supplies. Later, Los Angeles spent upward of \$200 million for an aqueduct to bring water from the Colorado River to her metropolitan area. This was and is an expensive water supply because every gallon of water taken out of the Colorado River for use by the metropolitan district of Southern California has to be pumped over the mountains,

and thus lifted more than 1,600 feet before it will flow to the west coast cities of southern California.

Of course, one would suppose that Los Angeles would much prefer to get most of its city water, if possible from the melting snow of the high Sierras, and have the water come by gravity, producing power as it comes rather than to get inferior city water from the distant Colorado River and be required to use expensive power to lift it over the mountains. The point I want to make here is, that the growing city of Los Angeles is now and has been to this hour getting most of her good water by gravity from the high mountains, and a smaller part of her less desirable water by an expensive pump-lift from the Colorado River. When Los Angeles, years hence, gets around to using their canal to its full capacity—if it ever does—the cost of its capital investment will have been doubled.

In the case of Greater Phoenix, she may expect to get a part of her augmented water supply from the high mountains of Arizona, but also the chances are good that Phoenix may have to resort to an expensive pump-lift to get main stream Colorado River water. Even so, I believe that Phoenix can get Colorado River water—certainly Little Colorado River water—with less of a pump-lift than the 1600-foot lift required for Los Angeles from the same source.

ARIZONA'S GEOGRAPHY POINTS WAY

Let us study the geography of this highland area on which Phoenix would have to depend. The Verde River reaches far north to the Mogollon Rim in the mountain divide near Williams. Oak Creek originates under the Mogollon Rim. Further west, Sycamore Creek heads near the rim in the mountain divide near Williams. There is, west of the San Francisco Mountains, a comparatively low area where the water divides, some going south into the Sycamore, and some going north into the Little Colorado. I am positive from a study of maps and from numerous inspections by automobile trips and from the air that it would not be anything like an impossible task to transfer water from one of the upper man-made lakes on the Little Colorado—such as I indicated in one of my preceding articles—over this relatively low divide to the Sycamore Canyon watershed. This transfer might be served by a short tunnel, but more than likely could best be done by high pressure pipeline for pumps.

Hold in mind that we are talking now about municipal water and not irrigation water which cannot bear so high a cost. Of course, any water imported by Phoenix would have to come from Arizona's allotment of Colorado River water either as confirmed by court decree or through an exchange of water, as for instance, out of the 50,000 acre-feet furnished Arizona annually under the upper basin States compact.

HOW USE THE ASSURED 50,000 ACRE-FEET?

In my discussion of the Little Colorado River project I could only suggest, and of course not be sure, that the annual 50,000 acre-feet guaranteed to Arizona by the upper basin States would thus be freely assigned to the Indians. Many will say that that is a reckless assumption, when we consider how short Arizona is of water. Perhaps so. It may be recalled that I undertook to say clearly that my Little Colorado project plan almost absolutely depends upon that "block of water"—50,000 acre-feet annually—being assigned to the use of those Indians, and that to prevent its going to them would go far towards wrecking that project. That is the way I view it.

It might occur to some that I made the suggestion that this block of "compact water" go to the Arizona Indians merely to

gain good will for the Little Colorado River project through the natural good will of the public for our neglected Indians, and now it may seem that I am making that "safe and sure" quantity of water—50,000 acre-feet annually furnished by the upper basin—an Indian gift in another sense, in deliberately trying to take it away from the Indians to bring it to Phoenix. No, I have not tried to deceive anyone. I really mean that that assured quantity of water can be used in a pump priming sense and this stabilizing supply may be the means of getting some mainstream Colorado River water to Phoenix. If this engineering plan is viewed in all of its prospects there is nothing mystical about it. The same water can serve both purposes even if not actually used in both places.

THE "EXCHANGE" PRINCIPLE

How would that be possible? A clear understanding of my proposal in the Little Colorado project reveals that it will yield to the Indian reservation much more water than it will take out of the main Colorado for those Indians. When the system is complete and functioning the Little Colorado system water will be more than enough for the Indian reservations, and there will be water to spare to be imported by Phoenix as well as return flow from the reservation. The whole arrangement legally would simply involve an exchange of water so that it may serve both purposes. The exchange of water is an old and well known legal and engineering principle in the West, and, desperate as semiarid regions may be for water, they know well how to make its usefulness go further by the exchange principle.

Let it be known that it doesn't matter so much whose water the 50,000 acre-feet annually of the upper basin contribution may be legally, so long as the exchange principle will permit it to be used in perpetuity in Arizona. So much the better if it can be used both ways as here indicated. Let it also be known that without its use for the benefit of the Navajo and Hopi Indians and also its use for the benefit of Greater Phoenix, it cannot be used any other way in the State of Arizona with such maximum results. In fact, it might otherwise go on down the river as the rest of the Colorado River flow is going and not be used as consumed water any place in Arizona. This sobering thought should cool any hotheads who might emphatically declare that the block of 50,000 acre-feet of water should never go to any Indians.

OF WHAT IS THIS WATERSHED CAPABLE?

Those who know the Little Colorado now in the state of nature may not agree with me that it could furnish as much water to the Indian Reservations and also to contribute additionally to Greater Phoenix as I have suggested in this article and in other statements. Even assuming an average constant daily contribution from the main Colorado River totaling 50,000 acre-feet annually, used as intended as a regulatory and pump-priming effect, doubting Thomases may say there would not be that much water in the Little Colorado system.

To answer that objection, I would say that there would be a contributing factor, not heretofore participating, as follows: First, it is a detail of my plan that additional useful water can be developed on sites in the reservations. To illustrate: Of the first 20 deep wells put down 9 or 10 years ago by the Navajos, 19 were producers, and there are other possibilities of increasing the water supply on the reservations by conservation methods. Modern science can bring the Indians rain better than can their rattlesnake messengers to the rain gods. These same conservative methods will also contribute to the useable supply in the Little Colorado River for additional uses.

The Vanishing American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Americans have fought on many battlefields to preserve their individual freedom. Ironically, over the last 25 years, during peacetime, they have gradually surrendered to the Federal Government more and more of those responsibilities which are inseparable from personal liberty.

This Congress is being urged by powerful pressure groups to enact legislation which would encroach still further on the fundamental right to make our own decisions and to plan our own individual futures. The threat of socialism is grave and real.

My good friend, Mr. Elmer Lindseth, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., accurately evaluated this threat in an outstanding speech recently before the Cleveland Rotary Club. Mr. Lindseth's speech can be classified as "recommended reading" for every citizen concerned about his country's future—and "required reading" for every Member of Congress whose votes will help decide that future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit Mr. Lindseth's speech:

THE VANISHING AMERICAN

(An address by Elmer L. Lindseth, president, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., at a luncheon meeting of the Cleveland Rotary Club, Cleveland, Ohio, January 29, 1959)

I

When the United States was born, some 200 years ago, it was dedicated to a new and bold concept of citizenship: freedom of the individual from domination by government. This philosophy became the so-called American way of life, which by any yardstick is an impressive phenomenon.

Materially, it has given us Americans the highest standard of living in the world.

It has given us more years and better health too, with which to enjoy our material wealth. Since 1900, the average American's life expectancy has risen from 47 to 70 years.

It has brought the benefits of education within reach of all. Some 3 million young people are today enrolled in our institutions of higher learning alone.

And, notwithstanding the jibes of some critics both foreign and domestic, it has given us a rich cultural life.

But I need not go on. As a Nation, we have grown rich. And by all indications, we have every intention of growing richer, materially, culturally, and in every other way.

Few of us doubt that we can grow richer. We look back at what has been accomplished in the past 200 years by hard work in an atmosphere of freedom, and we feel that without question we have the formula for unlimited progress. With freedom, we have traveled far; with continued freedom, we can travel a lot farther yet.

II

With continued freedom? Let's think about that for a moment. Are we as free as we think we are?

The fact is that the American, as the world knew him not many years ago, is today a vanishing breed.

The thing he feared most—the thing he tried to prevent in his Constitution—has been happening apace. The bonds he placed on Government have been loosened, one by one, while for the most part he stood idly by. And the American people, who once stood out in sharp relief as individuals, are fast becoming regimented into the mediocrity of collectivism.

Because this process has been gradual, spanning generations, it has largely gone unnoticed. Only when we look back do we see what a tremendous change has taken place in the social, political, and business climate of these United States.

In the beginning, we assigned to Government only its legitimate functions—foreign affairs, national defense, law enforcement, the postal service, to name a few of them.

Today, the Government is not only carrying on all those legitimate functions, but in addition is regulating the economy and engaging in business in a big way, in competition with its own citizens. A whole multitude of Government regulatory bureaus and business agencies has sprung up, playing so prominent a part in the Nation's life that people recognize them by their initials alone: FHA, FPC, TVA, ICC, SEC, NASA, FTC, and so on. Some even bear affectionate nicknames like Fannie Mae.

The Government today has become the most dominant single factor in our economy. It buys, sells, competes, regulates, protects, subsidizes, manufactures, lends, borrows—and, of course, spends on a corresponding scale.

In 1950 the well-known American Communist, Earl Browder, spoke these words: "State capitalism, in substance if not in formal aspects, has progressed farther in America than in Great Britain under the Labor government, despite Britain's nationalization of certain industries, which is a formal stage not yet reached in America. The actual, substantial concentration of the guiding reins of national economy in governmental hands is probably on a higher level in the United States of America."

III

American business is full of success stories, in the Horatio Alger tradition. But ironically enough, the biggest success story in all the annals of American business is the Government's rise to wealth and power in business.

How did this happen?

Many Government-in-business operations began as emergency measures, particularly in wartime. It was tacitly understood that they would be dissolved as soon as the emergency had passed. But many of them were overlooked, and, like Old Man River, "they just keep rollin' along."

In 1933 a special committee of the House of Representatives took a look at Government business enterprises. The committee found 232 of them created during World War I and still operating, although the war had been over for 15 years.

If 232 Government business enterprises sounds like a lot, it is only a drop in the bucket by today's standards. Last year there were over 19,000 commercial and industrial enterprises in the civilian branches of Government alone. And there were at least 2,500 more in the Defense Department.

This the Hoover Commission brought out in a scholarly and monumental work which created quite a stir when it was published some years ago. A citizens committee was formed to press for curtailment of these unnecessary Government activities.

But their efforts and similar efforts have met with very limited success. True, the Inland Waterways Corporation was liquidated around 1950. In the midfifties, 900,000 Government housing units were

disposed of, and 27 synthetic rubber plants were sold to private industry. In 1957, the Director of the Federal Budget reported that 137 business operations in the civilian branches of the Government had been closed. Nevertheless, Government's stake in business went on getting bigger, not smaller.

Today, the U.S. Government manufactures surgical, medical, and dental equipment, rope, chain, watches, clocks, fertilizer, paint, and a thousand other commercial products. It operates motion picture studios, coffee roasting plants, sawmills, rum distilleries, furniture repair shops, printing plants, powerplants, and garden nurseries. It is in the aluminum-sweating business, the plastic-laminating business, the cement business, the railroad business, and the wood-preservation business. At military posts all over the country are Government-run supermarkets and department stores selling at tax-subsidized prices, in competition with local retailers.

We obviously have not time to name all the businesses the Government is in. If it is not yet in your business, you—and we—are lucky. But it may be only a matter of time.

Some of you may be in the life insurance business. If so, you are well acquainted with national service life insurance. By 1957, this Government-operated business had written 6½ million life insurance policies with a total face value of \$44 billion, one-sixth of all ordinary life insurance in force in the country.

This vast Government insurance business exhibits all the bad features of virtually every Government business enterprise. It pays no tax on property or income, leaving the entire taxload to be carried by citizens who for the most part are not its customers. It taxes these same citizens again for direct subsidies. And because of these financial advantages it is able to undersell private business and thus weaken our free enterprise economy through unfair competition.

Its administration requires a vast number of civil servants in Washington and throughout the Nation, who become entrenched in their jobs and effectively resist any effort to displace them. It develops a core of friends and supporters in Congress who are able to perpetuate its existence by log rolling and trading votes with other legislators, in return for support of their pet projects.

Thus it lives—and grows—and prospers.

In 1932, just a quarter of a century ago, two-thirds of all tax dollars went to local and State governments, and one-third to the Federal Government. Today that proportion is reversed. The Federal Government now gets 2 tax dollars out of every 3. And I hardly need add that the total number of tax dollars is vastly greater today than it was in 1932.

Competent economists say a free society is in trouble when 20 to 25 percent of its wealth goes to government in taxes. Today, our various levels of government—local, State, and Federal—take more than 30 percent of the wealth we create. One in every six employed persons in America today works for the Federal, State, or local government.

What does this mean in plain language? It means that we—you and I and our fellow Americans—have abdicated to government the responsibility for controlling almost one-third of this country's total income. If we think we can throw away that much responsibility without losing some of our freedom, we are sadly deluding ourselves.

IV

All these pieces fit into a pattern, the name of which is an ugly word: socialism.

Repeatedly, through surveys and public opinion polls, Americans have stated they want no part of socialism. When a socialist government came into power in Britain, we

shook our heads sadly at the folly of the British. When that same government was defeated, we told ourselves that the British had finally regained their senses.

Yet all the while we were buying socialism for ourselves, piece by piece.

This is certainly a paradoxical state of affairs. But it is not particularly astonishing, because it could have been predicted. In fact, it has been predicted by Socialists themselves, who played a prominent part in bringing it about. They knew us better than we knew ourselves.

The Fabian Society in England became well known for its philosophy of gradualism. The society was founded in 1883 by a group of British intellectuals, and took its name from the Roman general Fabius, who made some notable conquests by avoiding major battles. His method was to isolate small parts of the enemy's forces and wipe them out, one at a time.

That's the method the Fabians used in putting socialism over in Britain. They were smart enough to see that the Marxists, with their "all-or-nothing" approach, would get nowhere. But they had the shrewd idea that people would buy so-called welfare schemes, one by one, until they wound up with a Socialist society.

It took the Fabians a long time in Britain—from 1883 to 1945—but they succeeded.

It is already well on its way, in part because we have our Fabians here too, using the same methods that worked so well in Britain. The prominent American Socialist Stephen Raushenbush, advocated "encroaching control" in the New York Leader in 1927. He urged Socialists to get jobs in the Government; to work toward a program of Government ownership of electric power; to work for political control and management of all key industries.

Another well-known American Socialist, Norman Thomas, said this in 1940: "The people of America will never buy socialism in one package. But they will buy TVA, social security, compulsory health insurance, Federal aid to education, and all the others, one at a time." The language is his.

Those are the key words: "one at a time." No matter how loudly we Americans may protest that we want no truck with socialism, we are today buying socialism by that typically American method, the installment plan. The end result, unless we do something about it, inevitably will be outright ownership—except that rather than our owning socialism, socialism will own us.

V

Let's look for a moment at a single case history, a classic example of how a socialistic measure, once it gets its foot in the door, starts taking over the entire household. This is the electric power business. I use this example, first, because I am in the business and know something about it at first hand; and second, because the power industry is so fundamental to our economy that it is a prime target of Socialists everywhere in the world.

In the early decades of this century, with the growth of the conservation movement in the West, a number of Government dams were erected for irrigation and flood control purposes. Rather than waste the water power available at these dams, the Government installed generators and began the incidental production of electric power.

But in 1933, with the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the picture took on a different aspect. True enough, the TVA Act specified that the dams on the Tennessee River were for navigation, irrigation, and flood control, and any electric power produced was to be incidental. But those who nurtured the TVA had their own definition of the word "incidental." Soon TVA assumed the role of sole supplier of electric power to the surrounding territory, and achieved the complete elimination of all

investor-owned power companies in the area.

This was accepted by the people in the valley, because TVA electric bills were low. Naturally they were low, and still are. TVA pays no Federal taxes at all, and only one-third as much in local taxes as a privately owned power company would pay. It pays no interest on money loaned to it from the Federal Treasury, and returns to the Treasury virtually none of these borrowed funds. Thus relieved of three of the biggest cost items on taxpaying power companies' books, it can well afford to price its power below theirs.

It wasn't long, either, before TVA began building coal-burning generating plants. By this time the word "incidental" had lost all meaning.

Today, 25 years after TVA's birth, more than four-fifths of its total investment is in electric power facilities. It is the Nation's largest electric power producer, generating almost two-thirds of its power in coal-burning plants. Estimates of how much tax income has been lost through TVA vary between one-quarter and one-half billion dollars. Total investment of taxpayers' money in TVA as of June 30, 1958, is just under \$2 billion. To date, the interest payments alone that TVA has escaped paying to the Federal Treasury total some \$240 million. And it avoids taxes of \$55 million a year.

We Ohioans, however, lose more than our share of the amounts paid out directly to TVA. The tax on electric power must be collected from somebody, and since TVA customers are exempt, the entire burden falls on the customers of taxpaying utilities—you and me. Our taxes are thus higher than they otherwise would be. Further, untaxed electric power is a drawing-card for industry, especially those companies whose power usage is high. Many an industry which might otherwise have located in Ohio, creating jobs and paying taxes here, has gone to Tennessee to take advantage of the low-priced power that we help to subsidize.

It would seem that TVA has already expanded far beyond any proper place it might have in the economy, and become a liability rather than an asset. Yet every session of Congress sees bills introduced by the backers of so-called public power which seek still further to expand the TVA empire. A typical bill, S. 1869, introduced at the last session, had provisions that would remove TVA from the limited budgetary control Congress still has over it and would give it virtually unlimited spending rights. It would authorize TVA to spread over another 25,000 square miles of adjacent territory, an area greater than the combined areas of Delaware, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Rhode Island. Similar bills can be expected to be introduced during the present session. Most Americans are never even aware of them. The President's so-called balanced budget is in part predicated on passage of a TVA revenue bond bill which would remove TVA spending from the Federal budget and from congressional control.

TVA is the biggest Federal power project, but by no means the only one. Prominent among the others are the Southwest Power Administration in Arkansas and Texas; the Southeastern Power Administration, in Georgia and North and South Carolina; and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Pacific Northwest.

All told, Federal power installations supply power for one-fifth of the population of this country. This means that one American in five receives tax-free power, at the expense of the other four. Of revenues received by tax-paying electric utility companies, about 25 cents out of every dollar goes to the various levels of government in taxes. Customers of such companies comprise four-fifths of American citizens, who pay higher taxes in order that a privileged

one-fifth may obtain power subsidized from the Public Treasury.

When government power expands, so does this privileged class of customers expand, and the demand on those who pay the subsidy grows heavier. Thus, whenever public power wins—you lose. Whenever public power wins, we move closer to the complete socialization of a major industry already one-fifth socialized.

VI

But we need not go outside our own State for examples of government in the power business. There are 102 tax-free municipal power systems in Ohio alone. In fact, we need not go outside our own city. The municipal electric light plant in Cleveland is government power on a substantial, though local, scale. Fewer customers are involved, and lesser amounts of money than in the TVA for example. But the principle is precisely the same.

The municipal light plant competes directly with the Illuminating Co. for customers and business. However, it pays no taxes of any kind, while the Illuminating Co. must of necessity charge its customers enough to cover its taxes as well as its ordinary operating expenses. And those taxes amount to more than 24 cents out of every dollar we take in.

The municipal light plant does render certain services to the city at rates lower than the fully taxed and regulated rates of the Illuminating Co. But such reduced rates are quite inadequate to offset the amount of taxes avoided through Government ownership. The vast bulk of the tax exemption is passed on to private residential, commercial, and industrial customers, many of them your competitors.

The municipal light plant serves about one-fifth of the electric customers in Cleveland—which is just about the same proportion of customers, you may remember, that is served by Federal Government power projects on a nationwide scale. Thus, the same picture holds true in Cleveland as across the country: one-fifth of Cleveland's citizens enjoy tax-free electricity, while the entire utility tax bill is carried by the other four-fifths.

Imagine what would happen if one-fifth of the people of Cleveland were to be exempted from paying the 3-percent sales tax on retail purchases. Suppose this one-fifth were picked at random—say, all those whose names started with the letters J through N. Wouldn't the other four-fifths have a valid basis for charging preference and discrimination? Fair play dictates that they would.

Yet, that's precisely the situation we have in regard to the tax on electric service, except that whether or not you pay it depends not on the first letter of your surname, but on whether you happen to be a customer of the municipal light plant of the Illuminating Co. It's just as inequitable, but the victims of this inequity—80 percent of the citizens of Cleveland—don't seem to be concerned about it. Many of them aren't even aware of it.

Incidentally, there's a simple way to remedy the unequal distribution of taxes on electric service in Cleveland, just as there is nationally. It won't cure the evil of socialistic ownership, but it will end the tax discrimination. It would involve merely raising the rates of the municipal light plant service to private consumers to the level of Illuminating Co. rates, which are commission regulated and include a full component of Federal, State, and local taxes.

The increased income to the municipal light plant—the equivalent of its tax exemption—could then be applied for the benefit of the entire community by the municipal plant reducing rates charged for public uses, such as city buildings, street and traffic lighting, and other similar charges against

the general fund; water pumping and sewage disposal; countywide services; and other similar public uses, thus reducing correspondingly the tax revenues collected from you and me.

The municipal light plant, with its tax-exempt rates to some private citizens, is only a small slice of the socialism that we in Cleveland have bought. It is all of a piece with national service life insurance, Government-operated factories and truck lines, TVA and all the other 19,000 Government-owned business enterprises which you and I pay to support and which compete with private citizens in at least 142 different fields of business, probably including your own.

VII

We Americans—if our words are to be believed—consider individual freedom as precious as life itself.

Then why, one asks, do we buy this socialism a piece at a time?

I believe it is because we are just plain complacent and apathetic. And our complacency and apathy stem from the fact that we fail to see what is going on before our very eyes.

It is like putting together a jigsaw puzzle. As we fit the pieces of socialism into place, one by one, the picture grows steadily bigger. But we still haven't quite recognized the whole picture for what it is.

Surveys repeatedly have shown that the American people are unaware of the danger they are plunging into. Typical is a 1955 nationwide survey conducted by Opinion Research Corp. In replying to questions about broad issues, those questioned clearly favored free enterprise over Government control. For instance, 72 percent were opposed to Government ownership of industry. Sixty-three percent preferred free competition to price control, to keep prices fair. Seventy-eight percent were against imposing a top limit on salaries. When asked their opinion of the business setup in this country, only 10 percent gave unfavorable replies. And 72 percent said the best way to keep the country prosperous is to let business do its own planning, as against only 19 percent who favored Government planning.

But when the questions narrowed down to specific issues, it was a different story. Nearly half—48 percent—favored farm price supports. Three out of four favored government housing. Five out six—83 percent—favored Federal aid to education. And three out of four favored Government help for small business.

Apparently people don't think of these things as socialism. The Fabians, it seems, were 100 percent right.

Another national public opinion poll, this one by Central Surveys, revealed the extent to which the American people are misinformed and uninformed. One-third of those interviewed had never even heard of TVA; presumably they didn't even know the Government is in the power business at all. What about the two-thirds who had heard of TVA? More than one-half said they approved of TVA. Only one in eight disapproved of TVA. One-third didn't even have an opinion.

This looks like a clear-cut victory for socialized power. But there's more to it than this. Those people who had heard of TVA were asked whether TVA pays taxes at the same rate electric companies do. Only one in three was aware that it does not. More than one-half didn't know.

There are a lot of people—among those who say they favor TVA and other socialistic measures, and among those with no opinion—who would be against these same socialistic measures if they only knew the facts. This was brought out too in the survey, which asked if they thought TVA should pay taxes at the same rate electric companies do. A majority said they thought it

should. Even in the very area which TVA serves with tax-free power, only one in five thought TVA should not pay taxes.

These and other surveys have shown beyond question that the better-informed a man or woman is, the more opposed he or she is to socialism. Obviously, a vigorous campaign to inform the public could work wonders in stimulating active opposition to socialism in the American economy. Once people know the facts, they'll make the right decisions.

VIII

But who is going to see that they get the facts?

George isn't going to—so it's no use saying "let George do it." That's the very philosophy that got us started on the socialistic road in the first place. It's a job for you and me. It's the biggest and most important do-it-yourself project any of us has ever faced. We do we start?

Right now. The hour is late enough at it is. And on top of that, we are just embarking on the most challenging era in history—an era that promises a lot of changes, including social upheavals. That means that this issue of socialism will intensify, unless we do something about it now.

We are on the threshold of the atomic age, the space age, and the age of automation. A new dimension is being added to international affairs with the emergency of the so-called backward nations. A quarter-century from now, today's world will seem mid-Victorian.

These developments lend a special urgency to the need for decision. We have our choice, but we may not have it much longer. With a rebirth of self-reliance, we can fit these changes into the framework of our free institutions. If we remain apathetic, the new forces in our society will be harnessed to the cause of socialism.

If we want to keep the freedoms we still have, there's a big job for each one of us of informing and enlightening. We can start right here at home. It's a good place to start—one of the most highly industrialized areas in the Nation, and one of the leading educational centers.

What, specifically, can we do, you and I?

Our first job, obviously, is to inform ourselves—and be sure that we keep informed.

Second. Let's inform others. Our audience is everybody—friends, neighbors, employees, chance acquaintances, anybody who will listen. It's later than we think, and government in business is something we should all be taking about, writing about, giving speeches about—using all possible means for getting the facts across.

Third. Let's help the younger generation through our educational institutions. Surveys show that today's young people, if anything, are even more misinformed and uninformed about economic facts than their elders. The schools sorely need all the support and cooperation we can give them.

Fourth. Let's take a more active part in self-government. Let's each support and take part in the political party of his choice. Each of us can join, and provide leadership to, one or more organizations dedicated to opposing creeping socialism. We must take time from our leisure to do this, while we still have leisure.

Fifth. It goes without saying that we should all be sure we are registered as voters, and that we vote. You may be sure that the people who want more socialism are voting. More support at the polls for those candidates who are opposed to socialism would encourage them to keep up the fight. It might even affect the thinking of those politicians who support socialistic measures, not because they believe in them, but because they think that's the way to get elected.

Sixth. Let's resolve to make our views known to our elected representatives. There's no other way in which they can find out what we want them to do.

And, finally, let's make sure we are never guilty ourselves of using Government as a crutch. If the abuse of subsidies is wrong for other people, their abuse is wrong for us. If Government favoritism is wrong when bestowed on some other business, it's equally wrong when it favors our business.

IX

We can never—nor do I think would we want to—get back to the life of colonial days. The world today is a different world, vastly more complex, and it will become more so. But the important principles that should govern our national life have not changed one iota. They are as simple and straightforward today as they were when our country was born. But they stand in need of protection today more than at any time in the past.

Near the outset of this talk I referred to the kind of American that built this great country of ours as a vanishing breed.

He hasn't quite vanished yet, although it's later than we think. However, it's not too late. Let's all pledge ourselves as we enter 1959 to do what we can to bring him back. For if we don't, our 200-year experiment with freedom will have been in vain. And that must not come to pass.

Poison in Your Water—No. 13

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the RECORD an article appearing in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune on February 25, 1958. The article entitled "Payrolls and Pollution," tells how three industrial firms in the Pryor area have agreed to start construction immediately on a plant to eliminate pollution in the Pryor Creek, in Oklahoma.

The article concludes that industry does not need to be a destroyer of nature. Pollution can be eliminated but requires vigorous action. The article is as follows:

PAYROLLS AND POLLUTION

Three industrial firms in the Pryor area—the National Gypsum Co., the Bestwall Gypsum Co., and the John Deere Co.—have agreed to start construction immediately on an aeration treating plant to eliminate pollution in Pryor Creek.

We hope the plant is big enough and effective enough to do the job, for surely the great fish-kills in Fort Gibson Lake, which were apparently set off after rainstorms flushed out Pryor Creek, have been ominous.

Industry does not need to be a destroyer of nature. The dramatic clean-ups that have been enforced on the Raritan River in New Jersey and the Wisconsin River in Wisconsin prove that there are very few industrial plants that cannot treat their wastes in such a way as to render them innocuous to human beings and fish.

Oklahoma's great new lakes have already brought the State millions in tourist spending and will be worth uncounted billions more. Oklahoma also welcomes and needs industrial payrolls. But a payroll can be very expensive if it makes our waters too foul to be enjoyed.

We hope the aeration plant at Pryor demonstrates how payrolls and nature can remain at peace.

A Real Leader Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct attention to the following brief but pithy remarks of the Honorable Carmine G. DeSapio, Democratic national committeeman for the State of New York, as delivered by him on February 14, 1959, to the New York State Democratic dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE CARMINE G. DESAPIO

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, Mrs. Wagner, Mayor Wagner, Arthur Levitt, Mike Prendergast, George DeLuca, Edna Kelly, and distinguished ladies and gentlemen, I wish I could say that this was an evening of celebration which we Democrats might characterize as an opportunity to assess the gains which we have made in the recent past.

But I would deceive no one if I attempted to do so—nor can any of us achieve any valid purpose by pretending that our gains in the State legislature and in Congress last November were not mitigated by the loss of two important State offices and our failure to win two other posts previously held by Republicans.

And any honest attempt to evaluate the results of the 1958 State elections, in terms of the present and future of our party in New York State, must acknowledge the simple fact that, with certain significant exceptions, we did not emerge from those contests as winners.

Often, in the sadness and disappointment of defeat, it is tempting to snatch at the easiest explanation, and even to create rationalizations which may have no validity whatever. This is a natural human failing, and it would be naive for any of us to assume that politicians are immune to it. For even the most sophisticated and most experienced politician may find it difficult to accept disappointment without succumbing to certain emotional pressures—from within, from without, or both—pressures which find expression in hasty or ill-considered actions.

Now it is no secret that there are some people within our party who have reacted to our recent reverses in a manner which does not reflect the traditional resilience of which all of us here tonight are so justly proud.

There are others—let's face it—who also have fallen into the error, or who have been goaded into it, of taking sides over a non-existent issue. And it is sad to think that our party—or at least certain of our fellow Democrats—may allow themselves to dissipate the strength we need to meet the challenge which we must face during the next 4 years.

And it is sadder still to realize that this squabbling—for it is just that—revolves around a question of semantics which has no practical application.

This question of semantics—about who or what is or is not a liberal, and which threatens to sap so much strength and vitality from our organization—can serve no constructive purpose.

Anyone can call himself a liberal. And almost everyone has at one time or another. To reactionary Republicans Dwight Eisenhower is a liberal. In 1952, Candidate Eisenhower characterized himself as a liberal. In 1958, Eisenhower denounced liberals.

Today, some Republicans will tell you that Nelson Rockefeller is a liberal, although there are others who would disagree with them.

My friends, telling people that you are a liberal doesn't make it so, nor does calling someone otherwise necessarily make him so.

The character and philosophy of a politician or of any public figure is molded and defined by his beliefs, by his principles, and by his actions.

And the character and philosophy of a political party evolves from the record of performance compiled by its members.

By these standards—and they are the only true standards—our Democratic Party is an association of men and women whose political creed is founded upon a concept of public service which has as its only goal the advancement of all of the people through a comprehensive program for social progress.

Our party is a party of and for those who subscribe to this liberal philosophy and who are not afraid to work to achieve it, who understand that political success ultimately depends upon the will of the majority of the people, and who do not interpret a temporary setback from unique causes as a manifestation of irreparable tragedy. Indeed, our country is a free nation, of and for those who subscribe to the principle of a two-party system of government.

Yes, there is a Republican Governor in Albany for the simple reason that the people of our State elected him. No crevices have opened in the earth. The structure of democracy has not come crashing down upon our heads. Armageddon has not arrived. The world has not come to an end.

But the cause of liberalism, the cause of progress, will not be advanced by disunity. Those who work divisively within our party prevent themselves from contributing to the tasks and problems which do face us. Not the least among these tasks is the election of a Democratic President in 1960. And not the least among the problems which confront us are the awesome increase in unemployment and the onerous and burdensome taxes which are contemplated for our wage earners.

These are the important issues, not the synthetic issues created by those who claim to have a monopoly on liberalism, but whose disruptive tactics served rather the cause of reaction. It may be considered by some to be fashionable to resort to name calling and characterization, but this does incalculable disservice to our party, our country, and to the very liberalism which they pretend to represent.

All of us—all of us who are dedicated to a liberal philosophy of government—must work together during the ensuing years with the legislature, within our own political organization, with responsible civic groups, and with the people, to uphold and to strengthen the tradition of liberal democracy to which every Democrat is heir.

If we can influence the course of progress in our State in the face of a Republican administration—and I believe that we can—then we will earn and we will deserve the friendship and the respect of the people. And their friendship, their respect, and their support will enable us, as a party, as their party, to reassume the titular, as well as the moral, responsibility for political leadership in our State.

Let us make that our goal. Let us work; let us build; let us gain new strength, new confidence, new inspiration, and new unity from that challenge.

Let us prove to the people that we are good losers, and that, even as losers, we are still strong leaders. And let us build upon the foundation of a forthright acceptance of adversity, a new, a greater and, ultimately, a more meaningful promise and prospect of victory.

Thank you very much.

New England Manufacturers Are Concerned About High Taxes and Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the New England Council has taken a sample of the sentiments entertained by manufacturers in the New England area. Because the findings reflect not only local but national concerns as well, I am submitting them to the Record:

NEW ENGLAND MANUFACTURERS ARE CONCERNED ABOUT HIGH TAXES AND DEBT

BOSTON.—Higher taxes and increasing Government debt head the list of New England's most serious current problems, according to a survey of the region's manufacturers announced today by the New England Council.

The study by the economic development organization pinpointed the tax situation and the growing debt at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

Manufacturers in the six States also are concerned about the cost of transporting some raw materials into the region and moving finished goods to other sections of the country because of the distance from major markets.

Concern over some labor unions and productivity by employees also were mentioned frequently in the survey.

Many manufacturers replying to the New England Council questionnaire also were self-critical. They deplored the lack of interest by businessmen in politics and mentioned the need for more aggressive management that would be alert to existing opportunities.

One northern New England company official said, "In this section of the region our problem is transportation and the import duties into Canada. Winter weather is a slowing factor but there isn't much we can do about that."

Among other quotes on New England's problems were: "Waste in government through expenditures we cannot afford."

"Lack of diversification of industry in some areas."

"Failure to appreciate that the greatest good for all is not dispensed by the Government but must be provided by the productivity and initiative of individuals."

"Need qualified politicians to halt the waste of taxpayers' dollars and who are interested in the future welfare of the region to counteract the trend toward socialism by a tendency to mass vote."

The New England manufacturers were equally vocal with their suggestions for helping to solve or alleviate the region's problems.

They called for:

"Less dependency upon Government and outside factors, and more ingenuity. There is little wrong with business which cannot be solved by a vigorous attack and more individual initiative."

"An educational program to teach our people to understand and appreciate New England."

"A reduction of Government spending and taxing, and recognition by the politicians that there can be no jobs without successful and profitable industries."

"Establishment of a conservative party with sincere men from both present parties, to speak up and espouse the old New England virtues of thrift and good government."

"Greater cooperation by business, labor and government to help halt inflation."

"A campaign for more citizens to vote, and to study what they are voting for."

"More interest by business in economic and political activities."

"Greater economy by legislators and a more active role by competent businessmen and women in local and State politics."

In the NEC survey, the responding manufacturers said that many of their problems were national in nature and not merely local. None expressed the least desire to move elsewhere and many pointed out that "New England still is the ideal part of the United States in which to live, work, and vacation."

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have received many, many letters in the past few weeks from my constituents urging that the Congress not delay action on legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii. It is my personal view that Hawaii has been more than patient in its long quest for statehood. When the measure to confer statehood to Hawaii comes before the House, I intend to vote for it.

A radio commentary on the subject by W. Earl Hall, the distinguished and learned editor of the Globe Gazette of Mason City, Iowa, which appeared in the Globe Gazette, one of the leading newspapers of northern Iowa, on February 9, states the view, I believe, of the majority of Iowans in the most cogent terms. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this very forceful article for the Record:

HAWAII, LAND OF INFINITE PATIENCE

If there's any reason, or semblance of reason, for further delay in admitting the Territory of Hawaii into the Union as its 50th State, it has been most effectively concealed. It has escaped the eyes and ears of all fair-minded Americans known to me.

Everything else—and especially God—has been extremely kind to the cluster of islands known as Crossroads of the Pacific. Of the more than 60 lands I've visited in my world travels, Hawaii comes nearest to measuring up to all advance notices.

Only Uncle Sam in this one broken pledge has dealt inconsiderately with the islands, except for that act of infamy set down in world history as Pearl Harbor. For at least a dozen years or so, Congress has been playing what can only be described as the old shell game with the islanders.

Time after time an unconditional pledge has been included in the two party platforms to admit both Hawaii and Alaska to statehood. Presidential nominees have promised it in their campaigns and Presidents have pleaded for it in their messages to Congress. Public opinion polls have unfailingly disclosed an overwhelming favor for admitting both.

Last year for reasons which never made sense, Alaska was given statehood but the door was slammed shut in Hawaii's face. Here I should explain that the action on Alaska had the islanders' fullest blessing despite the affront to Hawaii implicit in the matter.

There was, and is, every good reason that the situation will be righted in the present Congress. But if I were an Hawaiian and had

seen the rug pulled out from under me as often as the island dwellers have, I'd be loath to take anything for granted. Consider this record:

The proposal to accord statehood to Hawaii has been passed by the House of Representatives in Washington three times. The first time, in 1947, it was by a margin of 196 to 133. The Senate committee decided to conduct further investigation. The bill never got to President Truman for his signature.

In March of 1950 the House repeated its approval, this time by the convincing vote of 262 to 110. After public hearings the Senate Committee on Interior Affairs reported favorably on the bill. This was in June and again the Senate failed to act on it before adjournment.

Third passage in the lower branch of Congress took place on March 10, 1953. This time the margin was 274 to 138. The Senate combined the Hawaii and Alaska statehood measures and on April 1, 1954, passed the Hawaii-Alaska enabling act, 58 to 28. But, believe it or not, Congress adjourned before the House could act on the combined statehood measure.

Instead of taking up where the previous session had left off, the 84th Congress pretty much let the statehood matter lie dormant. The House on May 10, 1955, voted (218 to 170) to recommit the Hawaii-Alaska bill to the body's Committee on Interior Affairs.

It was in the 85th Congress, of course, that Alaskan statehood was authorized, 208 to 166 in the House, 64 to 20 in the Senate. The appropriate committees in both Houses, after prolonged hearings, again issued favorable reports on statehood for Hawaii and strongly recommended passage of the bill. But nothing happened.

This Congress, the 86th, has the proposal for Hawaiian statehood before it. There is an assumption by the press and by the public that passage of the legislation is assured, that only the time of the action is in doubt. Only occasionally does one find buried deep in some political commentary a hint that Southern opposition to another State may jeopardize passage of the measure.

Alaska, of course, is just one more argument for prompt admission of Hawaii to the Union. The course with respect to the 49th State has been enthusiastically applauded by the American public. On the light side we've been glad to have a State bigger than Texas. It just isn't to be doubted that Hawaii's admittance as our 50th State would be joyfully received.

Our most northerly State has discovered that statehood isn't an unmixed blessing. For one thing, its citizens—there are 215,000 of them—are having to pick up a good many checks that formerly could be passed on to paternal Washington. Would this happen in the case of Hawaii? Probably not because Hawaii, with 2½ times as much population, is far further along in its industrial, political, and educational development.

Just why should the 575,000 people in Hawaii want statehood?

That they do, of course, has been demonstrated numerous times. Every Delegate sent to Washington since 1900 has been ardently pro-statehood. In a plebiscite back in 1940, 67 percent of those voting favored statehood. In 1949 a State constitution was drafted for ratification the following year, 3 to 1 popular vote. In February 1954, 116,000 islanders signed a petition for statehood. It was addressed to the U.S. Senate.

Now for the answer to my question, "Why is statehood wanted?" I draw on a statement in a giant edition of the Honolulu Advertiser prepared for Congress and titled "The Case of Hawaii Statehood:"

"Hawaii's people have fulfilled the obligations of citizenship for more than half a century without enjoying all the privileges.

"They pay taxes as residents of the States do and serve on battlefronts equally, but have no voice in either tax or draft legislation. Taxation without representation violates a basic American precept.

"Statehood for Hawaii will mean—

"1. Full voting representation in Congress.

"2. The right to vote for President.

"3. The right to elect its State officials.

"4. The right to broad lawmaking by its legislature.

"5. The right to choose its own judges.

"6. The right to eliminate overlapping Federal-local authority.

"7. The right to equal share in Federal grants.

"8. The right to a voice in amending the Constitution.

And all these rights will be irrevocable."

Now let's reverse the question: "Why, aside from the fact that we've promised it many times, does the United States need Hawaii as a State?"

The reasons for this are even more numerous and extended than the reasons why the Territory of Hawaii would like to become the State of Hawaii.

Foremost is the fact that Hawaii has an economy of proved soundness. Its gross income approaches \$2 billion a year. In the years since Hawaii became a Territory of the United States (at its request, incidentally), the islanders have paid more than \$2.3 billion in Federal taxes.

Sugar last year was a \$147 million crop. Pineapples, second in importance, brought \$110 million. A record total of 168,000 travelers, a great majority of them from the mainland, spent \$77 million in Hawaii. Honolulu's airport ranked as America's 10th busiest and 1,300 overseas ships dropped anchor in the Honolulu Harbor.

Different from the situation in Alaska, Hawaii has a highly developed system of public schools, with attendance well above the national average. Again different from Alaska, there are modern roads everywhere, water systems, police and fire departments, parks, museums, symphony orchestras, community theater, libraries and numerous churches, 250 on Oahu alone.

Opponents of statehood have resorted to three basic arguments:

1. Distance and noncontiguity.

2. Small population.

3. Doubts about loyalty.

Alaska has shattered the distance argument; both Alaska and California knocked the noncontiguity objection into a cocked hat.

It's true that the individual Hawaiian voter would have a much greater voice than the average New Yorker or Californian in the selection of a U.S. Senator. But it's likewise true that one Nevada voter would have two or three times greater voice than the average Hawaiian. In the case of Alaska, the disparity would be much greater.

Hawaii's record in World War II and the Korean police action proved that its people were as loyal and patriotic as any other section of the entire United States. Though made up of many races, there was no case of espionage or treason during the war years. Hawaiians fought with distinction on every battlefield.

The average citizen of Hawaii is anything but proud of that imported character Harry Bridges, head of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union. He didn't land in Hawaii because he was invited there by the Hawaiians, any more than he settled down on California by invitation of rank-and-file Californians.

There is no denying that Bridges and his union wield a large influence over the island economy. But the same can be said of his influence over the Pacific coast's economy. He must be dealt with by Federal law, or maybe State law. But in its Territorial

status Hawaii has been without power to trim his wings.

So far as Communist infiltration is concerned, Hawaii has passed every test. Congressional committees, Government departments, military leaders, and others have marked her "A" for loyalty to America.

Statehood for Hawaii would be an example for the world of American democracy in action. As the crossroads of the Pacific, Hawaii is a showcase for the Orient and for many other uncommitted peoples of the world. Statehood would make Hawaii a center where Pacific peoples could study American traditions.

For almost as long as Hawaii has been ours by volunteer annexation, the islands have been our principal military bastion in the Pacific. Presently there are five major commands there. Statehood would be a stabilizing influence in that regard.

The people of Hawaii have proved their liking for the United States. They asked for annexation as a Territory and there was at least the implicit promise on our part that statehood would one day be forthcoming.

Our Government was wholly right in its insistence that Hawaii demonstrate its capacity for assuming the obligations and responsibilities of a commonwealth in our family of States. That test has been applied more rigorously than in the case of any Territory ever admitted to the Union, it might be added.

The people of Hawaii are deeply desirous of statehood. The people of the United States have demonstrated many times and in many ways that they want Hawaii admitted to statehood. It remains only for Congress to translate these two demonstrated desires into reality—and the sooner the better.

Someone Must Pay the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of February 10, 1959:

SOMEONE MUST PAY THE BILL

President Eisenhower sent a delicately balanced budget proposal to Congress last month. He warned that the utmost care would be needed to keep the budget from edging upward into the red.

Congress has paid about as much attention to the warning as a youngster who's told not to eat that bar of candy before supper.

In a little more than 24 hours last week, the U.S. Senate topped Eisenhower's budget proposals by \$1,250 million.

The Senate pushed through an omnibus housing bill calling for \$2,675 million—or more than a billion dollars above Ike's budget request.

The next day, the Senate came up with a \$465 million item for airport construction, to be spread over 4 years. Ike had proposed \$200 million.

If its action on these two items is an indication of the spending mood of the Senate this year, then we are headed for a mighty big budget—one that will far exceed our income.

And if that happens, the value of your savings, insurance, social security, and pay-

check will go down, because dollars will lose just a bit more of their worth.

So far, the Senate seems to be in no mood to observe still another Eisenhower request—a to-the-point challenge that Congress provide higher taxes in every spending bill that would unbalance the budget.

Congressmen seem to find it important to increase spending—but they dodge the inescapable need to increase taxes as the spending goes up.

Is that responsible lawmaking?

There's No Scholarship Surplus: It's a Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1959, I introduced H.R. 4220 to provide for a college scholarship program.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial by Dr. Charles A. Bucher, professor of education at New York University. Dr. Bucher's editorial appeared in the November 15, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

THERE'S NO SCHOLARSHIP SURPLUS: IT'S A SHORTAGE

(By Charles A. Bucher)

A New York City newspaper recently published an article entitled "Scholarships Go Begging." The piece played up the fact that a scholarship at Pembroke College was lying idle. This Harriet Rogers Jewett Scholarship is available to an upright needy girl who doesn't smoke. The grant, established in 1932, consists of a \$1,000 endowment, yielding about \$25 per year. Nevertheless Pembroke received hundreds of inquiries from hopeful applicants all over the country.

Deceptive headlines I have gleaned from the Nation's newspapers during the past 12 months read: "Scholarships Wither on the Vine," "Financial Aid Going to Waste," "More Scholarships Not Needed," "Students Ignore Financial Help," "College Education for Free." These journalistic forays into the unknown do not reflect the true picture. I surveyed 135 donors of financial help: colleges, war-service groups, labor organizations, foundations, state governments, benevolent societies and industrial firms. They gave the same answer: scholarships do not go unclaimed.

There are a few restricted scholarships which lie idle. For example, Rutgers University awards a scholarship to a poultry-husbandry major from a county in New Jersey where the poultry business is rapidly disintegrating because of Western competition. It is understandable that no youngster in that area is interested in this occupation.

Then, there is the Lithopolis Scholarship for boys and girls who live in the town of Lithopolis, Ohio (population 350); a fund maintained by a small New England town for the improvement and education of young ladies who have seen better days; and an award that goes to a person with the name of Randolph who desires to study gunsmithing.

The much-publicized, out-of-focus scholarship picture builds up false hopes in the minds of many high-school students aspiring to a sheepskin. When they find out

they have been deceived by some misinformed writer, drastic changes have to be made in their college plans. Dean W. J. Bender, of Harvard, who knows the accurate picture, pointed out that newspapers were doing "a grave disservice to American higher education." He continued, "It simply is not true that lots of scholarships lie idle . . . I know of no college in the country which has any significant number of scholarship funds which are not being used . . ."

Instead of scholarships going begging, there is a need for more. John S. Hafer, dean of admissions at Syracuse University, writes, "This year our scholarship applications increased by approximately 30 percent, so that we received a total of 1,800 scholarship candidates for approximately 275 scholarships. To date, we have overcommitted our funds by approximately \$12,000 and still have 210 extremely worthy candidates who wish to attend the university if financial assistance is given." Colleges in the North and South paint a similar picture.

Scholarships do not go begging. Instead, they are needed in greater numbers if we are to provide college education for all those who can qualify for it.

Should Stop Selling Savings Bonds Until Inflation Halted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include an interesting resolution submitted by Mr. R. W. Robbins, Pratt, Kans., at the American National Cattlemen's convention, Omaha, Nebr., assembled on January 17, 1959:

The thrifty and patriotic citizens who own the vast bulk of the \$42 billion of U.S. savings bonds outstanding are entitled to protection of the value of the principal and interest of their investment in Government bonds.

So far the Government has failed to give them that protection, and those who have held these bonds since the early offering years have lost over 50 percent of their savings in terms of buying power. This record stands as a shocking indictment of the fiscal integrity of our Government.

If this confiscation of savings by inflation continues, these bond owners, who qualify as the most patriotic of our citizens and also as the segment of our citizenry who can least afford to lose will be financially wiped out to the degree they have trusted their Government.

Accordingly we propose that the Government face up to this problem now, and that it take immediate steps to give these frugal and trusting creditors a square deal.

To this end we propose either of the following alternatives:

(1) That the sale of savings bonds be halted until the President has achieved at least a 2-year period of stability in the cost of living; or

(2) That savings bonds issued from February 1 on carry an escalator clause on both principal and interest, giving the owner a guaranteed increase of both interest and principal proportionate to further increases in the cost of living.

As citizens deeply interested in the economic and political independence of the peo-

ple of America, we contend that further temporizing with this grave injustice cannot be tolerated.

We urge that President Eisenhower, in his current stand against reckless and inflationary spending, recognize the significance of this evil, and that he make its correction a project for immediate action. We suggest that such prompt action on his part would do much to halt the "flight from the dollar" that is so apparent in the stock exchanges and trading markets of the Nation.

Address of Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson Before Texas State Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last the senior Senator from Texas, Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, made a memorable address at the luncheon meeting of the Texas State Society.

Honored at the luncheon were their Excellencies, the Ambassador from Spain, the Ambassador from France and the Ambassador from Mexico, and members of their families.

Senator JOHNSON's speech was such a splendid contribution to our understanding and good relations with these countries that I am asking leave to have it printed here:

This is a pleasant occasion and, in my opinion, a significant one as well.

As a longtime member of the Texas State Society, I am most pleased to be here. And to our honored guests I would say, sincerely and from the heart: Welcome, our friends from Mexico; welcome, our friends from France; welcome, our friends from Spain.

As the official representatives in America of three great nations whose flags once floated over the land of Texas, I want you to know we are happy you are here to break bread with us and to enjoy a period of friendly companionship on this Sabbath Day.

You are gracious to have come. You are triply welcome.

In honor of this occasion, our program committee asked that I speak today on "Our Spanish, French, and Mexican Heritage."

It says something for the character of our State that such a topic should be assigned to a man named JOHNSON.

If we are some day privileged to honor our considerable debt to the British—who built our State capital and developed much of our West—an Irishman such as BOB CASEY will probably be handed the speaking assignment.

There is to me something deeply moving and deeply meaningful in the fact that you of Mexico and France and Spain should meet with us of Texas in the Capital City of the United States.

It is a long way, in time and in distance, from the Texas in which I grew up to the great city in which we find ourselves today. Texas is a State where many, many place names and many, many person names may be traced back to the heritage that came down from France and Spain and Mexico—all powers in the world of 1959.

And this city of Washington—not so very many years ago a fever-ridden village on the banks of the Potomac—has become a place where men and women cope daily with problems in the successful solution of which

the free people of all the world have a vital interest.

We owe much to the heritage of our past. Yet, I cannot today speak of our heritage in the past tense. Nor can I speak of it in the sense of a one-way debt.

As Spain and France and Mexico each meant much to Texas in the past, so also did Texas mean much to the national experience of each of those nations.

The lure of Texas—the dream of the seven cities of gold on the Texas prairies—did much to stimulate in both Spain and France the force of their periods of great vigor and adventure and strength.

Texas, in centuries past, was for men of many nations a new horizon of hope and promise and opportunity. Today it is my strong conviction that we are returning on the cycle of history to such a time again.

Coronado, Cabeza de Vaca, DeSoto, LaSalle, and others who opened Texas were unaware that their explorations had scarcely penetrated the vastness of the American West—and that four centuries later we are only now coming to the time when the potential of the American West and of Mexico can be fulfilled.

The demands of our century leave us with no position but to build in the West a new capital of opportunity and strength for free men.

Our position today is comparable to that of the pioneers of our own country, who came into a wilderness brooding not upon the dangers they faced but joyously contemplating the opportunities they saw on the other side of danger.

With freedom as their guide and faith in the future as the force that impelled them constantly onward, those pioneers conquered the wilderness. They beat down the dangers. They embraced the opportunities. Time may have obscured our memory of these facts. But the facts remain unchanged.

We should build monuments to the past—but they should be monuments which recapture the values of the past and focus them upon the realities of the present.

One of these monuments could be the Big Bend National Park. When men first dreamed of this park, they thought of it as an international reservation where the people of Mexico and the United States could mingle freely—enjoying in common the rich beauties of the land.

I would hope that dream could be revived. I would hope that the park could lie on both sides of the border—as a symbol that our border is in territory only and not in friendship and good will.

It would be a potent force in advancing the Western Hemispheric community.

The hope of our hemisphere and the hope of free men everywhere is this: That we may have the wisdom to see in many lands greater promise than now meets the eye.

Spain, France, and Mexico were old before Texas was known. All had achieved greatness before our own Nation came into being. But today in those countries—and many more—there is a new surge of confidence and life and zest and determination. We, as Americans, are challenged to match it. In that thought is the special pride of this gathering today.

We from Texas realize ours is a young State and a strong State. A State now emerging into the fulfillment of a great promise.

We realize even more that these lands from whence came our origins are now once again young with us, and that the world is young together.

We are moving to a new world. Not new on the maps, but new in men's minds and lives and dreams.

We are hastening to the day when we shall together cross the plains of the future to seek, and I believe find, treasures greater than the fabled cities of gold. Our heritage is not of the past. Rather, it is a common

inheritance of a common future, a future of peace, a future of freedom, a future of opportunities unlimited.

This new era—and we are already beyond the threshold—can be, will be, an era of new and higher standards, of new and greater accomplishments, of new and wider potentials.

My friends, fellow Texans, and honored guests, we are fortunate to be living at the beginning of such an age as the one now before us. Our thoughts, our decisions, our actions, can shape the destiny of men for all time to come. This is the challenge. And there is the opportunity.

I like to think of the answer that my friend and truly great American, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, gave recently when a reporter asked him what was the most interesting time he had known during his 92 years of life.

"Why," said Senator GREEN, "it's right now." Let this wise man's words speak for all of us.

To the Ambassadors who are our guests, I would say on behalf of all Texas that, next to being freemen and Americans, Texans are most proud of their traditions of character.

We thank you for the pride of the Spanish, for the love of liberty of the French, and for the courage of our great neighbor of Mexico. Without these traits, Texas could not be Texas. Texans would not be Texans.

Air Force's New Agency—ADSID

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article on the new management agency established by the Air Force, as prepared for publication in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal by Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, USAF, Commander of the Air Defense Systems Integration Division, Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.:

ADSID—AIR DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION DIVISION

The Air Force has established a new management agency called the Air Defense Systems Integration Division (ADSID). Its purpose is to coordinate air defense planning, programing, and implementation in accordance with Air Force responsibilities. The organization is located at Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.

Air Force Regulation 20-13 prescribes the mission of ADSID "• • • provide the necessary managerial guidance for command action required to insure an effective, properly time-phased, and technically compatible integrated air defense mission system, in accordance with approved plans, requirements, and procedures." The air defense mission system consists of all weapons systems, electronic environment systems, and support systems employed in air defense.

To insure that the Nation possesses the best feasible air defense capability, special effort is required to integrate the various and complex components of the air defense mission system. In the past, the operating command could accomplish the integration by using men as conversion links in utilizing the separate components; however, the required increase in automaticity largely elim-

inates the human conversion links and replaces them with mechanical and electronic devices. Effective air defense now demands technically compatible and highly automatic components, designed, developed, produced, and installed to mesh with the requirements for an overall integrated system.

The air defense mission system must be continuously operational; therefore, time-phasing of changes or additions, and component relationships, are exacting stipulations. System integration has become a very intricate mixture of operational requirements, technical development and logistic support. Involved in this mixture are the efforts of the scientific community and industry, as well as various functional military organizations and other Government agencies. Coordination of activities to achieve air defense systems integration does indeed require a special management effort—an effort specialized and detailed to the point of being inappropriate to the Pentagon policy level, yet beyond the assigned functional responsibilities of the commands involved.

In July 1957 the Air Force established the air defense systems management office (ADSMO) as a joint ARDC-AMC-ADC organization to provide the managerial guidance for integration of air defense systems. Experience resulted in the decision to reinforce ADSMO, redesignate it as the Air Defense Systems Integration Division and support the organization with a technical group in the form of a central contractor. In March 1958 Secretary James H. Douglas enunciated the concept and basic policies by stating:

"For the past number of years the Air Force has been vitally concerned regarding the difficult task of integrating both the ground environment and the weapons associated with the ground environment to insure that this Nation will possess the best possible air defense capability. Proposals were made over a year ago on the organization of an integrated command structure of personnel from ADC, AMC, and ARDC to form the nucleus of an air defense team which could be supported by a civilian technical systems management team.

"To further improve the status of this Air Force organization which is now called the Air Defense Systems Integration Division, the Air Force has appointed Maj. Gen. K. P. Bergquist to command this organization. In this capacity, General Bergquist will have ample authority comparable to that enjoyed by the commander of the ballistic missile division in his field, to make final decisions for the Air Force on the integration of the air defense mission systems. He will have effective control of the funds necessary to discharge the system engineering responsibility of his office and to implement his decisions."

On March 31, 1958, the Air Force published AFR 20-13 prescribing policy and responsibilities for the formation, organization, and operation of ADSID. The new organization is a joint office manned by AMC, ARDC and ADC. The Commander ARDC is the Executive Agent. The ADSID is charged with analysis, guidance and monitorship, but not with responsibility for implementation of individual systems. Such implementation remains charged to appropriate commands in accordance with their assigned functions. The senior ADSID representatives of AMC, ARDC and ADC function as ADSID staff officers and also as senior members of the respective commander's staff.

The regulation assigned the following tasks to ADSID: (1) Assemble and maintain a current master plan and schedule for development and implementation of approved additions and improvements to the air defense mission system; (2) assemble and maintain a current set of individual system performance specifications; (3) conduct analysis and

initiate necessary actions or corrective measures to insure compatibility and effectiveness of components, systems and supporting activities; (4) monitor progress of actions and insure coordination, with respect to development, implementation, plans, schedules and funding; (5) assist ADC, ARDC and AMC in forming their plans as they pertain to the air defense mission; (6) develop test concepts to be used as a basis for system testing programs, and (7) evaluate requirements, established by other agencies, which affect the air defense mission system.

On July 30, 1958, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology entered into a contract with the USAF to serve as "principal systems adviser" on an interim basis to the ADSID. MIT proposed that the support should ultimately be given by a separate nonprofit organization, and agreed to sponsor such a corporation and support it until it could operate independently. As a part of the agreement, it was planned that those Lincoln Laboratory people directly engaged in ADSID support would be transferred to the new corporation as rapidly as possible and that the new corporation should seek a direct contract with the Air Force as soon as this could be arranged. The MIT proposal was accepted by Secretary Douglas.

The new systems engineering organization was formally incorporated as the MITRE Corporation. Heading the Board of Trustees is H. Rowan Galtier, Jr., chairman of the board of the Ford Foundation. The Executive Committee is chaired by William A. Webster, executive vice president of the New England Electric System. Included in the Board of Trustees are such well known individuals as Luis W. Alvarez, Charles A. Coolidge, Dr. Julius A. Stratton, and Robert C. Sprague. The president of MITRE is Mr. C. W. Halligan, formerly director of military engineering at the Bell Telephone Laboratories.

The systems integration task centers around the point at which decisions are made to introduce changes and additions to the air defense mission system. The principal function is to insure that the resulting system works and that it—or major segments—can be turned over to the operating commander on a specific date.

Solving the many and varied integration problems requires the utmost in teamwork. Scientific-industry-military team effort is applied to the problems to make thorough analyses, carefully balance the operational-development-logistic factors, advise as to priorities of effort within budget limitations, and prepare the managerial guidance required for coordinated action " * * * to insure an effective, properly time-phased, and technically compatible integrated air defense mission system."

Workmen's Benefit Fund Celebrates Its 75th Anniversary Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1884, a small group of German-American immigrants founded the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America, to provide mutual help in times of economic crises. Since that time, this fine fraternal order has grown to a membership of 58,000 in 26 States.

This year, the Workmen's Benefit Fund celebrates its 75th anniversary with a series of outstanding events, including its 75th anniversary national convention which will be held in Atlantic City, N.J., from June 15, 1959, to June 21, 1959, and a diamond jubilee celebration which will be held in New York City on Sunday, October 18, 1959. I am very pleased that this event will be held at a site, in my district and take this opportunity to welcome the officers and the members of the Workmen's Benefit Fund and to wish them success on the occasion of their 75th anniversary year.

Forty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I returned from Rochester, Sunday, to find 3 feet of water in my basement, and, yesterday, while others were paying tribute to the courageous people of Lithuania on the 41st anniversary of their independence, I was wading, barefoot, through my basement, in rather frantic pursuit of a number of trunks and footlockers which were floating about.

However, I do want to join with my colleagues in wishing Godspeed to the people of Lithuania in the fulfillment of their dream of once again, someday, breathing the fresh air of liberty and democratic self-government.

For century after century, Lithuania has been subjected to conquest—by Teutonic knights, Tartars, Russian czars, Nazis, and now, since 1940, by the Red terror which rules the Kremlin. From East and West alike, the power hungry of Europe have trampled back and forth across the face of this tiny nation with almost sickening regularity, pillaging and plundering, terrorizing and murdering as only ruthless barbarians are able. Yet, all of the bloodshed and brutality which has been the recurring fate of the people of Lithuania, has not, for all of its physical violence, been able to destroy the will to freedom and independence which has become their hallmark.

Forty-one years ago, at the height of the Russian Revolution, Lithuania declared her independence from the disintegrating Russian Empire, and for a little over two decades she struggled to maintain her status as a free, democratic nation. But from the very beginning her existence was a terrifyingly precarious one, for she was wedged squarely between two growing young totalitarian giants, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, and both were waiting only for that moment when the fortunes of history would present one of them with a chance to again engulf this little nation. The brief alliance between Stalin and Hitler gave the Soviets the opportunity for which they had been waiting, and by

the summer of 1940, Lithuania was once more in the iron grip of the Kremlin.

Almost 19 years have now passed since that fateful summer, and virtually every device known to the twisted despotic mind has been employed in an attempt to destroy the passion for freedom, the deep-rooted national consciousness, and the religious fervor of the people of Lithuania. But love of God, of country, and of liberty continues to burn as brightly as ever in the hearts and minds of Lithuanians everywhere—proof positive that such inborn yearnings will never be extinguished by the godless brutes of this or any other generation.

As they celebrate the 41st anniversary of their independence, I salute the brave and wonderful people of Lithuania, and I join with them in their prayers for a better, more peaceful world tomorrow.

International Crew Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, throughout history sports have contributed to a better understanding between nations. And, I believe, competition in sports has and will continue to ease the strain of international tensions.

Examples along this line are the crew races in London and Moscow last summer. I am pleased that a crew representing my State of Washington perhaps brought a bit of better understanding by its members' conduct, their sportsmanship, and ability, especially when they were in Russia.

Now there is a movement to return the hospitality accorded this crew by extending an invitation to crews representing the U.S.S.R. to come to Seattle, Wash., to participate in similar competition.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a resolution unanimously passed by the Washington State House of Representatives, requesting the cooperation of the Secretary of State in assisting to bring about the contest I have mentioned.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the University of Washington is a recognized leader of the world in all phases of eight-oared crew racing, its oarsmen, coaches, shells, methods, its consistency in winning national, international, and Olympic championships, all attest to its universal preeminence in one of the few remaining sports untainted by any touch of professionalism; and

Whereas in furtherance of this highly desirable sport, the University of Washington crew accepted an invitation to compete against the crews of other nations at London and Moscow and was accorded full hospitality by the Governments of the host nations; and

Whereas officials of the civic promotional organization known as Greater Seattle, Inc., have proposed to the U.S. Department of State that the University of Washington re-

ciprocate with a like invitation to crews representing the Soviet Union to compete with the University of Washington and other invited American crews as part of the 1959 Seattle Seafair celebration; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Government and particularly the Secretary of State of the United States consider and give the greatest amount of cooperation possible to the submitted plans and assist in bringing about the realization of this highly desirable international contest; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Members of the U.S. Congress representing the State of Washington.

Communism Brings New Dark Ages to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in Red China today we see the tragic picture of an entire civilization being uprooted and destroyed, a panorama of pillage on a scale never known previously in the range of modern history.

Details of this story are presented dramatically in Edward Hunter's new documentary, "Black Book on Red China." I ask that I may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of that scholarly work, as prepared by Mr. Lawrence Sullivan, the Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives. Mr. Sullivan's review is as follows:

COMMUNISM BRINGS NEW DARK AGES TO CHINA
(By Lawrence Sullivan, Coordinator of Information, U.S. House of Representatives)

WASHINGTON.—In China today roughly one-fourth of the world's total population is being starved and ruthlessly destroyed by communism.

Only fanatical class hatreds motivate the firing squads which enforce the made-in-Moscow whims of Mao Tse-tung.

A great and bountiful civilization, dating almost from the beginnings of recorded history, is being plowed under by psychopathic vandals, as a gigantic ant hill is leveled by the horse's hoof.

Full documentation of this appalling human tragedy is presented by Edward Hunter in his "Black Book on Red China," published by the Bookmaller, New York 16, N.Y., at \$2 retail.

The story is told largely from Communist sources on the China mainland, as collated by International Research on Communist Techniques, Inc. Distribution is sponsored by the Committee of One Million, 17 Park Avenue, New York 17, N.Y., which is organized in all our 53 States and Territories, to block admission of Red China into the United Nations.

China's population, now more than 600 million, increases by 13 million a year, net. But only about 1 million of this new labor force are put to work each year in the Moscow-planned industrial development program. The other 12 million are added each year to

the roving bands of hungry, landless vagrants, human degradation on a scale never before known on God's good earth.

"Under these unbearable conditions, people began to migrate in droves, hoping against hope to find something not quite so awful somewhere else. Farmers roamed into the cities, and city folk wandered into the country."

Such is the 10-year flower of Mao Tse-tung's progressive agrarian reform movement of 1940-45, which promised "land for the peasants, land for the tenant farmers, a plot of land for every Chinese family that tilled the soil."

It was precisely these promises which established communism in China. But today the farmers of China have been relegated to the craven status of serfs, more exploited than the serfs of czarist Russia ever were.

Roughly 500 million of these new made serfs now are shackled to the commune farm system. Before the Red wreckers moved in the average Chinese farmer had roughly 2½ acres for his family of five. Today, each prisoner in the communes gets the average yield of only 1.3 acres for his family of five. This means that under communism the living standard of the average Chinese farmer already has been cut in half, in 10 years.

How many thousands of times farmers, at the end of their endurance, rioted and even killed the intruders; then fled into the valleys and hills to form little guerrilla bands will never be known.

But these scattered defenders could never consolidate their anti-Communist insurrection.

The Chinese on Taiwan already were having some success in advising and supplying these solitary and struggling guerrilla bands when the war began in Korea (June 1950). The U.S. Fleet, hurriedly ordered to blockade the China coast, was somehow also instructed to cut off help to the mainland insurgents. That was the end of effective peasant resistance to communism on the mainland, almost precisely on the timetable foreseen in 1948 by some of the professors in Johns Hopkins University.

Red China actively encourages freedom of religion so long as the churches serve as a conscious patriotic movement. From Peiping, patriotism is defined officially by Chang Chih-yi, Minister for the United Front: "To be patriotic one must love socialism and the New China under the leadership of the Chinese Community Party." For Peiping, religion is that simple.

Humiliation and degradation visited upon both Chinese and foreign missionaries since 1945 is a story of savagery without parallel in modern history. The wrath of the Reds fell alike upon Christians, Moslems, and Buddhists. As long-imprisoned clergymen approached death in their putrid cells, they would be put on stretchers and rushed across the border to Hong Kong, so it could not be said that they had actually died on Chinese soil.

Red China's principal source of foreign exchange is the narcotics traffic. Hong Kong documents a single offer of 500 tons of opium to Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd. The offer was rejected, although Peiping had guaranteed delivery under protection of the Red army to Hong Kong. Reputable financial circles estimate that the Moscow-Peiping axis currently clears about one million U.S. dollars a week through Swiss banks to Soviet spies and narcotics pushers in the West.

Under Chiang Kai-shek, the Nationalist Government for 25 years had persistently discouraged poppy cultivation, almost to the point of extinction as a source of exports. The resumption of this nefarious trade by Peiping has restored the vast poppy fields of China.

One seizure of Chinese heroin in Switzerland in the summer of 1958 was valued at

\$50 million. Three peddlers were convicted, and one Swiss agent committed suicide after the trial. Another Peking shipment of raw opium seized in Bangkok measured 35 tons.

Peiping consistently directs huge shipments of opium and heroin to Indonesia and Malaya, to help break down nationalist pride by developing a steadily growing army of dope addicts—a very practical help to the roving bands of Red fifth columnists dispatched earlier to the struggling independent countries of Southeast Asia.

Before all the world, the aggressive Communist dope monopoly in Peking is the true measure of Mao Tse-tung's high moral purpose toward China and humanity. Now the world is urged to make this frightful engine of human depravity an integral part of the United Nations.

Perfecting czarish Russia's advanced work in animal psychology, Red China applied Ivan Pavlov's studies in conditioned reflexes on a scale previously undreamed of in the world of science. The 20th century's new scientific terror is the result—brainwashing.

An animal can be induced to follow its master's orders unthinkingly. Lenin thought man could be made to react the same way, once indoctrinated with the appropriate reflexes. Any individual would simply have to be trained to react to a slogan, the way a circus animal responds to a signal—anything from a word to the sound of a whip.

Mao Tse-tung feverishly embraced this established theory of animal psychology and applied it to the entire animal farm of Red China.

Nor does the thought of war alarm official Peiping. Mao was a visitor to Moscow in November 1957 for the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. Mao boasted that if war destroyed even half the population of China, 300 million would be left.

To understand Communist aims, one must be familiar with the special meanings of Communist code words. "Peace" in the Communist lexicon means unquestioning acceptance of Communist disciplines by all. "Aggression" means only one thing—opposition to Communist Party directives and programs. "Learning" signifies knowledge and theory not in conflict with Communist dogma. "Progressive" means pro-Communist ideas in non-Communist countries. In official Communist tracts this word is used interchangeably with "liberal."

During the winter holidays Chinese high school students are mobilized to assist on the collective farms. Illustrating this inspired patriotism, the Chungking Daily reported on February 17, 1958: "Students of 23 schools, including Chungking No. 1 Polytechnic School, No. 1 High School, and No. 4 Girls' High School, gathered a total of more than 6 million patties of manure for the village."

Such is the more abundant life, the affluent society, in Red China today.

Is Earning Out of Date?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of February 13, 1959:

IS EARNING OUT OF DATE?

A magazine for parents and teachers says the old idea that children ought to earn their allowance money is out of date.

"It would be false," says the magazine article, "to pretend that a 7-year-old, or even a 12-year-old actually earns his cash through household chores. That is why the idea of the unearned allowance has gradually developed."

The article goes on to include in a child's allowance the money that the youngster spends on bus fare, school lunches, school supplies, and other necessities.

That's not quite cricket. Most parents will agree that a child has a right to expect these things. And most parents provide 'em. But a lot of parents still feel that the money spent on luxuries and fun—candy, movies, dates, and such—ought to be earned, at least in part. They feel this helps teach children that money represents effort—that we must work for the things we want.

"We must train ourselves to remember," says the article, "that each child is entitled to his allowance in exactly the same way that he is entitled to the other things we give him."

Do you suppose this is why so many young folks figure the world owes them a living?

New Look at Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Washington was recently the object of an in-pouring of many thousands of persons directly concerned with the future of rural electrification. It was my pleasure to visit with many of these fine men and women who have dedicated their lives to the problems of making life easier for the farm families of the Nation.

Recently, the Lincoln Journal, of Lincoln, Nebr., published an editorial on the subject of REA's and their future. Without, at this time, going into the merits or possible drawbacks to the plan they suggest, I would like to place that article in the RECORD that my colleagues might read it and perhaps benefit from such a reading. The editorial follows:

NEW LOOK AT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Nebraska's rural electric leaders meeting in Lincoln could count more influential friends than they have had in some time.

A number of new Congressmen and Senators were elected last year with the blessing, if not the active help, of the rural power people. Veteran legislators, such as Senator GEORGE ARKEN, Republican, of Vermont, have set out with renewed vigor to help the rural electrification movement.

Nebraska's own Senator CARL CURTIS gladdened the rural folks by introducing a bill to make the Rural Electrification Administration an independent agency, free of the Department of Agriculture, and to keep able Dave Hamill as its head. Senator CURTIS is to be commended for this move.

Such friendship for rural electrification is completely warranted. Probably no other single program has done so much to improve the convenience and productivity of rural America.

Without Government help, rural areas might never have had electricity. Costs of

electric service there increase because of long lines needed to serve few customers.

This might be a time, then, for rural electric leaders to bow their necks and resist any effort to change their present access to 2 percent Government loans. They might be successful—for a time.

TIME FOR A PLAN

On the other hand, this might be a good time for the rural people to come up with a reasonable, workable plan that will ease their dependence on Government financing. Official opinion is not likely forever to be so favorable to a Government-assisted rural electric program.

This is particularly true while the Government pays more for the money it borrows than the 2 percent interest it charges the rural systems for use of the same money. Taxpayers will not support indefinitely this subsidy. Growing opposition from private power interests and other groups could eventually invoke measures that would seriously hamper the rural power movement.

Leaders and friends of rural electrification would help themselves and the Nation by getting together now to reshape their program in keeping with changing times.

They should come up with a plan that recognizes the continuing need for help in some sparsely settled rural areas, in line with the original concept of the REA.

They should also recognize that in many cases expanding cities, increased rural residence of nonfarmers and the growth of industry in rural areas have made electrical service in the countryside a self-supporting enterprise.

NEW APPROACH OFFERED

Therefore, the Journal suggests a plan based on this principle: A graduated scale of interest rates on Government loans increasing in proportion with the density of electrical service in a rural district—determined by the number of customers or, preferably, the amount of power sold by the district per mile of line operated.

This would mean that districts in sparsely settled, strictly rural regions could continue to get 2-percent Government loans. They are the systems that need help.

More fortunate districts, with ever-expanding service, would pay proportionately higher interest rates. The highest should be comparable to that paid by private utilities, municipalities, or other public power agencies which do not have access to Government loans. These districts could either pay this rate to the Government or go into the private money markets.

The average rate of interest by all the rural systems should equal the Government's cost of borrowing money plus administration of new loans. Thus, any subsidies to low-density districts would, in effect, be paid by the more fortuitous districts, rather than by the Government.

INCREASED EFFICIENCY

The plan also should outline programs by which all rural districts can cut their costs of doing business. This would call for the best possible management, merger of small districts, campaigns to boost power sales in periods of low power use, and, perhaps, a statewide engineering service to give top quality technical help to all districts.

With this program of graduated interest rates and improved efficiency, the rural power systems over the Nation could move toward their own credit institution. This could be free of the Government and operated by the borrowers themselves, much like the Federal Land Bank.

In the opinion of this newspaper, a detailed plan based on these principles would be of long-range benefit. It might be a subject for discussion at next week's convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association in Washington, D.C.

Human Values in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is an excellent and timely editorial by David Lawrence, for the information of my colleagues:

HUMAN VALUES

(By David Lawrence)

President Eisenhower was asked at his press conference last week whether, in view of his limited recommendation on school aid, he had decided that "it's more dangerous to unbalance the budget now than to run the risk of more inadequately educated citizens later." The interrogator suggested that Mr. Eisenhower differentiate between "difficult fiscal values and human values."

The President said, first of all, that he isn't sure there can be such a differentiation. He then added:

"The human values in America are not going to be promoted unless we are sane and sensible in our fiscal policies . . . I know of nothing that could injure more the great population—174 million people—we have got, than to allow the budgetary process to get out of control, fiscal measures going loosely, in such a way that inflation would absolutely be inevitable."

There seems no question but that every lobby is pressing Congress today for more funds. Each claims the right to assert that "human values" are above all other values.

But what really are the overriding values in the controversy over whether the budget shall continue to go unbalanced? Oddly enough, there isn't any agitation for a surplus, to be used to pay off debt. The drive seems to be to spend more than the Government takes in. Nor are there any signs yet of proposals for higher taxes so as to get the necessary revenues to balance the budget or to meet any increase in expenditures.

Are those "spenders" who really are pursuing a course that could lead to national bankruptcy thinking at all of basic "human values"? Are they aware of what has happened in past history as governments have spent money—and printed more and more paper money—for expenditures that seemingly were to benefit the community, but resulted later only in hardships to the individual and indescribable tragedy to the populace as a whole?

We should reread the story of what happened to paper money during the French Revolution in the 18th century and more recently in the 1920's in Germany, when the Weimar Republic went on the rocks. This writer happened to be in Berlin in 1923 when a taxi ride within the city was paid for by many millions of paper marks. In 1914 the exchange rate had been 4 marks to the dollar. By 1919 it was 30 marks to the dollar, and 4 years later 2 billion marks to the dollar. The German monetary unit had dropped to the point where the mark wasn't worth the paper it was printed on.

And what followed this period of economic and financial chaos during which the cost of living rose to fantastic heights, property values were destroyed, and widespread unemployment brought political upheavals? On the crest of that wave of discontent, which lasted several years, Hitler came into power and was welcomed by the people as a savior. Thus are dictatorships born and human values destroyed.

But it will be said, "It can't happen here." No bigger illusion could be concocted by a wishful-thinking generation. No nation is safe from financial danger if it ignores the laws of arithmetic. The people will not indefinitely retain their confidence in the monetary unit if they come to believe that the Government is wasteful and does not intend to honor its obligations.

There are disquieting symptoms already visible. Our own Government has been trying lately to convert its relatively short-term bonds into longer-term securities. The public balks. The last offering ran into difficulties, as more holders of maturing securities than had been expected demanded cash rather than accept an exchange even at a very attractive interest rate. The holders of securities showed uneasiness about the future value of the bonds they would be buying today. It is important for Congress, by a sound fiscal policy, to do at once the things that will remove such fears.

Confidence is an intangible. Nobody knows how long it will remain, and nobody can predict when a "run" on a monetary unit's value actually will begin.

There's only one safe course—to consider the human values of the millions upon millions of citizens whose fixed incomes and whose savings will be impaired if the Congress fails to heed the age-old laws of thrift. The legislators must soon convince the country that they do not intend to allow the public debt to be increased.

At a time when the Nation's safety and perhaps its survival requires more than \$42 billion for armament every year, we must begin to realize that we cannot have all the "butter" we want when we need so much to pay for the "guns."

No government—any more than an individual—can long continue to spend more than it receives. To do so would destroy not merely all hope of adding the very human values that the spenders keep publicizing in their unwitting drive to bankrupt the Treasury but also the basic human values already imbedded in American life.

Resolution Denouncing Showing of Soviet Propaganda Films

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution passed by the Members of the House of Representatives of the New Hampshire General Court on February 11, 1959, denouncing the showing of any Soviet film which contains propaganda either directly or hidden:

Whereas the U.S. State Department has been primarily responsible for the United States entering into a pact with the United Soviet Socialist Republics, providing for cultural exchanges, including the exchange of commercial motion pictures between the two countries to be shown in commercial theaters; and

Whereas the Soviet films may contain clever, subtle Red Russian propaganda: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the House of Representatives of the New Hampshire General Court, go on record as denouncing the showing of any Soviet film

which contains propaganda either directly or hidden; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request the screening or selection board set up by said pact to take cognizance of the possibility of such propaganda and refuse to accept any film which may contain such propaganda; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to our Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

FRANCIS W. TOLMAN,

Clerk.

Battle of Spenders and Savers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the position of the Federal budget appears destined to hold the center of attention throughout this Congress.

There are those of us who believe we should reduce unnecessary expenditures, provide adequate funds to insure our national defense and strive to live within our national means. On the other hand there is the philosophy of continued high level spending in spite of an unbalanced budget.

David Lawrence has recently drawn the line between the "spenders and savers" in one of his syndicated columns. His comments follow:

BATTLE OF SPENDERS AND SAVERS—DEMOCRATIC PARTY VIEWED AS FAVORING POLICIES LEADING TO A 10-CENT DOLLAR

The battle is on between the spenders and the savers. The Democratic Party has taken its position in favor of an unbalanced budget, deficit spending, and policies that could lead to a 10-cent dollar.

The Democratic advisory council, in a statement unanimously approved by its members, claims that "the new Republican budget comes close to being a fraud on the American people. . . . The individual budget items and the related legislative program are an intricate combination of defeat, deception, and denial."

This is strong language from Democrats who, during the 1952 presidential campaign, protested the alleged characterization of the Democratic Party as the party of treason on the Communist issue.

But apparently, in employing such words as "fraud" and "deception" in a description of the Republican Party today, and particularly in applying the comment to a message delivered to Congress by the President of the United States, no holds now are to be barred on the use of invective.

Among the listed sponsors of the statement of the Democratic advisory council are former President Truman and Adlai Stevenson, as well as Governors Williams, of Michigan, and Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, and former Governor Harriman, of New York. Members of Congress on the council who approved the statement are Senators KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of the House, and Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of the Senate, resent any implication that the Democratic Party is the party of the spenders. Naturally, as southern conservatives, they oppose any such classification. But party policy apparently is being made by the Democrats from the North, where they have been winning their big majorities. Here is the

Democratic Party doctrine as the advisory council sees it:

"The new budget shows, above all, that in the GOP administration there are no modern Republicans and no conservative Republicans but only men who put pocketbooks before people. This the people of the United States will surely remember. What is bad for people is also bad for pocketbooks, both private and public"

"Nothing better symbolizes Republican attitudes than the one big increase in the budget. That is for interest charges which rise from \$7.5 billion in the present fiscal year to \$8.1 billion in the next. This is exclusively the result of the increase in interest rates. The only people who benefit in a big way from the new budget are those who have money and lend it to the Government."

But are the many millions of persons who buy Government savings bonds to be persuaded in the future to buy them if the interest rates are presumably to be reduced—if the Democrats have their way—while the securities of well-established companies pay a much higher interest rate? The reason for the higher interest payments is that the national debt is increasing and investors are, in effect, demanding an interest rate on Government bonds comparable to some degree with other bonds.

The statement goes on to lament the fact that the States and cities are assuming their local responsibilities and implies that, because they are increasing their debt, the Federal Government should do more and more to relieve them of their obligations. But the key paragraph in the statement about the budget reads as follows:

"National defense outlays are reduced, and reduced even more when proper allowance is made for price changes."

What, indeed, is bringing about those price changes? Monopolistic power exercised by nationwide unions which, by their extortions at the bargaining table, set the pattern that leaders of other unions feel they must match if they are to be reelected to their posts.

The Democratic Party advisory council apparently favors more and more spending, more and more deficits, and more and more inflation. This, they argue, is what the people voted for last November. The Eisenhower administration disagrees and, if it is wrong in its fiscal policy, there will be a chance in 1960 to resolve the issue.

Meanwhile, there must be tens of millions of citizens whose income is from the money they have saved and invested or from retirement and pension funds. Also, many millions of persons, including widows and orphans, are living on the proceeds of insurance policies. These and others on fixed incomes may soon have to decide where the deception begins and ends as they try to compare the purchasing power of their dollar today with what it will be in November 1960, if the budget isn't balanced.

In Praise of John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is repugnant to me that those presidential aspirants in the Democrat Party of the other body, who just a few days ago were most critical of Secretary John Foster Dulles, saying "we should get off dead-center" and he is "too rigid and inflexible," are now adding their voices to the

praises of his efforts. It would seem either that the gentlemen from Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Missouri, and the distinguished Majority Leader did not mean what they said and have been saying for years about Secretary Dulles' statesmanship, or their statements now might reasonably be interpreted to mean that they are not quite so sincere as they should be.

The following is a very perceptive and objective résumé of the accomplishments of our great Secretary of State, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 16:

IN THE FRONT LINE OF FREEDOM FIGHT

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

John Foster Dulles has for 2 years remained at his post, working with an intensity that defies a time schedule, disregarding medical advice to let up and take things easier. His spirit has been that of the frontline soldier, who, after being wounded, fights on to his last cartridge and hand grenade.

No man in public life is indispensable. But the incapacitation of Mr. Dulles, in this year when storm clouds seem especially thick over Berlin, would be a grievous loss to the United States and to the entire free world. The trip to Western Europe, from which he returned just before his recent operation in Walter Reed Hospital, is one of many that infused an element of coordinated firmness into NATO.

Like most strong men, Mr. Dulles has aroused his full share of antagonism. Indeed some of his critics seem disposed to make him the scapegoat for everything that has gone wrong with the world since the Second World War, notably for the inevitable consequences of the growth in power of Soviet communism which the Roosevelt administration so fatuously promoted.

Undoubtedly faults of manner, timing, and phrasing can be laid to the account of Mr. Dulles. But if the Secretary finds time, during his enforced rest in the hospital, to turn from the immediate preoccupation of the looming Berlin and German crisis and to look back on the record of his 6 years in office, he will be entitled to pride in the thought of a very responsible and difficult task most ably performed.

USUALLY CORRECT

He has been right in his championship of German rearmament, right in regarding and treating Chancellor Adenauer as a key figure in the Western alliance, right in his aversion to the use of force in the Suez Canal controversy, right in refusing to kowtow to Red China, to sacrifice friends and allies in the Orient in the vain hope of appeasing enemies. He has been everlastingly right in his appreciation of the true nature and designs and tactics of Soviet communism and in his recognition of the need for a long-range policy of pertinacity, constancy, and fortitude in meeting this peril.

The full stature of John Foster Dulles will only be recognized, one suspects, when he is obliged to quit the public service permanently. It will take a very big man in terms of judgment, experience, firmness, and consistency to fill his shoes. It was no small achievement to have preserved peace with honor during these last 6 troubled years—especially with jittery backseat drivers sometimes shouting contradictory admonitions in his ear.

The views of some possible aspirants, in both parties, for Mr. Dulles' post are enough to send chills down the spine of anyone who regards appeasement, even if disguised by some nice word like "flexibility," as very bad medicine for the prospects of peace and of national honor. For as soon as Dulles' political critics got beyond generalities into the

field of positive alternatives all sorts of speculators begin to loom up: cloudy and dangerous ideas of German neutralization, abandonment of Formosa and whatnot.

AUSTRIA AND CHINA

It is not true, as is sometimes charged, that Mr. Dulles is inflexible in the sense of an ostrichlike unwillingness to face realities or to negotiate with hostile governments when negotiations offer some prospect of advantage. The general evacuation of Austria was arranged during his term of office. He has waived protocol and carried on informal talks with representatives of Red China at Geneva and Warsaw—without visible results, to be sure. He has incurred the criticism of those who regard our struggle with communism as a straight moral crusade without any nuances of diplomatic finesse, by sponsoring limited economic aid to the dissident and semi-independent Communist regimes in Belgrade and Warsaw.

What Mr. Dulles believes, as he stated in his recent joint declaration with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of Germany, is that concessions must be on a reciprocal basis. He is not willing, in the name of that famous word, "flexibility," to abandon carefully built-up political and military positions in one-sided retreat. Nor is he willing to say that the cold war is over while Moscow is waging it full blast.

History may be counted on to do justice to John Foster Dulles. His failings are likely to seem smaller in perspective, his achievements greater when others assume his heavy load of work and responsibility. Even now it is notable that voices of strident criticism in foreign capitals tend to become hushed and stilled when there is a prospect that the Dulles leadership will be missing, even for a short time.

Every Communist, every sympathizer with communism, every woolly-minded appeaser, every dreamy utopian, is a bitter critic of the Secretary of State. Perhaps this is his highest title to the respect and confidence of the patriotic majority of the American people. Perhaps, as was once said of Grover Cleveland, he deserves to be loved for the enemies he has made.

Export-Import Bank of Washington Completes 25 Years of Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, our efficient Coordinator of Information, Mr. Lawrence Sullivan, has sent me an outline of the work done by the Export-Import Bank of Washington during the past 25 years. The Bank, under the able direction of my good friend, Mr. Samuel C. Waugh, is doing an outstanding job, and both he and his staff are to be commended.

The Export-Import Bank of Washington today completed 25 years of operations in support of U.S. overseas trade.

While providing direct assistance to U.S. exporters in cooperation with private banks and financial institutions, the Bank became the first public agency, either national or international, to arrange credits for large-scale economic development throughout the world.

The Bank was founded February 12, 1934, with a capitalization of \$11 million. Today

it is authorized to have loans and guarantees outstanding at any one time of \$7 billion.

In 25 years the Bank has authorized over \$10 billion in some 1,600 individual credits; disbursed over \$6.6 billion (an additional \$1.6 billion is committed for disbursements); collected \$3.3 billion in repayments; earned gross profit of \$997.8 million; paid \$438 million to the U.S. Treasury as interest and dividends; paid all administrative expenses out of earnings; charged off losses of \$2.9 million; retained net profits of \$536 million as reserves; and encouraged more than \$1 billion in private investment abroad.

The Export-Import Bank made its first credits for economic development abroad in the late 1930's and has continued making these credits, either to private borrowers or to governments, for more than 20 years. Most of the various programs for economic development have followed in general the path pioneered originally by the Export-Import Bank.

In Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Oceania, the Bank has assisted the development of steel mills; iron, copper, nitrate, manganese, and uranium mining; electric power installations; cement mills; fertilizer plants; chemical plants; innumerable types of industrial plants; large-scale irrigation projects; highways; ports; and public works. The immediate result of these credits has been to provide hundreds of thousands of orders for U.S. industries throughout the country and many millions of hours of employment for American workers. In addition, these projects have resulted in economic growth abroad which has permanently expanded U.S. overseas markets.

Throughout its 25 years the Bank has maintained a flexible lending policy designed to meet changing conditions of world trade incident to a world economic depression, a world war, and a period of reconstruction and development. It has done so within the three basic concepts which Congress has written into its governing statutes: To "aid in financing and the facilitate exports and imports and exchange of commodities" between the United States and other countries; to "supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital"; and to make loans that shall "in the judgment of the Board of Directors offer reasonable assurance of repayment."

In addition to its loans running into billions for economic development projects, the Bank has made hundreds of small loans to assist sales abroad of individual pieces of equipment, has lent approximately \$1 billion to finance export sales of U.S. cotton (among other commodities), and has made various types of balance of payments credits to assist other governments in maintaining essential trade relations with the United States.

The Export-Import Bank has actively encouraged new private investment abroad. Since 1952, the earliest year for which complete statistics are available, credits by the Bank have resulted in concurrent loans and participations and equity investment by U.S. private interests in excess of \$880 million without guarantee from Export-Import Bank.

Diversion of Water From the Great Lakes Into the Illinois River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under consideration at the moment in the

House Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member, is a perennial subject. That is the question of whether additional water should be drained from the Great Lakes into the Illinois Waterway. I would like to include my remarks before the committee on this subject in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, we who are members of the House Committee on Public Works have a relatively simple problem before us in the matter of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion of water from the Great Lakes into the Illinois River.

The question is whether we are going to keep our bucket filled after we have punched a hole in the bottom.

All of us agree that a full bucket—in this case the Great Lakes—is a desirable state of affairs, not only for our vast Midwest region surrounding the Great Lakes, but for our neighbor, Canada, as well.

From this year on, we are going to need an especially full bucket. We on this committee are well aware that the St. Lawrence Seaway, our dream in the Midwest for more than a half century, will become a full-fledged working reality later this year.

Now we are going to try to pull the plug.

We in the Great Lakes region have been bothered by inadequate channel depths for a number of years, and we will continue to be bothered in the future when the larger oceangoing ships start plying our waterways in ever-increasing numbers. The proposal before us today is to make these channels even shallower and narrower by the diversion of additional water from the Great Lakes.

We are asked to approve a 1-year test of this extra diversion which will bring the total to an average of some 2,500 feet per second, and much more when peak volumes are drained off Lake Michigan. We can only conclude that most of the water will be diverted during the height of the already short Great Lakes shipping season.

May I point out to my colleagues that there is no reason for a 1-year test of this added diversion plan under existing circumstances. Such tests can only bring harm to the Great Lakes States and Canada.

First of all, we have in the U.S. Corps of Engineers reports from last year stating that the full effects of such diversion would not be felt for a 3-year period at the very earliest. So, next year we will be faced with the prospect of these same people coming in here and asking for a continuation of the extra divergence so they can give this plan a fair test.

But this same engineer's report points out another fact which seems to have been grossly overlooked by some of the members of this committee. That is that it will take some 15 years for the Great Lakes to build up enough water to completely dissipate all effects of the temporary diversion. We are asked, therefore, to give this plan a 1-year trial. Then we will be asked to give another 2-year trial period. But if the calculations of the engineers are not correct and more damage is done to our lake shores, our channels, and our harbor depths, then it is going to take us 15 years to correct the mistake. In my opinion, that is too great a chance for our Nation to take in a matter which has such grave consequences to the economy of such a vast portion of our country.

Now, it has also been indicated in the newspapers that some of our committee members have said that Canada has no objections to this diversion. After checking, I find that such is not the case. Members of the Canadian Parliament not only continue to object to this extra diversion, but Canadian opposition has, in fact, stiffened on this plan during the past few months. As yet, the Canadian Government has not taken a formal stand on this matter. However, a

statement of Canadian policy is expected within the next 30 days.

Canada has as much at stake in this matter as we have. The water we drain off the Great Lakes belongs as much to our great ally as it does to us. We should have absolute assurance that Canada has no objections and no reservations to this extra diversion before we take any action whatsoever.

Finally, we have been told that this hearing will be on the basis of facts alone. One of the facts in this matter, gentlemen, is that those States which are opposed to this extra diversion were not given enough time to prepare their cases before this committee hearing.

Because of the lack of time afforded by the committee to the gathering of new facts and the short notice given on the start of these hearings, I would recommend to my colleagues that we continue to take testimony from the gentlemen present and then give them an opportunity to be heard before this committee at a later date during this session of Congress.

Thank you.

Initiation of a Program To Assure U.S. Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a thought-provoking synopsis by John L. McLaughlin, Jr., of Swampscott, Mass.:

INITIATION OF A PROGRAM TO ASSURE U.S. GROWTH

The slow economic growth of the United States in recent years, emphasized by the 1957-58 recession, has most intelligent people genuinely concerned. To reverse the trend, a systematic approach is needed, and this synopsis outlines a possibility. For success, business would have to exert leadership—far more than it has in the past—and the appeal to business would be for its cooperation in the initiation of a program designed to expand markets in predetermined orderly ways.

Such a program would be like an advertising and sales promotion campaign, except that it would lean toward the industrial type, be more rational and educational. It would be scientific and utilize all the best of the modern techniques of management, marketing, sales, and advertising and sales promotion.

The approach to the program would be via study under three main heads: Research, planning, and action. But this must be emphasized: That the study would entail looking at all three and integrating action with time. In short, there'd be some action in 6 months, 1 year, 2 years, 5 years. For simplicity, however, the kind of study that now seems indicated will be explained under each of the three main heads.

RESEARCH

History may yield clues. But it must be simplified. Gross national product looks like the best yardstick. Its four salient phases—Federal, State, and local, capital, and consumer spending—can be plotted together in, say, "an economic map of the United States from 1929 to date." Then the relationship among these four phases, and the effect that each has on the total, can be studied.

In the same way, goals can be plotted; the performance required by each phase or area can be determined and then, at any time, measured.

Thus, history soon ceases to help and statistics on the future become absolute necessities. That should probably be one of the major objectives of the program: to prove that more statistics are vitally necessary to progress. But what kinds of statistics can be ascertained only by envisioning the needs that are called for by the planning.

PLANNING

Plans for the program will be derived from the goals. The facts from the research should have sufficient authority to prove that steady growth of this country can be achieved only by expanding markets in accordance with the needs of the people. So we come to, what could be called managed markets.

Basic needs are five: Food, clothing, shelter, health, and education. Varying with population, they can be calculated, then supplied. Education—buildings, facilities, personnel—makes markets. So, too, do improvements in our cities, towns, and rural areas. Then there are the unbelievably big, and almost untapped, foreign markets. Finally, of course, there is defense.

All these constitute markets that can be managed; that is, expanded in ways that will best assure continuous growth.

Soon will arise the layman's question: Where will the money come from? The campaign will devote most minute care to explaining that hardest-to-understand portion of economics, money.

ACTION

Action would be governed by research and planning, but the kind required should be considered in the initial thinking. If something is known early about what action is to be taken, then the research and planning can be directed toward getting the necessary information.

Gradually, in this way, plans for action would be evolved. The specifics would be obtained by creative writers working closely with economists and then allowing specialists in presentation methods to translate the results into the different media for particular audiences.

Business would be the major audience: Its support is essential to success. Hence, early, the benefits would need to be outlined: managed markets would result in accurate forecasting, orderly expansion, efficient operations, and increased profits. Once sold on the general idea, business could carry on. Its brains and knowledge are needed. A big help here would be the cooperative support of the business press.

Other important audiences would be Government (via the Employment Act of 1946) and labor unions (particularly the economists). Approaches to these would be very humble—couched in terms of "we've all much to learn; is that about right?" When agreements are reached—and not too much would be attempted at one time—then the story could be broadcast to the general public. If it clicks then, the program is assured of a successful start.

The mechanics of the program would be left mainly to the advertising agency or agencies. But as I conceive them now, they would be in four parts: First, completely written-out plans, fully approved by consulting economists; second, oral presentations, with visual aids, designed for particular groups; third, booklets with more details for the same group; and fourth, publicity of all varieties—from press conferences to news releases of many kinds.

All this presupposes that there'd be genuine news in the program. There must be (and still it must not be too controversial), if the program is to create the excitement that's needed for success.

In the long run, too, that's what our country needs most—excitement. It's been too long on the defensive; it needs to fight, it needs something to fight for—like in a war. Only with a purpose in mind—with visions of how great their country could really be—will the people make the sacrifices that are required. This program could start to supply that purpose.

JOHN L. McLAUGHLIN, JR.

FEBRUARY 6, 1959.

Whither GAF?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press of February 8, 1959, highlights the problem facing a community whose biggest single industry is 97 percent owned by a government which hopes to divest itself of ownership, but cannot do so without action by the Congress.

I wish to point out that my bill, H.R. 1345, offers a logical and feasible approach to this problem and I strongly hope the Congress will at long last take action this session to permit sale of the Government-held shares in General Aniline & Film Corp. to private investors.

BUT WILL IT EVER HAPPEN?

What others outside may think about a question that is close to the interests of the Triple Cities commands our attention. Donald I. Rogers, financial editor of the New York Herald Tribune, speculates, with some facetiousness, on the effects of a decision on the ownership of General Aniline & Film Corp.

The Eisenhower administration will soon propose to Congress a bill that would permit the sale of Aniline shares, of which the Government holds 97 percent, to the public. What Congress, moved by innumerable clashing interests, will do is unpredictable.

But there is a possibility that the question of ownership, already bearded like Father Time, will be so resolved. Triple Citizens, whose fond hopes of the past so often have come to naught, are incapable of breathless expectancy, but hope never really dies.

If it happened?

Mr. Rogers comments that with the issue settled, composing rooms of the newspapers of the land would throw away a story that virtually has stood in type for more than 10 years, the heading of which reads roughly, "Aniline Solution Near."

Settlement of the Aniline case conceivably could produce unemployment among lawyers. Rogers notes that enough lawyers to fill all the boxes at Yankee Stadium have been engaged in the Aniline case.

These lawyers have represented German, non-Germans, Swiss, non-Swiss, the U.S. Government and a big assortment of other interests. These lawyers have to be paid. They don't come cheaply. And last year, poor Aniline for the first 9 months had profits of only \$3,335,000 on sales of \$103 million.

All the evidence suggests that General Aniline is a gallant ship that, under government control, never can put to sea. Always haunting management—and personnel, too—are the morale-hurting questions: Who owns us? Where are we going? What will happen tomorrow?

Government control poses inflexibilities and a rigidity of courses that stand as a bar to maximum exploitation of the company's assets, and as a bar to always needful long-distance planning and even to an adequate and uncomplex meeting of competition.

The Triple Cities has a big stake in what will be the fate of Aniline. Ansco is Binghamton's biggest industry and Ozalid is similarly a vital component in the Triple Cities economy.

We hope, we hope, we hope after years and years of disappointed hopes that a settlement of the Aniline case is near.

If and when Aniline shares pass to public ownership, will the proceeds go to the U.S. Treasury to help sweating American taxpayers?

Aw, you know the answer to that. The \$100 million, more or less, will go into foreign pockets. As Rogers laments, "Alas and alack . . . into the pockets of righteous citizens abroad. For the past century or so, it seems, 'twas ever thus."

No-Man's Land in Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin employment-relations board over a period of the last several years, has called to my attention the difficulties which the Wisconsin board has encountered with the so-called no-man's land in the field of labor-management relations. The absence of any remedy for labor disputes in this particular area has been deplored by spokesmen for both management and labor during the past year.

Several proposals have been made and will be considered by this 86th Congress. Among the proposals is my bill H.R. 1140, which has received widespread support throughout the United States and in particular from State labor boards who have been confronted with this problem frequently.

The Wisconsin employment-relations board has prepared a memorandum which has been submitted to the Senate Labor Committee under date of February 12, 1959. I received the following letter from the employment-relations board which I would like to place in the RECORD at this time, to be followed by the memorandum on behalf of the Wisconsin employment-relations board, which was addressed to the Senate Labor Committee:

MADISON, WIS., February 12, 1959.
Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: The continuance of the no-man's land in labor relations is a serious problem for the smaller employers, their employees, and labor unions in this State. The no-man's land was brought about by the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Guss v. Utah*, 353 U.S. 1, in 1957. As a consequence of this decision, labor disputes involving those employers over whom the National Labor Relations Board declines to exercise jurisdiction are not subject to State regulation or any regulation. The ab-

sence of any remedy for disputes in this category has been deplored by spokesmen for management and labor. Various proposals are presently being considered by the Congress to remedy the situation.

We are forwarding a copy of a statement transmitted to the Senate Labor Committee of the position of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board on this problem. We hope that you will have the opportunity to read the statement which describes the problem of the no-man's land in detail.

When the various labor bills are considered by the Congress during this session, we hope that you will lend your best efforts to eliminate the no-man's land problem.

We would be pleased to answer any inquiries that you might have concerning pending legislation.

Very truly yours,

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD,

L. E. GOODING, Chairman.

MEMORANDUM ON BEHALF OF THE WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD TO THE SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE

This memorandum is submitted on the question of the power of the States to regulate labor disputes over which the National Labor Relations Board declines to exercise its jurisdiction.

The State of Wisconsin has had a comprehensive labor relations code since 1939. During the 20 years of its existence, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board has processed approximately 2,000 representation election matters, 3,000 referendums concerning union security agreements, approximately 1,000 unfair labor practice complaints involving both employer and union practices, 316 arbitrations and over 2,000 mediation cases. Prior to *Guss v. Utah*, 353 U.S. 1, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board exercised jurisdiction in the regulation of labor disputes involving employers whose businesses affected interstate commerce over which the National Labor Relations Board declined to exercise its jurisdiction because said enterprises did not meet the jurisdictional standards established by the National Labor Relations Board. The *Guss* decision, as the opinion of the court acknowledged, created a vast area subject to no regulation, an area in which Federal power in many instances cannot be practically applied and in which the exercise of State authority has been banned. It has been estimated that the no-man's land area applied to approximately 25 percent of the working force.¹

Prior to the *Guss* decision, when this Board was satisfied that the business of the employer was such that the National Labor Relations Board would not exercise its jurisdiction, this Board did so. In no case in what now constitutes the no man's land, when the question of jurisdiction was raised before the Board, was there an appeal taken to the courts on the Board's determination to exercise jurisdiction.

In Wisconsin, it has been estimated that approximately 29 percent of the working force and about 92 percent of all employers were within the no man's land as a result of the *Guss* decision.²

On October 2, 1958, the National Labor Relations Board, pursuant to one of the mandates of the Supreme Court in the *Guss* decision, announced revised jurisdictional standards. This action was taken subsequent to increased appropriations granted by the

¹ "County Business Patterns," pt. I, 1st quarter, published by U.S. Departments of Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare, pp. 4-6, table IA. For statistics as to the individual States and Territories, see table IB, pp. 8-52.

² Helser Ready Mix Co. decision, No. 4780, Wisconsin Employment Relations Board, June 1958.

Congress for the purpose of narrowing the extent of the no man's land. Prior to the announcement of the 1958 standards, representatives of the National Labor Relations Board had testified before Congress that the requested increase in appropriations would enable the Board to reduce the no man's land area by approximately 20 percent.² Applying the 20 percent assumption to Wisconsin, would still result in approximately 23 percent of the working force being included in the no man's land and about 73 percent of the employers. Regardless of whether the estimates of the National Board are correct, it is recognized that the workload of the National Board has increased significantly, and with it a backlog of cases, to the extent that many matters which should be expeditiously determined are delayed for such a period of time that they also may be considered in a no man's land.⁴

Of major concern to the Senate committee has been the elimination of racketeering in labor-management relations. It is hard to conceive of a better opportunity for racketeering to flourish than to have no regulation available, either State or Federal, among the smaller employers and smaller collective bargaining units throughout the land. Extensive testimony has been heard by this committee indicating that the service industries, usually employing small groups of persons, have been the most easy prey for the racketeers. The continuance of a vacuum in the labor-relations law encourages rather than discourages the continuance of unsavory practices in labor-management relations.

In addition to the problems of racketeering, the impact of the Guss decision has been very upsetting to normal labor relations. From the viewpoint of administrators who must deal with everyday practical problems of labor relations, we fail to perceive how the interest of uniformity declared by the Supreme Court as a major premise in reaching its conclusion will be achieved by its decision. The only uniformity apparent to us, is the fast growing practice of returning stable labor relations, which have been fostered by State and Federal statutes, to the anarchy which existed prior to the enactment of the Wagner Act, the Employment Peace Act, and the Taft-Hartley Act. In the no man's land, the right of employees to be represented by a labor union and to engage in collective bargaining will now be determined by economic force rather than by secret ballot; the right of employees to be free from discriminatory discharge because of union activities will be dissipated; and the rights of employers to be free from illegal picketing and from secondary boycotts will go unprotected.

When it is considered that 62 percent of all charges of unfair labor practices filed in the first quarter of 1958 with the National Labor Relations Board were filed by individuals,⁵ it is difficult to understand how such individuals over whom the National Labor Relations Board will assert jurisdiction have rights and remedies more worthy of protection by a uniform Federal labor policy than those individuals who are employed in enterprises falling within the no man's land area. This same argument applies to the rights of labor organizations and employers. We thus have a situation where neither the policies expressed in the Federal or State acts can be applied. The only uniformity apparent to us in the no man's land is the chaos of no regulation.

The question has been raised in previous hearings before this committee that the State

authority in labor relations permits regulation of uniform security agreements, including the enactment of right to work legislation. However, it should be noted that such State authority is not dependent and would not be blocked by the enactment of the proposed legislation since that authority is dependent upon section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act. The question has also been raised in previous hearings as to the number of States which do not have a labor relations board or agency, and thus would not benefit from the passage of legislation empowering States to act. While only twelve States and the Territory of Hawaii and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have Labor Relations Acts, they include such important industrial States as New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Michigan, Connecticut, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. In these 10 States were located 31½ percent of the nonagricultural employees of the United States in 1955 and during that same year these States accounted for 45 percent of the strikes in the country.⁶

Furthermore, the 10 States do not include the industrial State of Michigan and the State of Kansas which have representation procedures as a part of their State mediation functions. A compilation of various State labor relations laws indicate that some 43 States and Territories have laws protecting the rights of employees to organization and to bargain collectively.⁷

The fact that any particular State chooses not to adopt labor legislation in harmony with the Federal statute, or not to adopt any labor legislation on a particular subject, does not seem persuasive to forbid States from enforcing labor relations statutes if the enterprises which might be subject to such regulation are of such little consequence as to be determined unworthy or impractical of regulation by the National Labor Relations Board.

Since the Guss decision, there has also been an increased interest in utilization of damage actions in labor disputes. Traditionally, students of labor relations have felt that damage actions were not the best means of achieving stable and harmonious labor relations, but increases in such suits can be expected in the absence of any other means of resolving labor disputes.

The Supreme Court in the Guss decision also mentioned that the no man's land could be reduced by the execution of cession agreements between the National Labor Relations Board and various State agencies provided the State statute was consistent with or had received a construction not in consistent with the Federal act. While effective arguments have been made by the States on behalf of such agreements, no cession agreements have been executed to date.⁸ It is our feeling that the National Board has construed the word "consistency" to mean identical and has used such argument as means of blocking a cession agreement. Furthermore, there is no assurance that, even if a State statute was conformed to a Federal statute, litigation over consistency of construction could not be advanced in a particular case as a means of delay. With nine circuit courts of appeals passing on National Labor Relations Board decisions, it would be impossible for any State administrative agency to guarantee total consistency of interpretation no matter how hard it tried and no matter what the spirit of the administrators were toward the statute. It is our belief that most arguments against the

execution of a cession agreement could be overcome if the National Board were willing to seriously consider entering into such an agreement but that to date such willingness has not been demonstrated. The unsuccessful experience of the State of New York in attempting to reach a cession agreement for the taxicab industry in New York City is the most recent and best detailed. From the legislative and administrative history of the present cession provision, section 10a, it may be concluded that a clarifying amendment of at least the consistency provision should be considered by the Congress if there is to be any hope of implementing the cession provision by the making of such agreements with State agencies.

In submitting this statement to the Senate Labor Committee, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board wants to make it clear that our primary concern is to remedy the no man's land. The problem can be minimized by directing the National Labor Relations Board to take jurisdiction of all labor disputes arising under the national act and by providing for cession agreements to State agencies. The no man's land can be eliminated entirely in those States which have labor relations acts by amending the National Labor Relations Act so as to empower the National Labor Relations Board to decline jurisdiction and permitting State regulation over those matters which the National Board declines to handle.

As administrator of a State labor relations act, we believe there are many reasons why State administration of local disputes, especially involving smaller employers and smaller collective bargaining units in the no man's land category can be most effectively regulated by the States. However, if the Congress should not provide for State authority where the National Labor Relations Board declines to act, we would hope that the Congress would appropriate sufficient moneys to enable the National Labor Relations Board to fully occupy the no man's land, and further that if the Congress should decide to continue the cession provision of the present statute, that said provision be clarified to make cession agreements possible.

Respectfully submitted,

L. E. GOODING,
Chairman, Wisconsin Employment Relations Board.
FEBRUARY 12, 1959.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Communist leaders of the Kremlin are using and will continue to use every diabolical means and method to capture the nations of the free world. These Communist leaders seek to destroy the free world by the method of divide and conquer. During this critical period in history the peoples of the free world must remain alert to the intrigue of the Communist masters in the Kremlin. The free world is forced to remain strong militarily, economically, and spiritually. It is paramount that we act as one—in unison. It is paramount that we stand firm in our commitments to one another. It is paramount that the free world agree on every issue and, last but not least,

² Testimony of Chairman Leedom, June 10, 1958, 42LRR185.

³ Third Quarterly Report, NLRB, 1958, 43LRR55.

⁴ First Quarterly Report, NLRB, 1958, 42LRRM14.

⁵ Blumrosen, "The Misinterpretation of Section 10a," Labor Law Journal, April 1958, p. 266.

⁶ CCH, par. 40, 355.

⁷ Memorandum to the NLRB on behalf of the New York State Labor Relations Board, by Philip Feldblum, general counsel, 1958.

that we maintain our faith in the Almighty. Only then can we avoid the pitfall of being engulfed into the orbit of the Communist fold. Let us recall the fate of those peoples and nations who are now the captives of the U.S.S.R.—Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Eastern Germany, not to mention those on the threshold of enslavement.

None of these nations have lost their craving for liberty. It is important to them that we rekindle their hope for freedom and help them maintain their morale. Therefore, on this February 16 Lithuania commemorates the day of its independence and the day of its national birthday. I join with the Lithuanians on this sad occasion and pray that the future holds for them the day of their liberation to which we in the free world rededicate ourselves.

Poison in Your Water—No. 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the water from the Potomac River, one of whose tributary streams is the Shenandoah River, contains the zinc waste compounds dumped into the stream by the Viscose Corp., of America plant at Front Royal. An article setting forth what happened there appeared on the front page of the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald of February 13, 1959. The zinc wastes dumped into the Shenandoah River find their way into the drinking water of the people of the city of Washington, D.C., among whom at least some time during the year are all Members of Congress. This is the water that we drink:

SHENANDOAH WATER TESTED: RIVER POLLUTION FROM ZINC WASTES BLAMED FOR DEATH OF 200,000 FISH

(By Aubrey Graves)

An estimated 200,000 fish have been killed since late December in a 10-mile stretch of the Shenandoah River below Front Royal, Va.

A report made by the staff of the Virginia Water Control Board at Richmond has "tentatively" laid the blame on a high concentration of zinc compounds in wastes dumped into the stream by the Viscose Corp. of America plant at Front Royal.

This was confirmed yesterday by A. H. Paessler, the board's executive secretary. Paessler said the staff report was made to the board on January 29 after a meeting at which Viscose officials were present.

Paessler said investigation by the board and the State game commission had been going on for about a month. Analyses of water samples have been completed but complicated, time-consuming analyses of the flesh of the dead fish are still proceeding in the board's laboratory. Paessler expects a final determination within 2 weeks.

The dead fish appeared in increasing numbers until late in January, then tapered off. Some were observed this week, among them bass up to 9 pounds.

About 15 years ago, the corporation started construction of a million dollar waste treatment plant after thousands of Shenandoah River fish had died from the effects of pollution. Last year the Izaak Walton League gave the corporation an award for its efforts in behalf of conservation.

During recent months the corporation greatly increased its consumption of zinc compounds, used in processing rayon products.

Amzi G. McVay, corporation president, said yesterday he could make "no comment at this time."

Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. R. McC. Pate Receives the Veterans of Foreign Wars Commander in Chief's Citation and Gold Medal Award for Outstanding Contributions to National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening, February 3, it was my privilege to attend with more than 400 of the Members of Congress the annual congressional dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Gen. Randolph McC. Pate was there to receive the coveted Commander in Chief's Citation and Gold Medal Award in recognition of his outstanding services to the security of our Nation in these troubled times.

The presentation remarks of the distinguished senior vice commander of the VFW, Mr. Louis G. Feldmann, delivered in presenting the citation and gold medal deserve the careful study of all Members.

For there in brief form we find recognition of the very real need for the qualities, strengths and professional combat readiness of the Marine Corps which this Congress strives so unceasingly to insure will always be available to the Nation.

That this tribute to the Marine Corps comes from such a fine organization of American veterans of overseas service as the VFW is highly significant. Very clearly it demonstrates the fact that the deep concern so many of us feel over the slashing cuts in these tense and difficult times in the most ready of our Nation's limited war forces is widely shared by millions of our citizens. Our continuing efforts to provide the Nation with an adequate Marine Corps force-in-readiness do not stem only from the Armed Services Committee or even the Congress itself. They but reflect the awareness of the vast majority of the citizens we represent that such a force is vital in an era of relentless Communist pressure and deliberate incursions upon the interests and the safety of the free world.

I feel that it is particularly noteworthy that the remarks stress the concern of an organization of nearly one and a half

million veterans of oversea service. Certainly, of all our citizens, these are men whose judgments in matters of national defense are entitled to more than ordinary consideration.

They support without qualification the repeated efforts of Congress to provide the Nation with the three full Marine divisions and air wings the law requires. They too have noted the events of Lebanon, Suez and Quemoy and turned to view with amazement the slashing cuts—12½ percent below appropriated strength—of the very service which responded so quickly, so decisively in those emergencies.

VFW Senior Vice Commander Feldmann's views concur with the belief held by this body that never before has the Nation's need for a combat ready Marine Corps been more obvious than it is today. Through this VFW presentation those oversea veterans have assured us that in keeping with the resolutions of their last national encampment and the informed views of their national security committee they will continue to support us in our determination to have a Marine Corps adequate to the actual needs of the times.

They share the ever-growing concern that concentration on weapons of massive destruction at the expense of the more versatile, more flexible military capabilities, so well represented by our ready Marine forces, is making us less and less able to cope with the demonstrated and continuing threat of constant Communist pressure tactics.

This firm expression of unqualified support from a group of our citizens so capable and well informed as the VFW should confirm and strengthen the resolve of all of us who have fought over the years to retain in our national defense structure the unique and vitally necessary combatant skills and amphibious know-how of the U.S. Marines.

Equally significant are General Pate's brief words of acceptance. They stress a fundamental faith in the human and moral values of the individual which remain basic to the Marines in an age when too many of us find it all too easy to place our faith in the search for shiny new weapons.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that both Mr. Feldmann's presentation remarks and the acceptance by General Pate be placed in the RECORD:

PRESENTATION REMARKS BY LOUIS G. FELDMANN

General Pate, as a former marine and on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, it is my privilege and pleasure to present to you this Commander in Chief's Citation with the following wording:

As a token of the high esteem in which you and the Marine Corps are held by the Veterans of Foreign Wars—and by all patriotic citizens of our Nation—it is also my privilege to present to you this gold medal, which accompanies the citation, in recognition of our outstanding services to the security of our Nation in these troubled times.

I hope this medal will, in the years to come, serve as a reminder of the sincere appreciation we veterans have for the competent manner in which you have directed

the Marine Corps during your tenure as Commandant. Our Nation and the Free World have benefited from your leadership and the manner in which your marines have responded to every call.

The brief inscription on the citation and on the medal cannot fully express the reasons why you so rightly deserve this award. In these days when such great emphasis is placed upon technological and material advancement, you and your marines have continued to retain and demonstrate those precious attributes of the spirit and the heart. These characteristics, which have been notably associated with the marines, are esprit, dedication, and unfailing devotion to country and corps. Although these attributes have been the continuing features of your great organization, under your leadership the Marine Corps also has made great technological advances. Since the end of World War II, through the corps conception, and development of the large helicopter as the ship-to-shore vehicle operating from troop-carrying aircraft carriers, our marines are fully capable of being a major factor in modern warfare.

This valuable technological progress reflects the manner in which the Marine Corps is carrying out the job assigned to it by the National Security Act. Under your direction the corps has tended to its own knitting and in so doing has complied with the spirit and intent of the law in developing the techniques of amphibious warfare and in providing the hard-hitting, ready force so vital to our national defense.

As repeated international crises have so well proven—Suez, the Formosan Straits, Syria, and Lebanon—the Marine Corps, under your command, has performed in the competent manner we have come to expect from marines. Its business-like, professional response to each of these crises demonstrates why our marines today are the first echelon of our Nation's limited war forces.

These accomplishments have not come easily. In making this award the Veterans of Foreign Wars recognize that what you have done has been accomplished in the face of extreme difficulties. You are required to maintain three combat divisions and three air wings while being administratively deprived of adequate funds to do so.

Never has the need for a combat-ready Marine Corps been greater. The demands for the flexibility provided by the Marines have rarely been more obvious. Unfortunately, with so much more to do, there does not seem to be enough to go around. Congress recognized the need for an adequate Marine Corps in these troubled times and appropriated funds for the 200,000 marines necessary for you to provide three divisions and three air wings which the law requires.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars are disturbed.

We find that by this procedure of withholding appropriated funds the Marines are being reduced substantially below the strength appropriated and intended by Congress.

You have, however as Marines, gone ahead and done your best.

Speaking for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as a result of resolutions adopted at our last national encampment and at the recent meeting of our national security committee, we want you and our congressional guests to know that we shall support the intent and efforts of Congress to provide an adequate and combat-ready Marine Corps. My personal congratulations, General Pate.

GENERAL PATE'S REMARKS OF ACCEPTANCE

Commander Mahan, Senator JOHNSON, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I am happy and proud to accept this handsome and generous award. I do so with the

full realization I am accepting it for the great organization which I have the honor and the privilege to command: The U.S. Marine Corps.

I hope you will join with me in looking upon this award as a tribute to marines, past and present. Each one has made a significant and lasting contribution to the fighting force which you honor here this evening, and to the security of our Nation.

I would like to take a moment to tell you about an incident which recently took place in our headquarters and illustrates how deeply we feel about the importance of the individual marine.

A short time ago, a distinguished American artist told me he would like to do a painting of what we in the Marine Corps consider the most notable event or achievement in our history.

I wanted to be sure that our selection was made with a care and deliberation commensurate with the honor the artist offered to our corps, so I appointed a board of officers to consider the matter.

Their conclusion, which I readily and heartily approved, was that the most notable achievement in the history of the Marine Corps is the creation of the individual fighting marine.

The individual U.S. marine, trained to stand confident, resolute, and firm in the adversities of combat is our greatest achievement and our most important contribution to the defense of the Nation.

Of course, we cannot and do not claim full credit for his creation. He is created from the American youth who comes to us from your homes, your churches, and your communities with the spiritual and physical courage, the moral stamina, to accept the rigorous demands of training for combat.

On behalf of marines everywhere I assure you that we will continue to strive to maintain those standards of combat readiness and proficiency for which you have so honored us with this award. Your Marine Corps will exert its every endeavor to continue to give this Nation a faithful performance of the duty and responsibility placed upon Marines by the law—the responsibility of being a combat-ready force of amphibious specialists prepared to move instantaneously toward any trouble spot to protect our national interests.

This is the job assigned us by law. This is the job we do.

We are determined that in doing this job Marines will continue to merit the confidence and the trust which you have accorded to us.

On behalf of marines everywhere, I accept this cherished honor which you have awarded to us this evening.

February 16 Marks the Anniversary of the Birth of an Emancipator of American Women—Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this past week, we in the U.S. Congress have been celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the emancipator of an entire race. It is fitting that we now pay our tribute in the same way to one who was an emancipator of American women—Susan B. Anthony.

Her birthday is being celebrated February 16 in all parts of the country. Her statue is here in the crypt of our Capitol building, a gift from American women. The 19th amendment to the Constitution, which enfranchised women, is popular known as the Susan B. Anthony amendment. Every year comes new recognition of what she did to elevate the position of the women in our country.

Suffrage for women is, of course, taken for granted to day—and this is well, for we do not like to recall that our mothers, wives and daughters did not always share with us, their husbands and fathers and sons and brothers, the primary right—and duty—of the franchise. Fortunately man's memory is so constituted that we do take for granted what is obviously right and good.

But the ideal for which Susan B. Anthony and her valiant fellow workers had to struggle so long and so mightily—yes, and to endure sacrifices and ridicule and indignity—is not yet realized. We here have the power to complete the task and to erase the blot which makes half our Nation not equal under the law. Let us complete the task now, and within a short time—I feel confident—it will be taken for granted that in the United States all citizens are equal under the law.

On the anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony 200 Members of the House of Representatives announced publicly their intention to carry to a conclusion, as far as Congress can do so, the work to which Susan B. Anthony devoted her life efforts by giving their support to the Equal Rights for Women amendment introduced by the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE and 38 other Members. There is no better way in which to bring our tribute to Susan B. Anthony.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts is proud that one of her distinguished citizens, Judge David B. Williams, of Concord, is the present national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

The Honorable Christopher H. Phillips, U.S. representative on the United Nations Economic and Social Council, spoke at a testimonial banquet in Concord honoring Judge Williams last November 29. He brought a message from President Eisenhower, and presented some valuable facts as to the work of the Disabled American Veterans. Believing that Members of Congress and others will be interested in his speech, I am including it in extension of my remarks:

Commander Williams, members of the Disabled American Veterans, ladies, and gentlemen, I feel privileged to join in this testimonial to Dave Williams. I am especially pleased to bring you greetings from the President of the United States. He has given me a message which I would like to read to you:

"Please give my congratulations to the members of the Disabled American Veterans gathered in honor of their national commander, Judge David B. Williams. It is gratifying to see the emergence of such leaders as Judge Williams from the ranks of the younger veterans of the Second World War.

"Despite adversity, he has risen in his State to a place of honor and strength and now his leadership will be felt across the Nation.

"As Judge Williams enters his new duties with the DAV, it is a pleasure to send him my congratulations and best wishes.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

As an old friend of Dave Williams, having served with him in Massachusetts' General Court, I am much impressed by the distinguished company that has gathered for this testimonial dinner. I am almost equally impressed at seeing that such a large number of Commander Williams' friends chose to take part in this banquet on this particular holiday weekend—having taken time out for only 2 days to recover from their Thanksgiving feasts.

The presence of so many Congressmen as well as the Acting Administrator of the Veterans' Administration indicates our deep satisfaction in the fact that Commander Williams' tremendous energies, his capabilities and sense of devotion to public affairs, are being put to work nationally during the next 12 months.

On our national scene there are few causes as deserving of inspired leadership as that of the Disabled American Veterans. As they have in the past, the Disabled American Vet-

erans have now chosen just that kind of leadership.

This good cause and its leadership have earned the widest backing from the rest of the community. And in his labors Commander Williams will be able to count on the kind of top-drawer public and official support that we see represented here this evening. To me this cause, this leadership, and this support look like an unbeatable combination.

In fact, from my own vantage point down in New York at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, I could well be a little envious of Dave. By good fortune he and Brad are constituents of Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. Since World War I, in the care, readjustment and rehabilitation of war veterans, Representative ROGERS has ranked as First Lady of the Land. Even if they were not voters in the Fifth Massachusetts District, Dave and Brad could look to Mrs. ROGERS as a legislative tower of strength, a determined and invariably successful task force in any mission concerned with American war veterans.

Every President since the Wilson administration has known of Mrs. ROGERS' unceasing endeavors in behalf of the sick and wounded. She was the personal representative of Presidents Harding and Coolidge in the care of the disabled. Her preeminence in this work was achieved even before she began her illustrious career in the House of Representatives in June 1925, as the successor to her late husband, Congressman John Jacob Rogers.

I said a moment ago that this is a distinguished company. It is distinguished most of all in its dedicated service to our national welfare. Members of the Disabled American Veterans have in heroic measure lived by the watchword of our Republic: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Mrs. ROGERS and others of you here have led in exercising eternal vigilance on the home front, both in times of war and peace.

The qualities which the Disabled American Veterans symbolize were never in greater need than they are today. Much the same kind of "guts" which these men showed in combat is needed now to wage foreign policy in the nuclear stalemate which we see hanging over our future.

In the Soviet Union, the United States faces a determined opponent. Moscow, with its tightly centralized dictatorship, is prepared to play a waiting game, to try to wear us down with alternate crises and phony peace offensives. We can be fairly sure that the Soviets won't intentionally set off a world war III in which there could be no victor. The chances are that they won't try a nuclear play through the center of our line. Instead, they will plan to catch us napping, relaxed in our vigilance, so that they can pull off a sneak end-run play by subversion and indirect aggression.

It is the Communists' cynical belief that the citizens of our democracy will prove to be weak in self-discipline, that they cannot keep their guard up in a long-drawn-out war of nerves. Making liars out of the Communist prophets will continue to be one of the toughest jobs our Nation ever tackled. And in this contest the example of vigilance given to us by the Disabled American Veterans is one of our great assets.

There is a direct parallel between the caliber of alertness which your organization

has shown and the sharp watch we must keep as a Nation. The Disabled American Veterans and Congresswoman ROGERS can testify that immediately after the two World Wars our people and their Government have been more than generous in providing veterans benefits and services. But as time passes this enthusiasm tends to fade.

In the same way there is a tendency to forget all of the terrible costs of war. There is a tendency to grow weary at the infinitely smaller costs of defense and mutual security.

The Disabled American Veterans have done a remarkable job in fighting such forgetfulness. Without their unflagging efforts to mobilize public support, the programs for disabled veterans could not have been maintained at present levels. They know that it takes eternal vigilance before the voters and their elected representatives to combat indifference, to resist the wasteful dismantling of worthy programs for enabling the disabled to lead happier and more useful lives.

I see no cause for complaint or regret in this need to keep ourselves steamed up about our responsibilities. To the contrary, it is part of our pride that we can rise to any real challenge. This is the way of men who love liberty.

Turning now to the problems of national security. In keeping the shield of our Republic strong and high we are faced with a task that is like washing the dishes or mowing the lawn. No matter how well we have done the job, it is a job that never stays finished for very long.

We must never forget that our national security today involves a great many complex factors. It rests on far more than the maintenance of adequate Armed Forces—vital though they are. Political, economic, and diplomatic activities constitute a major part of our defense arsenal. Because these activities sometimes seem less directly related to national security, we tend to underestimate their importance. But we can afford to do so only at our grave peril.

Consider how the Communists view the nature of today's struggle. This is what Mr. Khrushchev said:

"We boldly challenge the capitalist world. Let us compete to see who can reach the highest level of productive forces, who will produce more per capita, who will ensure the highest material and cultural standard of living for the people, where are the best opportunities created for the development of all the capabilities of man; whichever regime insures the best conditions for the peoples will win. We are convinced that it is the most progressive socialist regime that will win. The future is with our socialist system. Capitalism is at its ebb, heading for collapse. This does not mean that it is already lying down with its legs stretched out; much work has yet to be done to bring it to such a state but this is inevitable, just as death inevitably comes to a living organism."

This Soviet challenge is reflected in the vast ruble offensive it has undertaken during the past 3 or 4 years. Its activities on the economic front constitute a sort of sneak end-run play that could penetrate where tanks and ballistic missiles would not succeed. Since 1954 the Soviet bloc has made available \$2 billion in aid to the underdeveloped countries. During the same period it has double its trade with these have-not countries.

This is one field in which the United States is especially well equipped to meet the So-

viet challenge. Long before the Soviets became interested in these matters, the United States was taking steps to help strengthen freedom in many parts of the world. We have done this through our mutual security programs. Today we are moving to strengthen these programs to make them more effective in meeting this Soviet economic offensive. With bipartisan congressional support, we hope there will emerge during the coming year a new look and increased vigor in our foreign economic policies.

There have already been several indications of increased activity in this field. For example, we have increased the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by \$2 billion. We have taken the initiative to increase the lending authority of the World Bank. We have expressed our willingness to participate in regional economic development institutions in Latin America and the Middle East. And finally, we are considering the possibility of increasing the lending authority of our own Development Loan Fund.

All of these activities are, as I have emphasized, directly related to strengthening our national security.

In Geneva today two conferences are being held which bear directly on another vital matter of national security. These are the talks on suspension of nuclear tests and on the question of surprise attack. Both are part of the broader problem of disarmament. Let me say a brief word about this complex subject.

In the first place, the word "disarmament" is somewhat of a misnomer. What we are really talking about is not disarmament in the literal sense, but rather a limitation of armaments so as to reduce the danger of war. And, of course, closely related to this objective is the problem of minimizing the dangers of surprise attack.

Now, these matters have been under consideration in the United Nations for several years. Progress has been at a snail's pace. This is due to the intransigent position taken by the Soviet Union when it comes to the question of effective inspection and control of any disarmament agreement. For some time now they have engaged in a "ban the bomb" campaign. They have been all too willing to make paper promises. Until more than paper promises are in sight, no really effective arms limitation can take place. For, to agree to a mere paper pledge would give the Soviets a serious toe hold on our security. Despite these obstacles, we will continue to persevere in our efforts for a meaningful agreement. The stakes are high and the need for effective arms limitation is real. If we continue to be persistent and determined, the day may yet come when the Soviets will see the logic of our view.

Now I would like to conclude my remarks with this observation. I have pointed to the parallel between two noble causes—the cause of the Disabled American Veterans and the larger cause of our national security. Members of the DAV have set for us a high standard, as a guide for the exercise of vigilance in guarding our liberties.

All Americans are indebted to them for their wartime sacrifices. Nevertheless, you have an enviable opportunity to do battle again—but this time with words and actions rather than weapons of war.

The Disabled American Veterans have the prestige and respect which can make them a potent force in keeping our guard up as a nation. You are an organization with proven political know-how. You can be a powerful force for bolstering our national strength for what is likely to be a long drawn-out contest with the Soviet world. We need perseverance. We need dedication. We need courage. All of those qualities you possess in abundance. Under the distinguished leadership of your new national commander,

I know the American people can look to the Disabled American Veterans to set an example of vigilance and perseverance which today, as never before, is indeed the price of liberty.

Free Kosher Kitchen Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert an article about the annual dinner of the Free Kosher Kitchen located in my district. This humanitarian effort is directed by my good friend Joe Pearson. The article was published in the Williamsburg News, a weekly newspaper, and reads as follows:

ABOUT IMPORTANT PEOPLE

(By Harvey Rosenfeld)

If we would compare the history of this year's Free Kosher Kitchen banquet—its preparations and occurrence—with last year's, we would find distinctive variations between the two. We would discover that the events preceding the banquets differ somewhat; and even the celebrities attending the affairs were not the same. Yet, the consequences will be the same. Poor people will again be contented, the unfortunate ones will once more be contented.

A few days before the banquet, we revisited "Big Joe's Happiness Exchange Program" on WABC radio in an attempt to aid the cause for the free kitchen. The previous year, we interviewed "Big Joe" on WMGM. But this time, he was on vacation—a very deserved one, indeed. Charity does not take vacations, however. His lovely sister-in-law, Julie Mitchell, filled in for him—ready to talk and assist. Along with us was Ira Pearson, whose father, Joe, directs the humanitarian work for the kitchen, located at 228 South First Street. He was there doing his share, too.

Julie called the charitable work that she was performing on the happiness exchange, fun. The former social science schoolteacher said that it was thrilling to see a person in despair leave our program completely changed. The change from sadness to happiness is a most gratifying one to observe. And, to work on behalf of the kitchen was no different.

At the banquet this year there were new faces. But many of the kitchen's old guard returned. There were some of the regular guests, who for personal reasons, were not able to be in attendance. But the poor people will be eating again, as they did last year.

The dais and tables were once more filled with the elite of communal and civic life. Political names and the people's elected officers and delegates were there to guarantee that the food baskets will once again be carried away by the needy. These profiles included: State Senator Harry Gittleman; Edward Lentol, neighborhood assemblyman; comptroller of the State of New York, Col. Arthur Levitt, and his worthy assistant, William B. Volet. In this bracket there were the judges all pronouncing praise on the dedicated institution. In this celebrated clique there were: Judge John MacCrate, chief judge of the appellate division, now in retirement, and his former secretary, Benjamin Groberg; Judges Flagg, Williams, and McLaughlin of the municipal courts; and

Judges Marasco and Blangiardo, other vital organs of our judicial systems.

When the stentorian voice of Master of Ceremonies Ira Pearson introduced the personages of the medical world to the audience, one senses the fact that these men will be working with Joe Pearson to help the mentally depressed, and to secure an exit for those who do not belong in those institutions. The list of the doctors include: Charles Buckman, Nathan Beckenstein, and John Bianchi.

Businessmen and members of other dignified vocations were there to express their thanks to Joe Pearson, a man who has solved intricate welfare problems. The Dropkins of the welfare department; Beldner's of Greater New York Mutual; Sylvester P. Elsemann, manager of the Big Four Insurance Co.; a table of the New York League of Locality Mayors; Berko's, of the chocolate sirup company bearing their name; Ringleheim's of the Marcy Do-Nut & Culler Co.; Philip H. Ellice, furniture store proprietor; Francis J. Greco, and Sidney Katz, lawyers; Rabbi Stern, Murray Ohl, and the Flintenstein's, and Charles Psaty, who with his Packard delivers food for the poor—all these signify the masses who were ready to guarantee that the poor will once again eat this year.

Even the entertainment was varied from that of the previous year. Lou Stimel and his men returned to play tunes for dancing; Elvira Helal was there with her soprano voice. But Rita Ellice, pretty recording and TV personality was missed; as were Sid Katz' jokes. Yet, the unfortunate will still be able to sing their anthem of thanks.

The banquet was once again, this year, in honor of Congressman Victor L. Anfuso and "Big Joe" Rosenfeld, Jr. The former's speech began with an anecdote, as it did last year. But this time it was in a humorous vein. It was about the Internal Revenue man who ascended to heaven before the rabbi because he had scared more hell out of people on earth than anyone else. However, before leaving for Washington and his Space and Preparedness Committee, he reiterated last year's theme: "Joe Pearson" serves the people all year long.

"Big Joe's" message to the throng differed a little from the previous year. On one count it was longer, and secondly, more personal. But the motif was the same—"If Joe Pearson spent the time he donates to charity on a personal business, he would be a wealthy man."

The Free Kosher Kitchen banquets of 1958 and 1959 show recognizable differences. Yet, to the needy and unfortunate they remain the same.

Progress of Wyoming Historical and Geological Society of Luzerne County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 12, 1959:

HISTORICAL SOCIETY PROGRESS

The progress, reported at the annual meeting of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society at the annual meeting last night as it completed the first year of the second century of its existence, was most gratifying.

During 1958, the society added 76 names to its membership roll. Through the generosity of Mrs. Frank G. Dart, it acquired Sweetland House, to be converted into a public museum. Exhibits and lectures it sponsored attracted thousands of local residents, including many adolescents. This constitutes a substantial contribution to local culture.

Obviously, the society has taken a new lease on life with the completion of the first 100 years. The new interest in its affairs, as the expanding membership and program of activities indicates, is a happy omen for the future. Its possibilities are tremendous.

Formed to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the burning of anthracite in a grate, the society has extended into many fields and with stimulating results. With colleges, high schools, and organizations like the Boy Scouts taking advantage of its facilities, there is added reason for public support and encouragement. To be affiliated with a group, motivated by the high idealism and practical service of the historical society, should be regarded as a high privilege.

Our REA Program Under the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, last week the national REA convention was held here in Washington, and many of us who are interested in, and sympathetic toward, the REA program had an opportunity to visit with friends from our home States who were here for the convention. These people justifiably feel a great deal of pride in this program which they have helped to initiate in their respective areas and have guided to successful maturity as a stable cooperative enterprise bringing electricity to rural areas.

Having lived beyond the reach of an electric powerline all my life, until REA brought electricity to our ranch 7 years ago, no one has a greater appreciation of what REA has meant to people living in the country. As I have said many times, no one in his right mind has any desire to see the REA program anything but stable and successful in the years to come.

For some reason, there are some folks who would try to make a political football out of REA. For some reason that I can only interpret as a means of attempting to bring discredit to our present administration, the inference has been made repeatedly that the REA program, under the Eisenhower administration, has been curtailed, and restricted in its operation. I believe the record of REA expansion during the past 6 years speaks for itself. I do not believe that that record indicates that anything but friendly, constructive direction and administration has been given to the program.

The remarks of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson at a press conference on February 12, 1958, outline clearly the real progress that the REA

program has made during the Eisenhower administration.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of these remarks of Secretary Benson as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BENSON ON THE REA PROGRAMS AT PRESS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

Thousands of the directors and managers of our rural electric co-ops financed by REA end their Washington meeting today. I would like to salute this fine group. We all know they have built well.

Because there have been some efforts through demagoguery and other means to mislead and distort the facts, I would like to set the record straight on a few points this morning.

Some of the so-called friends of REA claim, first, that the Secretary has taken away the authority of the Administrator to approve loans. This is untrue.

Second, they say this administration is destroying REA. This is absolutely false. The record speaks for itself—and let me give you just one or two items from the record.

First, the greatest progress ever made in REA has been made during the last 6 years; loans of \$1.2 billion have been made, compared to \$2.6 billion loaned in the previous 17½ years.

Annual power sales are approximately 22 billion kilowatt-hours, double the sales made in 1952.

Third, borrowers who are delinquent on loans have dropped from 45 to 6 in the last 6 years; and these co-op organizations today are \$139 million ahead of payments. The records of the past have not even approached this splendid record of repayment.

And fourth, the net worth of cooperative borrowers has more than tripled in the last 6 years.

Now, I think we should keep in mind that REA and the REA program, and the area served, have changed somewhat in recent years. Today over 95 percent of the farms and ranches of America have electric service; 75 percent of the new customers being added are industrial and nonfarm residential consumers, and one-half of the total power sales by the REA system today is for nonfarmer use.

In other words, REA has come of age. It has rendered a great service; it is rendering great service now. But it has come of age. In the interest of fairness to all and in the interest of its own future financial strength, we feel that the system should first pay interest rates at least equal to the cost of money to the Government.

This would eliminate one of the criticisms of REA and a criticism that will increase unless a change is made.

And second, the system should start moving forward to obtain supplemental financing from private sources.

Now, such actions I feel, and my associates feel, would be in line with tradition and with the sound policies followed by the Farm Credit Administration which started out rather heavily helped by the Government and is gradually paying off the Government capital and getting its loan rates on a realistic basis. Such a policy will reduce unnecessary Government participation and thereby protect and strengthen the free enterprise system of which these electric and telephone cooperatives are a vital part. And so this administration will continue to support and strengthen the services of REA to our farmers.

We will just as vigorously oppose efforts to socialize electric power or any other segment of our economy, including agriculture. As one who has spent most of his life promoting farmer cooperatives, I strongly feel that these recommendations, these suggestions will further strengthen the REA system.

FACTS OF REA GROWTH 1953-59 (DISTRIBUTED AT SECRETARY BENSON'S PRESS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 12, 1959)

1. Loans of about \$1.2 billion have been made. This is almost one-third of the \$3.8 billion approved since the start of the program.

2. Some 800,000 new consumers and 180,000 miles of line have been added to REA systems, to the point where almost 96 percent of our farms have electricity, more than half of which are served by REA borrowers.

3. Power sales on REA systems have reached an estimated 21.7 billion kilowatt-hours, or double the sales in 1952.

4. Loans were approved to provide facilities for 1,116,000 kilowatts of generating capacity, almost double the total provided in the previous 17½ years.

5. The number of electrification borrowers behind in their loan payments dropped from 45 to 6 out of a total of nearly 1,000. (The systems have made payments on principal and interest in excess of \$1 billion. At year-end the systems were ahead on their payments in the amounts of \$139 million.)

6. The net worth of electrification borrowers has more than tripled, increasing from \$161 million to \$512 million. (On January 1, 1959, net worth was about 16.4 percent of total assets.)

There are two other facts which indicate a significant trend in the growth of the REA systems:

1. Three out of every four new customers being added to the systems are industrial and nonfarm residential consumers.

2. About one-half of total power sales by the REA system is now being made to industrial and nonfarm residential consumers.

Airline Safety Before Frills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Rockford Register, Republic, Rockford, Ill., entitled "Airline Safety Before Frills":

AIRLINE SAFETY BEFORE FRILLS

President Eisenhower and Gen. Elwood Quesada, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, take the proper stand that Federal appropriations for civil airports should be earmarked for safety features—runways, control towers, taxiways, and improved ground landing-control devices. Need for this emphasis was pointed up by last week's Electra crash in New York City; the plane was headed for a runway lacking a safety beam to guide its rate of descent.

Yet, Senate Democrats, continuing their hasty rush to pass spending bills, last week approved a \$465 million 4-year program of Federal airport grants that would provide funds for terminal buildings, waiting rooms, and other passenger comforts and conveniences.

The President noted that the Federal Government has not built railroad or bus depots, and General Quesada said that facilities "beyond the gate" having nothing to do with aviation safety should be the responsibility of State or local authorities and the airlines themselves. In this respect, it will be noted that future improvements to Chicago's O'Hare field will be financed in part by landing fees charged the airlines.

President Eisenhower, who vetoed an airport-aid bill last year and suggested it was time for the Government to get out of the business of subsidizing airfields, included \$50 million a year for 4 years in the 1960 fiscal budget for facilities falling strictly in the safety category. Democrats, however, agreed only to trim the original \$565 million bill by \$100 million—and then at the urging of their Senate leader, LYNDON JOHNSON.

If the airport bill clears Congress in its present form, it will face the distinct possibility of a presidential veto. The inclusion of funds for nonsafety features is an old trick of congressional spenders; they know that the President lacks powers to disapprove individual items in appropriation bills, so they tack pork-barrel provisions onto measures calling for desirable projects.

Perhaps the House, which last year had a better economy record than the Senate, will trim the fat from the upper Chamber's bill. Taxpayers ought to tell their Congressmen to vote for greater aviation safety, but not for plush airport terminal facilities.

Washington's Dream of Great Port Here Near Realization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a goodly measure of pride that I take this opportunity to report on a wonderful civic endeavor undertaken by a group of public-spirited citizens of Alexandria, Va., and the Washington Metropolitan area.

I am inserting in the RECORD a fine article written by Mr. Raymond L. Tolbert, president of the Potomac River Port Association, entitled "Washington's Dream of Great Port Here Near Realization." This article is a summary of a larger item which appeared in the Alexandria Gazette, the oldest daily newspaper of the United States on the occasion of its 175th anniversary edition, February 5, 1959:

WASHINGTON'S DREAM OF GREAT PORT HERE
NEAR REALIZATION—METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON NEEDS SEAPORTS—POTOMAC RIVER PORT ASSOCIATION SEEKS WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

In 1739 Virginia ceded to the Federal Government a portion of its territory, part of which was the waterfront of Alexandria, to help make a 10-mile square area for the Capital of the United States, and it was of this area that George Washington said, "It is at the head of navigable water reaching to the ocean, so that large vessels could come from all ports of the world. It is likewise on the coastal road from north to south, so the transportation of commodities and persons between these regions would be by way of the Capital City. Here bulk cargoes would be broken up for shipment to the interior. Here great markets and exchanges would be established. The National Capital would become the center of trade and industry, as well as government. It would be the economic capital of the Nation as well as political capital."

GREATEST NATURAL ASSET

It has been 160 years since George Washington gave these reasons for selection of the Capital site—but, at long last, his vision

may be close to realization for the pressures of economic growth and an expanding population have made the people of this community conscious of the fact that their greatest natural asset lies decaying on their waterfront. What once was a busy port, a trading post to the world, has, like Rip van Winkle, let time and events pass it by. But the time for sleeping has passed and, belated though it may be, our citizens have awakened to the need for development of the Potomac River channel and for resurgence of their cities as thriving ports.

It is evident that the Alexandria of the early colonial days was conscious of its position in the world of commerce for the seal of the city represents a merchant's scale over a square-rigged merchant ship. Alexandria did, in fact, owe its early prosperity to waterborne commerce. From the back country great caravans of wagons rolled into the city, laden with tobacco, wheat and other farm products for export and returned to their plantations with glass, crockery, and fine merchandise from overseas. And as an evidence of their eagerness to make Alexandria a more thriving port, the good citizens of the community approved a plan which in 1776 resulted in cutting away the hilltop, upon which the early city was founded, to enable carts to traverse a gentler incline to reach the warehouses and wharves at the river's edge.

SIXTH IN NATION

After the Revolution, Alexandria's commerce expanded and flourished. It was common to see many European ships, and some from other parts of the world, alongside the docks, unloading their native goods, or loading the produce of this area into their holds. Alexandria at one time ranked sixth among the ports of the young Nation, in tonnage handled at its docks.

However, the early years of the 19th century saw the decline of Alexandria as an important port. President Madison's embargo on American shipping, imposed in 1809 in an attempt to stop seizure of our ships by the French and British, brought commerce to a standstill, with idle ships and crews lying in port resulting in heavy loss to ship owners. In 1814, as a prelude to their burning of public buildings in Washington, the British took brief possession of Alexandria, captured most of the ships in the port and seized the contents of the warehouses there. This was another reverse to the merchants and traders whose ships and merchandise were lost. Not content with these tribulations, fate dealt an additional blow in 1827 with a holocaust of fire leveled a large part of the city destroying most of the business area and causing a serious reduction in commercial activity. The coming of the steam-driven ship marked the end of large-scale commerce in Alexandria and in 1860 foreign trade had dwindled to a paltry value of \$1,750,000 from a high point of almost \$3,750,000 in earlier years. Alexandria's loss of trade, occasioned by the advent of the deep-draft steamship, whose owners feared damage to their vessels in the shallow reaches of the Potomac, was further aggravated by the War Between the States when the Potomac River was the boundary between those warring factions.

SPORADIC EFFORTS MADE

The century that has passed since 1859 has seen sporadic efforts at improvement of the river channels to recapture, for Washington and Alexandria, some measure of their former status as shipping centers. The efforts of local citizens and the action of Congress, however, failed to keep pace with developments in ship construction and though the Potomac River channel was deepened and widened it was, and is, able to accommodate only the smallest seagoing freighters. The last serious effort to improve the Potomac River for commerce started at the turn of the century when, in

1899, the Congress, even then impressed by the necessity for development of the resources of this area, authorized and appropriated funds to deepen the channel to 24 feet, and widen it to 200 feet along the 108 miles from Washington to the Chesapeake entrance. Unfortunately for the metropolitan area as a port, the drawing boards of shipbuilders were busy with design of bigger and better ships—24 feet of water in the Potomac River channel was not enough.

METROPOLITAN GROWTH

While the last hundred years has seen little improvement in the river that passes Alexandria's front door, the communities that once bordered it as a series of sprawling, and sometimes brawling, towns have become a metropolitan area, which includes Washington, D.C., Fairfax, Arlington, in Virginia, and Montgomery County and Prince Georges County in Maryland, and the independent cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va. The metropolitan area of Washington has led the 10 largest metropolitan areas in the United States in population growth. Alexandria has shared prominently in this growth, having increased its population from 24,149 in 1930 to 87,000 in 1957 with an estimated population of 105,000 by 1965.

Population is just you and me and many other people. But you and I and these other people must have, for living and for survival, many things—schools and hospitals, streets and highways, police and fire protection, business and industry, work and recreation. These things don't just pop up like magic produced from a magician's tophat. They require revenue for support and careful planning for orderly development. Without one, vital services could not be obtained, without the other a chaotic situation would result.

The communities that make up the metropolitan area are all experiencing growing pains. Each has its problem of land utilization, of economic development, of transportation, of all the things that make up life in an urban setting. Concerned by the impact of these problems in the Washington area a Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, 85th Congress, 2d session held exhaustive hearings during 1958 to review what is being done by local governments and private organizations of the area to identify their growth problems and, where possible, to solve them. These hearings described population growing by leaps and bounds, with a metropolitan area population now totaling 2 million to become nearly 3,500,000 by 1980. Economic development was pictured which would, by 1970, completely close the corridor between Baltimore and Washington and would have expanded into the area south of Alexandria as far as Woodbridge, Va. The necessity for development of port facilities along the Potomac River, not alone at Alexandria and Washington, but along both shores was expounded as being vital to the future of the metropolitan area. Testimony was given by eminent economists, experts in transportation, engineers of distinction in the field of water use, all of whom emphasized the need to take action now to meet the problems of tomorrow. The committee will make its final report to Congress at this present session and should propose measures which will promote the economic stability of the metropolitan area. Alexandrians are confronted by essentially the same problems of growth that plague the rest of the metropolitan area and they are aware that these problems are insoluble without utilization of every available community resource, natural or manufactured. They see the vital necessity for redevelopment of the Potomac River into an avenue of world trade as a partial solution to the economic problems of their city. This dormant giant, drowsing now for a century, would be awakened and made to be a source of financial support as well as of scenic in-

terest. They recognize that the entire metropolitan area would be a beneficiary of a deepened and widened Potomac River channel, particularly in Alexandria.

ALL HAVE INTEREST

Though Alexandria is the logical first site for a deep-water freight terminal, it is evident that the District of Columbia, Maryland, and the rest of northern Virginia have an equal interest in the entire development project and need to be partners in its formulation and progress. The future can only bring additional growth and what is now visualized as an early development of Washington passenger terminal facilities and cargo handling terminals at Alexandria will undoubtedly result in similar, but later, development on the Maryland shore and south along the Virginia side.

The metropolitan area of Washington, particularly Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland, and Fairfax County in Virginia, are experiencing a tremendous growth in research and development installations. These installations in turn will lead to the production of new ideas in the future. The development of the ports for this area will stimulate and further the development of light industry in these areas.

With this in mind a series of studies on the economic justification for the development of port facilities on the Potomac River was inaugurated by the city of Alexandria, the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce, and the Washington Board of Trade. The report on the first of these studies was made in April 1956 and, though admittedly limited in scope, was highly favorable.

A year later the Virginia State Ports Authority, after a more exhaustive study which included the metropolitan area and surrounding areas, reaching to parts of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio, reported that there is a substantial foreign and intercoastal commerce potential for Potomac River ports, and recommended that everything possible be done to build up Alexandria as a world port.

RECENT STUDY MADE

The most recent study and probably the most important was authorized by the 85th Congress which appropriated \$133,000 to the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army to conduct: (1) an economic analysis of additional commerce to be developed by a Potomac port development and the extent of transportation savings, and (2) a survey to determine dredging costs. According to Representative JOEL T. BROWN, the first part of the Corps of Engineers analysis has been completed with a highly favorable report. This report, with its succeeding analysis of dredging costs, will be the basis for further congressional action to appropriate funds for the actual work of widening and deepening the Potomac River Channel.

These surveys have convinced the civic leaders of the community that they must actively support this project; that its fulfillment will bring a vitally needed economic boost to the entire metropolitan area. One of the first steps that they must take to insure its success is development of the master plan outlining construction which will be required to provide a modern and efficient freight terminal facility. This will necessitate a comprehensive survey of the present waterfront facilities and a detailed recommendation on the most suitable utilization of waterfront land, bearing in mind the need to integrate into the master plan access and egress routes which will provide optimum availability of highway and rail transport. One of the many badly needed highway bypasses that Alexandria is considering might be included in this plan as an elevated highway running the length of the waterfront serving the port activity and through traffic as well. The master plan, while addressing itself primarily to transit

and storage facilities essential to an efficient port operation must give consideration to other municipal needs relating to recreational areas, sailing marinas and small-boat facilities. Our planners would need, of course, to establish a time schedule to provide for orderly progression and enable construction to remain an even distance ahead of requirements, obviously it would be uneconomical to build a capacity into either Alexandria or Washington's port facilities which would not be used until long after completion. Consideration should be given to the various possibilities of funding the development and of its operation. Operation of a busy port is a highly competitive and specialized business and selection of the form of port administration most suitable to our plans should not be long delayed. The benefits of a port will not come to this area without concentrated promotion to secure scheduled service by shipping interests and to convince shippers of the advantages to them in moving their goods through this area. As improvement of the Potomac River Channel advances, this promotion will be an important step in insuring the success of the ports of Alexandria and Washington.

VISUALIZE CARGO PORT

In the absence of formal plans, the Potomac River Port Association visualizes a cargo port, with wharf-type berths paralleling the mile-long waterfront of Alexandria. The port facilities should be capable of handling an annual flow of 3 million tons of cargo which will serve the entire metropolitan marketing area of part of Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, and Maryland, an area that now has a population of over 10 million with a personal income in excess of \$16 million. Few cities have going for them the transportation facilities which already exist in the Alexandria area; excellent highways connect with major centers east, south, and west; seven railroads, the Southern, the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac, the Chesapeake & Ohio, the Atlantic Coast Line, the Seaboard Air Line, the Pennsylvania, and the Baltimore & Ohio serve the area. The Potomac Yard is one of the leading freight terminal and classification yards in the Nation. Washington National Airport is one of the most active in the United States and a new airport, now building at Chantilly, Va., not far from Alexandria, will add an even greater capacity for air traffic. With modern port terminal facilities at Alexandria and Washington to accommodate deep draft cargo and passenger ships, this area will be a well-balanced and complete trading center, with transportation readily available by rail, sea, air, and highway.

A POSSIBLE PLAN

It is contemplated that the port development will be fully integrated with other plans affecting both cities. A first step in terminal construction in Alexandria could be utilization of the spoil dredged from the channel to fill behind the bulkhead which will form the wharves, such a procedure will reduce the dredging cost by shortening the distance such material must be transported and will add a considerable usable acreage to the Alexandria waterfront. Storage and transit warehouses will be constructed for nine ship berths, and existing facilities used as far as practicable. A loop highway, connecting with the main arterial highways, will be elevated, running the length of Alexandria's waterfront over the roofs of the transit terminals. Existing rail spurs will be extended to serve all terminal warehouses and loop back into Potomac Yard. A 6-acre open lumber storage area with attendant wharf will be established at the southern extremity of the waterfront. Complete refrigeration services and cold storage facilities will be included in the terminal plans.

What will this revitalized port mean to the area? The terminals for deep draft ves-

sels that are visualized will introduce a vitally needed new source of economic strength into the community. The surveys mentioned earlier have indicated that many millions of dollars could be saved annually to importers and exporters of the metropolitan marketing area by having their goods moved through Alexandria. This saving would be passed on to the consumer in lower prices for goods now received through rail and highway transportation from more distant ports. Passenger traffic through Washington, limited as it has been in the past by the 21-foot channel depth, has proved financially remunerative. With improved terminals and a deeper and wider channel which would accommodate modern cruise ships, Washington could richly support a flourishing and profitable seaborne tourist and cruise business.

MANY BENEFITS SEEN

The 3-year operation of the Yarmouth Castle and the Arcos Star has convinced the business leaders of this profit potential. An increase in the number of industrial plants in Alexandria and its vicinity would result from the increased volume of goods which could be moved to this area by seaborne transportation at reduced freight rates. Experience has shown that direct employment involved in operation of such a port as is planned for Alexandria amounts to over 1,500 men—and, more important, that supporting activity employs three men for every man directly employed by the port. These are direct benefits—savings, employment, payroll. Indirectly, the community will profit in numerous ways. The introduction of new industry, coupled with the activity generated by the movement of goods through the port, will mean a broadening of the economic and tax base of the community. The next 7 years will see an added 400,000 residents in this metropolitan area and the employment and civic services which will be required to support them will be in part found in port activity and the revenues generated there. An active port will not be a panacea for all the growing pains of Alexandria, but it will, as ports have in other areas, contribute in large measure to their cure. There are, unfortunately, still obstacles which must be overcome before the community can be assured of the port development so urgently required. But similar obstacles have been overcome by the enthusiasm and support of citizens of other communities who sought deep water shipping which was denied to them by the lack of adequate channels.

WORK TO BE DONE

Here, in the metropolitan area, while the Corps of Engineers has completed the first phase of their analysis of the value of Potomac River development, the second phase must be expedited. To obtain congressional authorization and appropriations to dredge the channel, the cost of dredging must be determined to finally demonstrate the economic justification for the project. This can only be done through the Corps of Engineers and each one of us must do all in his power to insure prompt action in this field. Improvement of the Potomac River channel and development of its port facilities is a project which will require the coordinated action of two States, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government.

ASSOCIATION AT WORK

In order to insure that action is not delayed, and to maintain the interest and effort needed to insure the development of Potomac River ports, leading citizens, not only of Alexandria but of Washington and Maryland as well, have formed the Potomac River Port Association, a nonprofit public-service corporation, to spearhead the movement. An indication of the caliber of the men devoting their time and energy to this cause is shown by a listing of the associa-

tion's board of directors, which reads like a Who's Who of the metropolitan area. Their purpose is to collect and prepare data regarding the improvement, development, and uses of the rivers, harbors, and waterways of the metropolitan area, to promote and develop ports in the Alexandria-Washington area and to educate the people of the community to the importance of the development as well as inform them of the benefits which will result from its fulfillment. The association's program includes research into products which can most economically be brought into and shipped from the metropolitan area by water and publication of the results of that research to shippers and to shipowners. Through all possible means of communication the association is spreading information regarding benefits of port development, and its vital necessity to the future of the community, to those whom it would serve. The association is supported in its work by the voluntary memberships of businesses, organizations, and individuals of the metropolitan area, who are in sympathy with its objective. If concentration of effort will bring Potomac River improvement to quicker realization, this association will provide the focus of interest and activity necessary to the job.

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. STANLEY A. PROKOP

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, I am happy indeed to join in this observance of the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This small nation, whose sons and daughters have contributed so much to the building of America—is, of course, not independent and free today.

Lithuania is a race of character, courage, and culture.

America is indeed grateful for the contributions that men and women of Lithuanian blood have made to our common strength.

They have a faith that the Soviets cannot destroy.

They have courage that the Soviets can never vanquish.

Lithuania has a character that will survive when all the fraud and force of godless tyrants will have vanished from the face of the earth.

This annual commemoration of her independence which was gained more than 41 years ago serves a most useful purpose. It is a reminder of the tragic fate of Lithuania and other countries that were formerly free but today are fettered by the chains of Communist slavery.

But this occasion is far more than a time for tribulation and sorrow over the fate of Lithuania and these other countries which are existing in the darkness of the Iron Curtain. Let us make it a time of rededication in the eternal fight for freedom and independence.

This observance here and throughout other lands where people of Lithuanian blood are living today will be heard behind the Iron Curtain. It will clearly demonstrate to the people of Lithuania

that they are not forgotten, that their struggles are the struggles of the freedom-loving world.

It will help to keep bright in their minds and hearts the flames of hope for the day of liberation.

Our own Nation must also make it abundantly clear to all other nations that we stand for liberation from tyranny and oppression and for self-determination and freedom of choice for all peoples to ordain and to establish their own form of government under democratic processes.

I, therefore, extend congratulations to the Lithuanian people on this anniversary of their independence day. Let us all join them in more than words in their efforts to unloose the shackles of tyrants and reestablish their independence.

All hail to Lithuania on the anniversary of its 41st birthday. May her courageous people soon regain their precious liberties.

Time To End Special Favors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared under date of February 16, in the Rockford Register-Republic, Rockford, Ill., entitled "Time To End Special Favors":

TIME TO END SPECIAL FAVORS

President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson last week answered effectively the false charges of the long-entrenched rural electric cooperative pressure group that the administration is trying to wreck its ambitious program.

Both the President and Benson pointed out the true facts—that the administration in the last 6 years gave out rural electrification loans totaling \$1.2 billion, as compared with \$3.8 billion in loans for the preceding 17 years of REA's existence; that about half the total power sales of REA cooperatives are now being made to industrial and non-farm residential consumers; and that at the end of 1958, the cooperatives were \$139 million ahead in principal and interest payments on loans.

The President told members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative association, who met in Washington, that they should pay their own way. The Government must live within its means or face inflation and cannot continue to pass out subsidies to favored groups.

Yet the cooperative association, showing hostility to any proposals to take away some of its favorable tax treatment and low-rate-interest privilege, wants to keep on moving into areas served by taxpaying, Government-regulated private power companies. Now that rural electric cooperatives have just about blanketed the areas for which they were established, they are aiming at selling power to suburban residential and industrial consumers.

The REA lobby has succeeded in persuading House Speaker SAM RAYBURN to join in protesting the President's request to increase the interest rate charged by the Government

to the cooperatives from 2 to about 4 percent. The 2-percent rate has been in effect since 1935, and in those 23 years the Federal Treasury has loaned REA some \$3 billion.

There is no valid reason why a successful enterprise should continue to enjoy what amounts to an outright Government subsidy. The U.S. Treasury loans money to REA at 2 percent, but must pay interest as high as 4 percent to borrow money from the rest of the taxpaying public.

If Speaker RAYBURN believes that the American public should continue to subsidize the electric cooperatives, he should be consistent and vote to restrict REA sales of power to industries and residential users in villages and suburban areas, because electric cooperatives were not set up on that basis.

Some electric cooperatives have devised a way of relieving their shareholders of Federal income tax payments on earnings; the cooperatives issue reports to their shareholders on earnings and amounts invested, but Federal courts have held that these certificates are not taxable as long as earnings are not taken out in cash.

Propaganda activities of the rural cooperative association are also exempt from taxation, a status not enjoyed by private power companies which band together in public-information advertising campaigns.

Need for Improved Postal Service in Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, a very definite need has arisen in the State of Maine for improved postal service. The discontinuance of railway passenger service in many parts of the State has caused a serious deficiency in the system of postal transportation.

The need of better mail transportation has been evident in my State. For example, when a letter is sent from Rumford to Mexico, a distance of 2 miles, it must first be directed to the Portland terminal and back again, a round-trip distance of approximately 150 miles. Needless to say, the delay which this roundabout method causes is inexcusable. The people of Maine expect and deserve good postal service, which they are not now getting.

A personal example of this slow service is a letter which I sent airmail to Rumford from Washington, D. C. The letter took 5 days to reach its destination, although the plane trip from Washington to Portland, Maine, takes only 3 hours. It was, therefore, a 4-day trip from Portland to Rumford—75 miles.

Growing use is being made in some areas of the Highway Post Office Service—H.P.O.—a method of filling the needs caused by the disbandment of the railroads. Besides providing for better service, the Highway Post Office would also be less expensive to maintain. For these two reasons, I advocate that the Post Office Department extend the use of the H.P.O.

Following is an article, compiled by Robert W. Reed, secretary of the Portland branch of the National Postal Transport Association, which should give a further picture of the problem of mail transportation as it exists in Maine:

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF EN ROUTE DISTRIBUTION OF MAIL IN MAINE

From the time of the establishment of the first post route in what is now the State of Maine, a route from Portsmouth to Falmouth (now Portland), about 1760, until the time of the Civil War, distribution, or sorting of mail en route was unheard of or untried on any practical scale.

The Congress of the United States, on July 7, 1838, provided that every railroad then in operation or that should be thereafter completed should be a post route and the Postmaster General " * * shall cause the mail to be transported thereon * * * ". The first railroad to start operation was the Portland, Saco & Portsmouth Railroad on December 22, 1842. The report of the postmaster for the year ending June 30, 1843, shows service, Portland to Portsmouth, rail, 50 miles, 12 weekly trips, \$5,000.

The route agent was the first departure from the custom of turning the mail over to the carrier for transportation. He was an employee of the Post Office Department placed on trains to receive and put off pouches along the route and have custody of the pouches in his possession. People soon came into the habit of handing loose letters to him at the train, when there was not time to mail them in the post office. These he carried with him to the post office at the end of his route.

Where the first experiment in distribution en route was tried, we do not now know, but one day a route agent took with him the key to unlock the pouches and a device to cancel stamps. He opened the necessary pouches and inserted the letters he had received on the train. From that, the next logical step was to take the entire contents of the smaller pouches received and consolidate them with the others. Thus mail for other offices along the line did not have to go to a post office at the end of the route for sorting and be returned the next day. This was about as far as the route agent could go without special equipment being built into the car.

In 1864, under the administration of Postmaster General Blair, a few cars were so equipped and en route distribution as we know it came into being. The savings in time and equipment, and the improved service were so obvious that the new Railway Mail Service spread very rapidly. It is sometimes hard to distinguish from the records that remain whether service at a certain time was by route agent or true en route distribution, but between 1875 and 1879 there seems to have been about 15 railway runs in Maine on which mail was actually distributed. Some of these overlapped to a degree.

Between 1875 and 1905 there are known to have been 28 railway post office runs in operation in Maine. Some authorities show a far greater number than this, but in almost all cases the extra ones will be found to have operated along a part of a longer line. In addition to these, several were operated in electric cars and at least two in summer operated in steamboats along the Maine coast serving the isolated points and islands.

At about the time of the First World War the railroads began curtailing service. This was resumed on a far larger scale after World War II and is now approaching its ultimate conclusion. The Post Office Department has sometimes gone ahead on its own, however, and discontinued railway post office service where trains were still operating.

Thus at the present time we find only seven railway post office runs serving the State of Maine and one of these is now under petition of the railroad for abandonment of service. Furthermore, in nearly every instance, there are far fewer trains per day left on the remaining lines. In other parts of the country highway post offices (HPO's), nicknamed by employees "hypos," have been used successfully, but as yet there are none in Maine. These bus-like vehicles can exchange mail at the post office door, thus saving mail messenger service to and from railroad stations. They are generally cheaper to operate than railway post offices, and since they include some of the functions of star route service, they provide much better mail service to the small towns than can be had by star routes.

Every curtailment in en route distribution brings the State back nearer to the times of 1840 when all mail was hauled to the end of the route to be distributed and either sent back or onward the next day. The only significant difference now is the use of trucks instead of a coach and four.

Policies of Washington Blamed for Missile Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. William Hines, Washington Evening Star science writer, which appeared in that paper on Tuesday, February 17, 1959:

POLICIES OF WASHINGTON BLAMED FOR MISSILE LAG

(By William Hines)

A swing through the industrial and military complex we have labeled "Missileland" provides convincing evidence that the scientists, production men, and military officers in the field are doing a superlative job. But at the end of such a trip, there is still a nagging question:

Why are we where we are in missilery—in second place to the Russians?

The first, obvious answer is that we got started later. We waited for the feasibility of a hydrogen bomb to be proved and the Russians didn't, and consequently we are several years behind.

This explains the whole thing away nicely, although it begs the question of the wisdom of our course. But it does not explain the fact that while research, development, production and operating efficiency are high in Missileland, morale is sagging and perplexity is king.

Nor does it explain the widespread feeling out there that Washington is a sort of big brother—always watching, but not wanting to be bothered with a lot of troublesome questions.

OFF AGAIN, ON AGAIN

It leaves unanswered, too, questions about off-again, on-again production schedules; inaccurate public statements by officials that cannot be refuted by officials in the field because of security wraps; contradictory statements of objectives; tangled lines of authority; information policies that swing overnight from arrant press agency to airtight security.

Too often, the observer feels, distraught missilemen look to Washington for guidance

and find the paths of responsible officials crisscrossing like contrails in the sky.

Examples:

The Army is told to acquire some more for land for its White Sands range in the New Mexico desert so the antimissile missile, Nike-Zeus, can be tested there. But now there is doubt whether the Zeus will ever be built.

The Douglas and Chrysler people are ordered to open their Thor and Jupiter assembly lines to press tours at virtually the same moment as Thors and Jupiters are becoming passé.

Project officers on the solid-fueled Minuteman ICBM forge doggedly ahead, but cannot be sure that Minuteman will ever get built—much less off the ground.

Congress, the usual thorn in the side of Government activities in the field is less of a vexation than in most cases. There are probably two reasons for this.

First, the missile business is spread rather evenly around the country and a lot of money is being spent. Inclinations to rock the boat are absent.

Second, with the exception of a handful of legislators, Congress doesn't comprehend the complexities of the missile age.

Occasional summonses to Washington to appear before this committee or that committee are regarded by military and industrial leaders in missileland as minor annoyances, rather than as outright harassment.

INFORMATION POLICIES HIT

There are strong complaints, however, about information policies. Often the fire centers on Assistant Defense Secretary Murray Snyder, head of Pentagon public relations.

"Murray seems to regard public information as a proprietary commodity," one west coast industrialist commented. "He says this or that can't be given out because of security, so we point out that the information has already been published. 'All right,' he says, 'its policy' not to put it out. And how do we answer that?"

It is clear to the visitor to missileland that Mr. Snyder's role there is an important one. Constantly the visitor runs into evidences of a restraining hand on information that seems to go beyond the requirements of security. There is scarcely a plant but has things that can be shown, described in detail, even sketched—but not photographed because the timing isn't right. Hardly an industry publicist but has a drawer full of photographs he can show, but cannot release.

The restrictions are less oppressive than they might be, however, because newsmen have little trouble, given adequate contacts, in getting the information they need from services beyond Pentagon control.

STUNTS CRITICIZED

The other side of the information coin is the use of strategic weapons for publicity stunts. The sober second thought of 2 months since the orbiting of the talking Atlas has left scant doubt that the shot was a stunt, however good, with only secondary scientific advantages. Numerous industrial, scientific, and military men expressed the opinion to this writer that shots which could not stand up on their scientific value alone should not be undertaken.

"At a time when the American public should be aware of its defense and space potential, it is being confused," one scientist prominent in industry said. "Whether the confusion is deliberate or accidental, I am in no position to know."

NUMEROUS AGENCIES

The men in the field attribute a good part of the confusion surrounding the missile program to the complicated governmental setup which finds a sextet of agencies—the civilian National Aeronautics and Space Agency and the Pentagon's Defense Research and Engineering Office, its Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Army, Navy, and

Air Force—all figuring in the space and missile programs.

The ire and perplexity of industrialists and military men was more than mirrored recently in that of Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON who heads the Senate Space Committee. So criss-crossed were chains of command in the Pentagon that Senator JOHNSON was unable to find out who, among Pentagon, space officials W. M. Holaday, Roy W. Johnson and Herbert F. York, was boss, Dr. York assumed the position—but only retroactively, a day after the go-round before the Space group.

COOPERATION IN THE FIELD

In evaluating America's missile progress, one looks at the obvious things. Cooperation among the services in the field is excellent, and sharply in contrast with the jungle warfare of the Pentagon. The performance of industry oozes efficiency, and whatever slippages in production schedules occur can usually be traced back to a moment of indecision or a change of plans in Washington.

The conclusion one reaches is that our place in the race must be blamed in part at least on this fact: There are seven leading contenders for space and missile supremacy in the world. One is in Moscow. The other six are in Washington.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, Ukrainians all over the world, except in Ukraine, observed the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence. Normally, it would seem strange that such an event would be celebrated everywhere but in the country most concerned, but under the present conditions, independence there is but a memory, even though a vivid one, and one which sustains Ukrainians wherever they may be, and instills in their hearts a determination to continue their efforts to again make freedom a reality in their homeland.

The Americans of Ukrainian descent in Maryland, commemorated this anniversary with a banquet in Baltimore on January 25, with Federal, State, and municipal representatives present.

On this occasion a resolution was unanimously adopted, which I think is worthy of the consideration of all Members of the House and therefore is inserted in the RECORD herewith:

The following resolutions have been adopted by the Americans of Ukrainian descent of Maryland on the occasion of commemorating the 41st anniversary of the January 22, 1918—proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

The observance held on January 25, 1959, at YWCA, Patterson Park Avenue, Baltimore, Md.:

A. INTRODUCTION

"We, the delegates and representatives of the Ukrainian American organizations, who are organized in the Baltimore branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America—have gathered on this memorable and glorious day of January 22, 1918—proclamation of Ukrainian national independence—to discuss and deliberate problems which have

a direct bearing upon us, as citizens of this great and democratic Republic, the United States of America.

"On this occasion it is fitting to recall that our organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America had been founded in 1940, at a time when the world was gravely threatened by the totalitarian forces of nazism, fascism, and communism. The U.C.C.A. has proved to be one of the most spirited and ardent antitotalitarian and anti-Communist organizations in the country.

"Strongly supporting the efforts of our U.S.A. Government in maintaining peace, our organization boldly and without hesitation states that a lasting peace could not be achieved without granting freedom and independence to the nations enslaved by the forces of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism, among which nations is Ukraine, the country of our fathers' origin."

B. THE ENSLAVED UKRAINE

"The suffering of the Ukrainian nation has been largely due to the brutal and enslaving policies of Soviet Russia, which fact is recognized today by everyone, save the stooges of Nikita Khrushchev and die-hard Russian imperialists. Mass deportations and executions of Ukrainian patriots, ruthless destruction of all Ukrainian churches, Russification of Ukrainian culture and language, the unrestricted genocidal policy of Moscow with respect to the Ukrainian people—all these crimes express the fundamental and traditional Russian policy aiming at the destruction of the Ukrainians as a separate ethnic entity.

"Because Ukraine, by virtue of its geographical position, its numerical strength, and its natural resources has been and is a natural springboard for aggressive Russian imperialism, its full and unqualified liberation from the brutal rule of Moscow would contribute considerably to the strengthening of international peace.

"We do resolve—

"1. To support fully and unswervingly the aspiration of the 45 million Ukrainian people in their efforts to regain their political freedom and national independence.

"We call the attention of the U.S. Government and the free world at large to the fact that the Ukrainian people had achieved their full freedom when on January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence, and on January 22, 1919, they united all the Ukrainian ethnographic territories into one independent sovereign Ukrainian Democratic Republic, established through a due process of democratic elections and endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the Ukrainian people.

"The new free state of Ukraine was recognized as the legitimate nation of the Ukrainian people by many governments, including that of the Soviet Russia, the latter, however, almost simultaneously with recognition, declared war and conquered by forces the new Ukrainian Republic.

"In place of their free national democratic government, the Ukrainian people were forced upon by Soviet Russia a puppet Soviet Ukrainian Government, which from the very first day never represented the free will of the Ukrainian people.

"The Communist system has brought about the ruin of the Ukrainian people and turned their land into the status of colony of Russian imperialism. Since the final conquest of Ukraine by Russian Communist force of arms and subversion in 1920, Ukraine never surrendered in spirit or gave hope of eventual liberation and complete independence. The heroic struggle of the Ukrainian people today inspires peoples of all nations enslaved by Russia to fight for freedom.

"2. To support fully and unhesitatingly the ever increasing endeavors of the United States in its policy of maintaining peace in

the world, and in its growing determination to oppose and challenge the aggressive and imperialistic policies of the Soviets, whose ultimate goal is imposition of slavery upon this country and the destruction of its freedom and independence, as it has already done in Ukraine and in many other non-Russian countries of central and eastern Europe and Asia.

"3. To call the attention of the U.S. Government to the fact that the Soviet Union, with a population of 200 million, is not a monolithic state of the Russian people, but conglomeration of many nationalities, among whom the non-Russian, people comprising 110 million, were conquered by Moscow by force and are kept in slavery and subjugation against their will. Their desire for freedom and independence presents the weakest link in the Soviet system, which, if properly capitalized upon, could greatly enhance our chances of success in combating Soviet Russia imperialistic communism.

"4. To denounce those undemocratic Russian anti-Communist leaders here and in Europe who, in unison with the Kremlin rulers, agitate against the democratic and just aspiration of the Ukrainian people for their basic freedom and independence, thus strengthening the power of Moscow over Ukraine and all other non-Russian countries within the U.S.S.R. and the satellite orbit.

"At the same time, guided by the sense of Christian charity and compassion, we recognize the important distinction between the perennially oppressed Russian masses and the traditionally undemocratic and aggressive Russian leadership; therefore, while denouncing the Russian chauvinist leaders and imperialists who would keep Ukraine in perpetual slavery of Moscow, we deeply sympathize with the Russian masses, who are entitled to a better life and unrestricted freedom, as are the Ukrainians and all other people enslaved in the U.S.S.R.

"5. To call the attention of the U.S. Government and the free world at large that in Ukraine there exists and resists Russian domination an indomitable Ukrainian insurgent army as well as an entire network of underground resistance, which oppose the domination of Moscow and strive for the attainment of a free and independent Ukrainian democratic republic and a free world as well."

C. APPEAL TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

"Whereas the U.S. Government is solely able to rally all the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain toward a hopeful and meaningful free world of tomorrow; and whereas, the enslaved peoples of Eastern and Central Europe and of Asia look forward to our moral and political leadership:

"We do resolve, To appeal to and urge the U.S. Government to make it known to the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain that it upholds the rights of all non-Russian peoples within the present U.S.S.R., as well as of the Russian people themselves, to their basic and inalienable freedoms, which include the right of unqualified self-determination and independence. Such a step ranks in importance with NATO, which is primarily designed to safeguard Western Europe against the encroachment of Russian communism and messianism.

"In doing so, the U.S. Government will bring encouragement and hope to those peoples oppressed by Moscow, peoples who are fighting against the same tyrannical power which killed brutally the flower of our youth in Korea and which threatens to thrust into ignominious slavery not only our country, but the entire world as well."

Dr. JAROSLAW SHAWIAK,
Chairman of the Citizens' Committee
for the Observance of Ukrainian
Independence Day.

STANLEY STELMACH,
PETER WOJCIWITZ,
ANATOLE BULAWAKA,

Members.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, of Baltimore, was unable to be present, but was ably represented by Col. Richard C. O'Connell, superintendent of the bureau of transportation of the city of Baltimore. The address he delivered for the mayor, together with the mayor's proclamation, follow:

Due to a particularly heavy schedule for this afternoon and evening, it is impossible for Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., to be with you in person, as much as I know he would have liked to be able to do so, therefore, he has asked me to bring you his official and personal greetings, and to read to you a copy of his proclamation designating the commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

Today, as you observe the 41st anniversary of the declaration of your country's independence, we find the world in turmoil with many countries in Europe under the domination of a government who denies every right to the people of these lands, including your own country.

On behalf of all our people in Baltimore Mayor D'Alesandro asked me to give voice to the hope that is in your hearts, that the delivery of the Ukraine will not be long delayed, and that before many years have passed, not only your loved fatherland, but all the once-free peoples of Europe will be restored to that freedom and equality among the nations that is their just and God-given due. And, again I quote the mayor, who said: "In thus voicing the sentiments of the people of Baltimore, I am speaking not only for those who had America for their birthplace, but I know that I truly represent the feelings of those amongst us who came from the Ukraine and other enslaved nations, or who are descendants of former residents of these countries."

America glories in the fact that the people of other lands, while they have been assimilated into the great melting pot that is America, nevertheless, retain a love for, and a continuing knowledge and appreciation of, the customs and traditions of their fatherland.

We glory in it, I say, and we would not have it otherwise, for we believe that the man or woman, who comes from a foreign land, and who retains his or her love for that land, while giving their first loyalty to America, is the better citizen therefore.

As against the communistic doctrine which states that their form of government must rule the world, by fair means or foul, we, the American people, can stand cleanly before the world and say plainly to any state: "This Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressor."

Since the origin of the American people, their chief trait has been the hatred of war. And yet these American people are ready to take up their arms against aggression and destroy, if need be, by their might, any nation which would violate the peace of the world.

There can be no compromise with aggression anywhere in the world. For aggression multiplies—in rapid succession—disregard for the rights of man. Freedom when threatened anywhere is at once threatened everywhere.

With the monstrous weapons man already has, humanity is in danger of being trapped in this world by its moral adolescents. Our knowledge of science has clearly outstripped our capacity to control it. We have too many men of science and too few men of God. We have grasped the mystery of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount. Man is stumbling blindly through a spiritual darkness while toying with the precarious secrets of life and death. The world has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power

without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace—more about killing than we know about living.

Karl Marx and his theory of communism tried to tell the world that his theory of government would be the salvation of the world. We all know how wrong he was, because the people now in power in the Kremlin only seek to enslave men and women, and deprive them of all those things freemen cherish and hold most dear.

We, here in America, believe in democracy. We believe the people should rule, and not a few dictators. If we will only believe in democracy, use it, and practice it every day, we shall so strengthen ourselves that nothing can prevail against us—or against those who stand with us in like good faith.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THOMAS D'ALESAN-
DRO, JR., DESIGNATING THURSDAY, JANUARY
22, 1959, AS UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY
IN BALTIMORE

Whereas January 22, 1959, marks the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Ukraine, proclaimed in the year 1918, in Kiev, the ancient capital of Ukraine; and

Whereas Ukrainians everywhere, especially those who came to America to escape the tyrannic dangers of communism which threaten the peace of the world today, realize that it is vital for all free peoples to combat the rising spread of subversive propaganda by spreading the doctrine of democracy, both here and abroad, and to bear witness to our American way of life; and

Whereas although the Iron Curtain makes it impossible for those subjects under temporary communistic domination to inform the free world as to the real nature of the rule of dictators, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is well aware of the true facts and takes the lead in pointing up for all Americans the danger of communistic world domination:

Now, therefore, I, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim Thursday, January 22, 1959, as Ukrainian Independence Day in Baltimore, in recognition of the efforts being made by Americans of Ukrainian birth or ancestry to extol the merits of true democracy, and to urge all our people to be alert to the ever-present danger to liberty and justice throughout the free world. I further urge all citizens to join with the Ukrainian Congress Committee of Baltimore in the hope and prayer that the 40 million Ukrainians, as well as all other persons temporarily behind the Iron Curtain, may soon be able to live as free men and be masters of their own destiny.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this 21st day of January, in the year of Our Lord 1959.

THOMAS D'ALESAN-
DRO, JR.,

Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor also issued a proclamation in this connection, which I would like to insert here:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION: UKRAINIAN IN-
DEPENDENCE DAY, JANUARY 22, 1959

Forty years ago, on January 22, the free and independent Ukrainian Republic was proclaimed.

Now the Ukraine lies behind the Iron Curtain—after mass Ukrainian deportations and executions, ruthless destruction of churches and Russification of Ukrainian culture and language.

The stalwart Ukrainians and those of Ukrainian descent have not forgotten their lost liberty.

January 22 is observed as a memorial to a once free and independent Ukraine.

Marylanders welcome the opportunity to join with their Ukrainian brethren in a day of prayer and hope that the inalienable rights of all freedom-loving people, to live in harmony with their fellow men, soon will be realized.

Therefore, I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor, do hereby proclaim January 22, 1959, as Ukrainian Independence Day throughout the great State of Maryland.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the city of Annapolis, this 20th day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1959.

By the Governor:

Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present at the banquet and to bring a brief message to the group, which was as follows:

May I first express my thanks and appreciation for the honor and privilege of being invited here today by the Maryland branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to join you in the observance of the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

We are all aware of the fact that the Ukrainian Congress Committee represents the unification of the Ukrainian people of the United States through numerous social, cultural, fraternal, and political organizations.

The overall purpose of the committee is to build and maintain a common, united front with all other peoples in the general anti-Communist struggle.

The Ukrainian people have no community of fate nor any community of interest in the Bolshevik doctrines of the Soviet Union which is dominated by the greater Russian people. Communist rule has been imposed upon the Ukraine by terror, by starvation, and by extermination.

The Ukraine today is a gigantic state of landlord system of agricultural peonage, enforced by terroristic repression. The Ukrainian peasant has been reduced to a status inferior to the serfdom of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Today the Ukrainian farmer cannot determine the hours of his labor nor the conditions of his labor. He cannot choose the crops he will plant, nor the time of the plantings. He has no choice in the disposition of his harvest nor in what he receives for his labor.

The struggle between 40 million Ukrainian farmers and the dozen men who ruled the Soviet Union came to a climax in that tragic winter and spring of 1932-33.

The Soviet authorities deported whole communities and villages en masse to Siberia. In some areas the people were blocked from travel for food. The Soviet authorities as a last weapon, plundered and extorted all food from the people where any resistance appeared.

The Soviet's penalizing policy of national famine resulted in the death by starvation and undernourishment of more than 5 million freedom-loving people in the Ukraine.

The suffering and death of these millions of unfortunate human beings need not have been in vain.

If their death will help us to understand the true nature and the false philosophy of communism, then this tragedy may prevent the recurrence of similar mass-murders wherever communism might strike.

Most of us are aware of the denial of God in communistic dogma. We know that communism rejects and ridicules the moral precepts of Christianity and of every other religion.

This country is engaged in a cold war with the Soviet for the friendship and support of the free nations of the world.

The struggle today is not between the capitalism of the United States and the socialism of the Soviet. Rather it is a struggle between sunlight and darkness. Between individual dignity and state slavery.

We can no longer be on the defensive in this ideological war. We must unmask the Soviet and her propaganda of capitalism.

We must expose to the people of the free countries the fact that the Soviet is a new form of tyranny and slavery. We must prove to all free peoples that Soviet socialism, essentially is nothing more than concentrated state monopolistic capitalism, founded upon human slavery and held together by threat of violence.

I would like to assure the Ukrainian people that this country has not abandoned her interest in the freedom-loving peoples of Central Europe. We will continue our efforts to resist further aggression and to point the way toward the liberation of all oppressed peoples.

Liberian Ambassador Urges African Unity in Areas Where Cooperation Is Possible Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following releases:

LIBERIAN AMBASSADOR URGES AFRICAN UNITY IN AREAS WHERE COOPERATION IS POSSIBLE NOW

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 10, 1959.—Liberian Ambassador to the United States, George A. Padmore, said recently that the valued cultural diversities among the peoples of Africa might make it necessary to wait until doomsday for an African federation while opportunities would be lost in the areas where cooperation is possible now.

ADDRESSES CAPITAL PRESS CLUB

Addressing a dinner meeting of the Capital Press Club in Washington, D.C., Ambassador Padmore asserted:

"We do not object to federation in the least, provided it is entered into by states which are in a position to make up their own minds, free of outside interference, and which come to the decision that federation is the political arrangement best suited to their needs.

"But we have had a long experience of the way these things are done in the world, and we believe it is a sober truth, and not necessarily a frightening truth, that if we wait for a voluntary federation of all the states, all the tribes, all the peoples of Africa, we may have to wait until doomsday."

SAYS OPPORTUNITIES MAY BE LOST

"And while we wait, opportunities for fruitful cooperation, within the limits of political patterns less rigid than that implied by federation may go begging."

Ambassador Padmore said it was these factors which led President Tubman and his government to propose recently the formation of the Associated States of Africa, an organization which would achieve close association without burying national or international identities.

States associated under this proposal would have a common cultural institution, a regional health authority, a scientific research and training agency, and a uniform tariffs and customs convention.

Comprising this association would be Africa's independent states and dependent territories with fixed independent dates. Other nonindependent states could join when free.

STATES WOULD RETAIN SOVEREIGNTY

"No state entering the association," the Ambassador continued, "would sacrifice even a fraction of its sovereignty. Much less would it be exposed to the risk of being brought under the domination of a state whose language, culture and institutions might bear small resemblance to its own."

"We are convinced that cooperation on this basis is the kind that can be most speedily attained and will be most likely to endure," he added.

He said Liberia stands among those countries "who feel that freedom must not and cannot be unduly delayed unless irreparable harm is to be done to the cause of world peace."

The diplomat cautioned against breaking up Africa's coalition once colonialism has been vanquished, "even if it is only a coalition of the spirit," because poverty and disease are also among the common problems Africa will have to face.

DIVIDE AND RULE MAY ENSUE

Ending the coalition, he added, would also "be an invitation to outside influences to resume the dangerous game of divide and rule."

"We do not wish to see repeated on our continent the feuds and the clash of ambitions and the wrangling over frontiers which for centuries has made Europe a playground for the armies of proud monarchs and scheming dictators," Ambassador Padmore said.

"Unity then," he stated, "must be the continuing watchword for Africa. But how is it to be achieved? We know it cannot come overnight. . . . It is often said that there is as much difference between a tribe in Gabon, for example, and a tribe in Sierra Leone as there is between a Portuguese and a Swede."

"That is true, and perhaps we should be grateful it is, for the solution to the world's troubles lies more in the preservation of the right people to be different from one another than in any misguided attempt to reduce the whole of mankind to a drab conformity."

UNITY GROWS OUT OF DIVERSITY

"Unity should grow out of diversity and not be used to crush it. Eliminating national characteristics is likely to prove as hard a task as eliminating the difference between the sexes."

"Liberia has a unique history. It follows that it has also a unique culture. It has traditions and customs and social institutions of its own. We have no wish either to give them up or to impose them on other people," Ambassador Padmore stated.

The Capital Press Club, which he addressed, has 67 members, including editors, reporters, photographers, radio and television news commentators and public relations practitioners.

Among the media they represent are U.S. News & World Report, United Broadcasting Co., the National Negro Press Association, the Associated Negro Press, the New York Post, the Carolinian, the Cleveland Call and Post, the New York Amsterdam News, the Journal of the National Medical Association, the Afro-American, the Pittsburgh Courier, and the Chicago Defender.

PROMINENT CLUB SPEAKERS

The magazines and newspapers among these media have a combined circulation exceeding 4 million. The radio and television stations service a total area audience exceeding 1 million listeners.

Previous speakers before the club have included Supreme Court Justice Felix H. Frankfurter; Congressmen Adam Clayton

Powell, of New York, and William L. Dawson, of Illinois.

Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield; Presidential Press Secretary James C. Hagerty; Democratic National Committee Chairman Paul M. Butler; and Republican National Committee Chairman Meade Alcorn.

[From the Liberia Official Gazette, Jan. 26, 1959]

With the emergence of newly independent states in Africa, Liberia is happy that she no longer stands alone as she did in the age of colonial expansion and exploitation. In that age she lost over half of her territory and suffered unspeakable indignities, discrimination, and perils. But never for once have the Liberian people lost sight of the fact that they are inseparably engaged in the great total human struggle for freedom and independence taking place everywhere and more particularly in Africa.

Liberia has consistently maintained that every people have an inherent right to be free to decide upon the type or form of government they desire as well as the political machinery they wish to employ in the solution of their problems in their own way without interference.

However, when the Liberian Government speaks of noninterference in the affairs of member countries, this cannot be construed to mean that it advocates the principle that any government can violate fundamental human rights of its citizens without such violation being the common concern of the entire world community. Neither can it be interpreted to refer to governments which have not been voluntarily created by the people of their own free will and accord.

Therefore in the United Nations and elsewhere Liberia has sought every opportunity in a constructive manner to advocate the cause of African freedom and independence. She has always maintained that Africa should not be half slave and half free. She has felt that Africa must be totally free so that her peoples might become masters of their own destinies. Thus, even at great risks to her own safety, Liberia has remained an asylum for the oppressed peoples of Africa. But the Liberian people are convinced that only friendly cooperation among all nations and races will insure that degree of peace and prosperity necessary for universal progress.

The Liberian Government and people believe that there is no substitute for freedom except it be greater freedom through equal participation and unlimited fulfillment of the whole purpose of a people. They also believe that any hasty or superficial semblance of unity in areas where conflicting issues are not carefully resolved may undermine the entire structure of any permanent political unity and retard real cooperative effort.

Hence, taking into consideration differing economic systems, differing political allegiances and preferences, differing cultural backgrounds and differing social customs; and not wishing to superimpose any artificial unity upon these differences, it is the opinion of the Liberian Government that the peoples of Africa should resolve to achieve close association and cooperation, without prejudice to their national or international identities, in the following or some similar manner:

1. That a single convention which would provide for a permanent organization to be known as the Associated States of Africa, be concluded among the independent African nations and those which have fixed dates upon which they shall achieve independence, with the understanding that other nonindependent countries of Africa shall have the right to join the organization upon attaining independence.

2. That the Associated States of Africa provide for continuing consultation on problems of common interest and for the peaceful solution of all disputes which may arise among its members.

3. That, within said organization, regional associations be recognized where they already exist or be organized to develop closer unity and provide uniform and common solution to specific problems in certain areas. For instance, it is suggested that in west Africa:

(a) A regional health authority should be created which would concentrate on the eradication of diseases common to the area.

(b) An agency should be developed to direct regional scientific research and training projects.

(c) A common cultural institute for the region should be developed.

(d) A uniform reduction of tariffs and a customs convention should be undertaken.

The Liberian Government feels that these political, social, cultural, and economic actions should be achieved in consonance with the aims of the United Nations and in support of its endeavors to achieve peace and raise the level of living of the inhabitants of the earth.

By order of the President:

J. RUDOLPH GRIMES,
Acting Secretary of State.

Health Benefits for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I have again today introduced a bill providing for the payment of certain health benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program. The measure I introduced today is substantially the same as the proposals I made in the 85th Congress, which are embodied in H.R. 9467, except for the omission of improvements in cash benefits, which were, in large part, enacted last year. I favor additional improvements in cash benefits along the lines proposed before, but I am not pressing that point at this time.

My new bill provides insurance against the cost of certain hospital, skilled nursing home, and surgical services for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. This is done as part of the established Social Security System. The new benefits would be financed by adding one-quarter percent to the contribution rates of employers and employees and three-eighths of 1 percent to the contribution rates of the self-employed.

A detailed analysis of the earlier bill is available in the printed record of the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means last June—page 880—and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 30, 1957. I shall not repeat that analysis now.

It is my sincere hope that the Ways and Means Committee can arrange promptly for hearings on my proposals so that the House can take action this year. The committee should give con-

sideration to possible improvements along lines which have already been suggested to me or which may be proposed by members of the health professions, and other groups interested in the welfare of the aged.

As I said in the House, in 1957, the present details are not necessarily the best that can be drafted or the final ones that I shall support. But I am even more determined now than ever before to seek constructive legislation at the earliest possible date, because the more I study the problem of the aged the more I see the need for prompt action.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT

Extraordinary interest has been shown in the provision of health benefits for the aged as part of our national system of social insurance. Many individuals have written me endorsing my efforts and telling their own tragic experience with heavy costs and other obstacles to security and good health care.

Important organizations have again strongly endorsed health benefits under the old-age, survivors and disability insurance program. These include the American Public Welfare Association, the American Nurses' Association, the National Association of Social Workers, the AFL-CIO, the Group Health Federation of America, and other organizations with an intimate knowledge of the problems of the aged and the values of social insurance.

The Governing Council of the American Public Health Association on October 30, 1958, adopted a strong resolution which states that "health services for the aged are inadequate throughout the Nation" and supports "appropriate proposals to provide paid-up insurance for health services required by aged persons."

The American Hospital Association has recognized the need for some type of Federal action and has been exploring alternatives.

The American Medical Association has also acknowledged the need for vigorous action along new lines and urged its member societies to explore and support private programs that will help to avoid Federal legislation.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE ON NEED

Despite efforts to find alternatives stimulated by my proposal, the need for Federal action is greater than ever. A 1957 study by the Social Security Administration shows that only two out of five old-age beneficiaries have some form of health insurance. Much of it is highly inadequate. It is expensive—too expensive considering the meager resources of most of our older citizens. It can be canceled in most cases at the discretion of the carrier, and it may run out completely when lifetime ceilings have exhausted the benefits stated in the policy. Even when in effect, much of this insurance is of very limited amount.

The limits of commercial insurance for the aged are illustrated by a "65-plus" policy now being widely advertised by a national company that has been given publicity by the American Medical Association. The policy costs \$6.50 per

month per person, but its benefits are very limited. It provides only up to \$10 per day for hospital room and board for a maximum of 31 days for each confinement. Have any of my colleagues, any members of their families—or indeed any of our constituents—found a hospital room recently for \$10 per day? Up to \$100 is allowed for miscellaneous hospital expenses. Payments for surgery are limited to not more than \$200, and the company reserves the right to increase rates or to cancel on a statewide basis.

For many aged, such a policy may well seem better than nothing and in fact the policy to which I refer does appear to be about the most liberal in its terms. Many are far more restrictive. Surely this is not a sufficient answer for people with limited incomes. And the aged, typically, do have limited incomes.

Many aged persons find increasing difficulty in meeting their health problems as charges continue to mount. Hospital charges have risen 4 percent or 5 percent a year, partly because of improved services and long overdue wage increases, but also because of inefficiencies, and the lack of available alternatives.

Welfare agencies are hard-pressed to pay for necessary medical care for their clients. Hospitals wrestle with large deficits as their expenses per patient-day mount above what they can collect. All protection under group plans has been lost by many workers because of continuing unemployment.

The voluntary prepayment plans established by the hospitals and medical societies—Blue Cross and Blue Shield—are threatened by increasingly severe competition from commercial insurance companies. The latter can balance losses in this field with other profitable business. They can and do select for coverage the groups which typically have the least need for health services. Charges can accordingly be reduced on an experience rating basis below the levels possible to the nonprofit associations who are carrying the more expensive load.

THE PROPER CONCERN OF GOVERNMENT

Many Blue Cross plans have raised their rates recently, by amounts ranging up to 40 percent. As a result, a growing number of State insurance commissioners and legislative committees have asserted that the State must intervene in regard to consumer representation on Blue Cross boards' overuse of hospitals, and methods of determining charges.

These and other developments are clarifying the inevitable concern of Government as the agency to which the people turn to seek ways in which they can obtain high quality health care.

The Federal Government has for many years played an active part in the provision and financing of health services. In fact, it was in 1798 that the Congress enacted measures to provide health services for our merchant seamen. The program thus established grew into the United States Public Health Service.

Today the Federal Government provides funds for medical care for millions of persons under the public welfare programs. We have appropriated billions of

dollars for veterans' hospitals, health activities of the armed services, the National Institutes of Health, the Hill-Burton Hospital construction program, and various State health programs, all of which I heartily approve.

The vastly intricate health system of our Nation is going through rapid changes. These developments necessitate congressional consideration of various types of constructive steps that will enable all our citizens to obtain high quality medical care of the type made possible by the remarkable skills and knowledge of members of the health professions.

DESIRE FOR EXPERT ADVICE

Last summer I told the House that I was suggesting to the Committee on Ways and Means that a subcommittee be appointed to look into the question of health care for social security beneficiaries. I added that I hoped that the subcommittee would be given the authority to appoint its own staff with a director and with its own group of advisers. I feel strongly that this should be done.

In developing our final legislative proposals, the committee will certainly want information and advice from persons intimately connected with the problems of the people who need medical care and with the people who furnish that care, whether they are hospital administrators, physicians, nurses, or representatives of other allied health and technical groups.

I repeat my earlier request that such persons come forward and give us the results of their studies and deliberations so that we can get a solution to this distressing problem in the not too distant future.

MINOR CHANGES IN BILL

In preparing the new bill, I have included financing provisions similar to those which related to the health benefits section of the 1957 bill. An additional increase in the contribution rates would take place starting in 1960, consisting of one-fourth of 1 percent more for employees and employers and three-eighths of 1 percent more for the self-employed. The estimates so far available indicate that one-half of 1 percent of taxable earnings will meet the cost of the program for some time at least.

The 1 percent increase in combined contributions provided in the 1957 bill took into account the proposed changes in the cash benefits as well as the health benefits.

Up-to-date cost estimates are due shortly as part of the report which the Ways and Means Committee has requested from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It should certainly be available by March when I hope the committee may be ready to commence hearings. As part of our consideration, we can, if necessary, further adjust the schedule of contribution rates to take into account the best available cost estimates for the program which we recommend.

As usual, I personally shall support adequate financing provisions so as to maintain the soundness of the program,

which has just been attested to by the Advisory Council on Financing.

I have at this time made only one substantive change in the provisions of the bill in regard to health benefits. It occurs in paragraph (2) of subsection (c) and has the effect of broadening the group of physicians among whom the patient may select a person to provide surgical services for which payment will be made. Some of my doctor friends told me that the original definition was too limited. Perhaps others will think that the new definition is too broad. I shall welcome suggestions for further improvements.

IMPROVEMENTS TO EXPLORE

Among the strongest backers of my original bill, who have continued serious study of the health needs of the aged, there are some who question the feasibility of including surgical benefits at this time. This is one of the matters which the committee will want to weigh as it hears testimony.

We have had much experience in this country with prepaid medical care programs and private medical care insurance. Such experience indicates that the method of payment for medical care is inseparable from the kind and quality of care provided. The broad extension of prepaid health protection through collective bargaining and other types of private plans has shown that pressures are created on hospitals and physicians to hospitalize people needlessly for diagnostic services when the cost of such services is insured only during hospitalization.

We fortunately can learn from such experience under private programs how to avoid over-hospitalization in connection with the provision of similar benefits under governmental programs. Our first line of defense, of course, must be the integrity of the medical profession and the hospital administrators. As a second line of defense we should help to develop standards such as those we have found appropriate in other areas where public funds are spent and where it is necessary to protect the public interest.

When the Federal Government lets contracts for its veterans' hospitals, it insists upon specifications which must be met. When a Federal agency buys a hospital bed or drugs, it uses quality specifications to be sure of getting its money's worth. We should similarly consider proposals for assuring that hospital care or skilled nursing home services paid for from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund are of a quality approved by responsible and respected members of the health professions.

In addition to these safeguards I am most earnestly seeking from expert sources constructive suggestions on the provision of payment for medical services that are an alternative to hospital services. Aged persons typically do not want to be in the hospital unless it is essential, and they will often recover more rapidly if they can be in a more homelike environment. Outstanding hospitals and various private and public groups have developed valuable experience

on steps that can be taken to minimize hospital care and encourage rapid and lasting recovery.

I intend to explore the possibility of paying for diagnostic services, such as X-rays and laboratory tests, on an outpatient basis. Payment for such diagnostic service as part of the insurance program might well be valuable in making prompt diagnosis more available to aged persons without the necessity of hospitalization.

I intend also to explore the possibility of including benefits for home nursing care through such responsible agencies as visiting nurses' associations, hospitals, or local health departments. Much valuable work of this kind is already being done by devoted members of the nursing profession.

Another worthwhile suggestion that has been made is that the Congress should provide funds from general revenues for demonstration projects in the treatment and rehabilitation of aged persons. Grants to hospitals and other appropriate organizations could well contribute greatly to patterns and practices that would help our older citizens to lead self-sufficient lives even after serious illness.

I recognize, in view of the immensity and complexity of the problem, that any bill we can enact will have its shortcomings. Not everyone will be satisfied with even our best efforts.

But, we cannot wait, and the older people who look to us, cannot wait for perfection. We must go forward carefully and soundly. We are not attempting to meet the whole of the problem. My bill does not provide payment for as long a period of care or as many forms of care as aged persons and other beneficiaries require. It will still be necessary for such persons to make what provision they can through savings and other forms of insurance to meet medical emergencies.

I am hopeful, however, that we can enact a measure which will result in better health care for millions of Americans, that will relieve many American families of serious financial worries about health bills, that will avoid financial disaster for many aged persons, and that will also lighten public welfare loads and hospital deficits, and bolster the efforts of Blue Cross and similar nonprofit groups to provide protection for the entire community at a reasonable cost.

Adm. William F. Raborn Tells
Polaris Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of Jan-

uary 30, 1959, written by Mr. Courtney Sheldon.

ADMIRAL RABORN TELLS POLARIS STORY
(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Adm. William F. Raborn oversees the development of one of the Nation's most promising retaliatory weapons—the submarine-launched Polaris missile. In his opinion:

"Upwards of 50 (Polaris submarines) would be a most significant force, bearing in mind that we don't have to be able to clobber every military target in order to have a good deterrent.

"Mobility and using the hidden depths of the sea make the Polaris submarine almost invulnerable."

This is how Admiral Raborn told the Polaris story in an interview with this correspondent:

"What are the great advantages of the Polaris as a war deterrent weapon, Admiral?"

"With an effective deterrent system we would have the ability and the time to retaliate in case of overt action against this country. If a prospective enemy felt he could zero in (pinpoint as a target) the positions where our retaliatory capability is located, he might be misled into taking a calculated risk and try to wipe out our positions in a surprise blow.

"This is one of the reasons why mobile systems—such as Polaris—are so well thought of. Mobility and using the hidden depths of the sea make the Polaris submarine almost invulnerable. Certainly, if an enemy can't zero in Polaris submarines, we can have much more time to make a mature decision to retaliate, if we wish.

"Another desirable feature of Polaris is that it will draw the enemy's bombs to sea, away from population centers in the United States.

"Further, many millions of cubic miles of ocean will be available to the Polaris submarine as launching sites. It will be international real estate not subject to control by other nationalities."

"What would you say were the limitations of Polaris?"

"There is no weapon for any purpose that can be a panacea. The drawbacks—well, it is an expensive system, though it is not any more expensive than any other major war deterrent system that I know of."

"What about the number of missiles a submarine can carry (reportedly 16), the distances it has to operate over, and the ease of communications?"

"I think that people who have made a lot of to-do about these things probably know the least about them. As far as the number of missiles go, we will have a surprisingly large number of missiles in these submarines. You should keep in mind what you are trying to do, how many targets you are trying to hit, and what constitutes a good deterrent system.

"I for one, feel that we should not have to put all of our money, a sizable portion of our national budget, into systems designed to destroy every military target and major population center in enemy country.

"Communications—we have been talking to submerged submarines ever since World War II and there is no reason to believe that we are suddenly going to forget how."

"When will the first Polaris submarine depart from a U.S. harbor with operational missiles aboard?"

"As far as operational dates, Mr. McElroy has said that Polaris would be available in 1960. I have some very well-defined dates that I have my eye on."

"What is the score on your successes and failures in tests of Polaris?"

"Well, tests to technical men mean tests of the whole system. We have conducted a very large number of tests in each of the

major areas that contribute to the system as a whole and to date we have been extremely successful, and we are on schedule."

"At one time there was speculation that Polaris would be used as a land-based solid propellant missile. Then the Air Force was ordered to develop the intercontinental-range ballistic missile Minuteman. Is the difference in capability of those two solid propellant missiles mainly one of range?"

"Principally. A submarine can carry a missile 3,000 or 4,000 miles closer to the enemy. It is therefore more efficient for the Navy to build a shorter-range missile."

"It has been reported that the first Polaris missiles will have a relatively short range, and this will be upped later to 1,600 and ultimately 3,000. Is that correct?"

"The first missile we put in operation in 1960 will be as good a missile as we can possibly build. No one can say definitely what we will have. We know our technical goals, and it is going to be a very usable and useful weapon in a submarine where, if you don't have quite the range you want, you just walk the submarine in a little closer."

"Your goal is 1,500?"

"The Polaris is thought of as an intermediate-range ballistic missile, a 1,500-mile weapon. As we go along, we will make improvements which will permit us, of course, to improve this range. Our submarines have been constructed with this in mind."

"Nine Polaris submarines are, or will be shortly, in the works. What would be your idea of the size of a Polaris fleet necessary to be an effective war deterrent?"

"If you want Polaris submarines to be the only war deterrents, you will have to have one size force, but if you want to have Polaris submarines in combination with other capabilities, it will have to be another size. I would say that upward of 50, something of that sort, would be a most significant force, bearing in mind that we don't have to be able to clobber every military target in order to have a good deterrent."

"Have you solved to your satisfaction the navigation problems with which the Polaris system confronts you?"

"I can say that at this state of development of the entire Polaris system we are ahead in the program for the development of the navigation element of this system. I have no doubt of our ability to perfect the navigation element. It is easier to solve the navigation problems of missile ships than it is missile-carrying airplanes."

"Are there any indications that the Soviets have a solid fuel missile capable of feats you plan for Polaris?"

"I can't pose as exactly an expert on this, but I would say that we are considerably ahead of them in this field."

"Will Polaris be fired from naval ships and installations other than submarines?"

"We can capitalize on our investment in surface vessels hulls and machinery by adding a modest number of Polaris missiles. It would make vessels even more valuable and versatile."

Cost of Second Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an editorial, "Cost of Second Best," appearing in the Washington Post of February 18, 1958.

As the editorial well said:

Mr. MAHON—

Congressman MAHON—

is one of the best-informed men in Congress on military finance, and his judgment is entitled to respect.

Congressman MAHON, one of the most sincere and ablest Members of Congress and a dedicated American is one of the best versed Members of Congress on military matters and national defense. His views are worthy of deep consideration.

The editorial is as follows:

COST OF SECOND BEST

Chairman MAHON, of the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee, has put the defense spending issue into much needed focus. He estimates that \$700 million annually in additional spending authority would be sufficient to match possible Soviet production of long-range missiles, and that a total of \$1 to \$2 billion would meet this and other defense needs now neglected such as limited war preparedness. Mr. MAHON is one of the best informed men in Congress on military finance, and his judgment is entitled to respect.

The net effect of this estimate is to show for what essentially narrow budgetary considerations the administration is willing to jeopardize the country's power position. Secretary McElroy has virtually acknowledged that there has been a deliberate decision to accept a second best position in missiles, with the explanation that other methods of delivery such as manned bombers will maintain an adequate balance. Even if the latter point is true, the psychological consequence of an inferior missile status could be devastating.

The American people have never been willing to accept a second best position in defense, and if they were consulted on the basis of the facts we are confident that they would not do so now. A \$2 billion additional expenditure on top of a \$41 billion defense budget would not bankrupt the country. Whether the increase were financed by higher taxes or by new borrowing at a time of considerable unemployment, the impact upon a \$450 billion economy clearly would not be great. The country can afford what is required, and it requires at least parity with the Russians.

Apart from the possible military disadvantages if we sat by and counted our dollars while the Russians outproduced us in intercontinental missiles over the next 3 years (as there is general agreement that they could do), fruitful negotiations with the Soviet Union surely would be more difficult if the United States were dealing from real or apparent inferiority. An adequate military posture is as important in the immediate future as 20 years hence and this means increased production of present liquid-fuel missiles until solid-fuel carriers are available. Development of further limited war potential accelerated submarine and submarine-defense programs and perhaps some further intensification of solid-fuel missile efforts would round out the program Mr. MAHON is talking about.

Congress has as much responsibility in this matter as the President. If Members abhor the prospect that the United States will be reduced to a second-best position as much as they ought to abhor it—and many legislators have voiced their apprehensions—it is their duty to vote the military appropriations they think the country really needs. President Eisenhower and Secretary McElroy cannot be compelled to spend the money, but Congress certainly can say emphatically that it thinks the administration approach dan-

gerous. A wise President will reconsider his judgment in such circumstances.

One caveat needs to be added. Unfortunately Mr. MAHON tainted his valuable contribution with the suggestion that higher defense spending might be offset by reductions in foreign aid or in various domestic operations. Cuts of \$1 to \$2 billion in either area would be disastrous—and totally unnecessary. We do not have to sacrifice one essential element of overall defense to finance another; indeed, economic development help ought to be increased.

The entire \$12 billion deficit forecast for fiscal 1959 need not be erased in a single year—and if the economy should pick up faster than is now anticipated a tax increase could cover the extra cost and provide any needed damper on inflation. In any event inflation is a lesser danger, and there has been altogether too much preoccupation with it at the expense of everything else. It is time that Congress broke loose from its close-quarters scuffling with the President about who has saved how much in the past 6 years and addressed itself to the more vital problem of who is going to save the country in the next 6.

School for Solons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the congressional seminars conducted by Congressmen JOHN F. BALDWIN, Republican, of California; FRANK M. COFFIN, Democrat, of Maine; CARL ELLIOTT, Democrat, of Alabama; GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Republican, of Michigan; PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois; and STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, for freshman Congressmen was an outstanding contribution to the difficult task of becoming oriented as quickly as possible.

The course was thoughtfully presented. The time and effort of those who conducted it will have a beneficial result, I feel certain. The ability to conduct this type of schooling on a complete nonpartisan basis and with a friendly atmosphere made the course an outstanding one.

I am very proud of the fact that one of the Nation's outstanding newspapers, the Newark Evening News, on February 10, 1959, commented editorially on the seminars, and I am pleased to include the editorial in full in my remarks.

I must admit that I do not recall learning how to get reelected, as suggested by the editorial, but still believe, after attending these very informative seminars, that the voters back home are the only ones who can teach us this part of the subject:

SCHOOL FOR SOLONS

The value of orientation seminars for freshmen Members of Congress was pointed up not too many years ago when a newly elected legislator from New Jersey sought to

learn when it would be proper to stop by and introduce himself at the White House.

He was told, of course, to wait until he was invited, but the incident served to dramatize the bewilderment of many a newcomer to the House of Representatives, unable to find his way about Capitol Hill, much less fathom the intricacies of a parliamentary system unlike any other in the world.

The freshman Congressman is aware, of course, that he should be seen more than heard during his first 2 years, but he is also haunted by the fear that if he isn't heard at all during that period, he may never be heard of again.

The frequent consequence is that he introduces too many bills, becomes involved in too many debates, gets into procedural tangles from which he cannot extricate himself, fails to observe proprieties of which he knows nothing and alienates the friendship of veterans who can help him.

The recently concluded course of instruction in Washington for the many whose House of Representatives terms began last month must have been welcomed by all of them. They learned rules, procedures, traditions, etc., from veterans. They learned of research facilities available to them, and of the Legislative Reference Service where talents are at their beck and call.

They learned how and when to speak, how to socialize, and even how to get along with the press.

At the end of the course they learned how to get reelected, which is something every Congressman wants to know.

Relief Food Rolls Gain 12 Percent in Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news article from the Washington Post of February 14, 1959:

RELIEF FOOD ROLLS GAIN 12 PERCENT

The number of Americans on relief rolls receiving donations of Government surplus foods at the end of 1958 was the largest since 1942.

Reporting this yesterday, the Agriculture Department said the number increased nearly 12 percent in the past year. It was 5,230,044, as compared with 4,719,300 a year earlier.

Pennsylvania had the most, 829,550. Numbers in other States and areas included: Puerto Rico, 596,076; Michigan, 538,385; Mississippi, 331,441; New York, 348,871; Oklahoma, 246,960; West Virginia, 278,223; Arkansas, 219,354; Kentucky, 254,377; Tennessee, 154,551; Texas, 127,698, and Louisiana, 137,713.

The Department reported that it had donated 347 million pounds of surplus foods to Americans in the last half of 1958 at a cost of \$62 million. The foods included dry beans, butter, cheese, corn meal, flour, dry milk, peanut butter and rice.

In addition to those on relief rolls, donations were made to school lunch programs feeding 14 million school children and to charitable institutions housing about 1.4 million.

Illinois Farmers Had Good Year—Best Since 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared under date of February 4, in the Rochelle, Ill., Rochelle News, entitled "Illinois Farmers Had Good Year—Best Since 1951":

ILLINOIS FARMERS HAD GOOD YEAR—BEST SINCE 1951

(By L. H. Simerl)

Most Illinois farmers had a very good year in 1958. Average net income was up 15 to 25 percent, making the year the best since 1951. The year ahead will probably not be so good as the one just ending.

Weather conditions did more than anything else to lift farm income. The weather helped to boost prices of livestock and produce bumper crop yields.

The boost in livestock prices came through the ending of the drought that had been particularly severe in the Southwest. As ranges improved and feed and water supplies increased, ranches and farmers began to hold back calves and cattle to increase their herds. This reduced marketing, lowered output, and raised prices of livestock.

The meat supply shrank 151 pounds per person in 1958, the smallest since 1952.

Where monthly average prices of choice steers ranged from \$21 to \$26 in 1957, the range was \$26 to \$30 in 1958. For the year as a whole, prices of fed cattle were the highest since 1952.

Monthly average hog prices, which ranged from \$17 to \$21 in 1957, were \$18 to \$23 in 1958. For the year, hog prices were the best since 1954.

Total volume sold by Illinois farmers was probably about the same in the 2 years.

Looking ahead to 1959, we anticipate that increased marketing of hogs, and probably of cattle, will reduce prices of livestock, particularly hogs.

Most cash-grain farmers, too, had a good year. Crop yields were generally much better than in 1957, and well above the 10-year average. The statewide average corn yield in 1958 was 68 bushels—4 bushels more than in 1957 and 13 bushels over the 10-year average.

Soybeans averaged 28½ bushels an acre, which was 3 bushels more than 1957 and 5 bushels above the 10-year average.

Illinois wheat in 1958 yielded 31 bushels, 10 bushels more than the year before and 5 bushels above the 10-year figure.

Oats made 53 bushels an acre, 14 bushels more than in 1957 and 11 bushels over the State 10-year average.

Ordinarily, extra big crops depress prices so that total returns decline. With price supports in effect, however, total returns went up.

Dairymen gained less than most farmers in 1958. Both prices and amount of milk sold remained about the same as in 1957. Dairymen benefited from good pastures, good crop yields and a substantial increase in prices received for calves and cows sold.

The State's poultrymen did not share in the increase in farm income in 1958. Profits from eggs, usually made during the fall, were

low. The broiler business became increasingly competitive. Prices on turkeys were lower than in the previous year.

Looking ahead to 1959, we can see an increase in the output of pork. Increased sales of hogs will offset only half of the expected decline in prices. The increasing abundance of pork and poultry, and a possible increase in beef, may depress prices of cattle.

As for most crops, it seems likely that both yields and price supports will be lower than in 1958. Farm income in the year ahead may be near that of 1957.

United States-Soviet Economic Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken several times about the Federal Government's need for additional tools in order to combat Soviet Russia's declaration of economic war against the United States. I introduced H.R. 2159 to create a U.S. Trading Corporation which I thought would go a long way in providing some of the tools we are lacking. I called attention to the problems created by Soviet Russia buying up Iceland's fish at an economic loss to herself in order to attain a political objective; the problems created by Russia's attempt to buy up the cotton crop of the Sudan for 5 years at uneconomic prices to attain other political objectives; the problems created by Russia swamping the aluminum markets of Western Europe with uneconomically priced aluminum. The private purchasers of Iceland's fish or the Sudan's cotton cannot compete with the state trading of Soviet Russia if she decides to concentrate her economic power in selected and limited areas. Even our powerful aluminum companies cannot compete with the low price for which Russia decides to sell her aluminum in order to disrupt the market.

I am placing in the Record an article appearing in the January 24, 1959, Business Week, entitled "Russia's Newest Trade Weapon," which points up another area in which the United States is unequipped to compete.

What is this new item that Russia is selling considerably below cost? School laboratory equipment. It does not take an expert in propaganda to understand what Russia seeks to achieve by underselling the U.S. market on school laboratory equipment. What better way to impress on the minds of our youth the scientific prowess of Russia than to have in the United States school laboratory equipment marked "made in Russia."

I am sending this material to the State Department and the Department of Commerce asking them just how they expect to combat this trade weapon of Russia's unless they have something like a U.S. Trading Corporation which I have proposed as a weapon in their trade arsenal.

The article from Business Week follows:

RUSSIA'S NEWEST TRADE WEAPON—SAMPLES OF SCHOOL LAB EQUIPMENT ARE EXCITING U.S. MAKERS AND CUSTOMERS—QUALITY IS SO GOOD AND PRICES SO LOW

Following a pattern laid down in aluminum and benzene, the Soviet Government's next invasion of the U.S. market will come in the school laboratory equipment market. That seemed clear this week as the first sample lot of 26 items arrived in the United States. The Soviet offer: delivery of the items, f.o.b. New York, at an average price only one-fifth of prevailing prices for comparable U.S.-made items.

In the opinion of educators who viewed the sample Soviet items, there is no question of the quality of merchandise up for sale. "They are," as one expert put it, "fantastically good."

"It would be impossible," according to one MIT scientist who carefully inspected the numerous spectrometers, microscopes, navigation instruction equipment, rotators, and the like, "to hope to buy anything of similar quality made domestically for six times the price. They're offering a top-grade spectrometer for \$53, f.o.b. New York, including tariff," he points out. "That's about one-third the price of the cheapest spectrometer on the U.S. market today. And the Russian equipment is good enough for a number of industrial uses, too."

GROWING MARKET

The first shipment to be sold in the United States by the Ealing Corp. of Cambridge, Mass., will be valued at \$45,000. This will bring in 300 to 500 of each of 12 different pieces of equipment.

The total U.S. market for school lab equipment is currently about \$6 million a year. But with the new Federal bill for education, some experts think the total sales potential in the United States could run many times higher in the years just ahead.

AMERICAN WORRIES

Reaction of U.S. school lab equipment makers to the latest Russian move is a mixture of anger and frank incredulity. In an industry dominated by two manufacturers—Central Scientific Co. and W. M. Welch Scientific Co., both of Chicago—most companies admit they can't hope to fight back against price cuts of this magnitude.

Disturbed as they are over what would seem to be a stunning blow to their business outlook, however, they're banking on the belief that this is just another step in a larger Soviet plan to unbalance first one and then another section of the U.S. business community.

"Maybe," a manufacturer of microscopes suggests hopefully, "they'll shift their interest to somebody else soon."

In the past, this has been the pattern—a large supply of Soviet merchandise would suddenly appear on the market, then as suddenly dry up.

Official Washington is even more unconcerned about the latest Soviet economic maneuver. The average duty on scientific educational materials imported into the United States from Iron Curtain countries is about 42 percent, they point out. This is about as high a tariff bracket as you can find on any legal Russian-made item brought into the States. And it should be enough to protect the U.S. manufacturer, officials say.

MASS PRODUCTION

Why this may not be the case—and why the Russians apparently feel they are now in a position to export quality-grade equipment of this type—is a question that interests industry representatives who have seen the sample items.

One logical answer is supplied by Paul D. Grindle, president of the Ealing Corp. Print order numbers on the instruction books accompanying some of the instruments, he says, indicate that, compared with ours, the

Soviet school lab instrument industry is huge.

Science education was one of the announced goals of U.S.S.R. leaders, and one of the first things the postwar Russian economy was tooled up to supply. As a result, the Soviet-produced equipment is the only equipment of its kind being mass-manufactured anywhere in the world today.

MORE TO COME

The economics of mass-manufacturing any standard item are well known. Having amortized engineering and development costs, the Soviet production machine has undoubtedly reached a point at which it costs hardly more than the price of materials to extend production of scientific lab equipment a few hundred thousand items more.

This puts the U.S.S.R. in a position to sell its run-off in world markets on a cut-rate basis. On the basis of reports coming out of Russia, the same over-run may occur sometime soon in other things from communications equipment to high-speed cameras. Grindle himself brought back a suitcase full of catalogs of electronic equipment.

MAKING CONTACT

How this particular deal came about is a story of startling simplicity. Ealing's president Grindle happened to notice a picture on the cover of the U.S. Physical Society's "Physics Today," showing a Russian physics teacher at work in his classroom. On the table top in front of the teacher was an array of lab equipment that would be unusual in a typical U.S. physics classroom.

Grindle asked the U.S. Department of Commerce about the legality of importing sample lots of this equipment and found that it was completely within the law. He inquired about the equipment at the Russian Embassy in Washington and was promptly referred to Amtorg—the Soviet trade corporation in New York. Amtorg suggested a note to the proper authorities in Moscow. This was answered by an encouraging letter and a list of 96 laboratory equipment items that the Soviet Union would be willing to sell, with estimated sales prices.

MISSION TO MOSCOW

Grindle then decided to go to Moscow to look over this bonanza for himself. He found a well-organized sales setup, prepared to handle his requests. Proper Ministry of Trade officials were available for discussions. Raznoexport, the Russian agency charged with handling Soviet consumer products, permitted him to examine any of its sales products.

Almost as startling as this organization and planning is the significance of the quality of the Soviet lab equipment. University professors, looking at the equipment, are flabbergasted at its educational implications. The Soviets seem to have planned it for use in classrooms up to the 11th grade level. In the United States it would be adequate in classrooms up to and including the first year of college.

Moreover, all of the instruments were obviously designed by people who understand and care about science education. "The most awful part about what we saw," says one professor, "is how embarrassingly good it is."

We'll Know Before Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

include the following editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the *Savanna Times-Journal*, *Savanna, Ill.*, entitled "We'll Know Before Long":

WE'LL KNOW BEFORE LONG

Editor Godfrey M. Lebharr of Chain Store Age writes: "If the new Congress is wise enough to curtail public spending in order to curb the dangerous inflation which is otherwise inevitable, the outlook for the economy in general, and for retail sales in particular, will be bright indeed."

"But if, on the other hand, the new Congress should be unwise enough to increase public spending instead of reducing it, we will be following a path which can lead only to economic disaster."

"True enough, adding fuel to the inflationary flames which are already threatening the economy would mean an increase in retail sales in dollars as a result of rising prices, but any increase in dollar sales without a corresponding increase in unit sales hurts our economy instead of helping it. Declining unit sales mean reduced production, increased unemployment and a lower standard of living for all."

Lebharr goes on to say that retail sales are likely to increase this year no matter what Government fiscal policy is followed. But the question—and it's as big a question as the Nation faces—is whether this will be a healthy increase, based on a stabilized currency, or an increase which merely reflects further degradation of the dollar.

We will know before long. The answer is up to Congress.

Forty-first Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, today we think of wars as the worst events in human history, and as the horrors of destruction and death that are sure to be caused by wars in this atomic bomb and nuclear age, we dread the thought of any war. In this we are probably and rightly justified in regarding wars as scourges of the human race. That is the consensus of today. But in the past, even in the relatively recent past, there have been wars which were regarded as the only way out of difficult international situations, and even out of some imminent calamities. Certainly defensive wars are always treated in this spirit. The First World War is also regarded as such by many peoples who found their liberation and independence in the culmination of that war. As that world holocaust drew to its close, autocratic monarchies tumbled down one after the other: The Russian czarist regime, monarchical Germany, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, all perished in that destructive and devastating war. And that war shattered the chains which held millions of innocent and helpless people in bondage and servitude. The Lithuanians were among these people.

The Lithuanian people have a distinct place in the turbulent history of north-eastern Europe. They are justly proud of their long and glorious past. For centuries the Lithuanian kingdom was a powerful force in the whole east European region. At times they not only successfully repelled some of the incursions of barbarian invaders from the east, but they were the stouthearted champions of Christianity and its advance guard in that part of Europe. Late in the 16th century their kingdom was united with the Polish kingdom, and formed a dual monarchy. This union lasted for about 200 years. During that time the destinies of both nations were wedded together. In the late 18th century when Poland was partitioned, most of Poland and with it all Lithuania was incorporated into the Russian Empire. But the loss of national independence almost 200 years ago did not mean the loss of the spirit of freedom on the part of Lithuanians. While they suffered under the autocratic regime of the czars, they worked hard for the attainment of their freedom. They became firmly convinced that individual and national well-being could not be fully achieved or enjoyed without national political independence. They learned that in order to enjoy the benefits of their labor, they should have complete freedom in their homeland. To regain that freedom they worked ceaselessly, but it took them more than a full century to see their cherished dream come true. Not until the detested regime of the czars was overthrown could they have their freedom. In 1917 when that regime was shattered by the Russian Revolution, then, along with other peoples, the Lithuanians felt free. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and set up their Republic. That day marks a new day in the modern history of the Lithuanian people.

Both in the attainment of Lithuanian independence and in its maintenance for more than two decades the United States has made important contributions, officially and unofficially. The encouragement which the Lithuanians found in the famous 14 points of our former President Wilson was a boon to their cause. It was a source of inspiration for them to know that their struggle for liberty and independence had the support of our wartime President and our people. Nor was the moral and material aid given to Lithuania by the people of this country, especially by the body of our loyal citizens of Lithuanian descent, of less significance. With such aid, and through their own industry and perseverance, the Lithuanian people turned their war-torn country, in a short time, into a happy habitat for all lovers of freedom and liberty. They worked wonders in making Lithuania a prosperous and progressive democracy, a model in many respects. And during those two decades the people were happy, leading a contented life. But, unfortunately, this period did not last long. As the war clouds began to thicken in the late 1930's, Lithuania sensed the danger to her independence. No mercy was expected from either totalitarian regimes, neither

from Berlin nor from Moscow. In the end, however, it was Moscow that in a series of villainous acts put an end to Lithuanian independence in July of 1940 and enslaved the people.

Today, for more than 18 years, unhappy Lithuanians find themselves once more in chains and cut off from all contacts with the free world. There are some 3 million helpless and innocent souls completely sealed off behind the Iron Curtain. Many elemental means of livelihood and all freedoms are denied to them. They live as in a large prison camp, to work as slaves for their taskmasters in the Kremlin. Communist rulers of the country have been doing their very worst to eradicate any feeling of nationality and, one might say, rationality, among its inhabitants. All national events and the observance are rigidly controlled and prescribed. There is no freedom of speech, of press, of movement, and no one is free to correspond with people in the free world. The only freedom these poor souls have, the one which their heartless overlords cannot take away from them, is to cherish their freedom and pray for deliverance from Communist totalitarianism. On this historic anniversary, on the 41st Lithuanian Independence Day, I hope that they will regain their freedom and once more enjoy it in their historic homeland.

Under One Roof 58 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *RECORD*, I include the following editorial from the *Washington Evening Star* of Sunday, February 15, 1959:

UNDER ONE ROOF 58 YEARS

Last week the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press moved out of the old Star Building to quarters in the spick-and-span new Machinists' Building, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW. Within another 2 or 3 weeks (much about that later) we shall ourselves be leaving, setting up shop overnight in our brand-new building on Virginia Avenue between Second and Third Streets SE.

So ends an era for the AP bureau as well as the *Star*, and the beginning of a bright new one for both. But having shared the same roof for more than 58 years, the physical parting has not been without regrets. The Associated Press (although its organization and concept are vastly different now) is older than the *Star*, the first AP Washington correspondent having been stationed here in 1848—4 years before the *Star* was founded. In 1856 the AP established its lone correspondent in an office, which became the first AP Washington bureau, one of two in the United States. And in 1900, when the *Star* moved into its ultramodern "marble palace" at Eleventh and Pennsylvania Avenue, the AP bureau moved in with us. We have been together ever since, both of us, in recent years, bursting at the seams as we outgrew what, so few years ago, seemed

unlimited space. Both of us have room now for future expansion—but no longer under the same roof.

The physical separation between the Star and the AP bureau now is measured in miles, rather than feet. Yet, due to the marvels of modern communications, the Star will be in closer contact with the AP bureau, and the news and pictures it receives and sends, than when we were separated by a few floors. For more than half a century we exchanged our copy with the AP through pneumatic tubes, a marvelous device when they were installed. Now the AP's battery of teletype machines and photo transmitters, bringing the news from around the world, will be within a few feet of the editors who handle the copy, with direct telephone lines linking the desks in both buildings.

This is all fine, and means progress. Yet 58 years is a long time to have shared a building together, and all the good news and all the bad news that rushed in and out of that building every day in all those years. It is hard to be casual about such a parting.

Truman Endorses Macmillan Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 18, 1959:

TRUMAN ENDORSES MACMILLAN VISIT—HOPES MOSCOW JOURNEY WILL OPEN A DOOR—OPPOSES TRIP BY A U.S. LEADER

(By Harry S. Truman)

I hope the visit of Prime Minister Macmillan to the Kremlin results in the opening of a door. I, for one, can see no objection to the initiative of the British Prime Minister.

Macmillan may be able to use this occasion to take soundings of the Soviet's immediate intent. All recent attempts to engage in exchanges and conversations with the Kremlin have proved futile and have been subverted for propaganda purposes.

Despite all the discouragements suffered by the West to date and the continuing skepticism of the Kremlin's peaceful intentions, I think the Macmillan trip is all to the good. This mission cannot be construed as arising out of weakness, or division of the West, or appeasement, and is one not likely to be used by the Russians for external propaganda purposes.

VISIT BY AMERICAN OPPOSED

If the Russians have a grain of peaceful intention in their program, the Macmillan visit might provide them a chance to return to constructive diplomacy where matters may be discussed quietly without the need for warring missiles in public.

In my judgment, this approach could not now be undertaken by the President of the United States or the Vice President without such a move being misunderstood and leading surely to another serious setback.

I have seen some public suggestions that the Vice President undertake a trip to Moscow in return for the Mikoyan visit and address the Soviets and the Russian people, with the stipulation that all of his remarks be published as given.

Because of my well-known personal feelings about the Vice President, I hope that no one will misconstrue the conviction I have that a visit by him to Russia, particu-

larly at this time or a visit by any other leading American official, for that matter, would backfire.

There is another reason why I think a mission such as Macmillan's should be welcomed by us. I feel that the situation in which we find ourselves makes it desirable for our allies to assume equal initiative in the diplomatic field, provided, of course, that they do so in full concert and communication with all their partners.

We must realize that what we are after is not only to keep the peace but to make it durable, and at all stages to leave the door open to reason and conciliation, if we are to be met by a like attitude. And by like attitude, I do not mean flippant statements such as Khrushchev made recently before the Soviet party congress in Moscow when he declared that he is willing to concede victory in the cold war to the West while expecting the West to capitulate on Russian terms.

BLAME FOR THE COLD WAR

The Soviets initiated the cold war and have kept it up ever since with taunts, threats, and broken agreements.

We never wanted the cold war, and we don't like it. It has diverted our economy from further expansion for peaceful purposes at home and abroad. We converted from a war economy, beginning in 1945, and achieved immediate and unprecedented success in full employment and a balanced budget. But Communist aggression in Korea and elsewhere compelled us to redirect some of our economy to measures of defense at great sacrifice to our people.

The Russians have now embarked upon an economic war against us. It is a war they cannot possibly win. They can only bring further privations to their own people. They could not win even if our own leadership failed to put to maximum use our enormous and as yet untapped industrial capacity and economic might.

Let me remind the Kremlin rulers that this would not be a struggle between socialism and capitalism but one between dictatorial state capitalism and a free enterprise system where there are laws protecting the rights and welfare of the individual.

The Russians may feel confident that they possess the ability and the capacity to upset the economy of the entire world. If so, they are laboring under a delusion.

Such a task is beyond their ability or that of any other single power. More and more we see that the future welfare of all mankind is based upon the free cooperation of all nations.

NO MISGIVINGS SEEN

We have no misgivings about the industrial and economic progress of Russia. Neither are we disturbed over the dramatic strides in industry and agriculture in Red China. If the policies of Russia and Red China were aimed at peaceful cooperation with all their neighbors and for the benefit of mankind, we would be the first to acclaim their achievements and extend to them fullest cooperation.

Mikoyan told the Soviet party congress that peace follows trade and that nations that trade with each other are at peace.

If Mikoyan had come here not with the blandishment of trade but with a program of peace, his chances for success would have been greatly enhanced.

But Mikoyan has the mistaken belief, as do the Kremlin leaders and, I suspect, some businessmen here, that trade comes first and is a cure-all for all international differences. They believe that if you have trade, peace automatically follows.

Two world wars have proved that trade alone is not the road to peace.

One thing history teaches us is that dictatorships almost inevitably have led to war. From the days of Augustus Caesar the record on this is clear.

WILL TO BE FREE SPREADS

In this respect, however, I think the world is getting younger, rather than older, and the will to be free is manifesting itself in every part of the world. There is comfort in the fact that in this century of the two most oppressive dictatorships in history, freedom has come to more nations and to more millions of people than has ever been known before.

I hope and believe that in Russia and in China—perhaps not in my lifetime—the indomitable will in the human being to be free will triumph.

This immutable process of the will to be free will take some time. But in the meantime we have the problem of living and getting along with the Russian and Chinese dictatorships as best we can. This means that we must keep our guard up, much as we would prefer not to do it, in order that we secure ourselves against rapacious and foolhardy imperialism.

If Russia would agree to a peaceful unification of Germany, with proper safeguards to Russian as well as European security, that would be an important step in keeping the peace.

If Russia would make another step by abandoning her intrigue in the Middle East so as to create a climate for peaceful international cooperation, the peace of the world would be strengthened.

Success in the direction of peace in these two critical areas could produce a constructive approach to the problems in the Pacific. But let us remember that up to now the Communists use words they do not mean.

THE PRINCIPAL DIFFICULTY

The principal difficulty is that where you have a government which has total control of mind as well as material things, it is hard to find many opportunities for meaningful negotiations.

But limited as the opportunities may be, the statesmen of the West must be on the search and on the alert for any possible chance to advance the cause of peace. The most immediate pressing problem facing the West is the ultimatum date set by Khrushchev to abandon West Berlin.

Russia would like a meeting at the summit without an agenda and we do not know for what purpose. Our experience at the summit conference at Geneva proved it a complete waste of time and effort. It only served as a stage to present Khrushchev and Bulganin to the world as the new rulers of the Kremlin.

It seems to make sense that before we are maneuvered into another such meeting we at least wait for the report of Prime Minister Macmillan after his visit to Russia.

Republicans, by Whatever Name, Are Not the Friends of the Masses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the February 16, 1959, issue of the New Republic:

ROCKEFELLER TAXES

Faced with a large prospective deficit, mandatory increases in State aid programs, and uncertain revenue prospects in the State of New York, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller could

have chosen one of two unpleasant alternatives—a cut in spending or an increase in taxes. He creditably refused to curtail programs which he had supported and promised to expand during the successful campaign. He was left only with a tax increase. Quite possibly he has overestimated the gap between receipts and expenditures. Such, at least, is the contention of Arthur Levitt, the only Democrat to survive the Republican landslide in New York. But much more disconcerting to the Governor's liberal admirers is the character of the increases. Of the \$277 million in new revenue anticipated, \$150 million will come from the State income tax, \$47 million from a 2-cent rise in cigarette levies, and \$69.5 million from larger gasoline imposts. Given the structure of State finances, the Governor had to depend on these taxes, but he could have moderated their regressive impact. Of these taxes, both the cigarette and the gasoline tax (save possibly in New York City where the poor do not own cars) take a larger percentage from those whose incomes are lower.

The change in the State income tax which might have counteracted these effects seems rather to intensify them. The drastic drop in exemptions from \$2,500 for a married couple to \$1,200, and from \$1,000 for a single person to \$600, will add 400,000 new taxpayers to the rolls. The \$10 exemption will relieve only 100,000 of them from this new charge. Such changes inevitably fall most heavily on those who earn less than \$5,000. For example, a married couple with no children earning \$3,500 will pay \$39 instead of \$13, a rise of 200 percent. If a couple with the same income have a single child, their tax liability rises from \$5 to \$21, or more than 300 percent. Although the dollar amounts are small, the tendency is unfortunate. It is not as if there were no alternative. Relatively slight increases in the upper brackets and more modest downward shifts in the exemptions would have produced the same revenues.

Eleven Million Dollars Paid to Unemployed in 1958 in Wilkes-Barre Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of February 12, 1959:

ELEVEN MILLION DOLLARS PAID IDLE IN WILKES-BARRE—NANTICOKE GETS \$5 MILLION AND PITTSBURGH \$2.7 MILLION

Economic impact exerted in 1958 through State unemployment compensation disbursements made in the area covered by Wilkes-Barre office of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security is indicated in announcement yesterday by the manager of the office, N. J. Haydock, that approximately \$11,258,000 was paid last year by the various State unemployment compensation programs to unemployed workers in the immediate Wilkes-Barre area. This sum is estimated to be the equivalent to annual payrolls of a number of substantially large industries.

Total unemployment compensation claims processed by Wilkes-Barre office of the Bureau of Employment Security in 1958 was 397,200.

Manager Haydock announced a breakdown of disbursements and number of claims for the various State unemployment compensa-

tion programs last year as follows, through the Wilkes-Barre Bureau of Employment Security office:

Regular unemployment compensation: \$9,825,000; 346,200 claims filed.

Unemployment compensation for Federal civilian employees: \$61,000; 2,100 claims.

Unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen, under Social Security Act amendment of August 28, 1958: \$31,000; 1,100 claims.

Unemployment compensation for veterans under Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952: \$209,000; 8,900 claims.

Temporary unemployment compensation under Federal act approved June 4, 1958: \$1,132,000; 38,900 claims.

Mr. Haydock also announced that for 1958, unemployment compensation disbursements totaling \$4,972,000 were made to unemployed workers in the area served by the Pittston office of the State Bureau of Employment Security; and a total of \$2,768,000 to idle workers serviced by the Nanticoke Bureau of Employment Security office.

Through claims filed at the Hazleton Employment Security office, the fourth in the Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton labor market area, State unemployment compensation payments totaled at \$5,314,000 to idle workers in the Hazleton City area.

Of a total of 107 local Bureau of Employment Security offices in Pennsylvania, the Wilkes-Barre office's 1958 unemployment compensation disbursements of \$11,258,000 were exceeded by only four other offices. These were: Johnstown, \$11,640,000; McKeesport, \$11,439,000; Uptown Philadelphia, \$11,341,000; Frankford, \$11,287,000.

Scranton office unemployment compensation benefit payments totaled \$8,847,000.

The Armenian Struggle Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, February 18 is a memorable day in the history of the Armenian people. This is the day on which they successfully challenged the forces of communism in their historic homeland 38 years ago, and for a while evicted them. That event marks one of the first instances in which the forces of evil suffered a setback, even if only a temporary one.

Armenians had lost their independence centuries ago. During modern times their country was divided, for the most part, between Russia and Turkey. Under the autocratic misrule of the czars and the despotic Ottoman sultans they suffered untold miseries. During the First World War they faced almost total extermination in Turkey, when more than 1 million were massacred.

The survivors of that holocaust and their kinsmen in Russian Armenia joined hands in 1918 and proclaimed their national independence.

Soon after the end of that war the country was overrun by Russian Communists and by the end of 1920 it was dominated by them. Communist misrule and cruelty was intolerable, and the people staged a revolt against their un-

wanted overlords on February 18. The revolt proved successful; in the course of a single week the oppressors were evicted, and once more the people were free.

The freedom thus gained did not last long. Soon the Communists were reinforced and came back with greater force and fury. By early April they again overran the country, and incorporated it into the Soviet Union. Since then Armenian independence has vanished into past history. All those who still cherish freedom and independence, celebrate the anniversary of that day because it marks the beginning of their short-lived but long-remembered liberation from the yoke of totalitarian communism.

I am glad to join these fighters for freedom on the anniversary celebration of that memorable event and with them pray for early deliverance for all tyrants.

The Federal Government Should Assume the Cost of ROTC Facilities at Colleges and Universities Since ROTC Programs Are Essential to the Defense of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the colleges and universities in this country which accommodate ROTC units on their campuses appear to be grateful that I have introduced a bill—H.R. 1983—which seeks to provide Federal financial support for the various facilities occupied by these ROTC units. In the opinion of the State universities and land-grant colleges which accommodate over 80 percent of the students enrolled in ROTC programs this legislation is not only just and needed but is long overdue. Other Representatives and Senators have recognized this need for a long time and have introduced similar bills in previous Congresses. It has been a source of disappointment, discouragement, and disenchantment to these institutions that their efforts have not succeeded.

These institutions must assume that over the years the civilian and military officials in the Defense Department have meant what they have stated on repeated occasions that the ROTC programs are essential to the defense of the Nation. No less a respected authority than Gen. George C. Marshall has stated that our mobilization for World War II would have been delayed much beyond what it was had it not been for the availability of Reserve officers trained through the ROTC. Some 90,000 of the first 120,000 officers mobilized in 1941 were ROTC graduates.

More recently the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, has assured

some distinguished university presidents of the essentiality of the ROTC program to the Defense Establishment. Indeed, I know of no one in authority who has stated otherwise.

All of this being so, there was ample justification for Defense officials as far back as 1945 making commitments to the colleges and universities that they would vigorously support proposals that the Federal Government provide the necessary facilities to accommodate these units. However since 1945 when these commitments were made and continuing to the present when they have been reaffirmed, the Federal Government has yet to build the first facility at any institution.

The universities and colleges in this country simply cannot understand why they should be expected to expend their own limited capital funds to construct and maintain buildings for the exclusive use of the U.S. Government. Some institutions have done so only at the expense of depriving themselves of other sorely needed academic facilities. Still other institutions have been obliged to maintain their ROTC units in completely inadequate structures, some of them being World War I barracks which to say the least ought not to be imposed upon any college or university.

Obviously this matter cannot or certainly should not be confused with the complex or controversial issues involving Federal aid to education. All the institutions seek is a payment from the Government for facilities used by the Government. These institutions believe the Government should pay 100 percent of the cost of ROTC facilities. The bill I have introduced provides only for 50 percent of the cost which I daresay the institutions will willingly accept even though they believe it is but half of that which they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the 86th Congress will give favorable consideration to H.R. 1983 as its provisions will enable the Federal Government to assume at least 50 percent of the cost of ROTC facilities which are borne in full at the present time by our educational institutions causing many of them to divert funds from other badly needed academic facilities.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1959, was the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. This day means so very much not only to our good Lithuanian friends, but to all of us who espouse the cause of freedom.

We who have had occasion to meet Americans of Lithuanian descent realize the debt owed to Lithuania and how

much its sons and daughters have contributed to the progress of America.

It is with a sad and heavy heart that we contemplate the present condition of Lithuania enslaved as it is by the brutal forces of Soviet Russia. The recent struggle for freedom against impossible odds by the Hungarian people pointed up and made clear to everyone the cruel suffering and tyranny with which people have been confronted in the captive nations such as Lithuania.

We all know and appreciate Lithuania's fine contributions to civilization during its independence and we all join on this memorable occasion in sympathetic greetings to all those in Lithuania and express to them our wish and prayer that their great country and people will again enjoy freedom as a nation.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, once again we pause to observe the anniversary of Lithuanian independence, this year, the 41st. As we do, we realize that the Communist regime is endeavoring to tighten its control over its satellites, a definite indication that there is considerable unrest in these nations, a chafing at the bit, so to speak. We are again reminded that the price of freedom comes high. It is not something that is won once and then remains our possession for as long as the country exists. The price of freedom is still eternal vigilance. Lithuania serves as an example of how freedom can be won and lost.

As it has done for a number of years, the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore commemorated the anniversary of Lithuanian independence with a banquet held in Baltimore on February 14, with the president, Mr. Thomas G. Gray, serving as toastmaster. The invocation and benediction were given by the Reverend Anthony Dranginis of St. Alphonsus Catholic Church. Prominent Federal, State, and city representatives attended to pay tribute to Lithuania.

In this connection, I would like to include in the RECORD, a proclamation issued by the Governor of Maryland and also one by the mayor of Baltimore:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION—REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

It is not easy to shackle a liberty-loving nation.

It is doubly difficult when the nation has known the experience of freedom. Lithuania gloried in her liberty.

But her people were deported, enslaved, and mass-murdered. Religion was repressed and freedom obliterated.

No American can take a casual view of the plight of Lithuania. Those whose ancestors came from Lithuania and their friends of all national origins join them in their hopes and prayers for liberation from communism.

In recognition of the faith and courage of the Lithuanian people and in support of

all men who fight for freedom, I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1959, the 41st birthday of Lithuania's independence as Republic of Lithuania Day in Maryland.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the city of Annapolis, this 23d day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1959.

[SEAL]

J. MILLARD TAWES,
By the Governor.
THOMAS B. FINAN,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, JR., DESIGNATING MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1959, AS REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY IN BALTIMORE

Whereas on February 16, 1918, liberty-loving Lithuanians unfurled the flag of their country to indicate their independence and to declare that henceforth their country should be free and independent, but recent events have seen the forcible enslavement of Lithuania by the powerful might of ruthless dictators who have, for the time being, crushed all opposition on the part of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania; and

Whereas despite despotic oppression, the people of Lithuania never allow the fires of freedom and justice to burn dim, but work and pray constantly for the day when, once again, Lithuanians can walk erect as freemen in the enjoyment of that freedom that is the birthright of all men; and

Whereas every year, on February 16, the Lithuanian colonies throughout the Nation gather together to observe the independence day of Lithuania and to offer up prayers that their beloved mother country will soon be enabled to enjoy the blessings of freedom not only for their own country but also for all other nations now under the domination of despotic rulers who seek to destroy all those things freemen cherish and hold most dear; and

Whereas the city of Baltimore is justly proud of the many citizens of Lithuanian birth or ancestry who have made important contributions to the civic and industrial life of our community and who have been enabled to enjoy here the freedoms denied their compatriots in Lithuania: Now, therefore,

I, Thomas D'Alessandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim Monday, February 16, 1959, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Baltimore, and do urge all our citizens to join with the people of Lithuania in praying and working unceasingly to the end that the blessings of liberty and justice will again return to the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and cause the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this second day of February, in the year of our Lord 1959.

[SEAL]

THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, JR.,
Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, which I believe will be of interest to all Members of the House, was adopted unanimously at the banquet:

Whereas in this year of 1959 millions of freedom-loving Lithuanians in their homeland are not permitted to openly celebrate or even talk or write about Lithuanian Independence Day; and

Whereas it is manifest the people of Lithuania have bravely resisted all Soviet attempts to convert them to the Communist outlook and the way of life; and

Whereas Kremlin propagandists, such as Menshikov and Mikoyan, talk of their peaceful aims in one breath and boast in the next breath that the future of man shall be determined by scientific achievement and the development of new and terrifying weapons of war;

Now, therefore, we Americans of Lithuanian descent, living in the city of Balti-

more, in the Free State of Maryland, assembled at Lithuanian Hall, under the auspices of the Council of Lithuanian Societies, on this 14th day of February 1959, in commemoration of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, hereby resolve to remind the American people, and particularly their appointed and elected representatives, that every time we read a newspaper born of our free press, every time we vote in our free elections, every time we celebrate the Fourth of July, we do so in full awareness that millions of our fellow human beings in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and other subjugated countries are being denied by the Kremlin liberties and freedoms which we in America often take for granted, and, further, let none of us forget the age-old lesson that the human spirit is still the ultimate weapon in any conflict, and men, rather than mechanical weapons developed by them, will decide who shall be the winner in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES
OF BALTIMORE,
THOMAS G. GRAY, President.
LUCY LASKAUSKAS, Secretary.

Relief for Our Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing in the House of Representatives legislation that will provide some small measure of relief for our taxpayers.

The first bill will increase the present income tax exemption of a taxpayer and/or his dependent from the present \$600 level to \$1,000. The \$600 exemption now in effect was adopted over 10 years ago, and, of course, in this day and age is totally unrealistic and unfair.

The second bill grants an exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions. We must be concerned about our older citizens who have been forced to exist on fixed incomes while prices continue to rise. These citizens are over the age limit where they can seek and find employment to supplement any such annuities or pensions, and with the current lack of jobs their situation is more desperate than ever.

The third and last bill would permit a parent to deduct for income tax purposes amounts paid for the care of children while the parent is working, and would allow an income tax exemption for any child under 18 years of age who has been a member of the taxpayer's household, or attending school at the taxpayer's expense, during the entire taxable year. Once again the high cost of living has made it necessary in many instances for both husband and wife to seek work, thus necessitating the care and supervision of any children to another individual or organization. This provision would give much needed relief to those parents who are forced to pay for the care of their children while they themselves are working.

The cost of living in the last decade has continued to skyrocket like a missile and the tax laws have placed a heavy and unfair burden on our middle and lower income families. Recent figures show that there is still too much unhealthy unemployment throughout our country and the trend shows no signs of diminishing in the near future unless we take some steps to place more money into the hands of the consumer.

A tax cut now, even in the form of increased or liberalized exemptions, would increase consumer income and at the same time stimulate purchasing power, thus giving a "shot in the arm" to our sagging economy.

We must take some action, and quickly, to ease the burden of the taxpayer, and I respectfully urge my colleagues to give this immediate consideration to the enactment of a program which will provide that relief.

Steamship "Argentina": Launching and Initial Voyage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the launching of a large vessel and its initial voyage are always thrilling experiences to those who watch the ship slide down the ways to become waterborne, and are fortunate enough to be on board during its first trip at sea.

On March 12, 1958 the Steamship *Argentina*, owned by the Moore-McCormack Lines, was launched at the Ingalls Shipyard, Pascagoula, Miss. It was uniquely fitting that, as special launching and initial voyage guest on this vessel which will run to South America, was Harry W. Frantz, the distinguished foreign correspondent of United Press-International whose extensive writing published in Latin America for more than 38 years have made his name a notable journalistic tradition.

It is fortunate that Mr. Frantz recorded his impressions, later published in a news story in the January 8, 1959 issue of the *Mulberry Reporter*, Mulberry, Ind.

The indicated news story follows:

A REPORTER ON THE STEAMER "ARGENTINA"
(By Harry W. Frantz, foreign correspondent of United Press-International)

WASHINGTON, December 22, 1958.—The outstanding event of my reportorial life in 1958 was to act as "trigger man" at the launching of the \$26 million superliner *Argentina* at the Ingalls shipyard in Pascagoula, Miss.

The Moore-McCormack Lines, owners of this wonderful ship, gave me this task as a mark of good will for 38 years of news-writing for Latin American countries. The *Argentina* was built for first-class passenger service between New York and the east coast ports of South America.

On March 12 I pushed the lever that started the *Argentina* down the ways into the Pas-

cagoula River, and at the same moment the ceremonial champagne bottle was cracked across the bow for the christening. The launching occurred without a hitch, and my reputation for good luck was established with the builders and the owners.

At midnight on December 3, I arrived again at Pascagoula with a newsmen's party, and boarded the *Argentina* for its trial tests and delivery run to New York City. My cabin was No. 174 on the upper deck.

At 6:10 a.m., on December 4, I was awakened by the announcement on the communications system: "Attention. All ashore that are going ashore. The gangway is going off."

On the previous day I had written an advance story, and as a reporter had no immediate reason to get excited. I waited drowsily in bed for the whistles, noise, and commotion which ordinarily attend a big ship's departure.

A radio in the cabin carried a quaint song from a shore station purportedly sung by three chipmunks. I felt no motion and heard no noise, except the radio, and presumed that the departure had been delayed.

Ten minutes later I roused myself and looked out of the port. To my amazement the *Argentina* was already out on the Pascagoula River and on its way to New York. This was my first realization that modern ship designers had accomplished a miracle, creating a 22,770-ton vessel which was almost entirely without vibration or tremor. It meant goodbye to that ancient hazard to ocean travelers—seasickness.

The propulsion machinery was located far aft, and experiments at every stage of construction had progressively eliminated the possibility of abnormal motion.

I soon learned that even in the rough seas, the new Denny-Brown stabilizers could be turned on to reduce the ship's roll; the *Argentina*, therefore, would become something like a floating hotel for its passengers.

When a new steamer takes to sea on its trial cruise, the sequence of events suggests a butterfly emerging from its cocoon. Countless objects are unboxed for the storerooms, carpets are uncovered, swimming pools are filled, teak deck chairs are set on the promenade deck, trash is thrown overboard, all the metal is scoured, and the vacuum cleaners go to work.

There were four reporters aboard, and we were given the freedom of the ship's seven decks, the bridge, and even the engine room. About 250 officers and crew from the Ingalls shipyard were taking the *Argentina* to New York. Also aboard were about 150 contractors' representatives, Federal inspectors, and Moore-McCormack Lines' officials. Tests of all equipment were in progress.

The Barbadoes suite on the upper deck was assigned to the idling and conviviality of the newsmen and their company escorts. Our hosts were Joe Medaroch and Harold Hatch of New York. At intervals we made excursions to every part of the steamer. Curiously, the reporters seemed to be most fascinated by the wonderful interior decorations of the de luxe liner. The general theme was Spanish Colonial, with special attention to Argentine scenes. The prominent colors in the wool-carpeted lounges were orange and yellow and red, and the long passageways were finished in a bluish plastic called Mikarta.

The dining salon is called the Inter-American room, and the waiters come by escalator from the chrome and stainless steel galley. The deck cafe decorations feature the whaling industry with a mural of whale ships and a cabinet of scrimshaw, the name for the whale-tooth oddities, logbooks, and other relics of a great period in Yankee shipping. There was a quiet room for passengers not looking for excitement.

On December 5 a news story was indicated and we had to go to work. A hot bearing

had developed on a differential gear between one of the turbines and a propeller shaft on the previous evening. The ship idled for repairs, and we sent news stories to New York by radio-telephone. The ship was in no danger, and the repairs were made at sea.

Trouble with a bearing is more or less routine when a big new ship takes to sea for the first time. There was no other mechanical trouble of any kind during the voyage, and our reportorial holiday continued.

Before dawn on December 6 a passenger tanker flashed a greeting to the *Argentina* with its blinker lights. "Are you the *Argentina*?" the tanker asked. After affirmative reply, the tanker signaled, "Good luck on voyage to New York and then to South America."

This incident was memorable because it was the first greeting to the *Argentina* from another ship, and meant that the marine world already was aware that a new queen of the sea was on the ocean. To me, this was a tipoff that one of my earlier stories had been used in shore-to-ships service.

William D. Dubulsson, port captain for the Ingalls Shipyard, was commander of the trial run to New York. He generously explained the radar, "Loran" navigational system, and other equipment on the bridge. His wife writes feature stories on historical topics for southern newspapers, and I ventured to give him a collection of travel pieces that my wife Kathleen and I had written for the Mulberry Reporter.

In repayment he showed me charts of the Hydrographic Office, which on their back print technical stories about the seas which would be of much value to me as a reporter.

Three engineers from the General Electric Co. spent a lot of time explaining the propulsion machinery to me, and each gave me a good Havana cigar.

Another valuable informant was Harold Pearlman, assistant works manager of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp. at Pascagoula. He watches the ship construction through every stage, sees all, knows all, and answered every conceivable question.

In the forenoon of December 6 we passed the Dry Tortugas and Sand Point Island, and at noon the *Argentina* passed Key West and entered the Atlantic Ocean for the first time. Now we cruised smoothly northward in the Gulf Stream. By dark we were 30 miles offshore from Miami. In the next 24 hours there was nothing more noteworthy than the fact that the temperature dropped about 50 degrees from Key West until our arrival off Cape Hatteras December 7, at 8:36 a.m.

The *Argentina* easily cruised at its required speed of 23 knots or better, and made up the time lost during repair of the hot bearing. On December 8, at the appointed hour of 11:30 a.m., the pilot boarded from the pilot boat *Romer* to direct the ship into New York harbor for the traditional waterfront welcome.

Fifteen minutes earlier, a 14-foot broom had been hoisted to the radio tower of the *Argentina*. The broom meant clean sweep, and was a symbol that the ship had successfully completed its trial run.

Soon airplanes with cameramen were flying past the ship, and the Jersey coastline was visible.

Thomas Murphy, chief purser, invited us to his cabin for final toasts and Godspeeds, and we raised glasses enthusiastically "to the country and its people for which the *Argentina* is named."

By 12:40 p.m. we were off the Statue of Liberty. The sky was clearing and the sun broke through overhead. Manhattan's mighty skyline loomed ahead. Twenty or more tugs, fireboats, and ferryboats took up the escort, and innumerable ships blasted welcome. Huge fountains of water played from the fireboats. Helicopters and airplanes flew overhead.

The *Argentina* was full-dressed with pennants and flew the blue-and-white flag which meant trial run.

At 1 p.m. we were off the Battery and moving up North River, and an hour later the *Argentina* docked at the Todd Shipyard on the Hoboken side.

In a reporter's life there is no greater thrill than to arrive on a fine new ship at its home port of New York. You can almost feel the surge of interest from the spectators on the waterfront, and in the ship's company there is a strange mood of pride, enthusiasm and eager speculation about voyages yet to come.

I was so thrilled that I forgot to make notes, and only came back to life when aboard a limousine in the Lincoln Tunnel. A traffic jam was delaying the "Special" for Buenos Aires which I would write upon arrival at the newsroom.

On December 12 the *Argentina* departed from the Moore-McCormack Lines, pier 32, North River, on its maiden cruise to Buenos Aires, about 12,500 miles round trip in 31 days.

Trials and Executions in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial:

HAVANA, CUBA, February 5, 1959.

The Honorable ADAM C. POWELL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Thank you for your letter of January 27 and the copy of your speech before the House of Representatives.

A great deal is being said in Congress today about the Provisional Government of Cuba and the executions of some known murderers. In the majority of cases, misleading information and misinterpretation are taking the place of veracity and sound judgment of the Cuban events.

I am glad that you visited our country and had face-to-face conversations with our leaders. You are now in a position to tell your colleagues in Congress that Castro and his bearded ones have nothing to do with the ordering of the executions as such; it is the people of Cuba who demand that the guilty ones be punished exactly as is being done now.

I enclose an editorial by Ralph McGill, one of the most distinguished American writers. This is by far the finest, clearest, most unprejudiced piece I have seen in the American press concerning our trials. It expresses exactly how we feel about the Cuban executions; it is, in fact, the most eloquent exposition of our behavior toward Batista's hired killers.

I hope you will pass this information on to your colleagues and that you will continue to work so effectively for real and amicable Cuban-American relations.

Yours very truly,

J. MIRO CARDONA,
Prime Minister, Republic of Cuba.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Jan. 8, 1959]

A REVOLUTION WE MUST AID

(By Ralph McGill)

This is about the Pearl of the Antilles—Cuba. It needs a text.

Let us take one from so conservative a figure as Eugene Black, president of the

World Bank. He said recently that the greatest story of this part of the 20th century was the stir and development going on in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

They are, in final analysis, the last best hope for the future. If we can export to them the western industrial civilization—well and good. If we can't then the Marxists will export theirs.

This brings us back to Cuba.

A viciously ruthless and corrupt dictator, ethically and politically bankrupt, has been driven from Cuba. Fidel Castro and the young people of Cuba have won a revolution. They have not consolidated it. This may be difficult for them to do. Powerful interests will oppose them.

But it should be obvious that Fidel has no intention of going Communist. He is a product of western civilization. Nor do the intellectuals and the people about him consider orienting themselves toward Moscow.

But it is apparent that if this revolution does not succeed the next one will go far to the left.

A STABLE CUBA

Therefore, it is to the selfish interest of the United States to do all it can to make this revolution, so ardently won, a success. A stable Cuba would have a stabilizing effect on all the Caribbean. That is important to us.

First, we should recall Ambassador Earl E. T. Smith. He several times referred to the revolutionists as bandits. This stamps him as a most unobservant man, and an ambassador who failed to give his country sound information. The U.S. policy there was damaging. Not only was the Ambassador blind to the strength of the Fidel Castro movement, he continued to be very cozy with the Batista crowd.

Happily, the Cuban people are not angry with the United States as a people. They do believe, with reason, that official Washington supported one of the most evil dictators in Latin America.

Secondly, we should assist the Fidel Castro government to carry out at least two of its platforms. One should be easy. Our Government should be rigorous in assisting to root out the gambling underworld from the United States which Batista allowed to proliferate there. It was arrogant and powerful. It once again demonstrated that gambling is the worst of vices. The worst of our gangsters were overlords in Havana. They will try to get back in.

SUGAR LAND

Fidel Castro also wants to expropriate some of the American-owned sugar land—paying an agreed-upon price and carry out a program of land reform. This will not be easy. There are millions of acres of idle land in Cuba, much of it is owned by sugar corporations. Unless some of the thousands of landless squatters are anchored on land of their own, they will remain a focal point of radical infection.

About 35 percent of Cuba's sugar mills are United States owned.

This isn't good for the United States or Cuba. It compels us to be too much concerned about U.S. interests in Cuba and not enough about Cuba herself.

The United States would do well to assist this new Government to affect a land reform. Cuba lives on sugar. About 75 percent of her economy is built on it. To protect a small field of sugar-beet growers we impose a tariff and a quota. It is not as high as the tax on other sugar-producing countries, and it should not be.

It would be good sense for the United States to assist Cuba to own more of her economy and to see to it that her sugar market is at least not restricted. This is the sort of foreign aid which the last half of the 20th century needs.

Cuba, insofar as national security is concerned, is as important as Florida. A sound, democratic Caribbean would be of incalculable value to us.

If we fail to assist this test revolution to find its feet we later will have cause to regret it.

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish once again to call the attention of our colleagues to an excellent series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald. The distressing conditions caused by this archaic law are well known to me and I believe that Mr. Mintz has performed a real service to the community by his excellent analysis of the situation existing today as a result of easy credit operations. The House District of Columbia Committee will commence hearings tomorrow, February 19, and it is my hope that a reasonable solution can be found in order that human misery and grief now present in the District can be eliminated. The first of this series is enclosed at this point in the RECORD.

EASY CREDIT IS WRIT LARGE ON SEVENTH STREET

(By Morton Mintz)

(First of a series)

About 190 times every working day, a deputy U.S. marshal hands a District employer a writ of attachment—a municipal court paper ordering him to freeze the wages owed an employee and turn them over to a creditor.

Some of these writs are the last resort of creditors who have acted in good faith and exhausted every other means of collection from deadbeats. But a huge share originates with a few easy credit stores.

Most of the easy credit stores' customers are such poor risks that they cannot get ordinary credit. At least 9 out of 10 wage attachments are against poor Negroes (earning roughly \$30 to \$60 a week), uneducated and unequal to both the inner and outer pressures to buy more than they can possibly afford. And when their pay is attached, they often are left with nothing for necessities.

NO CASH, PLEASE

The easy credit stores, unlike other merchants who extend credit, balk at selling for cash, and extremely few of their customers can pay cash. A common denominator of their operation is interest charges concealed in the sales price and little or no concern with whether the buyer is a reasonable credit risk.

What these operators are concerned with is that the customer, or another person whose name gets on the account as a guarantor, is privately employed. This is because they can and do, under the District's bad debt or garnishment law, use the municipal court and private employers as their collection agents. The pay of Federal and District employees cannot be attached.

The District's garnishment law, which will be detailed in later articles, permits a credi-

tor to get successive attachments for the same debt, to attach every cent of wages a man has coming to him, to have a man's wages frozen while he seeks an exemption, to give their demands priority over a court order for support of a man's family. If a head of a household earned more than \$400 in the preceding 2 months, some judges understand the law to direct that not a penny of this shall be exempt for food, shelter, or anything else.

Thousands of writs served on employers of one person (a maid, for example) up to those who have thousands working for them—have their roots in a few—not all—easy-credit stores in the 700 block of Seventh Street NW. A Washington resident who shopped but did not buy in these stores reports some of these sights, sound, and practices:

Temptations: "Credit as you like it." "No money down." "One dollar for each new account you bring in." "Free shoes for all the children." "Free—big, juicy, delicious ham for your Easter dinner with every purchase amounting to \$15 or more, when opening a new account or reopening an old one."

A prospect looks in the window and a man grabs him by the arm and whisks him inside. "What can I show you?"

"An overcoat."

"Where do you work? Not a Government employee? OK, we'll fix you up. Do you have an account here? No? That's all right; we'll fix you up. Let's open an account first; we have what you want."

"What's the price on this coat?"

"Don't worry about prices; we have what you want to pay. Let me show you this one at \$59."

TEN DOLLARS DOWN, MONTHS TO PAY

So saying, he unbuttons the prospect's coat.

"I know you'll like this one—just sold one like it to the famous orchestra leader so-and-so."

"I saw the same one at — for \$45."

"How much can you pay down? About \$10? Fine. Pay \$2 or \$3 a week for 6 months, 6 months, mind you, not 6 weeks."

"That would come to \$82."

"But we're not charging you any interest. Can you pay \$2.50 a week? You look like a person who could pay \$2.50 a week. If you can pay cash you can have it for \$40. Let's go back and talk to the gentleman back here."

The gentleman back here: "All right; step right up, \$10 down, \$2.50 a week for 6 months."

"That would be \$70."

"Well, look we gotta have some interest—we can work this thing out, anyway you want to do it."

The prospect starts to leave but is halted at the door by a third man: "You like the coat, you want the coat, don't be ridiculous; we can work this out to suit you. We're in business to make a profit, but still we're willing to practically give it away to you."

The prospect gets away and goes to another store.

"What are your prices?"

"Forget about prices. We've got a coat you can buy. We don't sell prices. Do you have an account?"

"No."

"We can open one up for you. Where do you work? A private outfit? Good."

The salesman shows a coat he says is priced (there is no price tag) at \$69.50.

"I can't pay that," the prospect says.

"You can have it for \$60."

"Is it wool?"

"All wool. Pure wool, wool."

The prospect cannot find a label certifying the fabric is all wool.

The salesman whispers secretively: "Look, you want the coat? I'll let you have my

profit. I'll let you have it for \$55, but for heaven's sake don't go out on the street and tell other people."

The prospect still balks.

"You look like an intelligent, clean-cut young man, and I want you to have a break."

"I saw a gray tweed I liked at — for \$45."

"Gray tweed? That's an old man's coat."

"But this one is dark blue."

"There's a difference between an old man's coat and a conservative coat. This is conservative. How much money do you have on you? Can you pay \$15 down?"

"Maybe \$10."

Ten dollars, OK, fine.

Instantly someone nearby starts filling out a sales contract, but the prospect is still hesitant.

The owner approaches; his tone is harsh: "You like the coat, take the coat, take the coat, fellow, for heaven's sakes."

The salesman: "Oh, come on, come on, come on."

The owner, as the prospect leaves: "We just want to talk to you. Nobody's going to hold a gun to you. We'll work out whatever terms you want to work out."

Prices: A conservative estimate is that such stores average on clothing about 50 percent more than for the same or comparable articles elsewhere. However elastic, they include provision for interest and intricate bookkeeping. The merchandise is often shoddy.

From the bag of tricks:

A customer on the phone: "I can't make my payment this week. I'll pay next week."

An employee who calls himself "Jack" replies: "Perfectly all right."

The next day a suit is filed against the customer which could lead to garnishment of his wages. He goes to the store to find out who gave the oral assurance.

"I'm Oscar, he's Joe, she's Wilma. There's no Jack here."

A customer goes to an easy credit store to complain that he is "paying and paying, and I can't seem to see the end." He asks for a copy of his account. This brings on laughter—and a refusal.

A person opens an account. Another name, usually the husband's or wife's, is put on the account as a guarantor.

The purchaser becomes delinquent. A suit is filed. The summons, under rule 4 of the municipal court, is served on an adult on the premises. It happens that the summons is served on the very person who made the purchase, and he tears it up.

Twenty days pass, and no answer is made in court. The court therefore declares a default judgment.

The innocent party—the guarantor—gets his first knowledge of all this when his pay is attached. If the creditor has waited 90 days after the default judgment, it cannot be attacked. Even if it asks more than what is owed, even if otherwise there would have been no legal liability. The guarantor is stuck, and that's it.

The actual purchaser, or one of those innocent guarantors, pleads with the easy credit store not to attach his wages, because if it does he will be fired. He promises to pay, say, \$2 a week.

A garnishment is filed despite assurances that none would be. He tries to find out who gave him the assurance. Again, "There no Jack here."

A \$35-a-week maid, the sole support of her daughter and four grandchildren, picks out an Easter topper. She is told not to worry about the price.

After it is entered on her account, that is, after it's too late, she finds the price is exorbitant—\$109. The store refuses to cancel the sale or give her other, more needed merchandise in exchange.

The store tries to attach her wages but fails, because she has no wages owed her; as

a matter of fact, she is in debt to her employer. Finally she arranges to pay \$2 a week. "As soon as I get in there," she said, "they follow me all the way back to the door, trying to get me to buy something more, but I just won't do it."

Municipal Court Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr., testifying before a Senate District Subcommittee June 19, 1957, said of the handful of retail easy-credit merchants who have made a garnishment mill out of the court:

"Their floor personnel and credit manager are instructed to extend credit to workingmen and their families far beyond their ability to pay. Poor people without luxuries are easy prey to a fast-talking salesman who tells them that all they have to do is sign now and pay later. The storekeeper has learned to rely on the garnishment statute to collect his money and some retailers in Washington have lawyers who devote their entire day, every day, to garnishment of wages."

In a statement to the same Judiciary Subcommittee, Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, referred to this handful of easy-credit operators as "credit racketeers; they are nothing more."

Preserving the Family Farm as a Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most alarming developments in recent American history is the accelerated deterioration of the family farming units of our Nation. The replacement of family-size farms with huge corporation-style farm operations is not only undercutting the opportunities for young Americans to make their livelihoods in agriculture, but it is a direct threat to the continuance of our rural communities with their schools, churches, and commercial life. When scores of farm families are replaced by one large factory-type operation, we have actually set the stage for a kind of modern day feudalism with the remaining farmers playing the role of serfs.

Deploing this trend, Rev. Louis J. Miller of Colman, S. Dak., rural life director of the Catholic church in South Dakota, recently offered a most urgent and compelling statement to a committee of the South Dakota State Legislature. I urge my colleagues in the Congress to read Father Miller's statement which I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BEFORE A LEGISLATIVE HEARING AT PIERRE RE THE REORGANIZATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, JANUARY 29, 1959

Gentlemen, I appreciate very much the opportunity of appearing before this legislative committee. I am speaking as the director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference in the eastern part of our State. I also make bold to say that the thinking stated here is widely shared by many farm people not of my religious persuasion.

I am specifically concerned with Senate bill 134, section I on policy, and section 5(c) on rural development. The conference for

nearly 40 years has been grappling with serious problems that confront the family unit of agriculture—seeking to apply Christian principles to a solution of its difficulties.

I am sure every member of this committee is concerned about this social institution of the family as the basic unit of agriculture in South Dakota, and throughout the country for that matter. You are concerned that it remain the predominant pattern of farm production. You are interested in maintaining it as an efficient unit, as well as a way of life.

In dealing with any kind of legislation it is vital to have clear objectives. Legislators would not be like some trigger-happy, irresponsible game hunter who fires in all directions at anything he hears or sees. Here, likewise, it is not enough to take a random legislative shot in the general direction of farm problems, make a big noise to kid the folks back home something is being done for them. We need what we have not had in agricultural policy in this State—a clear objective—a rifled aim at the maintenance and development of family unit agriculture and the rural community that springs from it. We need an objective that will seek in season and out of season to help upgrade those family units that have fallen short of a sound operation, and at the same time to discourage and cut back if need be super-scale factory farming.

As you know only too well, agriculture is No. 1 both as an industry and as a way of life in our great State of South Dakota. I wish to call to your attention that, despite assurances we have heard from the USDA and other spokesmen as to the continued strength and prevalence of the family farm pattern, the fact remains that there are forces in the economy today that pose a real threat, yes, have already wrought their damage, to family-unit farming.

Let's look at one aspect of the record. According to a study recently published by State College on vertical integration we learn that 275 units, vertically integrated with feed companies in California are producing 90 percent of that State's need for beef—that is an average of about 18,000 head per farm. There you have it—a type of agriculture foreign to our concept we derive from Jefferson. It's here. In California as a matter of fact, the family type operation is no longer the predominant.

There are powerful interests in the country for whom agriculture means this type of operation. Agriculture is simply a profit-making enterprise in the field of food and fiber production instead of in appliances, cars or what have you. These folks even visualize a time when there will be, let's say several thousand hog units to produce the pork of the Nation, so many cattle feeder lots to fatten the beef the Nation consumes, etc. They speak of easier solutions to the problems of surplus, grading, marketing when the factory methods have taken over in the field displacing the family. This is the kind of cold-blooded thinking that is going on.

We feel this whole matter is an urgent one. The family pattern of farming has disappeared in California; it is weakened in other areas of the Southwest where some 500,000 Mexican nationals are being exploited at sub-American wages for the aggrandizement of factory-farm operators. In these days of rapid communication we must recognize that what happens in one State, might conceivably happen in another.

We have been informed by the USDA and farm experts that the greatest single factor of change in the farm picture is a technological revolution. The word "revolution" is well and deliberately chosen, for it is clear to any student of the problem that the changes this technology brings will affect the farm family as radically and disturbingly as the industrial revolution affected urban England more than a century ago. Any

reader knows the wretchedness and misery follows as described in Dickens' novels. It was not that mass production technology was evil; rather that the technology was imposed on a nation's economy with almost total disregard for human beings.

I mention this to emphasize the urgency of the subject matter before you in bill 131. One might say we have come to a fork in the road in South Dakota agriculture—take the path to the right and we enter what might well become the golden age of agriculture, the wedding of the farm family to the best modern agricultural know-how; or take the fork to the left and we enter the realm of factory farming, with its depopulated countryside, dependent serfs in what remains of ghosttown communities—an ugly sight to behold.

We do not believe that the sovereign State of South Dakota should sit neutral on the sidelines when a way of life for so many tens of thousands of our farm families is at stake; it is inconceivable that our State government lift nary a finger while blind economic forces be allowed to operate unhampered, monopolizing markets that at present undergird the economy of our families on the land.

We believe that the State of South Dakota should take a positive role in fostering a climate favorable to family unit agriculture, first by an explicit declaration of policy supporting its preservation and growth, and by legislation which will enable it to maintain its level of efficiency, and assist where needed in raising it to a level of sound operation. In view of the mere dollar sign thinking in the field of agriculture, we feel the impact of a legislative policy is needed to focus attention on the value to the State of a family type of agriculture.

For it's more than poetry to speak of farming as a way of life. The greatest product of rural South Dakota is its people. A public relations man, who spent some years in war industry in California, told me the other day—among personnel men the Midwest farm boys were the most sought for in recruiting labor. Why? They were versatile, they had some initiative, responsibility, and, above all, they weren't afraid to work. This is one of the products, believe me, that this State and this Nation can ill afford to lose. So we feel there is no such thing as being neutral when a valuable way of family living is in danger of being replaced by huge factory-farm agriculture.

Be that as it may, not only should the State department of agriculture actively foster the welfare of the family farm, it should also be concerned about what's happening to people in the rural communities of this State. Certainly the State has a role to perform other than recording the demise of one rural community after another in its bureau of statistics.

One of the great reasons why many of our rural communities are dying is because we are sending too many of our raw products outside of the community, yes, outside of the State, to be processed. This is in many cases inexcusable at a time when our farm people, with the enlightened partnership of their Government, have brought power to every community of the State. For whenever we send out such raw materials, we send with them some of the finest talent, brains and brawn in young people along with those materials. We have been at the mercy of out-of-State processors and manufacturers long enough.

One of the most heartbreaking experiences I have as a rural pastor is to see some of our fine lads come back to the community after a stretch in the service. They want to stay in the community; they would like to give their work-span to the community, but we have nothing for them to do. So off they move to the big city where many of our products are being processed. And this is part of that endless subsidy farm folks make

that makes the chambers of commerce of neighboring cities boast of their growth.

If we profess a love and concern for the youth of our State, if we have a regard for the opportunities of our young people, their future, their potential contributions to our State, it is imperative that the State Department of Agriculture be authorized to direct, let's say, an institution like our land grant State college (which Abe Lincoln made possible so the American farmer might not be just a dumb farmer or peasant); commission this institution to give the people the knowledge, the research that is needed if they are to help themselves. I do not mean research on crop varieties, seeds, animal husbandry, etc., which is being done, and is important from the viewpoint of agriculture as an industry.

At the same time we should have more research that has to do with rural people and their resources, rural development; we need, for instance, knowledge on the economic potential areas in the State, the possibilities of rural-related industry, processing, recreation; knowledge of land ownership and tenure, research into how widespread ownership can be maintained with capital outlay so high, problems of and extent of land concentration in this State—and a host of research of this nature that concerns people, and not mere agricultural economics. For knowledge is power, and without it a free people will die.

In driving through the land of magnificent distances that is our State, I have seen a sign: "South Dakota State College—Education With a Purpose." A noble quote indeed. But to this day I have met no two people who agree on what that purpose is supposed to be. We feel that the people, the rural people of the State should supply the answer for our land grant college: place the duty upon it of giving rural South Dakota more research into that aspect of agriculture that is a way of life—people in rural communities, rural development.

There is one more thing I wish to bring to your attention as a kind of background for the big picture. The major problem in the trouble spots of the world today are rural problems. Who shall own the land? Look at South America, China, Spain, Europe behind the Iron Curtain—all of them places where family farming has not been the general state of affairs. Result? Social discontent and revolution.

The family and ownership of land is the natural God-given way of human living and whenever the church or the state or powerful influential people forget that, and take over the ownership of God's land in a disproportionate manner, the economic, spiritual, and social balance of a nation is disturbed and evils of every kind result.

It should not be forgotten by this committee that never before in the history of the human race have so many families enjoyed the privilege of living on land of their own as in the area between the Appalachians and the Rocky Mountains, between the Canadian border and the Mason and Dixon line. It's been a good way of life—it has proven itself. Indeed, this is a heritage that has meant strength for our Nation and our institutions, abundance for our tables, fiber for our factories. It is a heritage that must be passed on to posterity. It has proven its right to survive.

We believe that there is enough down-to-earth commonsense in this heartland of America and the Dakotas to insist that here in this State we foster and strengthen a pattern of agriculture that is at once efficient in the production of food and fiber and at the same time retain a good way of life for tens of thousands of South Dakotans.

For these reasons we believe, and respectfully submit to this committee, that in a rural State such as ours and after 70 years

of statehood we have a Department of Agriculture dedicated to clearly defined objectives. We further repeat that, along with a commitment to the traditional Jeffersonian idea of a family owned and controlled agriculture, the Department be given the duty to help strengthen the rural community.

This, we believe, will help maintain an agricultural industry first in productivity in the world, and one that will retain a built-in, cost-free subsidy to the Nation of an endless supply of hardworking people whose feet are on the ground, to help the Nation keep its feet there too.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Rev. LOUIS J. MILLER,
Rural Life Director.

United States Is Facing a Clobbering in the Battle for Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Washington Daily News of Monday, February 16, 1959:

UNITED STATES IS FACING A CLOBBERING IN THE BATTLE FOR MARKETS
(By Charles Lucey)

The United States is beginning to come awake to the fact that we face a clobbering in the battle for world markets.

Partly it's a matter of price. Evidence grows that domestic U.S. inflation is shoving up our costs so that overseas nations can undersell us.

Partly it's technology. No longer do we have any corner of it—and our edge might have been much thinner anyway if western European technology hadn't felt the havoc of two world wars.

Increasingly the gap closes between foreign productive techniques and capabilities and the marvelous big-volume, low-cost American way of pouring out mountains of goods.

The U.S. goal for a decade has been to build our allies economically strong. They've shaped up well. Any blithe notion we're competing today against a scattering of pot-and-kettle tinkers is fatuous. As more and more of the world reaches out for the good life, Japan and western Europe will be competing steadily harder against us to provide it for a price.

Partly, too, the new challenge rises because our competitors are trade-hungry. Exports are their lifeblood. They provide jobs for millions.

Yet the issue is not simply one of whether our foreign competitors take a bigger share of the overseas market. It involves also the ability of foreign-made goods to compete with U.S. goods here at home.

TURNABOUT

Many of these goods from overseas are made by U.S. firms. In the postwar years U.S. firms have increased their direct foreign investments by \$20 billion—three times as much as in 1946. So long as U.S. plants overseas sell their output abroad perhaps few U.S. jobs at home are lost. But when they import lower-cost goods in the United States it's a different story.

Many U.S. businessmen believe the danger of the United States pricing itself out of

foreign markets is an immediate one. But even if costs and prices are kept in check here at home, more intense, vigorous overseas competition against the United States is a challenge still to be met.

On the broad question of whether the United States is pricing its exports too high, some Government economists are skeptical. They say most commodities or articles cited represent special cases. Others say wages and prices generally have not increased more here than in other competing nations—though the foreign rates, starting lower, could have climbed faster and still be under United States levels.

WARNINGS

Warnings of danger ahead are increasing. In President Eisenhower's economic message to Congress was an insistence that high prices here at home could "lower our capability to compete in world markets."

The National Industrial Conference Board, in a study made partly in response to a suggestion by the House Ways and Means Committee, found that in hardest-competing Western Europe, unit production costs were lower than U.S. costs in 55 of 85 instances analyzed.

Other warnings have come from Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, United States Steel Chairman Roger Blough, Ford Motor Chairman Ernest R. Breech, and Board Chairman John McCloy, of the Chase Manhattan Bank, former U.S. High Commissioner to Germany.

Said Mr. McCloy:

"We have to face the fact that in many lines we are pricing ourselves right out of the world market. It is up to us to make clear to all that we have to keep prices and costs down, we have to make better products and we have to work harder and longer to make them. There are disconcertingly large numbers of people in this world who are working harder than we, and they are achieving comparable know-how."

"I have referred to Europe but we are all aware of the tremendous strides Russia has made in industrial development. We no longer stand out as the single great supplier of goods we were in the early postwar period."

NO WAGE PRESSURE

Mr. Breech, returning from Europe, praised German and English labor leaders who, he said, had not pressed for wage increases they felt their countries could ill afford. He cited Ford assembly-line workers' hourly wage of \$2.44, not counting a 50-60-cent fringe benefit, compared with \$1.05 in England, 69 cents in Cologne, Germany.

Mr. Breech found auto factories producing a couple thousand engines and bodies daily, a rate comparing well with U.S. auto plants. He found striking advances in design, making and selling of autos and consumer durable goods; noted a 1958 European total auto output not far behind ours.

Like Mr. McCloy, Mr. Breech cited the disappearance of the long-held U.S. advantage which let this country beat lower wage competition overseas with its greater investment in plant, tools and big volume. He particularly warned of a movement overseas of U.S. products with high labor content.

CHEAPER IMPORTS

Steelman Blough described a Dusseldorf, Germany, steel plant laying down barbed wire in Cleveland at \$40 a ton less than wire his own company sold there. Even with Germany's progress, a Cleveland steelworker, with his highly productive tools, can turn out more steel than a German worker. But, said Mr. Blough, Cleveland's three-times-higher wages shove U.S. costs above those of Dusseldorf.

Mr. Blough sees the technological revolution that began in the United States in the

early 1900's "sweeping across the face of the globe at a vigorous pace—and happily so."

But it means rougher competition for the United States everywhere.

Labor, of course, has big stakes in this argument. It recognizes the possible inroads on U.S. overseas markets by foreign competitors but it is by no means ready to acknowledge high American wages are a main factor.

Mayor Jess Lanier and Miscellaneous Proposals of Municipal Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 17, 1959, a fine group of mayors from 35 different Alabama cities and towns came to Washington for a conference with the Members of the Alabama congressional delegation. The purpose of the visit was to enable the Alabama League of Municipalities to present its views on 20 separate legislative items presently pending before the Congress.

Twenty mayors each presented the position of the league on a particular field of legislation. Among the 20 was the Honorable Jess Lanier, mayor of the progressive and expanding city of Bessemer, Ala., in my district, who commented on the subject of "Miscellaneous Proposals of Municipal Interest."

With the thought that Mayor Lanier's remarks will be of interest to the Members of the Congress, I am privileged to insert them herewith in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS OF MUNICIPAL INTEREST

(By Jess Lanier)

You gentlemen have been very patient and kind to listen to our expression of municipal views on programs and legislative proposals considered from time to time by Congress. We want to thank you for this courteous hearing and I shall close it with a brief review of miscellaneous programs and legislative proposals which affect the municipal government interest.

ASSISTANCE TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Hearings are to start next week, I believe, on a bill—S. 722—which would create an independent Federal agency to administer a program designed to provide economic redevelopment in industrial and rural areas which are suffering from or are threatened with chronic unemployment and poverty. The program would include loans for private industry at low interest rates, loans for public facilities at low interest, \$75 million annually in grants for public facilities—as well as informational, planning, and technical assistance to eligible areas.

Assistance under the proposal would be available to: industrial areas with unemployment equal to 6 percent of its labor force for 18 of 24 months preceding, or 9 percent for 15 of 18 months preceding, or 12 percent for 1 year preceding—or, at the discretion of the agency head, 15 percent for 6 months preceding; and rural areas with the largest number and percentage of low income families and substantial and persistent unemployment.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES TO MUNICIPALITIES

Another bill—S. 910—is of general interest to city and town governments. It would provide limited payments in lieu of municipal taxes on federally owned commercial and industrial property, as well as special assessments levied by municipalities for streets, sidewalks, sewers, etc., on other federally owned property. Municipal officials in Alabama are more interested in the latter feature of the proposal—that the Federal Government come along with other property owners and pay its proportionate part of the cost of public improvements that are financed through the issuance by cities and towns of public improvement assessments bonds. Other classes of property do this and we feel that such improvements improve and enhance the value of Federal property the same as they raise the value of other classes of real estate and property.

CENSUS OF GOVERNMENT FACTS AND DATA

We favor ample appropriations to carry on effectively the work of the Federal agency which collects, publishes, and distributes useful and dependable facts and information concerning the operation and programs of all layers of government—the census of governments.

FINANCING GOVERNMENT OFFICE BUILDINGS

Municipal officials all over the United States are aware that a heavy backlog of Federal office buildings exists because no sound method has been established for the construction of such facilities. With the collapse of the Federal lease-purchase arrangement for the construction of such buildings, no new program has emerged which will provide for keeping abreast of the demand for new Federal office buildings. The municipalities have a vital interest in this problem, not only because of the need for improving Federal services to local citizens, but also because such new Federal construction can provide the cornerstone for redevelopment of blighted urban areas. It would seem logical to establish a Federal office building corporation, patterned after the Federal National Mortgage Insurance Agency. It could sell bonds on the open market for the construction of new Federal buildings, which bonds could be retired by charging rentals to the Federal agencies occupying the buildings. Such a device would not only provide a means for keeping abreast of the need for new office facilities, but would eliminate the possibility of adding to the national debt or requiring annual appropriations from Congress. I might say that we have such a law in Alabama whereby municipal governments may issue revenue bonds payable from rents charged various departments and agencies of our municipalities. It is being widely used at this time in our State and frees municipal funds that would normally go into building programs for other municipal uses.

There are other matters we could discuss, but we have already used up the time we planned for this session with you. As bills of interest to cities and towns come up in this session of Congress, we shall be sending you expressions of our interest and policy with respect to them. Thank you again for your courteous and patient interest in our viewpoints. From time to time, representatives of the American Municipal Association and the U.S. conference of mayors will appear before your various congressional committees or discuss pending legislation with you in your offices. Needless to say, we shall appreciate hearings and time given them in acquainting you with the national municipal viewpoint on various bills and programs handled by Congress from session to session.

I thank you again.

The Foreign Affairs Committee Should Review Local Currency Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion during the past few months concerning the possible uses for and the extent of the local currencies held by the United States and of counterpart funds. Counterpart funds are those derived from the mutual security program through the sale of commodities in the foreign country. They do not belong to the United States but are under the joint control of the United States and the local government.

These counterpart funds are, in effect, matching funds provided by the foreign country to those provided by the United States. Up to 10 percent of counterpart funds are set aside for the uses of the U.S. Government such as local currency administrative costs.

Local currencies belonging to the United States are solely owned by the United States. The United States owned local currencies are derived from a variety of sources, United States income tax collections, sales of surplus property, repayment of loans, the 10 percent counterpart described above, and so forth. The greatest portion of these United States owned funds, however, is derived from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 and under the Mutual Security Act.

There follows a summary of local currencies owned by the United States and of counterpart under the mutual security program. The figures shown reflect sums on hand as of June 30, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I should emphasize that many of these funds and much of this counterpart are already committed for new embassies and consulates, for support of armed forces, for development projects, and so forth. Furthermore, most of the Public Law 480 funds can be spent only pursuant to the agreements with the purchasing country which, in many instances, restricts the use of such funds.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget administers some of these local currencies. The International Cooperation Administration administers others, the Department of Defense still others, and so on. In view of the lack of central control in the executive branch, it would appear that some mechanism should be devised to provide such control both in the executive branch and in the Congress. I think that it would be most appropriate if the Foreign Affairs Committee would undertake a thorough review and study of the entire local currency situation. I think that the Foreign Affairs Committee is best equipped for this task.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, the summary to which I previously referred, of the foreign currencies owned by the United States or jointly controlled by the United States and other countries as of June 30, 1958:

Status of foreign currencies owned by United States or jointly controlled by United States and other countries, as of June 30, 1958

[Dollar equivalent calculated with the June 30, 1958, Treasury market rate]

[In thousands of U.S. dollars and thousands of foreign currency units]

Country	Unit of currency	Exchange rate, foreign currency to \$1	Currencies owned by the United States						Currencies owned by other countries—But requiring U.S. agreement as to use						Grand total	
			Dollar equivalent acquired under—					Total								
			Mutual security program surplus agricultural sales	Title I, Public Law 480, surplus agricultural commodities sales	U.S. portion counter-part funds	Lend-lease and surplus property	Miscellaneous	Units of foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent	Mutual Security Act	Title II, Public Law 480	Miscellaneous	Total		Units of foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent
													Units of foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent		
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Afghanistan	Afghani	57.00	432				551	56,010	983						56,010	983
Argentina	Peso	42.20		8,872			1	374,429	8,873						374,429	8,873
Australia	Pound	44167				123		55	125						55	125
Austria	Schilling	25.91	5,333	20,254			21	663,497	25,608	42,056	129	130	1,096,373	42,315	1,759,870	67,922
Belgian Congo	Franc	49.55					1	72	1						72	1
Belgium	do.	49.82	899	73	183		5	58,262	1,169	408			20,305	408	78,567	1,577
Bolivia	Boliviano	8,850.00	145				44	1,673,258	189	4,222	77	213	39,926,703	4,512	41,599,961	4,701
Brazil	Cruzairo	132.00		14,495	20		4	1,916,494	14,519						1,916,494	14,519
Burma	Kyat	4,7125		20,375	38		149	96,893	20,560	286			1,347	286	98,240	20,847
Cambodia	Riel	34.772	273		54		577	31,423	903	4,712			163,859	4,712	195,282	5,616
Ceylon	Rupee	4.7375	472				7	2,270	479						2,270	479
Chile	Peso	1,080.00		9,908			85	10,792,703	9,993						10,792,703	9,993
China	New Taiwan dollar	36.08	12,395	3,450	81		86	577,732	16,012	10,350			373,439	10,350	951,161	26,362
Colombia	Peso	7.81		8,911	4			30,577	3,915						30,577	3,915
Costa Rica	Colon	6.63					55	367	55						367	55
Cuba	Peso	1.00					2	2	2						2	2
Cyprus	Pound	35524					1	(1)	1						(1)	1
Denmark	Krone	6.90125	599		44		8	4,492	651			2,784	19,216	2,784	23,708	3,435
Dominican Republic	RD peso	1.00			12			12	12						12	12
Ecuador	Sucre	16.55		1,771	(1)		(1)	29,309	1,771						29,309	1,771
Egypt	Pound	436141	1,079	12,212			5	6,191	14,195						6,191	14,195
Ethiopia	Ethiopian dollar	2.48					3	7	3						7	3
Finland	Markka	319.00	94	3,335			4	1,095,125	3,433			7	2,091	7	1,097,216	8,440
France	Franc	420.00	1,160	3,770	545		258	2,408,012	5,733	137			57,646	137	2,465,658	5,871
French West Africa	CFA franc	209.70					2	315							315	2
Germany	Deutsche mark	4.20	31,295	763	3,322	6,650	30,964	306,577	72,995	19,768			83,026	19,768	380,603	92,763
Do.	Deutsche mark	16.51					2	32	2						32	2
Ghana	BWA pound	35241					3	1	3						1	3
Greece	Drachma	30.00	10,672	14,457	19		125	758,196	25,273	123,100			3,692,985	123,100	4,451,181	148,873
Guatemala	Quetzal	1.00	2,907	10				2,917	2,917		159		159		3,076	3,076
Haiti	Gourde	5.00							808				4,042	808	4,042	808
Honduras	Lempira	2.00			18			36	18						36	18
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5.78					21	121	21						121	21
Hungary	Forint	48.00			3		4	145	3						145	3
Iceland	Krona	25.2495		726			4	18,421	730	7,961			201,018	7,961	219,439	8,691
India	Rupee	4.75	44,527	307,641			2,603	1,684,089	354,671						1,684,089	354,671
Indonesia	Rupiah	30.28		33,018			399	1,011,855	33,417	8,894			298,359	8,894	1,280,244	42,280
Iran	Rial	76.00		5,078			17	387,288	5,095	6,011			456,853	6,011	844,141	11,107
Iraq	Dinar	35635			34		91	45	125						45	125
Ireland	Pound	35982					1	(1)	1						1	1
Israel	do.	1.80	538	53,834			5,906	72,680	40,378	8,508			3,096	8,508	3,096	8,508
Italy	Lira	625.00	22,868	59,660	849		111	52,180,337	83,489	70,821		34	48,034,140	76,855	100,214,477	160,343
Japan	Yen	360.00	2,555	19,771	1,108		5	8,459,712	23,499						8,459,712	23,499
Jordan	Dinar	35611					3	1	3						1	3
Kenya	EA shilling	7.09471					2	16	2						16	2
Korea	Won	800.00	30,501	20,392	1,035		1,310	29,664,201	52,328	226,750			113,375,097	226,750	143,039,208	286,078
Laos	Kip	35.00	166		1		90	8,965	256	3,260			114,110	3,260	123,075	3,516
Lebanon	Pound	3.18					7	21	7	2,516			8,000	2,516	8,021	2,522
Lithuania	do.	3544					1	(1)	1						(1)	1
Mexico	Peso	12.49		13,942				174,132	13,942						174,132	13,942
Morocco	Franc	456.00	4,145				2	1,890,788	4,146						1,890,788	4,146
Netherlands	Guilder	3.779375	2,429	308	2	106	8	10,782	2,853						10,782	2,853
New Zealand	Pound	35955					3	1	3						1	3
Nicaragua	Cordoba	7.40			28			209	28						209	28

Nigeria	W A pound	352224				3	1	3						1	3
Norway	Krone	7.12	1			12	1,814	255	98					2,512	353
Pakistan	Rupee	4.7325	2,724	122,433	4,733	2,465	626,370	132,335	22,846	65	2,024	118,009	24,935	744,379	157,261
Paraguay	Guarani	111.10		136			15,162	136						15,162	136
Peru	Sol	23.70		3,270	(1)		78,045	3,263		176				82,221	3,469
Philippines	Peso	2.0075	7,360	7,121	47	2,695	34,554	17,212	4,527			4,176	176	43,641	21,739
Poland	Zloty	55.00		31,817			1,749,911	31,817				9,087	4,527	1,749,911	31,817
Portugal	Escudo	28.60		2,116	66	6	62,574	2,188	725			20,744	725	83,318	2,913
Singapore	M. dollar	3.041825				2	5	2						5	2
Spain	Peseta	54.25	12,203	106,782	5,555	478	6,782,201	125,018	21,825			1,184,062	21,825	7,066,203	146,842
Sudan	Pound	3.4626				3	1	3						1	3
Sweden	Krona	5.17				11	69	11						59	11
Switzerland	Franc	4.284375		201		12	913	213						913	213
Syria	Pound	3.59				2	6	2						6	2
Thailand	Baht	20.72		2,707	123	326	65,400	3,156	413,878			287,543	13,878	352,943	17,034
Tunisia	Franc	419.00	2,255			26	956,098	2,282	1,882			788,467	1,882	1,744,565	4,164
Turkey	Lira	5.75		62,495	561	1,367	370,431	64,423	5,587			32,124	5,587	402,555	70,010
United Kingdom	Pound	356665	88,493	26,605	1,564	502	23,956	67,167	807			288	807	24,244	67,974
Vietnam	Plastre	69.80	2,513			429	205,433	2,943	24,921			1,739,516	24,921	1,944,949	27,865
Yugoslavia	Dinar	600.00	31,906	167,269	9,936	805	125,948,832	209,915	13,085	11,523		15,124,280	25,208	141,073,132	235,122
Total			280,019	1,144,878	30,053	7,125	52,714	1,514,789	663,163	12,129	5,192	680,486		2,195,273	

¹ Indicates amounts less than 500.

Adequate National Park Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the San Joaquin Valley Council of the California State Chamber of Commerce recently conducted in that area a most important and significant study meeting, a Sierra Access Conference, which developed opinion and crystallized views about the preservation, availability, and proper use of our magnificent Sierra Nevada, the majestic mountain chain rearing its snow-clad peaks from end to end of the great Central Valley of California and incorporating three great national parks.

One of the thoughtful messages laid before the conference was that of Mr. Chester H. Warlow, a most respected leader for many years in public affairs of the valley and the State of California, and a prominent citizen of my home community of Fresno. I think Mr. Warlow's views will be of interest and importance to conservationists throughout the country, and I have therefore sought and obtained permission to insert his address in the *RECORD*, where it will be available for study.

Mr. Warlow is eminently qualified to present authoritative views on the preservation and the wise use of our mountain areas and to make specific recommendations about mountain roads and trails required to make available those areas dedicated to public use and enjoyment. I feel sure that reading of his address will show that from his long and varied experience he has developed a philosophy worth considering, particularly in relation to pending controversies about Mission 66, under which our national parks are being rehabilitated.

Mr. Warlow has been actively concerned with our mountains for more than 40 years, during which he has both enjoyed them and contributed materially to making them available for the enjoyment of others. Since 1929 he has been honored with a succession of posts of responsibility in the development of our national parks, park roads, water resources, and State highway matters. For the past 15 years he has been a member of the California State Highway Commission. Last year the Fresno Chamber of Commerce honored him as "Mister Highways."

Mr. Warlow approaches our mountains with reverence. His reverence is coupled with the belief other people are entitled to share with him, in safety and at a cost within their means, the majesty of the mountains, the cathedrals of nature which so perfectly display the hand of the Creator.

I commend to you the eloquent words of a man who has devoted his life to people and to mountains:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I crave your indulgence, but I have something to say which in general is perhaps pertinent to all the matters which have been discussed here today.

First, however, let me remind you that I have been an active member of the San Joaquin Valley Highway Committee of this chamber of commerce since prior to 1927, and that I speak to you today solely as such. I would also like to briefly mention my mountain experiences, with which most of you are entirely unfamiliar.

For nearly 20 years, commencing prior to 1913, I spent most of my vacations in the High Sierra in the territory between Yosemite Valley and Mount Whitney. On two occasions I led the large parties of our local citizens from this valley to the mountain tops of this region. Those who went with me also came back with acute cases of "mountain mania," from which none of us ever recovered. With pack and saddle animals, I wandered in wildernesses. I have to my credit many firsts—passages where only knapsackers had gone before. I love our Sierra. I respect them. I revere them, but I have what I believe to be a rather unselfish attitude toward them because I feel that others are entitled to the inspirations which their grandeur induce.

These high, hard rocks, these deep canyons, these lofty, snow-covered peaks, the quiet meadows, the roaring rivers with their waterfalls, are all a part of God's cathedral, and our Sierra should be treated as such.

Most of my public activities have been directed to the positive, but today I find myself in a critical mood. I propose to speak frankly to and about some of my very best friends, and also about some of my acquaintances for whom I have the utmost respect. I speak not of their motives or of their sincerities, but solely of their philosophies and their conclusions as to how our mountain areas are to be administered.

Of what value is a cathedral with spiked doors upon which the parish communicants are impaled while seeking to enter. We expect all who so desire to enter to enter with safety, to sit quietly in the solitude of the nave and transept and even to approach the rail for communion. But the vestry, the pulpit, and the foot of the altar are reserved for the use of the few. True, the altar and, in many cases, magnificent back altars are in view of the communicant to inspire, elevate, and broaden the horizons of his thoughts, but communicants need not tread upon the more holy ground behind the rail to grasp these inspirations. I ask you, what esthetic values have our mighty mountains unless mankind, the average fellow, is to be able to move at least within reasonable sight distances of these truly magnificent panoramas that have been prepared for him from all eternity by the Great Creator.

What is all this about? Well, a great controversy is raging, most of it entirely under cover. The United States Park Service has a great program of rehabilitation underway, Mission 66, with which most of you are generally familiar. It is in great danger. Our particular interest is in that part of the mission relating to park roads. I hasten to point out that in this whole mission road program, there are only a very few miles of proposed new roads and that mileage is not under dispute. The rest of the entire road program is entirely rehabilitation modernization. Not opening new areas to vehicular traffic—not putting motorcars behind the communion rail, but removing the impaling spikes from the cathedral doors.

Safety, safety of travel for the many who desire to enter the nave of God's cathedral, for the many who desire and need the inspiration of our mountains but who, like some of us who have now grown old, will never be able again to wander in wildernesses, to walk between the altar and the communion rail.

This great controversy is not about from where to where these reconstructed roads shall lead, but only about their basic designs. Many of the apostles of the wilderness vehemently insist that reconstructed secondary

park roads should consist of two 9-foot lanes with 3-foot shoulders on the outside, with 12 percent grades, 200-foot sight distances, and hairpin turns.

The Park Service has been lately talking about 10-foot lanes with somewhat lesser grades, and with about the same sight distance and curvature. Even if that is to be the program, why waste the money rebuilding these auto trails when on being finished they will still be wagon roads? No public agency, Federal, State, or county, has built such roads in the last 25 years except logging roads in the timber area and fire protection roads where they are necessary.

I find myself now critical of the Park Service. I speak only as one of their very sincere friends. No one is proposing anything but two lanes for these roads. However, these roads should be built upon not less than the minimum standards set by the State of California for 40-mile-per-hour travel. That means 11-foot lanes, 6-foot shoulders, and the following minimums: 550-foot radius on curves, nonpassing sight distance of 275 feet, and passing sight distance of 1,100 feet. Grades should be kept below 7 percent. When the El Portal, Big Oak Flat, and Ash Mountain entrance roads, and the roads leading into Lassen Park are to be reconstructed, these standards should be considerably stepped up because of the higher volumes of traffic involved. Certainly on these roads the standards should not be less than those provided for 50-mile-an-hour movements.

Returning to our 40-mile-per-hour roads, the limit-standards above suggested should be used only where they are absolutely necessary on account of the terrain or landscaping features. Reasonable turn-outs should be provided at appropriate places so that there would be no stopping on the regular travel lanes.

Imagine a driver of a modest car towing a camp trailer (I refer not to luxurious house trailers 30 feet long and 10 feet wide, but many of the camp trailers are 8 and 10 feet wide). Imagine this driver attempting to negotiate a 12 percent grade. He is either completely stalled or moving in low gear with 6 or 8 cars fussing along behind him until some restless soul tries to pass with only a 200-foot sight distance ahead of him.

Take a look at the fellow with a flat tire on a 9-foot lane with a 3-foot shoulder. He is either running a tire while seeking a safe, wide spot, or is incurring the danger of getting smacked by a passing car while attempting to mount the spare on the wheel at that point where he first noticed the flat.

We are talking about safety and human lives, and reasonable passage ways through country presently open to auto travel.

There is even more to this controversy than this. Unless you see the whole picture the true equities are not apparent. These Apostles of the Wilderness are subject to criticism for they are not only pressuring the Park Service to adopt these obsolete road standards for these reconstructions in areas already open to motor vehicle travel, but they are also being extremely selfish.

Much testimony has been introduced at Congressional Committee hearings reciting that but 1 percent of the visitors to our National Parks and National Forests use exclusively 99 percent of those areas, while 99 percent of the visitors have available for their use but 1 percent of these lands. These Apostles of the Wilderness are not content with what has been assigned to them, but they insist on telling the 99 percent under what conditions they shall be permitted to use their limited part of God's Cathedral.

Except in a very few limited places, this 99 percent, these communicants who look longingly from afar at the majesties of the High Sierra, presently can approach within reasonable viewing distances of these vistas only by auto trails over which they do not dare to travel, roads which long since have become obsolete and now demand modern-

zation. If a few do dare to travel that way they dare not look at the scenery, but must fasten their eyes continuously on these old roads which demand their undivided attention. They are negotiating a tortuous passage with no safety turn-outs where they can stop their cars, get out and really enjoy the scenery.

I do not point the finger of disapproval toward that great mountain club which is so important to California or toward the great majority of its 10,000 members. I do decry the thinking and what to me appears to be a selfish philosophy of a very small group of that membership—a small group which meets in a tower, feeds on its own thoughts, and then endeavors to fasten its conclusion upon our national parks and national forests, never comprehending that there are other people in this world, and without any conception of the mountain travel limitations of these other people.

It is not a case of the tail wagging the dog, but a situation where the flag at the tip of the tail is temporarily in full control of the vocal apparatus of a very fine, highly pedigreed and very useful creature.

Let me remind you that the National Park Service, the National Forest Service, and the Bureau of Public Roads are in the charge of highly skilled, long service, dedicated groups of men, and within their personnel we find the most experienced road builders and the most capable landscape architects. These men of all three branches cooperate completely and proceed carefully in relation to every problem.

You may perhaps think that I am being inconsistent when I suggest that you do something about this particular problem and at the same time criticize others for attempting to dictate to these services of our Government. Let me suggest that where there is great pressure on these agencies to do something not in the public interest then there is great need for a great organization like the California State Chamber of Commerce to provide a counterirritant to the end that the true public interest be brought into full public view.

Let us look further. A recent publication of that club contained many pictures of a partially constructed park road unmistakably presented to create in the minds of the beholders an impression that great desecration is taking place. Heretofore I had occasion to suggest to you the impropriety of a group placing a great Sequoia log as a part of a picture on the front page of a pamphlet objecting to the construction of the proposed Mammoth Pass highway, when without doubt the producers of that picture knew that there was not a single Sequoia gigantea growing anywhere within many miles of the study lines of that proposed route.

Now I question the ethics behind the set of pictures above referred to because to me they appear to be deliberately misleading.

I question the ethics of publishing a picture which is presented to create the idea of excessive road width when we know that that picture was taken at a place where a view turnout plaza is also being prepared. A narrow angle lense could have been used to make the roadway appear in the picture even wider than it is on the ground.

I question the ethics of presenting views of piles of fractured rock, including views of the stumps of scraggly trees along partially cleared rights-of-way, all to show desecration when the construction contract definitely provides that such debris be entirely cleared away before the roadway is accepted as completed.

Who would have, in good conscience, presumption to present a view of a half finished Union Square Garage to show how Union Square Park in San Francisco would not look when the whole undertaking was completed? Do our friends think they are de-

ceiving any thinking persons where they picture partially completed highways?

Take a look at that magnificent double page photograph of Tenaya Lake appearing in the publication which we are now discussing—read the printed caption line of that picture. "We'll do well to remember Tenaya as it used to be * * *." Horrors. Something terrible is to happen to that scenery. Now be informed that the only change which is being made here, and which would appear in a later photograph taken from the same place after all the work is done, will be the absence of the boulder slide which shows in the lower center of the published print. An ugly pile of detritus, a closeup view of which appears on another page of that publication. The removal was necessary to permit construction of a safe road on the identical alignment of the road which has been there in place since long before the establishment of that park.

The sacrifice is a pile of rock to make over a couple of miles of a dangerous one-way auto trail into a two-lane mountain road. And what did they find beneath that rock pile—a much revered, highly polished native granite, polished by the ancient glacier that had passed that way.

I could belabor you further on the subject of that set of pictures, but I will not do so. I must say, however, that Dr. Bradley's photographs presented proper views of very beautiful complete mountain roads though one of them was of a very narrow, winding wagon trail unfit for motor travel.

These Priests of the Pinnacle are unusual people. They strain on a goat and swallow a camel. Not a single erratic must be moved in putting in a safe road, a road, not a freeway or a highway, but a simple safe road. There are thousands of those glacial erratics and millions of volcanic erratics scattered over the High Sierra. These people shudder with horror at the thought of moving one single such stone. I get the same reaction when I think of rusting spikes and rotting ropes dangling on the face of two of the most magnificent monoliths in the world. These Apostles of the Wilderness cheered and danced in ecstasy while the climbs to the summits which children could reach by safer routes were taking place. My reactions—well with a hammer and a sufficient number of spikes an ordinary fellow can climb a tall flagpole and monkeys swing on a trapeze. Why deface these magnificent cliffs.

I shock you—well I shock myself. I merely seek to bring out that all these so-called desecrations discussed here today are primarily psychological and to these our minds can be adjusted. That is fortunate because I am not going to get the spikes and ropes removed and they, unless I am badly mistaken, are going to suffer the agony of seeing the 99 percent travel on safe roads, not freeways, not highways—just on safe roads through that part of these wonderlands that the 99 percent are to be permitted to use.

I seek to bring this controversy into the open where public opinion will solve it in the public interest. I am hoping that the pressures of the opposing forces will offset one another so that the skilled, dedicated men of the services will be permitted to do, unhampered, that which ought to be done, and so freed, I will be satisfied with whatever they do.

If these specialists should perchance go too far and make a few errors in all their plans and completions, our friends can take solace in the fact that eventually another glacial age will obliterate the puny scratching of mere man and that God's cathedral will be resculptured to His liking.

Meanwhile, let us give the present tabernacle reasonable opportunity to elevate the plateaus of human existence. I am on the side of the 99 because I believe all of us and all our thinking can be greatly improved.

After study and deliberation, I hope that the California State Chamber of Commerce will take a firm and aggressive stand on this basic problem because there are several national park roads in California which will have to be reconstructed in the next few years. The money must not be wasted building wagon roads.

Connecticut's Labor Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement regarding the number of man-days lost in work stoppages in 1958 in Connecticut, noting that Connecticut's record is better than the national average. The statement by Connecticut's Labor Commissioner, Renato Ricciuti, is from the January issue of the Monthly Bulletin of the Connecticut Labor Department:

Preliminary estimates show that Connecticut had approximately 0.1 percent of man-days lost due to labor disputes in 1958. Once again, this will put Connecticut below the national average, which is estimated at 0.2 percent. Since the end of World War II, Connecticut's labor relations record, based on man-days lost due to work stoppages, has been below the national average in every year except one. In addition, using the same measurement, Connecticut's labor relations record has been consistently better than other industrial States.

This fine record can be attributed in large measure to the generally responsible leadership of labor and management in our State. Another factor is the work done by the members and agents of our own State Board of Mediation and Arbitration. Quietly and effectively from day to day throughout the year, these people do the groundwork in maintaining industrial peace. They work harmoniously with the representatives of the Federal Mediation Service in Connecticut. * * * In Connecticut the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the State Board of Mediation and Arbitration don't just preach cooperation—they practice it daily. The close coordination of assignments and activities between these two services makes for more effective and efficient service to the parties involved in labor disputes.

Such a labor relations record provides one of the elements necessary for a favorable climate of industrial development. Governor Ribicoff's proposal that labor and management sit down for discussions, away from the emotional pressures of their particular negotiations, is aimed primarily to enlist the assistance of labor and management in further enhancing the favorable atmosphere for industrial development in Connecticut. The enthusiasm with which industrial and trade union leaders have responded to this idea is encouraging.

Although these meetings will concentrate primarily on the broad topics of area development, the groundwork can be laid for a better understanding of other problems which confront labor and management and point up more dramatically many mutual goals. Eventually, the results of these conferences should encourage an even greater degree of stability and maturity in Connecticut labor relations.

Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the following material is submitted for the consideration of my colleagues in the House in connection with remarks which I made on the floor this afternoon.

The material, compiled by Mr. John W. Darley, Jr., an industrial manager engaged in the nuclear aircraft propulsion program, gives a comprehensive picture of the present status of the project along with the trials and tribulations it has gone through since its inception.

I feel that if each Member of the Congress would read carefully this presentation he would have a better understanding of what needs to be done to support this project which is so vital to our national security.

Under leave to do so, I herewith submit a letter from Mr. Darley to me; a letter addressed to President Eisenhower by Mr. Darley, and the text of Mr. Darley's summary of pertinent views on the importance to our national security of the aircraft nuclear propulsion program:

HON. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Subject: The aircraft nuclear propulsion program.

DEAR MR. PRICE: One month ago, on January 14, I sent the attached letter to the President concerning the national aircraft nuclear propulsion program. In this letter, I stated that I did not plan further distribution until after an appropriate period of time had elapsed and would not further distribute this information should he instruct me that such an act would be contrary to the best interests of the United States.

One month has now elapsed. No further word has been received from the White House.

Due to your expressed interest and work in the area of the ANP program, coupled with your responsibilities as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee, I am here transmitting this information for your use as you see fit.

Speaking frankly, I have become convinced that if any corrective action can be taken, the impetus for same must now come from the legislative branch of the Government. All other avenues of approach to the decisionmaking problem appear to have been exhausted.

I join in your conviction that the ANP program badly needs a definitely targeted date for nuclear flight—with programmatic decisions and funding levels consistent with that target. Without same, there is no possible ANP program which can still meet the needs of this Nation.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. DARLEY, JR.

(NOTE.—Additional copies of this letter to the President are currently being transmitted to Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Representative CARL T. DURHAM, Representative WILLIAM E. HESS, and Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.)

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.
Subject: The aircraft nuclear propulsion program.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am an industrial manager engaged in the national aircraft nuclear propulsion program—having been connected with this activity for the past 7 years. I have sought neither counsel nor approval from my associates or superiors, however, for what I am about to say.

I am speaking as a conscientious voting citizen who is sorely troubled by the trend of events taking place in the world around me.

While the individual statements contained within this letter are not security-classified, their overall content is certainly sensitive. Since you occupy the most powerful office in the world and are the only common authority over all of the agencies and departments who effectively administer the national ANP program, however, there are certain things which cannot be left unsaid.

I am trying to gain your understanding that what has been written here has been decided upon after very careful personal thought and after an evaluation of the pending risks versus the responsibilities involved. Opinions, of course, must be properly evaluated; please consider my specialized experience and the personal knowledge thus acquired when you evaluate mine.

On December 10, during your scheduled press conference, and in answer to a question on the subject of aircraft nuclear propulsion from Mr. Merriam Smith, you are reported to have replied as follows: (1) "There is no usefulness that anyone could possibly see from such a plane"; (2) "there is no use of going into a field where the whole purpose would be to get a plane a few hundred feet off the ground"; (3) "there is absolutely no intelligence to back up a report that Russia is flight-testing an atomic-powered airplane."

I recognize that your responses were based upon the best information available to you. I am only concerned as to the quality of that information and, speaking frankly, it is my opinion that you have been on the receiving end of some sloppy staff work, which may be setting some sort of historical records in this direction.

Because I know full well that this letter has only a small chance of reaching you through a buffering staff wall unless some incentives are offered, I have simultaneously prepared copies of this letter for eventual distribution to the managing editors of selected magazines and newspapers. I do not plan to send these copies to these editors until after an appropriate period of time has elapsed, and will not send same if you instruct me that such an act would be contrary to the best interest of the defense of the United States.

You may be wondering why I have delayed so long after your press conference of December 10 before sending you this letter. Speaking frankly, I have been caught on the horns of the dilemma as to whether or not I would be doing the ANP program more harm than good by responding to the situation in this way. The compelling reasons behind my choice were that (1) the situation is urgent, (2) it does not show signs of straightening out through the normal channels, (3) the problems of understanding and motivation are so massive that it appears to me that they can only be overcome by a thorough airing.

The text which I have used, and which is attached to this cover letter, is quite lengthy; to assist you in its understanding, I will be following this outline:

- I. Strategic considerations.
- II. Soviet ANP capability.

III. The promise and status of the U.S.-ANP program.

IV. Criticisms of the U.S.-ANP program.

V. The national problems of administering the U.S.-ANP program.

VI. Recommendations for action.

VII. Concluding remarks.

It is my hope that by the time you have digested these remarks you may agree with my premise that you have not been receiving the best in information. Further, I hope that, through such an overall view of the ANP program, you will join those of us who are moved by a compelling faith and conviction that the program is vital to the continued security of the United States.

At the least, I hope that I have provided another point of view.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. DARLEY, JR.

I. STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

Let me first talk to your first point that "there is no usefulness * * * from such a plane," dealing in order with various elements of national strategy.

If I correctly understand our country's strategic concepts for survival, they are based upon:

(a) Posing a massive retaliatory threat such that a potential enemy cannot help but see that he will suffer considerably more damage than he will be able to inflict should he decide to start anything. In consideration of the amount of effort which is going into it, this seems to be our No. 1 strategy.

(b) Erecting sufficient air defense to warn of an incoming attack in sufficient time to permit the dispatching of our retaliatory force, to minimize civilian casualties, and to cause an enemy some loss in his attacking force; included in this element is passive civil defense through dispersal, evacuation, shelters, etc., on which little has been done to date.

(c) Deploying sufficient mobile ground and sea forces to quench local eruptions in so-called police force action or small wars.

No preventative war—what this means

I share with you the absolute conviction that the United States must never engage in a preventative war; this then rightly means that we have effectively granted an enemy any advantage accruing to the initiative. Any retaliatory threat posed by the United States will therefore only prevent a war as long as a potential enemy can only conclude that he will not be able to stop this retaliatory force from destroying those targets which he cannot afford to lose if he is going to eventually prevail in the disagreement.

I agree with you that there will be no winning of any future war—only the prevailing of one ideology over the other. It is my opinion that a disciplined and ruthless enemy will decide that the side which prevails—all other massive destruction forgotten—will be that side which has remaining an active strategic force after all the major strategic forces of the other side have either been spent or destroyed.

Our real war to end war, then, is the task of convincing of the other side that (a) he cannot save any portion of his active strategic force should he decide to embark on the path of armed conflict, regardless of how mobile and unpredictable in location that strategic force may become; (b) he cannot destroy the strategic striking force of the United States, due to the fact that it is mobile and dispersed beyond his reach or beyond his ability to destroy before it retaliates against his forces.

The concept of mobility—its meaning to us

I realize that the above looks like the application of a double standard to the two systems. The key to this effect is that for the

United States and the Western Allies, mobility provides an even greater advantage than it does for the Soviet Union. This is because of the fact that (1) we are already granting them the initiative; any additional advantage due to mobility is sugar coating to their main capability and mainly defensive against our retaliatory strike, (2) the world's area available for on-alert dispersal of our mobile force far exceeds that behind the Iron and/or Bamboo Curtain.

I will be dealing more with the meaning behind this concept in subsequent paragraphs.

The retaliatory threat

Our No. 1 strategy—the retaliatory threat, including current plans for the implementation of same—involves the use of (1) intercontinental missiles, (2) intermediate-range missiles—ground, air and undersea launched, (3) manned strategic chemically powered bomber aircraft.

Weaknesses of missiles

All of these missiles, since they can hit targets of known importance and location, are certainly vital weapons in the military inventory. They do, however, suffer on two counts one of which is being worked on and the other of which is beyond their reach: (a) In that all missiles have to possess sufficient protection against attack or a sufficiently quick response time to get off the ground after warning and before the enemy's weapons strike—they either have to be put on active standby underground or under the sea—or fueled by propellants which permit the necessary quick response on short notice (hopefully 15 minutes in the case of the ICBM's but shorter in the case of the IRBM's). I can see that both of these methods of improvements are being undertaken; (b) in that missiles, however, are only able to hit targets of known importance and location, they absolutely fall short of being able to hit the highest priority targets—namely those containing or contributing to the enemy's mobile strategic striking force—a force which can only be predicted in location by the most detailed intelligence information. It is my understanding that we do not have nor will we ever have this quality of intelligence coverage. Should the Russians come to possess operational quantities of air-orbiting nuclear-powered aircraft, the problem will become even worse than in our current situation—which is already difficult enough (I will deal more with this later).

Continued need for manned aircraft

Because of this need to pose a threatened strike at these mobile and unpredictable targets of opportunity, the role of the manned aircraft will continue to exist. The availability of human eyes and human minds in target areas—whether on weapons carriers or reconnaissance vehicles—is absolutely needed if these highest priority military targets are to be identified and subsequently destroyed. That this need will continue into the future is verified by the existence of the B-70 program.

Weaknesses of chemically powered aircraft

Chemically powered aircraft, however, will suffer some definite drawbacks during future years due to the following:

(a) Limitations in airborne time—risks taken: Because of the fact that airborne time—limited by chemical fuel capacity or by the programming or logistic complexities of in-flight-refueling operations—is relatively short compared to ground turn-around maintenance time, only a fairly small proportion of a total chemically propelled bomber force can be in the air at any one time—or, for that matter, be gotten into the air within the period allowed by a 15-minute alert warning time. This means that, assuming that a potential enemy would logically concentrate on such ground-bound targets, only a fairly small proportion—

namely that airborne—would survive the initial, all-out blow.

I recognize that it is hoped that geographical base dispersal will save a larger proportion of the force which cannot get off the ground prior to the attack. My only reaction here is that, for the long-term future, the cost of an enemy's missile and launching sites zeroed in on a larger number of dispersed bases will be appreciably less than the cost of these dispersed bases. For those who say that the potential enemy's ICBM's are not as accurate as required, I can only say that if this is true now, it won't be true for long.

(b) Complicated fuel logistics—risks taken: Because of the fact that modern day military strategic aircraft require extensive aerial in-flight refueling in order to reach their targets, the total operation becomes dependent upon a critically linked chain of events involving (1) the availability of aerial tanker bases—both within the continental United States and overseas—all of which are subject to the same manner of obliteration and the need for discouragingly quick response times that apply to the regular bomber force; as a matter of fact, this could be the major weak link in the chain; (2) a critically programmed and extremely complicated requirement for rendezvous meetings between the surviving bomber and tanker forces at the right time and at the right place and with the right amount of fuel available.

(c) Vulnerability of chemically powered aircraft at high altitudes: Due to the technical characteristics of air-breathing jet powerplants, chemically powered strategic aircraft—even if suitably refueled near the enemy's perimeter—can only reach the required target areas by flying at high altitudes. If I interpret the recent test results on high-altitude nuclear bursts correctly, the survival of a manned aircraft at high altitudes—almost regardless of the speed at which it is traveling—will become increasingly less probably with the passage of time. If during the target-zone penetration portion of their mission chemically powered aircraft are forced to low altitudes, their range becomes so limited as to reach only a small proportion of the required target coverage.

This then is a technical fact. There is no known way by which any current or proposed chemically propelled strategic aircraft can reach anything more than a very small proportion of required target areas if it is required to approach same at low altitudes. This same limitation does not apply to nuclear-powered aircraft.

The promise of nuclear-powered aircraft

Here, then, due to an imposing combination of the above, is one primary regime of usefulness for the nuclear-powered aircraft, namely, in the area of retaliatory threat, strategic reconnaissance, and bombardment.

1. Nuclear aircraft—extended airborne alert: Because of their inherently large fuel capacity, nuclear aircraft will have much extended airborne time, i.e., the amount of time they spend in the air will grow to equal or perhaps even exceed the amount of time they spend in maintenance turnaround on the ground. This means that a much, much higher percentage of the total number of aircraft will be airborne at all times—airborne and armed at variable and unpredictable locations throughout the world from which they pose a maximum retaliatory threat without range limitations.

In effect, this airborne alert capability raises the percentage of the total force which is saved from the initial enemy blow in order for it to be able to go on and do its job. A potential enemy, recognizing this capability, is thus faced with the realization that he will not be able to eliminate that which will eventually destroy his mobile strategic force.

I would call this an improved retaliatory threat.

2. Nuclear aircraft—Independence from complicated logistics and foreign bases: Already airborne, the nuclear aircraft can do its job independent of any need for aerial in-flight refueling or foreign-based aerial tanker fleets. It is my opinion that our relations with our allies are or will be increasingly strained by the existence of these tanker fleets based overseas (and which constitute important military targets) in much of the same way that there was definite foreign reaction against the basing of IRBM's in England or Italy. I am not proposing isolationism—only trying to identify a trend in the climate of world opinion.

3. Nuclear aircraft—versatility in application: Once airborne, that portion of the nuclear aircraft force on retaliatory patrol duty is independent of any other logistic need—and only requires a signal that the United States has been attacked and that it should proceed on its assigned retaliation mission. Due to the inherently large weapons carrying capacity of nuclear aircraft, its armament can include a number of air-launched air-to-ground missiles and regular laydown weapons which far exceed the weapons carrying capability of their chemically powered counterparts. This means that fewer aircraft can do the job.

Due to this enlarged load-carrying capability, coupled with high endurance, the nuclear strategic aircraft possesses a tremendously improved versatility in usage which embraces (a) airborne retaliatory patrol, safe from initial attack, (b) missile launching from outside the enemy's defense periphery; (c) reconnaissance and warning near the enemy's periphery; (d) omnidirectional low-altitude penetration under the enemy's radar warning net for reconnaissance and location of the enemy's mobile strategic forces; (e) low-altitude penetration, followed by either missile launching and/or conventional bomb laydown or by a combination of both.

The significance of the low-altitude approach is treated in the following paragraph.

4. Nuclear-aircraft—potency of alternate low-altitude attack: Contrary to the range-limitation of chemically powered aircraft at low altitudes (where survival will become increasingly more probable than penetration at high altitudes), a nuclear-aircraft could actually come down from its cruise altitude and penetrate the enemy's early-warning perimeter from an infinite choice of directions and at extremely low altitudes—holding this low altitude on its way to its assigned target area. If you want to get a reading as to the enormous potential potency of this kind of attack, I would suggest that an answer can be acquired by postulating that an enemy had such a method of delivery. The answer may surprise you.

For those who would say that it is easy for a potential enemy to protect itself against such a manned-retaliatory force, I would suggest that for a country with the land mass and extended perimeter of Russia, they are welcome to try. The Soviet Union could very easily bankrupt itself in just erecting a low-altitude warning net—not to mention the number of active defensive missiles and aircraft which would have to be employed.

5. Nuclear-aircraft—fewer aircraft, fewer bases: Let us talk next as to the number of bases from which nuclear aircraft would need to be deployed. Because of the fact that a higher percentage are airborne at all times, because each aircraft has appreciably more weapons capacity, and because lower comparative attrition can be increasingly expected due to the omnidirectional low-altitude attack, a much fewer number of manned strategic aircraft would be needed. This

translates into a fewer number of costly bases.

My best estimate is that from two to three nuclear-aircraft bases—appropriately located on Atlantic and Pacific Islands to take an enemy's major attack away from the Continental United States—would do the peacetime job. It is to be assumed that all of these bases would be lost in an initial attack—but an attractive percentage of their based force would have regularly been airborne and would constitute a manned strategic force to fight the war.

The next question here is that of rearming and restriking with this surviving force after their return from their first strike mission. There are two services which will be needed, namely the probable replacement of the nuclear powerplants (in that the remote-handling base facilities for individual detailed powerplant maintenance will no longer be available) and the rearming of the aircraft with new weapons. Both of these services can be provided from mobile ground equipment and at locations which are variable and unpredictable. Any number of currently available landing and take-off areas would do the job. This rearming and restriking problem is essentially no different from that with chemically powered aircraft.

6. Nuclear aircraft—lower total costs than the massive chemical system: As a final note on this matter of a nuclear-aircraft retaliatory force, let us take up the matter of comparative costs. The best information which I have, and which is based upon appropriately detailed study, is that the nuclear-powered retaliatory force will cost appreciably less than its chemically powered counterpart system. I recognize that this statement is hard to believe in these days of accelerating weapons obsolescence; the major factor producing this situation is the fact that our current manned retaliation system is enormously expensive. The cost advantage accruing to the nuclear-aircraft force is predominantly due to (a) a larger percentage of aircraft airborne at all times; therefore, fewer losses on the ground and fewer aircraft required in total; (b) a larger weapons-carrying capacity per aircraft; therefore fewer aircraft required; (c) no tanker aircraft required; (d) no bases required, foreign or domestic, for the basing of the tanker aircraft; (e) no complicated chemical fuel logistics and staging required at a wide number of bases, foreign or domestic; (f) considerably fewer bases from which the manned retaliatory force would need to operate.

And, interesting enough, none of the above cost elements have even stopped to consider (a) that chemically powered aircraft can't even do the job if they are forced, as predicted, to attack at low altitudes, where their range is drastically limited; (b) that omnidirectional nuclear aircraft will suffer fewer losses using low altitude penetration than will their chemically powered brothers at high altitudes—again acting to cut down on the total number of aircraft required.

Practically all of the foregoing reasoning has concentrated in the area of continuing to pose a real threat of retaliation as a means of making the instrument of war appear unprofitable for a potential enemy. While this area alone testifies as to the potential usefulness of nuclear aircraft, the story does not end here.

Static defenses encourage circumvention

At numerous times during the history of the world countries have based their longevity upon static, immobile means of defense. The Chinese wall, the Maginot line, and now the DEW line, have all acted to create the popular impression of impregnability. While the DEW line, supplemented by BMEWS equipment for ballistic-missile warning, is heavily useful for protecting the retaliation force, its coverage is still based upon the threat coming from a predictable direction and at a predictable altitude. If history

teaches us anything, it is that a potential enemy is thereby provided with an incentive to circumvent the erected defense or warning line.

To me, the DEW or BMEWS line means two things: (1) That a potential enemy will strive to develop a weapon whose manner of attack will neutralize the usefulness of the erected defense; (2) that there is a supplemental need for mobile warning facilities which can react to various technological and political threats by virtue of their mobility.

Soviets advanced in neutralizing fixed defenses

Interestingly enough, the Russians already appear advanced in the development of weapons designed to neutralize the warning line. Their already recognized submarine force—improved in armament through the use of submarine-launched missiles—is in the process of being further supplemented by nuclear aircraft. Both of these threats circumvent our erected warning line.

Nuclear aircraft—Use as a defensive vehicle

If we are to be responsive to these threats, we should not respond by more massive, immobile, narrow-range equipments, but rather by systems whose versatility and mobility are matched to the changing and variable challenge. Air-orbiting, nuclear-powered, radar-warning aircraft constitute one family of such systems.

Ending commentary re usefulness of nuclear aircraft

I have now responded to two of the major comments which you are reported to have made relative to the ANP program—namely, that "there is no usefulness that anyone could possibly see from such a plane" and that "there is no use of going into a field where the whole purpose could be to get a plane a few hundred feet off the ground."

As indicated by the foregoing analysis, there is plenty of "usefulness." The "few hundred feet" comment, as provided to you by your advisers, is a dangerously simple statement which completely misses the point of low-altitude-penetration attack.

I realize that you may think I am proposing that the nuclear aircraft is an "ultimate weapon." Believe me, I am not. I do believe, however, that without them we stand every chance of no longer having a stalemate in the strategic chess game.

II. SOVIET A.N.P. CAPABILITY

The third comment which you are reported to have made went to the effect that "there is absolutely no intelligence to back up a report that Ausias is flight testing an atomic-powered airplane." The question which prompted your reply was undoubtedly triggered by the article in the December 1 issue of Aviation Week which reported on the estimated status of the Soviet A.N.P. program.

I would like to say, however, that the staff man who provided your text, was a hairsplitter of the first order:

1. Intelligence is available: In the first place, I am positive that there is intelligence on the relative state of the Soviet A.N.P. program. Considering the strategic incentives which we have given them in the form of our DEW line plus their natural interest in showing evidence of technological supremacy, it should not be surprising if they were ahead of us. Maj. Gen. D. J. Keirn, in charge of the U.S. program, made a public statement to this effect a few weeks ago, adding that it would not surprise him if the Soviets flew on nuclear power within a year.

2. Characteristics of Soviet aircraft are significant: To a second point, I understand that there is significant evidence that a Soviet aircraft of the size and configuration described in the Aviation Week article has been sighted.

Using the article's overall design dimensions—and unless the Soviets have suddenly retrogressed in their ability to competently design chemically-powered aircraft—there is little doubt but that this particular airframe is intended for use with nuclear powerplants. As a purely chemical airplane—even with advanced chemical turbojets—it is not a very good aircraft or weapons system.

As a side note, this is the first very large Soviet aircraft with pylon-mounted powerplants—it being the usual Russian design approach in such cases to bury their powerplants within the wing structure. This difference is particularly significant, however, because this is the direction you would take for easier later replacement of chemical with nuclear machinery and subsequent easier maintainability of the nuclear powerplants.

3. Existence of Soviet aircraft verified by their announcement: Subsequent to your December 10 press conference, on January 1, Moscow radio, in a formal multilingual announcement, made two promises for 1959. These were that the Soviets would shoot a rocket to the moon and that they were going to fly a nuclear-powered civil aircraft during the next year.

I think that you will find that your intelligence agencies place a high credibility on this particular type of formal announcement, even without the fact that the Soviets—within 2 days—had a 50-percent scoring record.

Many public comments re Soviet program are not to the point

I agree with your advisers; however, that the Aviation Week article presented no concrete evidence that this Soviet aircraft currently has nuclear powerplants installed. To the contrary, it is difficult to believe that any nuclear engine is currently installed within the comparatively small engine nacelles indicated on their drawings.

Whether or not this aircraft has actually flown on nuclear power, as questioned by your advisers and provided in their text for your use, is not really to the point.

It does not take any classified information to realize that if the United States started today on its prototype-aircraft program for A.N.P. purposes, it would be approximately 3 years before any substantial chemically powered flight-test program on the aircraft would take place. As far as the relative airframe programs are concerned, therefore, we now have a pretty good fix on relative progress.

Sightings of this Soviet aircraft, of course, do not necessarily testify as to the state of progress in the Soviet nuclear powerplant program. Some criticism of the news article takes this direction, with the additional inference that the Soviet nuclear powerplant program is probably only to follow with an installed powerplant at a much later date. Even if this opinion is partially true, as it would be for any such program where the approach must be to take logical sequenced steps, it is a defensive comment and underestimates Russian technological competence in those areas where they really apply their effort. Certainly it does so if you believe, as I do, their January 1 announcement.

Ending commentary re Soviet ANP capability

Completely aside from all of the above, however, I join you in the belief that just because some other country is doing something is no reason for the United States to undertake a similar program in the same direction. That which the United States needs to accomplish should be tailored to its particular situation and to the particular objectives which it must reach in order to survive and prosper.

While I have already adequately dealt with some of the unique usefulness of nuclear-powered aircraft within part I, there are other questions and subjects which need to be discussed.

It is for this reason that I would be irresponsible if I stopped here. Going by the theory that better understanding cannot but help in the evaluation and decision-making process, I would now like to turn to the other issues which are raised by this general subject.

III. THE PROMISE AND STATUS OF THE U.S.-ANP PROGRAM

In the foregoing pages, I have already laid a foundation with respect to the promise of the U.S.-ANP program. We have dealt with (a) the property of versatility and mobility, (b) the airborne alert-force concept, (c) the manned nuclear-aircraft retaliatory mission, (d) low-altitude penetration for reconnaissance and bombardment, (e) the freedom from chemical-tanker logistics, (f) the freedom from foreign-basing restraints, (g) the reduction in the number of bases required, (h) the inherently large load-carrying capacity of nuclear aircraft, (i) the cost implications due to increased simplicity in the total manned retaliatory system, (j) the air-defense potential of nuclear aircraft warning systems.

Promise similar to that of nuclear submarine, but more revolutionary

In many respects, this identified promise for the nuclear aircraft sounds much like that popularly assigned to the nuclear-powered submarine. A pure extrapolation here, however, would undershoot the mark.

The nuclear submarine provides quite a revolution over its diesel-electric-snorkel predecessors but, in terms of the relative gain in total systems simplicity, the revolution in the air due to the nuclear aircraft is of a much higher order of magnitude. By total system I mean the vehicle itself, its weapons, range, lethality, vulnerability, and the total complex of logistics and communications which permits it to do its job.

Compared to the submarine, nuclear aircraft have a more massive effect on these logistic parts of the overall system which, in the aircraft's case, constitute a very major part of the whole.

The promise, moreover, does not stop here. Nuclear aircraft program additionally important

The U.S.-ANP program for manned nuclear aircraft is important beyond the high value of its initial applications; this additional importance is due to the following:

1. Much technology transferable into space vehicles: The basic technologies of the manned nuclear aircraft program are transferable and/or expandable into the nuclear missile, heat transfer, nuclear rocket, and nuclear powered space vehicle areas.

2. Reason to believe aircraft must precede space vehicle: There is serious reason to believe that the United States will never proceed on sure footing into the more exotic nuclear space vehicle regimes until it has learned how to live and operate with a manned nuclear aircraft program. The king-sized step otherwise required appears indigestible from a practical mobilization and technological point of view.

3. Technology in forefront of nuclear reactor field: By the very nature of its effort in the area of comparatively lightweight, high-performance nuclear machinery, the ANP powerplant program is automatically working in the forefront of nuclear reactor technology, with resulting long-range ramifications in the atomic-electric field.

Thirteen years now invested

As you know, 13 years have now been invested in the aircraft nuclear propulsion program. With a modest beginning in 1946, feasibility studies into 1951 resulted in the conclusion that the application was feasible and deserving of development effort.

It is interesting to note that studies made during this feasibility period predicted the

amount of time and money which would be required to do the job.

The predicted time has now been exceeded; less than half of the predicted amount of money has thus far been spent. In periods of national emergency, we have rightfully excused the trading of more money for less time; in consideration of the threat now around us, I wonder if going so far in the other direction (trading more time for a lesser expenditure per year) makes real sense.

With engineering development beginning in 1951, the program was directed toward a flying-test-bed application in which the initially flyable powerplant would be tested within a worked-over and modified B-36 aircraft—the aircraft retaining its normal chemical powerplants in order to carry the nuclear powerplant aloft for testing purposes. This is normal practice with new aircraft powerplants and is practiced with chemical turbojets today.

Near cancellation in 1953

But what happened? In 1953, the program was cut back (and nearly canceled in total) because the B-36 wouldn't fly high enough or fast enough to make it a military weapon—something which this B-36 was never intended to be in the first place. You may remember the word "shitepoke" which was a term of endearment provided by the Secretary of Defense at that time.

Could have flown by now

It is my firm opinion that had this cut-back step not been taken in 1953, we would be flying a nuclear-powered aircraft today.

In consideration of what the Soviets show every sign of doing during this next year, we may live to massively regret this 1953 decision.

Still need an aircraft in the program

At the present time, however, we have yet to go through this flying-test-bed stage—or its equivalent using an experimental aircraft. It is absolutely vital that this step be taken at the earliest possible moment.

The way support seems to be leaning in 1959, however, this event is still some years away.

Don't get me wrong.

The decision in 1953 of heading toward a better airframe for initial testing of the powerplant was not a bad idea.

It is just that (1) at a point practically 6 years later, we have yet to even commit for the airframe part of the program, (2) the announced reason for making this 1953 decision did not reflect any sophisticated understanding of aircraft powerplant development philosophy—or normal research and development practices.

Eight years of engineering development

Actual powerplant development has now been proceeding for practically 8 years, with full-scale reactor and reactor-turbojet-systems tests in process since 1956. Considerable airframe studies have taken place intermittently and at a variable pace during the same period.

During 1954-55, the Air Force—undoubtedly remembering its 1953 experience—began to clothe the ANP development effort in the mantle of a weapons system. It must be remembered that it was the fashion of the day (particularly since 1953) that if more money was needed to get the job done, the only way it would be forthcoming was to prove that the project was going to result in something which flew higher and faster or carried more or what have you.

Uniqueness of initial nuclear-aircraft capabilities not recognized

This originally visualized weapons system (called 125-A) was to do everything that regular chemically powered aircraft could do—and then some—rather than harnessing

the particular and special capabilities of nuclear propulsion.

While this 125-A affiliation was undoubtedly on shaky ground from the start—due to nuclear propulsion trying to compete initially with the best of chemical propulsion in the chemical regime's own backyard, it did accomplish one very beneficial result. Some additional money was made available, at least enough to really get a leg up on the powerplant development work.

Since then, some real powerplant development progress has been made.

Development ready to proceed at a faster pace

The powerplant development work is now at a stage where it is ready to proceed at a faster pace. It is true that some solutions in detail (as opposed to feasibility) are required, but these are the reasons why the development is necessary in the first place.

In today's environment, I get the impression that the only way to really get development support is to prove that everything is already comfortably in position—with all challenges answered in minute detail. In such a position, there will be development money made available—when, if such was really the case, the weapon should be in quantity manufacture.

Today's situation on the nuclear-aircraft program is similar to that which prevailed on the missile programs 3 to 5 years ago. At that time, development work was accelerated on propulsion and guidance aspects of the work; today, we are just beginning to see signs that we will have operational missile systems over the next 2 to 4 years.

The same situation can prevail for nuclear aircraft.

Capability in depth available

When I say we are ready to proceed, I am not referring to an informal group of scientists working in the laboratory. I am talking about a balanced and sizable organization of scientists, design engineers, manufacturing engineers, and test engineers—all backed up by a complex of pilot-line manufacturing facilities, raw material sources, subcontractor installations, and hardware vendors.

Promise of the future is great

Of considerable significance to the nuclear-aircraft program is the fact that the initial powerplant and the initial application can now be clearly seen to be the first of a family of improving performers. Enough is known about the designs farther back in the conceptual and preliminary design stages to predict with certainty that the initial hardware approach will improve in performance even beyond that which is now called the requirement.

As a matter of fact, this promise is one of the problems.

The vacillator and the fence sitter want to wait for the 1985 model, although the 1959 model will still manage to outdistance anything on the road.

It is my conviction, however—and I have lots of knowledgeable company—that failure to buy the 1959 model is not going to result in any improvement in what the 1985 model will do in its time.

As a matter of fact, if we delay in facing up to the full-scale development of what can be done today, the 1985 capability won't come out until the year 2000, if ever.

"Camal" mission a unique application

One of the main reasons behind the fact that program acceleration now makes such sense is the unique concept of the "Camal" mission, as described in summary fashion in part I. This approach not only takes perfect advantage of the unique properties accruing to nuclear propulsion; it also turns out to offer a uniquely different and extremely valuable weapon for the defense situation which faces us.

Further, this approach will not only do a real job of using the initially developable airframe and powerplant, but will also improve in performance and capability as the second cousins come out of the developmental brooder.

Let's face it. Nuclear-powered aircraft are inevitable. The sooner we get about really facing up to the job in total, including an airframe, the sooner they are going to be a valuable weapon in our arsenal.

IV. CRITICISMS OF THE U.S.-ANP PROGRAM

With all of the promise and all of the progress which I have talked about thus far, you may well ask: "Where has all the trouble been coming from?"

Let's take a look at the collection of critical comments which have been made against the nuclear aircraft program, examine them in some detail, and see if some pertinent conclusions can be reached.

Criticisms of the U.S.-ANP program can generally be classified into three broad areas; these are: (a) applications (the use to be gained); (b) technology (the state of the development); (c) administration (program decision problems).

Let us deal with each of these areas in sequence.

Applications—oriented criticisms

Critical comments in the area of applications, or the use to which aircraft nuclear propulsion would be put, can be listed as follows:

"The aircraft is too big or too slow."

Here we find the man who wants to go higher and faster all of the time, regardless of where he should be. I can understand the necessity for going higher and faster with part of our retaliatory force—just to force the Soviets to defend against such an attack—but less and less of our total force will be able to penetrate in this way.

This critical comment therefore fails to recognize that the survival of aircraft at high altitudes and even very high supersonic speeds will become increasingly less probable with the passage of time. Attrition in this regime will be markedly higher than that at extremely low altitudes and respectable subsonic speeds. Chemical aircraft can't do the latter. (Please see part I.)

On the comment of size, initial nuclear aircraft will be no bigger, and possibly smaller, than today's larger chemical aircraft. They may weigh more; that is, be "denser" aircraft, but I can't see where the point is. As a matter of fact, nuclear power may very well cause a complete reevaluation as to what constitutes the optimum size of an airplane.

"The aircraft would be easy to shoot down."

This is probably the same gentleman who wants to go high and fast. He doesn't understand the overwhelming defensive requirements superimposed by an omnidirectional, low-altitude penetration attack. He doesn't realize the magnitude of investment required for a low-altitude, radar-warning net and the associated defensive missiles and air-defense aircraft (which are range-limited at these low altitudes).

In short, he hasn't recognized that for a country with the land mass and perimeter of the Soviet Union, he now has the weapon of economics (and possible bankruptcy) on his side.

"We don't really need a nuclear aircraft."

This gentleman either doesn't understand anything mentioned in part I, or else he is a saturation war man. This latter breed says if anything starts we will just plaster everything and everywhere, using an immense number of missiles carrying atomic and hydrogen warheads. This way, he says, we will be sure and hit everything worth hitting.

This reasoning is fallacious on two counts. First, the rest of the world would be in danger of becoming uninhabitable. Second, I don't believe the United States will ever

choose to adopt this inhuman and reckless defense posture.

It has been said: "As soon as men decide that all means are permitted to fight an evil, then their good becomes indistinguishable from the evil that they set out to destroy."

"The application being worked on is the wrong one" (regardless of which one is being worked on).

Here is the man who says that we should make up our mind over and over again. Or perhaps he is stating that he doesn't want to do anything until everybody decides to do it his way. I really don't know.

I only know that the application chosen is a particularly valuable one and that after satisfying this first step there will undoubtedly be others.

"I don't understand it."

We have found an honest man; he is one of the gentlemen for whom this letter is written.

Technically oriented criticisms

Critical comments in the area of technology, or the state of the development, are fairly represented by the following:

"An airborne reactor is too dangerous."

What this gentleman is saying is that aircraft are dangerous. As far as the aircraft's crew is concerned, a reactor with its radioactive parts is less dangerous than several tons of inflammable aviation fuel.

It is true, however, that experimental and perhaps operational nuclear aircraft will have to fly in specified corridors when over land to eliminate the danger of a possible crash in populated areas. This will undoubtedly be a function of the demonstrated reliability of the total aircraft system as well as the appropriate selection of locations for the operational bases. Significant study has already been devoted to this problem with encouraging findings.

Please understand that what is being talked about here is not an atomic explosion, but the potential spillage of radioactivity should an aircraft crash.

A fair comment in this area would be: There are some risks; they are the types of risks which can be overcome by operational procedures and system reliability; they are a very long way from being sufficiently large enough to give up what the aircraft has to offer as a military weapon.

"The radiation is too high; the crew can't last."

Without going into a mass of technical data, much of which is classified, let me just state that current design of the system is based upon each operational crew flying for a very appreciable number of days each year, for a very appreciable number of years, and still at the end of the period have received no more radiation exposure than they would have had they spent those years working in an AEC industrial laboratory. And please believe me, this is just about as radiation-safe as you can get—anyplace, anywhere.

"The reactor temperatures aren't high enough."

This is the comment of the man who wants to wait for the 1985 model—as mentioned in part III. The temperatures are high enough to do what needs to be done first; they promise to be higher by the time they need to be higher. If we wait until then before we accomplish development-testing needed now, the whole program will suffer and be delayed.

As a side comment, there is little if any doubt but that as the development progresses, the designed temperature capability of the reactor will come to put extreme engineering pressure on the designers of the remaining parts of the powerplant. Believe me, this is plenty high enough.

"It isn't being done the way I would do it." No comment appears necessary.

"I don't understand it."

The people who have already built and test-operated reactor-turbojet systems do understand it, and they'll talk to anyone who

has a security clearance and a desire to listen. As a matter of fact, they won't let you get away.

Administratively oriented criticisms

Critical comments in the area of administration, or making program decisions, can be summarized as follows:

"Aren't ready; wait until next year when things will be better."

Here is the administrator, either technically or politically motivated, who either wants to wait for the 1985 model or who is too tired to fight for what he believes is right. Perhaps he just doesn't want to risk his position by being a nonconformist in a bureaucratic world. Whatever he is, he is not doing a responsible, risk-taking, managerial job.

"It's too expensive."

Too expensive? Relative to what?

Individual nuclear aircraft will be more expensive than their individual chemical aircraft brothers, just as nuclear submarines are more expensive than conventional submarines. But the total cost of doing the overall larger and necessary job will be less through the nuclear application.

This is the gentleman who either doesn't understand the cost situation, or who equates a currently positive bank balance with lower overall, long-run costs. I will have more to say about this later.

"The other government agency hasn't made up its mind."

This is perhaps better described as the Alphonse-Gaston phenomena. It is the frame of mind which says that the only good decision is the unanimous decision. I firmly believe that many unanimous decisions, appropriately watered down and denatured to achieve unanimity, are the worst kinds of decisions. True, they are better than none at all, but unanimous decisions or "no decisions" appear to me to be the only kinds of decisions the ANP program has had.

"Government leadership on the program is too weak."

Here is a crackjack. This is hard to believe but some Government representatives have actually withheld enthusiasm for the ANP program because they felt that the Government leadership on the program wasn't strong enough. I can only say: either discard the criticism or fix the situation; don't use it as a reason for continued vacillation.

Criticisms raise major questions of program administration

All of these critical comments raise major questions.

It is evident that little understanding exists, that there are overlaps in responsibility and authority, that people have decided that it is much more politically comfortable to be against something or to be silent than it is to have faith and conviction and to fight for what they believe.

Let's take a look at some of these national problems of administering the U.S.-ANP program.

V. THE NATIONAL PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTERING THE U.S.-ANP PROGRAM

Many administrative problems of the U.S.-ANP program tend to be peculiar to it, and to it alone. These are disturbing.

Many additional problems of the U.S.-ANP program are shared with many other national defense programs. In that these have an even larger effect, they are even more disturbing.

We are trying to compete technologically with inadequate attention to the creaking administrative system for doing the competitive technological job. Our administrative machinery must be as up-to-date as the technology which it energizes.

Let's take a look at some of this machinery.

Problems peculiar to the ANP program

Those major administrative problems which tend to be peculiar to the ANP program can be described as follows:

Multiple Offices, Agencies, and Departments

I would conservatively estimate that there are well over 60 separate and effectively independent offices, agencies, and departments in the U.S. Government which have a measurable influence over the rate of progress of the ANP program. While there is currently existing an ANP office, its relative authority falls far short of that necessary to accomplish the job.

For example, in addition to the ANP office, there are:

1. The AEC (including the Division of Reactor Development, multiple staff groups, various committees, etc.).
2. The USAF (including the Air Research and Development Command, the Air Materiel Command, the Strategic Air Command, at least 15 different staff groups, various committees, study groups, etc.).
3. The USN (including the Bureau of Aeronautics, the Office of Naval Research, staff groups, committees, etc.).
4. The DOD (including the Deputy Secretary and his office, essentially all of the Assistant Secretaries and their offices, various staff groups, committees, study groups, etc.).
5. The NASA (NACA)—(I haven't figured this one out yet).
6. The Bureau of the Budget.
7. The Central Intelligence Agency.

Conflicts From the Contributing Government Departments

In the case of the Air Force, the issue is mostly a question of decisionmaking and delegating authorities to do the job. In many major respects, the decision mechanisms (even for many minor matters) only reside at the very top of the USAF organization. This means that even if major policy decisions are made, many of the individual implementing decisions either have to go bubbling back to the top or be laboriously handled through satellite staff or administrative offices.

The contributions of the Atomic Energy Commission have been very real and valuable. Although the AEC also suffers occasionally from bureaucratic strangulation, you can usually count on them to make a real college try. The AEC's responsibility, however, has been greatly complicated by the problems which the Air Force has had in making up its mind in the face of severe budgetary pressures.

The Navy definitely wants a nuclear aircraft program. But unless they can have a nuclear aircraft as soon or sooner than the Air Force, I am convinced that they will do everything in their power to destroy the Air Force program.

No Strong Governmental Program Leadership

The issues of multiple offices, agencies, and departments and conflicts from contributing departments would be less severe were the ANP program vigorously led by a program manager with appropriately delegated responsibilities and authorities. This has not been the case.

With all due respect to Maj. Gen. D. J. Keirn, he has not received necessary support and authority to do the job (regardless of various surface changes made).

Even if he had received such delegations, however, he is too much of a gentleman to knock heads together when the going gets rough.

With so many different people going in so many different directions, somebody has to be able to say follow me and keep in line.

Problems shared with other defense programs

There are other administrative problems which the nuclear-aircraft program shares with other defense programs. Since some of these are fairly well understood, I will only comment on those which appear to me to need some more understanding.

Remote Decision-Makers Have Meant the Usual (Easy Way Out) Use of Review Committees

The problem here is that most, if not all, review committees are also remote. How a group of men can spend 2 to 4 hours—at intervals of 18 to 24 months—talking with the people who are doing the job—and then say they have reviewed the program is beyond my understanding.

Depending upon their length of time in their positions, most committee members are previously committed to the support of other programs. Since these members are well aware of the pressures of funding, they are not going to support anything which looks as though it will steal support from something they feel they have already staked their reputations on.

Many committee members are simultaneously in other positions, either in Government or industry, where they can advance competing or delaying proposals of their own. Don't misunderstand; most competition is a good thing. It is just that here is an avenue for the guy who says, "Why don't you do it my way?" He can really delay decisions; after all, he is a member of the committee who will review the new idea he has just proposed.

There are those who say that the use of review committees is a fundamental part of the process of democratic government. This is hard to defend; we had democratic government long before we had review committees. The use of such committees is, in my opinion, a fundamental symptom of faulty organization. If policymakers are so enmeshed that they can't get closer to their decision-making job, then their positions are too big and should be split into smaller responsibilities. Adding extra layers of organization doesn't help either, and there are plenty of them.

High Security Classifications and Multiple Security Systems

It should be no surprise that the extent and height of security classification would come under criticism. Enough has been said about this elsewhere.

What is even more difficult to understand is why we continue to need both a military-security system and an atomic-energy security system. They duplicate one another in the military reactor field and only manage to get in one another's way to the detriment of everything else.

Excessive Checks and Balances

Many laws passed by Congress and many other administrative laws created and installed by Government agencies are based upon the premise that it would be horrendous for anybody to make a mistake. Mistakes must be prevented.

The result is that we now have erected an enormous, overlapping, and detailed system which goes significantly beyond the original intent of checks and balances and effectively achieves partial strangulation. Harmful program delays are inevitable.

The Tremendously Large Number of People Who Can Say "No" and the Effective Absence of Anyone Who Can Say "Yes"

I believe that I have adequately commented on this subject on previous pages. It is a shorthand description common to many of our major administrative problems: Extreme competition among the military services; absence of vision re something different, the solutions to problems and the predictable future; complacency re the Soviet threat; the concept of business as usual.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

In consideration of what I have already said, my recommendations should come as no surprise.

The United States desperately needs and must regain the initiative in all fields. In the military area, initiative should be equated to the concept of mobility and mobile forces, as opposed to relying almost solely on static concepts.

The United States should adopt the nuclear aircraft as one prime contributor to the operating concept of mobility; the implementation of this decision requires at this time: (1) The strengthening of Government program leadership in the nuclear-aircraft field; (2) growth in support for the power-plant program; (3) initiation of the prototype aircraft program.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In closing, I want to quote some extremely pertinent remarks by others on the general question of the defense posture of the United States.

Early in 1958, the Rockefeller report (from panel II) on "International Security—The Military Aspect," had this to say:

1. "The basic requirement . . . is a retaliatory force so well protected and numerous that it can overcome any defense."

2. "The hard core of this striking force, whether based at home or overseas, must be continuously alert, fully armed, and as secure as we can make it against destruction or neutralization by surprise attack."

3. "It is therefore imperative that . . . we develop units which can intervene rapidly and which are able to make their power felt with discrimination and versatility."

4. "Accelerated research and development support should be provided for all key programs including missiles and advanced reconnaissance systems."

5. "The panel is convinced . . . that . . . increases in defense expenditures are essential and fully justified. . . . We can afford to survive."

6. "When the security of the United States and of the free world is at stake, cost cannot be the basic consideration. The cold war cannot be won and a hot war cannot be avoided without a major effort. This is clearly not the time for complacency. . . . What is required throughout the country is an attitude of sustained and informed determination."

Late in 1958, the nonpartisan, nonpolitical National Planning Association issued a significant warning:

"The dismal fact is that unless the United States takes many measures not contemplated in its present military program, the moment is approaching when (the assumption that United States retaliatory power is an effective deterrent to Soviet military action) will have lost its validity. . . . If steps are not promptly taken vastly to strengthen American retaliatory capability, the Soviet Union in the not distant future will be in a position, by the use of ICBM's and IRBM's armed with thermonuclear warheads, to inflict so strong a blow on SAC bases in the United States and Europe that retaliation by the United States would be held within limits acceptable to the Soviet Union."

Any feeling of complacency in this defense area must be based upon a judgment that (1) communism is self-destructive; (2) an internal collapse of the Soviet system is inevitable; (3) only reasonable retaliatory strength is required.

I cannot identify any compelling evidence which supports this judgment.

I am sure, however, that the overwhelming majority of Americans are behind you in the mounting battle to balance the national budget. I believe that your leadership in the fight to eliminate deficit financing makes a real contribution to the noninflationary economic growth required over the next decade.

The problem then is one of making choices.

The Rockefeller report (from panel IV) on "The Challenge to America: Its Economic

and Social Aspects" emphasized this problem of choice—concluding that the United States could afford all defense essential for survival if it decided to do so.

In my opinion, the real danger lies in an underestimation of the American people. They are willing to pay for more national security, even if this means reduced Government services in other less immediate areas.

The proposed Federal budget for fiscal year 1960 has already taken at least part of this willingness into account.

But does it go far enough?

I cannot help but conclude that it does not. I believe that an overwhelming majority of American citizens would prefer to be absolutely sure that the amount of national defense available is adequate for security, rather than risk even a momentary period of potential collapse in retaliatory deterrent.

The nuclear-aircraft program can help to prevent this potential collapse.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. DARLEY, Jr.
CINCINNATI, OHIO, January 14, 1959.

A Program of Action for the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks before this 86th Congress convened on January 7, I received a letter from the social relations group of the First Unitarian Church of Toledo, a group of high-minded, forward-looking men and women who take their responsibilities as American citizens very seriously, as indeed they should.

The letter told how shortly after the elections in November this earnest group had carefully reviewed the national scene and compiled a comprehensive legislative program of congressional action to effectively meet the present needs of America.

Their program objectives fall into three main groupings: The first envisages some changes in congressional procedures to permit affirmative majority action; the second relates to recommended congressional action to improve the national economy and the general welfare, while the third aims at ameliorating American foreign relations.

With respect to the work ahead for the 86th Congress, their program impressed me as one of the best of its kind that I had ever seen, perhaps because it reflects a good many ideas and objectives which I share and which I know many of my colleagues also share.

I include the letter here and respectfully commend it to your thoughtful attention:

THE SOCIAL RELATIONS GROUP,

THE FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH,
Toledo, Ohio, November 25, 1958.

Representative THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. ASHLEY: It seems appropriate that our group should frame and present to the administration and to the elected

Representatives and Senators who will be present at the opening of the congressional term the first week in January, 1959, an expression of our thinking in the areas of work ahead for the Members of the 86th Congress.

At his post-election press conference President Eisenhower asked, commendably, what the public wanted. It is our firm conviction that those who feel their obligations as voters, and envisage to the best of their ability from study and research what needs to be done, should make their views known to their leadership.

We have worked out this statement of the needs of America as we see them and wish respectfully to present it before the opening of the 86th Congress. The following comments relate to three principal divisions of interest, and do not attempt to cover the entire subject:

1. Changes in congressional procedures to permit affirmative majority action.

(a) Provide for majority cloture in the Senate. (Senate Rule 22 which permits unlimited debate and filibusters has been the major stumbling block to action on civil rights legislation, welfare measures, school construction, etc.)

(b) Restore the 21-day rule in the House. (In 1949 the House voted to let any bill be brought up on the floor if it had been before the Rules Committee for as long as 21 days. This 21-day rule was rescinded after the election of 1950. The 85th Congress ended with several bills such as the \$2.5 billion housing bill, authorization for self-financing of TVA, etc., unconsidered because the committee would not grant them rules.)

(c) An expanded and more representative Rules Committee. (Six votes of the 12-man Rules Committee are enough to prevent a measure from coming to a vote on the floor. Moreover, by the operation of the seniority system the present Rules Committee has become controlled by an entrenched sectional block.)

2. The national economy and the general welfare.

(a) Upward revision of social security benefits to include housing for the aged and medical care.

(b) Increased initiation of activity emanating from the Attorney General's office.

(c) Federal aid to public education including school construction, teachers' pay, increased attention to vocational education, and the training of farm youth.

(d) Adoption by Congress of such measures as the community facilities bill, area redevelopment programs, public services of all sorts.

(e) Control of inflation, practical plans for adjusting U.S. economy to genuine disarmament.

(f) Improved civil rights legislation to insure equal opportunity for all our citizens and equal protection by the laws.

(g) Improved channeling of information on governmental activities to the public: "letting the people know."

3. Foreign affairs.

(a) Development of an economic aid program to help prevent the increase in anti-Americanism among the common peoples that has grown by our military support of dictatorships in Formosa, Thailand, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Morocco and Spain. Half of the \$30 billion that we have spent militarily in the last 10 years in these countries, if diverted to economic development would have created miracles in improved living conditions, education, and a more stable political rule in each country.

(b) Supporting of the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and then the channeling of the disputes with this country through the good offices of the United Nations.

(c) Making it imperative that all international questions be taken to the United

Nations. The United States must display more confidence in the ability of other nations to decide international affairs. The miracle that Abdel Khalik Hassouna performed in the Mid East crisis is an example.

(d) Full support financially and technically to India in these last 2 years of her second 5-year period. In its role as a key country in the Far East, India is of vital importance to the Free World. It is in our own self-interest to help maintain a free and independent India.

(e) Developing of an effective program of world disarmament to include the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The United States should redirect the use of its vast resources toward positive peaceful purposes rather than toward deterrence.

Respectfully yours,

ADRIENNE C. CURTIS,
Secretary.

Address Delivered at the Commissioning of the U.S.S. "Claud Jones" (DE-1033) by Rear Admiral John S. Thach, U.S. Navy, on Tuesday, February 10, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 10, 1959, I had the privilege of attending the ceremony when the U.S.S. *Claud Jones* was commissioned at the U.S. Naval Base, Charleston, S.C., by Rear Adm. John S. Thach, USN. Admiral Thach, who is commander of Carrier Division 16, has flown all types of naval aircraft, including heavy multiengine patrol bombers and high performance fighters. During World War II he developed what was known as the "Thach weave" and evolved the theory that a two plane fighter formation was superior to the old, established, three-plane formation. He is a distinguished leader and has one of the most stupendous jobs in the world, that of defending our shores from attack by enemy submarines. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the speech made at the commissioning ceremony by Admiral Thach:

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE U.S.S. "CLAUD JONES" (DE-1033) BY REAR ADM. JOHN S. THACH, U.S. NAVY

It's a pleasure and an honor to be present today as a new antisubmarine vessel joins the fleet. This ship is a most welcome addition to our antisubmarine forces, and as the first of a new class of ocean escorts, her performance will in many ways influence the course of antisubmarine defense for years to come. It is significant that she bears the name of *Claud A. Jones*, for there is a striking similarity between her mission of convoy escort and the career of Admiral Jones, who worked so diligently to improve the ships of our Navy. He was not rewarded by public acclaim, but, rather, by that inner realization of a job well done, which was exemplified in the steady material improvement of the fleet. Long hours, hard work, and competence were the ingredients of Admiral Jones' career. Such is the stuff of which convoy escort is made.

Today there is not the distinction between peace and war that existed during Admiral Jones' lifetime. Conflicts between nations now cover a wide spectrum, ranging from political maneuvering through an infinite variety of cold war and limited war situations, up to all-out war and mutual suicide at the extreme end of the scale. This extreme of total war and mutual suicide is the least probable situation, but within the range of cold and of limited wars we may struggle for a long time to come.

The United States is an island, and trans-ocean transport is her life's blood. Of this overseas transport, ships are responsible for more than 99 percent of the commercial and military tonnage. This is true because there is no other practical way it can be done. Not only is the United States economy dependent upon this vital seafaring but so is the economy of her Allies. We must have a strong anti-submarine warfare force to protect these vital sealanes from any airborne or subsurface threat.

This ship commences her naval career at a critical time. For at this time we are just becoming fully aware of the threat to our national security posed by the Soviet fleet of 450 submarines. In addition to the threat to our shipping, our cities may already be on the Communist submarine target list. Our population centers are at point blank range. To a 1,500-mile missile, not a single square inch of the United States is immune to attack.

The U.S.S. *Jones* will meet her test at a time when the submarine can go deeper, can stay submerged longer and need only reveal itself at the time of launching a missile. The ASW mission of protecting our shipping remains as vital as ever but now there has been superimposed on this mission the necessity of finding and keeping under surveillance every potentially hostile submarine that comes within missile range. This we must do during the current cold war and if we do it well enough, the cold war will never get hot.

As Admiral Jones devoted his life to improving the capabilities of the Navy, as he proved his courage in peacetime disaster; so this ship, his namesake, and her sister ships, may perform a similar mission by developing and improving our antisubmarine defense to the ultimate level required for us to maintain true control of the seas.

So to the commanding officer, the officers and men of this fine ship I wish to express my congratulations. You will be shouldering a great responsibility. To discharge it will require hard work, but from your efforts, and from the efforts of all of us in ASW can come the necessary contribution to the Navy's vital role in the defense of our country.

Herman P. Eberharter

SPEECH
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House, and especially the Members of the Pennsylvania delegation, were immeasurably saddened when we heard of the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague from Pittsburgh. We paused in that sad hour and recalled his long years of service in this body and the outstanding contribution he had made in our unending quest for a solu-

tion to the tax problems confronting our Nation.

The fact remains, however, that our estimate of a colleague's work in most cases rests on our day-by-day observation and how he conducts himself when on the legislation firing line. In HERMAN EBERHARTER's case, the highest accolade we can award him is to point out that never, even under the most severe provocation, was he observed to desert the role of gentleman which he played to the last.

His latter years in the public service were made doubly arduous due to the loss of his helpmate, who preceded him in death, and his own physical impairment. It can be said of this lovable colleague, however, that he accepted these burdens with a light heart and a cheerful mien, and no one can recall meeting him without receiving a cordial greeting and the firm handclasp of friendship.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to the members of his family who are left to mourn his passing, and it is our prayerful hope that they will be comforted by the assurance that we, his colleagues, mourn with them and for them.

James V. Bennett, Director of Federal Bureau of Prisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 20, the President of the United States presented medals to five distinguished public servants for their contribution to the country in the Federal civilian service. Each of these men has provided a lifetime of leadership in his particular field. I should like to make reference to one recipient of this award, and I single him out only because I have known and worked with him on a close personal basis.

He is James V. Bennett, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. I knew, and had a daily working relationship with Jim Bennett, during the period in 1955 and 1956 when I was executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States.

Jim Bennett's contribution to the country, and indeed to a great many other countries, cannot be overstated. He has been a credit to several administrations. He is a recognized world authority on the subject of penology. Anyone who has seen the results of his work, firsthand, cannot help but be impressed at the progress that has been made under his leadership. I would guess that no single service in the Federal system has a higher esprit de corps than the prison service despite the lesser pay scale under which it operates compared to some others. This is due almost entirely to Jim Bennett. I have visited three of the Federal institutions and in each place saw examples and evi-

dences of the Bennett touch. The respect for him among the inmates of all Federal institutions is a further example of the model way in which this aspect of the Federal service is managed. The country owes a vote of thanks to Jim Bennett.

A Killer Is on the Loose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert an article entitled "Crusade for Safety," written by Mr. Maurice R. Shochatt, executive secretary of the Safety First Club of Maryland. This article appeared in the February edition of the Baltimore Beacon, of which Mr. Shochatt is the editor and publisher.

The Safety First Club of Maryland, of which I am a member, is a nonprofit organization dedicated to traffic safety. It was organized on February 13, 1956, in Baltimore, with the premise that "Traffic Safety Is Everybody's Business."

Under the able leadership of Mr. J. O. Shuger, the club's president, the organization has enlisted the cooperation of outstanding safety leaders to serve as members of its advisory board and provide guidance in its program. Members of this board include leaders in the business, industrial, and professional spheres in Baltimore City.

The club will extend recognition to personalities who have made contributions in the field of traffic safety at its third annual Wheelmaster banquet to be held in Baltimore on April 14, 1959.

The text of the article is as follows:

CRUSADE FOR SAFETY

(By Maurice R. Shochatt)

A KILLER ON THE LOOSE

He is brutal, savage, cruel. He strikes on the streets, highways, and country lanes. He is within striking distance of each and everyone of us 24 hours around the clock. He's not the type of killer who skulks, lurking in the shadows, fearful and apprehensive when people are around him. In fact, he stalks boldly about—destroying, smashing, and maiming and adding to his long list of victims every hour, every minute, every second.

People are aware of his presence; yet ignore him and, at times, even play dangerous games with him. He never loses, but they always do. He has an inexorable record that neither time nor tide will halt. His devilish game of death and destruction can be predicted, but seemingly cannot be halted or deterred. He snatches a victim every 13 minutes in the United States of America. That doomed victim never returns to the land of the living. He injures a man, a woman, or child in the United States of America every 23 seconds. He is "Murder, Incorporated" of the 20th century. He is the modern monster of death on the highways.

The grim statistics show that 1,081,600 people lost their lives in the United States of America between January 1, 1925 and January 1, 1958, according to the to the National Safety Council.

In Maryland, the traffic toll for 1957 was 552 fatalities; while 504 persons lost their lives in 1958.

According to the Evening Sun of Baltimore the Nation's 1958 automobile driving records, in brief, are estimated thus: 40,000 killed, 10 million accidents, 2,500,000 persons injured, 20 million traffic court cases, and \$7 billion economic loss.

Now compare that record with our three recent wars.

In World War I, the United States had 126,000 fatalities, and 234,300 were wounded in the 2 years of that conflict.

During the 4 years of World War II, 407,828 were killed and 670,000 wounded.

In the Korean war from 1950 to 1953, a total of 25,604 Americans were killed, 7,955 listed as missing, and 103,284 were wounded.

"Murder, Incorporated" of the highways must be arrested. All citizens should join the crusade for safety to protect their own lives, their dear ones, their neighbors, their fellow Americans.

Where Do We Stand on Water Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent speech entitled "Where Do We Stand on Water Rights?" This speech was given at the joint commodity, land, and water conference of the American Farm Bureau Federation on December 8, 1958, in Boston, Mass., by Charles Butler, director of land and water use, American Farm Bureau Federation. This speech helped show the alarming possibility which could result from Federal encroachment on established State water rights:

I believe we stand in an extremely precarious position, one from which we could easily and quickly slip to complete Federal control of our water resources. No doubt many of you are thinking: "How could that possibly be true?"

To properly understand what has taken place in the field of water rights it is necessary to review some of our Nation's history.

I like to think that the men who framed our Constitution were political philosophers who had studied the lessons of history—and that upon this background they devised a basic concept to insure the survival of liberty in this Nation.

Their training, experience, and divine guidance told them that liberty could not survive the concentration of power in a strong centralized government, and so they wrote into our Constitution, as clearly as they knew how, the concept that political power should be diffused among the Federal Government and the States by reserving to the States those governmental powers not specifically allotted to the Federal Government.

This political system survived as its authors intended until the thirties and forties of this century. It was then that the protection of the Constitution against excessive concentration of political and economic power was smitten, first by the U.S. Supreme Court to be followed by actions of the Justice Department. It was during this period, when the Socialist-Communist centralization philosophy began to seriously influence our

Federal Government, that the Federal supremacy theory in water was advanced. With the implementation of this doctrine no right to the use of water in the United States is safe from Federal preemption.

For over 75 years prior to this period, the citizens of our country living in States where a definite system of water laws has developed, have thought that the State, as trustee for all the people, holds title to the water in the streams. They have never thought it was intended that the reserved rights of the States could be invaded by the U.S. Supreme Court by changing the definition of a navigable stream or by changing the definition of public lands. But that is exactly what has happened. This is how the Federal supremacy theory in water has been implemented.

Our concept of water right administration by the States was not pulled out of thin air. It was built upon judicial decisions of State and Federal courts, including decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court (prior to implementation of the Federal supremacy theory) and upon numerous laws passed by the Congress.

Prior to the passage of any Federal laws relating to the administration of water rights, a definite system of water law had already been formulated by various judicial decisions. The fundamental principles of many of these decisions are still recognized as basic water law.

In 1866 Congress passed the first Federal legislation ratifying the principle of State administration of water rights which had been developed to date in accordance with local customs.

In 1870 Congress reaffirmed its position taken in the act of 1866. Seven years later, in 1877, Congress passed the Desert Land Act which definitely reaffirmed the rights of the States to legislate on all matters concerning nonnavigable waters within their borders. In a discussion of this act the U.S. Supreme Court said, that all nonnavigable waters should be reserved for use of the public under laws of the States. The Court made similar statements on a number of other occasions during this period.

From these citations it can definitely be seen that by 1878 a new body of water law had been recognized by the Congress and the Supreme Court and reserved for State administration. Some students of this subject claim that there have been at least 17 congressional acts and at least an equal number of Supreme Court decisions to support State administration and control of water rights.

A number of years rolled by with the development of the Nation's water resources rapidly taking place. Little thought or question was given to the State's authority in water rights. Then came the 1930's and 1940's with the tremendous increase in the powers of the Federal Government.

Those who were ready, willing, and anxious to increase the powers of the Federal Government, and to form a strong centralized government, looked to the field of water resources with an envious eye—here was a fertile field in which to assert more Federal control.

The federalizers started their activities in the field of navigable waters. They well realized that in this area lie the main restrictions on State control of water because of the powers which the Constitution had conferred on Congress to regulate commerce and control navigable waters.

The Supreme Court gave the federalizers the cue when they said that the Federal Government holds a "dominant servitude" on waters of navigable streams, and that if the Federal Government chooses private rights initiated under State law for use of such water can be wiped out without payment of compensation.

Other Supreme Court decisions further implemented the Federal supremacy theory in

water, including the famous Appalachian Power case in Virginia and the First Iowa case.

In the former case the Supreme Court simply adopted a new definition of a navigable stream, which extended Federal control to any stream which might by reasonable improvements be made navigable, even though such improvements were never actually compelled or even authorized.

Under this definition, it is literally possible for a mountain torrent to be classed as a navigable stream.

The net effect of these decisions is that Federal control has not only been extended to the top of the watershed, but also to the entire watershed, which includes your farm and mine.

Why were such decisions handed down? At this time the federalizers realized that it would be most difficult to upset the acts of 1866, 1870, 1877, and the supporting Supreme Court decisions which took nonnavigable waters out of Federal control unless they took advantages of conditions in the East, South, and Middle West. They took this advantage by changing the definition of navigability, and this is why these areas are so extremely vital in the whole question of water-policy and water-right legislation.

By extending Federal control of water to the entire watershed, the federalizers calculated to destroy the authority of the States to claim title to the waters in all streams.

By 1955 the federalizers had found a way to directly upset the congressional acts of 1866, 1870, and 1877, and the Supreme Court decisions supporting these acts. They accomplished this in the now famous Pelton Dam case in Oregon, where the U.S. Supreme Court simply referred to most of our public lands as "reserved lands." By this decision it was held that the acts of Congress and decisions of the Supreme Court under which western water law was established had no application to "reserved lands."

This doctrine of Federal supremacy in water, as now expressed by the Supreme Court and supported by the Justice Department, is exceptionally dangerous because it has the elements of authoritarianism as the supreme law of the land.

These Court decisions bring up the question of the importance of "settled law." Abraham Lincoln defined "settled law" as something that had been affirmed and reaffirmed in decisions for years afterwards.

It seems that on the basis of the many congressional acts and Supreme Court decisions relative to State administration of water rights prior to the 1930's that State control of water and water rights should be a matter of "settled law."

How important is settled law to the future of our Nation? Former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Edward D. White, wrote in 1895:

"Teach the lesson that settled principles may be overthrown at any time and confusion and turmoil must ultimately result. . . . Break down this belief and let it be felt that on great constitutional questions this Court is to depart from the settled conclusions of its predecessors, and to determine them all according to the mere opinions of those who temporarily fill its benches, and our Constitution will, in my judgment, be bereft of its value and become a most dangerous instrument to the rights and liberties of the people."

Is it possible that we have now reached the stage described by Justice White 63 years ago? One cannot help but wonder when an analysis is made of some of the recent decisions of the Court as they relate to our water resources.

Perhaps you are saying to yourself, "Federal supremacy is nothing more than a theory; it has no application to me; no rights have been threatened or destroyed in my

area." Let us look at the record and then make a decision.

Soon after the Supreme Court's decision in the Pelton Dam case the so-called Hawthorne case broke into the news. Adjacent to the town of Hawthorne in the State of Nevada, the Navy Department operates an ammunition depot on reserved Federal lands. At the time of the Pelton decision, the Navy Department was in the process of applying to the State for a water right to make use of underground water. Following the Pelton decision the Justice Department advised the Navy that it was not necessary for them to obtain a water right under State law since the ammunition depot was located on reserved land.

In compliance with the advice of the Justice Department the Navy withdrew its application for a water right and proceeded to use water to which the town of Hawthorne held a prior right. This case was before the United States district court, and on August 27, 1958, the U.S. district judge ruled that the Federal Government did not have to comply with State water laws; in other words, a decision supporting the contention of the Justice Department.

This is an excellent example of the Federal supremacy theory in action and may have even more far-reaching effects on State control of water than previous decisions since groundwater is the main source of the base flow of streams.

The Justice Department's apparent determination to subordinate private water rights to Federal authority is clearly evident in the Santa Margarita case in southern California. This case has been before the Federal courts in California for the past several years, however, in the spring of 1958 it came to a very serious point.

The controversy over the rights to the use of water in the Santa Margarita River started during World War II when the Federal Government purchased the Santa Margarita ranch as the site for Camp Pendleton, a Marine Corps base. The ranch was not an irrigated area, and the question immediately developed as to the amount of water than went with the land.

Starting in April of this year the Justice Department, through United States marshals, started serving summonses to thousands of landowners and water users in the entire area to prevent their continued use of water rights which had been established for many years under California laws. The summonses were served during all hours of the day and night. Many farmers were awakened in the middle of the night to be served with a summons about the size of the old Sears, Roebuck & Co. catalog, a document which few of them understood.

The suit in which these summonses were served, asked the Federal district court to rule that all the rights to the use of water asserted by the defendants are subject and subordinate to the right of the Federal Government to the continued and undiminished flow of the river, including the rights to underground water. In other words, the Justice Department asked the Court to stop all water users from their continued use of both surface and underground water. Do you realize what this means to farmers in a desert area? What will happen to property values in the Santa Margarita Valley if the request of the Justice Department is upheld?

Each defendant was informed that unless he answered the complaint within 20 days, his right to assert any claim to the use of water would be gone forever.

It is extremely difficult to believe that such a thing as is presently going on in the Santa Margarita Basin could happen in America—that an individual's right to the use of water, a right which had been lawfully acquired under laws of the State, can be claimed by an all-powerful Federal Government without

payment of compensation to the individual water users. But it has happened within the past few months; it is the cold, hard facts of the Federal supremacy theory in water.

The Federal supremacy theory in water again raised its ugly head in consideration of Corps of Engineers authorization bill, S. 497, of the 85th Congress. This was the bill to authorize new rivers and harbor and flood control projects estimated to cost \$1,600 million. The President vetoed this bill twice and after it was revised and passed by Congress for the third time, the President signed it into law.

The bill which was vetoed on May 15 of this year extended to the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation an extraordinary delegation of congressional authority for water storage to regulate low flow and for present and anticipated future demands for municipal and industrial water. The text of the bill did not mention water rights in any manner. The American Farm Bureau Federation immediately became concerned because we saw in this authority the possibility of serious infringement upon individual water rights which had been obtained under State law.

Western State farm bureaus, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Reclamation Association contacted a number of Senators and requested that the controversial section, section 205, be amended by adding the phrase "and storage authorized under this section shall be used in compliance with applicable State water law and interstate compacts." A bipartisan group of 15 Senators presented this language to the Senate-House conferees. Naturally, the Corps of Engineers fought this type of an amendment because they are not used to being hampered by State laws. However, the real resistance to this suggested amendment came from the Justice Department.

This simple, clearly stated amendment was rejected by the conferees who in lieu added the following language: "Nor shall any storage provided under the provisions of this section be operated in such a manner as to adversely affect the lawful uses of water."

No one seemed to really understand the meaning of this ambiguous language. Some of the top lawyers in Washington commented that they could litigate over the meaning of this language for the next 50 years.

In an attempt to clarify the intent of the language Congressman ASPINALL, of Colorado, during a House floor debate on the bill, asked the floor leader, Congressman Davis of Tennessee, if the language meant that individual water rights obtained under State law were to be protected. Congressman Davis replied that that was exactly the meaning of the language. For some reason the reply of Congressman DAVIS was stricken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Could it be that the supporters of the Federal supremacy theory in water could not permit this kind of legislative history to hurt their cause?

Perhaps they couldn't take this chance and for that reason had the official record of the U.S. Congress stricken in their behalf.

The bill, therefore, emerged from Congress and was sent to the President with a clouded legislative history so far as this vital issue was concerned. The ambiguous language which had been substituted and the legislative history would have sustained the Justice Department in its contention that Federal projects may be constructed and operated without recognition of, or compensation for, the long-standing rights of water users to use water under rights established by State law.

This clear-cut invitation to disregard State law and private rights to the use of water established under State law, an invitation extended by the Justice Department, was too much for the American Farm Bureau Federation and, as a result, the President was requested to veto the bill. The President complied with this request on May 15.

There is yet another chapter to this story. When the revised Corps of Engineers authorization bill came up for consideration, the Senate bill had no reference to water rights. The House bill contained the same language relative to water rights which was in the bill vetoed by the President. Again, Congressman ASPINALL asked Congressman Davis, who was piloting the bill through the House, the meaning of the water-right language. Congressman DAVIS' reply indicated that individual water rights were to be protected under State laws. This was too much for the Justice Department, who immediately stepped in and demanded that no language with reference to water rights be included in the bill—and that's exactly what the Nation got.

Here you see unquestionable evidence of the Congress of the United States being forced to bow to the long-standing views of the judicial and Justice arms of the Government to the effect that the Federal Government should in no way and at no time bind itself to observe any rights of this kind. Again you see the Federal supremacy theory over water in action. Please keep in mind that this has just as much application to your area as it has to any other area in the United States.

Perhaps you are asking, "Is this a hopeless situation; have we gone so far down the road toward socialism as it relates to our water resources that there is no turning back, or is there a way to set at rest forever the dangerous doctrine of Federal supremacy as it relates to our water resources?"

This ridiculous situation relative to Federal control of water resources can be put to an end through Federal and State legislation. It must be remembered that there are few, if any congressional acts which definitely support the Federal supremacy theory. Actions in support of this theory are based on decisions of the Supreme Court and other lower Federal courts and Justice Department interpretations. Congress has the authority and the only authority to enact Federal legislation that will rout this dangerous theory.

One of the best methods of paving the way for passage of Federal legislation to protect individual water rights and State control of water resources would be the enactment of the States rights bill which was known as H.R. 3 in the 85th Congress. This bill was written to protect the States against Federal court decisions which have invalidated State laws in various fields under the preemption doctrine. Passage of this bill would underscore the rule, long ignored by the Federal courts and the Justice Department, that no Federal law or court decision takes priority over State law unless Congress decides that it should do so. The enactment of this bill was vigorously opposed by the Justice Department and the AFL-CIO during the 85th Congress.

The next step toward freedom from Federal control of water resources would be definite congressional legislation designed to establish the position of State governments in the control of water resources and the administration of water rights within their borders. Such legislation will be extremely difficult to enact because of the powerful opposition already in existence.

Each State can help put an end to the Federal supremacy theory in water by the enactment of State legislation providing for strong State department of water resources with authority for planning, construction, and operation of water resources projects. Such State legislation should not overlook provisions for the participation of local units of government in water resource development. Basic in any such legislation is the provision of a definite means whereby any individual water user may acquire a legal right to the use of water.

Why do the advocates of Federal supremacy so strongly support this theory? I am going to leave it up to you to answer that question. But I should like to remind you that we can have authoritarian laws and control in this country just as much as in Russia or Red China unless we assume our responsibilities to see that authoritative processes are used instead.

The Fiscal Tragedy of a Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues, as well as to other interested persons, an editorial which appeared in the *Kansas City Star* on February 12, 1959. It pertains to a matter which, in its implications, is of such vital importance to the future welfare of our great Nation that I believe it should receive the widest possible dissemination.

We find that the great State of Michigan is experiencing the most serious financial crisis in its history. The situation is directly attributable to the unsound policies pursued by the present State administration under the leadership of Gov. G. Mennen Williams and his political mentor, Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union.

Not only has Governor Williams spent every available dollar of State funds, but he has compounded the felony by driving taxpaying industrial concerns away from Michigan.

As the people of Michigan have learned, unrestrained spending by government can lead only to disaster. The lesson is clear and should not be lost upon those of us who have the responsibility of formulating Federal policies.

The editorial follows:

[From the *Kansas City Star*, Feb. 12, 1959]

THE FISCAL TRAGEDY OF A WELFARE STATE
Michigan is one of the wealthiest States in the Union. Its government is broke.

So the bubble of the welfare State bursts and as it does, we see a pointed lesson for the Nation. For the battle of the budget in Washington this year may determine whether the United States is to proceed further down the welfare path, or whether it is to regain its fiscal sanity.

The depth of the Michigan financial crisis is indicated by a recent desperation move by Gov. G. Mennen Williams. Politically underwritten by Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers, Williams has created what many regard as a totally unfavorable climate for private business and industry. His chief targets have been the big corporations. Now he has appealed to 23 of the largest companies to pay their taxes in advance. Most have agreed.

And for the next fiscal year, the Governor has proposed sweeping new tax proposals that would include the State's first personal income tax. The people of Michigan are learning that even the welfare State cannot provide something for nothing.

A report on the Michigan crisis appears in the current *U.S. News & World Report*. Politically, the magazine may be guilty of some understatement when it merely says that the Williams administration "is closely allied with Walter Reuther, politically powerful head of the United Auto Workers." We have heard it stated more strongly. At least Williams seems to have accepted much of the Reuther philosophy of welfarism.

The result of that philosophy has been the creation of a State in virtual insolvency. *U.S. News* refers to the plight of the two big State universities which have been living on money borrowed from banks against tuition fees. It mentions the unpaid bills due contractors.

Through the dawning period of crisis, welfare roles have continued to grow. And certainly Detroit has been the city hardest hit by the recession. In January unemployment was 11 percent. The impact of the business slowdown has been used to rationalize the fiscal crisis in the Williams government. It has been a factor. So has a large population influx. And inflation.

But two basic factors existed long before the recession struck. One was the statist philosophy that created expenditures far in excess of income. Paradoxically, the Michigan Legislature has been willing to go along with spending programs but not with revenue schemes.

Yet the drift of the Reuther-Williams tax line is to take the money out of the hide of business. That is the second large factor behind Michigan's troubles. *U.S. News* quotes the mayor of a Detroit suburb who pointed out that a large steel company decided against locating there because it didn't like "the political and industrial climate of Michigan." Since 1947 only 30 of the 100 new factories built by the Big Three of the car industry have been located in Michigan.

We see here an immediate moral for the other States. With a better climate for industry, Michigan might have created the new job opportunities that would have taken up some of the slack when motorcar employment fell off. But the lesson for all the American people is even more obvious.

It is particularly pointed when you recall the recent testimony of Walter Reuther before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. Reuther is the dominant spirit behind the Michigan welfare state. In Washington, Reuther spoke in terms that must have been all too familiar to Michigan.

He called for wage and price increases, a boost in the minimum wage, Federal aid to depressed areas, higher unemployment compensation benefits, stepped-up defense expenditures, more foreign aid, aid to education, and other spending.

We don't know how carefully the Senators and Representatives were listening. But we do know that the Federal Government is piling up a deficit of \$12 billion this fiscal year. Strong forces in Congress and in the Nation regard a balanced budget as unimportant. They think that Uncle, too, can exist indefinitely with a philosophy of "spend, spend, spend."

In effect, they are beating the drums for what Reuther was suggesting, without using the precise phrase: "The welfare state."

And in Michigan, the myth of the welfare state has been exploded.

Mr. Speaker, as a further extension of my remarks, I am including the article from *U.S. News and World Report* of February 13, 1959, to which reference is made in the editorial appearing above. This analysis of the extremely difficult problem confronting the people of Michigan is excellent and I commend it to the attention of all.

The article follows:

A WELFARE STATE RUNS INTO TROUBLE

G. Mennen Williams, now in his 11th year as Governor of the great industrial State of Michigan, saw his State come to the end of its financial road last week. The Governor was forced to appeal to the corporations that he has often fought for money with which to meet the State payroll.

Governor Williams frequently is spoken of as one of the hopefuls for the 1960 Democratic presidential nomination. People of Michigan six times have voted him their chief executive. The Governor is famed as a liberal. His administration is closely allied with Walter Reuther, politically powerful head of the United Auto Workers.

When the money ran out, however, it was the corporations which came to the aid of the State with advance payment of taxes. The Governor appealed to 23 of the State's largest employers to pay taxes early and help ease the financial plight. Most agreed to do so.

OVERDUE OBLIGATIONS

The State's finances had reached the point of crisis. The University of Michigan and Michigan State University received their last payments from the State last November. Both were living on money borrowed from banks against student fees. The banks were unwilling to lend more.

The State fell 3 months behind in payments into its teachers' retirement fund. Bills due contractors in some instances went unpaid. There was a question where money could be found to meet State payrolls. Interest payments of \$15 million are due on the State debt March 15, with no clear indication of where the money will come from. A payment of \$34.5 million is due on a school fund in May.

Through it all, checks went regularly to those on relief—and welfare rolls continued to swell as unemployment spread through Detroit and many other industrial areas of the State. More than 11 percent of the State's labor force was jobless in January, according to estimates by the Michigan Bureau of Employment Security.

Michigan, in other words, suddenly found that, while it was continuing to spend freely, it had run out of money to meet its bills. Spending from the State's general fund ran ahead of income by \$21 million in the fiscal year ended last June 30. A deficit of \$89 million is estimated for the current fiscal year.

A JUGGLING ACT

As the State's financial crisis deepened in recent months, Michigan officials searched for new ways to raise additional cash.

Last year, for example, the State government liquidated one of its assets by transferring \$19 million, representing liquor inventories held by State-owned liquor stores, to the credit of its general fund. The State also drew down \$10 million from a special fund for soldiers' bonuses and from other funds set aside for the redemption of bonds.

This fiscal juggling brought in an extra \$29 million of nonrecurring income, but that was still not enough to meet demands for cash. Money went out faster than it came in.

FLEA FOR TAX BOOSTS

As one way out of the financial crisis, Governor Williams last week asked the legislature to boost taxes by 18 percent over what was collected in 1958. He called for enactment of the State's first income tax, and for increases in other taxes that would bring in, all told, an additional \$140 million a year.

Included in the Williams tax proposals are some that are certain to run into heavy opposition among Michigan taxpayers and businessmen: a graduated tax on personal incomes, a flat 5 percent tax on corporation

incomes, and a 7 percent tax on the income of banks and other financial institutions.

Meanwhile, as a stopgap measure, the Governor has asked the legislature to mortgage the veterans' trust fund, which now contains securities valued at around \$38 million. If the legislators approve, these securities could be used as collateral to secure loans.

SPENDING AS USUAL

In the face of the present cash crisis, the Governor's budget for the fiscal year to start next July 1 calls for still higher spending, over and above that for the present year. He has asked additional outlays centering chiefly on education and mental health programs, and a pay boost for State employees. These would increase the State's general fund expenditures from a current annual rate of \$380 million to a rate of \$424 million in the coming year. For new public works spending—which lately has been cut sharply—Mr. Williams proposes that the legislature create a State building authority, empowered to issue revenue bonds.

A LONG-TERM PROBLEM

How did Michigan get into its present plight? Look back at the record, and you see that the State's troubles have been years in the making.

For one thing, over the past decade—the years in which the Williams administration has been in office—total State spending has gone up from about \$500 million annually to more than \$1 billion.

State financial officials say that inflation and the increase in Michigan population have accounted for about half that rise. The other \$250 million increase in spending is accounted for by new State services, improvements in old ones, or by a shift in costs from local areas to the State treasury.

For another thing, new revenues coming into the State treasury have not kept pace with the rise in spending. Over the years, Governor Williams has sought approval from the legislature for higher taxes. But the legislators, while generally going along with higher spending have not been eager to provide additional taxes.

A DOUBLE-EDGED RECESSION

Meanwhile, revenues from existing taxes have declined recently because of the recession in business. Sales-tax collections, the largest single source of revenue, fell off. The estimate of revenue from this tax for the current fiscal year had been \$322 million. Now the estimate has been reduced to \$296 million.

As auto plants and other factories began to lay off workers, welfare costs began to rise. These costs put a heavy drain on State revenues. Normally, the State pays 30 percent of general relief costs, cities and towns 70 percent. Recently the State has shouldered the entire cost in Detroit and some other areas because the local governments ran out of funds.

FRONT RUNNER IN WELFARE

Michigan's spending for many types of State services—for education, highways, health and hospitals, public safety—run well ahead of the average for other States. Most recent figures show that the State's spending for education, for example, was the highest of all States, at about \$61 per capita, compared with a nationwide average of \$37.41 per capita.

Other factors, having to do with jobs and business activity, have had a long-term effect on Michigan's financial problem.

Since 1950, Michigan has added more than 1.5 million to its population. This population increase included many thousands of people who came from other States, lured by the prospect of high wages on Michigan's world-famous assembly lines. But new jobs over the past few years have not kept pace with the rise in population.

"COLD SHOULDER" FOR BUSINESS?

One reason frequently cited by some businessmen for this decline in jobs is that the State has an unfavorable climate for attracting and holding private business and industry. All through the State government, businessmen say, they run into an attitude of hostility.

Last year, a big Detroit manufacturer closed down its factory with a payroll of 700 workers and moved to Arkansas. There, the company's president says, it will save \$75,000 a year in taxes alone—and many times that amount in wages.

In the Detroit suburb of Monroe, Mayor Milton H. Knabusch said that one of the country's largest steel producers decided against building a plant there because the company didn't like the political and industrial climate of Michigan. Since 1947, the Big Three of the auto industry have built or acquired about 100 new plants across the country. Only 30 of these have been located in Michigan. Neighboring Ohio alone got 29.

All these problems have combined to add to the State's financial worries. New business enterprises are slow to come to Michigan. Revenues from existing businesses are down. Spending is way up.

Thus, the people of Michigan, one of the wealthiest States in the United States, now find their government is broke. Many of these people are wondering whether the State can continue to spend as it has in the past—and whether taxpayers are willing to provide the new money that will be needed to support the spending programs already projected for the future.

A New Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a new publication of the Office of Technical Services in the Department of Commerce. As you will recall, the Select Committee on Science and Astronautics last year under the chairmanship of the majority leader expressed concern at the poor flow of scientific information. A great deal of foreign work of quality was not available to our own scientists. Although scientists abroad did publish reports, it was not translated or not brought to the attention of people doing work in comparable fields here.

As a result of the interest shown by Congress, some progress is being made. We still have a long way to go, to remove roadblocks in the path of information. Science, like news, should know no political boundaries, but should move freely across borders. Where language barriers stand in the way, they must be removed. This publication, called Technical Translations, is a step in that direction. It lists articles published in many journals, provides briefs of the contents where possible, and tells how to get copies. Members of the House may wish to bring this to the attention of universities or research centers in their districts.

Antipollution Law Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the Iowa Waltonian, official publication of the Izaak Walton League of America, Iowa division, in its November-December 1957 issue describes the real motive behind the move to return water pollution grants to the States along with the 10-percent tax on telephones.

That article is most timely in view of the nature of the issue.

[From the Iowa Waltonian, November-December 1957]

ANTIPOLLUTION LAW THREATENED—FEDERAL STATE ACTION COMMITTEE URGES ALL AID TO MUNICIPALITIES BE DROPPED

Under the guise of returning to States some of the powers taken unto itself by the U.S. Government, the Federal-State Action Committee has recently, while meeting in Chicago, voted specifically that the President should ask Congress in January of 1958 to discontinue the recently begun program of Federal grants to municipalities to build waste treatment plants. Such an action would nullify many years of effort on the part of the league and other conservation groups.

Many Waltonians will recall the stark drama of the moment during the convention in Washington last April when Dr. Preston Bradley called for immediate recess of the convention to permit league members to rescue the Federal Pollution Control Program. They will recall how, after the recess and after Waltonians had had time to contact their Congressmen, that an earlier vote by an economy minded Congress, scuttling the act by refusing to grant the \$50 million in funds needed to carry on the work; was overwhelmingly reversed in a later vote.

Now . . . comes a new and more threatening move on the part of the pollutionists.

Why the constant pressure by a certain group to dump this legislation designed to help give the Nation and its citizens clean water? Drew Pearson, in his column in the Washington Post and Times Herald for April 18, 1957, expresses it very plainly as follows:

"Opposition to the grant (program to aid construction of municipal sewage treatment plants) came from the powerful chemical, pulp and paper manufacturers which dump their factory waste into the Nation's streams. Federal aid to clean up municipal pollution, they feared, would eventually focus attention on industrial pollution."

As a result, these firms launched a virtual let-them-drink-sewage campaign.

Iowa Ikes cannot and must not disregard or treat this matter lightly. If we are to have clear clean streams and lakes, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act must be continued and the funds for its operation must be provided.

Pollution control must be kept in Federal hands if for no other reason than that most of the principal lakes and streams of the Nation go beyond the border of the State in which they rise and involve the well-being of the citizens of many States.

The Federal-State Action Committee is made up of people wielding great power. Its recommendations will be listened to.

The committee has on the Federal side, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, the Budget

Director, two Special Assistants, and one Deputy Assistant to the President, and other lesser officials. For the States, membership includes the Governors of these 10 States: Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Texas.

To preserve the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in the face of adverse recommendations of the committee will require action on the part of every Waltonian. Let the people on this committee know how you feel on the subject. Make sure your Congressman and Senator know how you feel. Send protests as individuals and as chapters. Organize opposition to the proposed cut in appropriations in other locals, sports, and civic organizations.

AND DO IT NOW—TODAY

The November issue of Sport Fishing Institute has this to say in part about this vital subject.

"Passage of Public Law 600 climaxed a 30-year-long period of legislative struggle and study. If it would be allowed to operate as Congress intended in the public interest, it would hold the promise of virtually unpolluted water for 50 million Americans who look to clean water for their chief source of vitally needed outdoor recreation.

"Moreover, these same citizens—including a large part of the voting public—not only drink a lot of this water. They also pour \$10 billions or more into the annual economy while purchasing all the goods and services they need out fishing, boating, hunting, swimming, picnicking, camping, and the like. All this requires an increasing amount of abundant clean water.

"Now, however, it looks to us as if the water-pollution advocates may come up with a completely new and cleverly appealing scheme for torpedoing this most vitally needed Federal function. This time, apparently, it's to be done under the alluring mantles of economy and State rights. On the contrary, if successful, we believe the public will 'pay through the nose' as never before."

[From the Iowa Waltonian, Nov.-Dec. 1957]

PRINGLE CALLS FOR INCREASED FEDERAL ANTIPOLLUTION FUNDS

WASHINGTON.—The Izaak Walton League of America called today for doubling Federal appropriations to help municipalities fight sewage pollution in the Nation's streams and rivers. This announcement of League action policy was made by League President William H. Pringle, Pierre S. Dak., and released here by J. W. Penfold, League conservation director.

Pringle said that the initial appropriation of \$50 million to implement Public Law 660—the bill authorizing municipal-Federal cost sharing on sewage treatment facilities—had "launched the most spectacular gain in water-pollution control in the Nation's history."

"Operating as a strictly voluntary program and recognizing that the demand for pollution control and most of the financing must come from the grass roots, the Federal Aid to Water Pollution Control Act has proved so popular with local and State public health and pollution control experts that a great backlog of requests for cooperative local-State-Federal projects has piled up," Pringle said.

Pringle emphasized that, "this demonstration of local demand to clean up our waterways must not be allowed to founder because of niggardly appropriations."

Pringle sharply disagreed with published reports—notably by a joint Federal-State action committee set up to study delegation of Federal authorities and tax sources to the States—which pointed to pollution control as a strictly State function.

"No citizen organization has had a more constructive record of pollution control activity than the Izaak Walton League," Pringle said. "We've worked since the early twenties to bring a stop to the pollution of the Nation's water resources. We've made good progress, but we all have been hampered by lack of a uniform national pollution control policy and program. We have that now, and we have no intention of seeing it abandoned in the misguided name of economy or of returning Federal powers to the States.

"Pollution is in many cases an interstate problem," Pringle continued. "Rivers don't stop at State boundaries. Moreover, hundreds of communities are unable to completely finance pollution control facilities on their own, even though the benefits in the form of clean and usable water for the home, the farm, industry, and recreation far exceed the investment required."

Pringle said that far from abandoning the pollution control program, the Federal Government should act decisively in the upcoming Congress to put itself unmistakably on record as recognizing the current program as an outstanding success and to further expedite progress made under it by increasing its annual appropriation from the present \$50 million per year to \$100 million.

"It has proved to be the most effective single piece of pollution control legislation ever passed by Congress and is a heartening example of voluntary cooperation by local, State, and Federal Government to combat a broad, public evil. The Izaak Walton League," Pringle concluded, "will fight with vigor and unity at local, State, and National level to assure continuation of the program and will seek increased appropriations in order that completion of the job can be assured within a reasonable period."

Forty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 15, I was privileged to address a group of approximately 1,200 persons at Maria High School, located in my congressional district, in commemoration of the 41st anniversary of Lithuania's independence. At this meeting the Honorable Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania, delivered a speech in Lithuanian and I am pleased to include a translation of it in the RECORD:

Lithuanian's Independence Day is February 16. On that day in 1918 the restoration of the state of Lithuania was declared by its National Council in the ancient capital, the city of Vilnius. The restoration of the independence of Lithuania was based on the principle of self-determination of nations proclaimed by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, and on the long history of the Lithuanian nation.

The history of the Lithuanian nation goes back to the pre-Christian era. The written history of the state of Lithuania began from the ninth century, marking Lithuania's struggles and sacrifices for herself and for Europe through the centuries. It was the Lithuanians who stopped the Mongol surge westward and the Teutonic push eastward

in the 14th and 15th centuries. At that time Lithuania was the great power between the east and the west—she was like a bastion in the center of Europe.

Lithuania's neighbors were envious. The Russians especially did everything possible to hinder the Lithuanians. For this reason, and due to lack of strong leaders, after the death of Vytautas the Great in 1430, Lithuania entered into an alliance with Poland in 1569 and finally fell under Russian occupation in 1795. However, the long and severe Russian occupation did not conquer the Lithuanian spirit of freedom. Each succeeding generation of Lithuanians revolted against the occupants and demanded liberty, until eventually the Lithuanians regained their freedom and proclaimed the restoration of their independent state during World War I.

In 22 years of independent existence, the Republic of Lithuania performed near miracles. Starting from scratch, the Lithuanians created a "Little America." Her progress and her people's prosperity were a blessing to the Lithuanians and a thorn in the side her erstwhile occupant and oppressor, Russia.

Disregarding the Lithuanian-Soviet Russian treaties of peace and nonaggression and the fact that both states belonged to the League of Nations, and that both had signed the antiwar Kellogg-Briand pact, the Soviet Communists invaded Lithuania during World War II, occupied her by force and illegally incorporated her in their empire. They robbed the state and its people, converted them into serfs without any rights, murdered or banished to Siberia some 300,000 Lithuanians. Even the cruelest czars hadn't done anything as barbarous.

The people in Lithuania, the farmers and laborers, are now slaves. They are forced into bolshevik sovkhozes and kolchozes as hired hands. Their pay is niggardly. Kolchoz workers receive from 50 kopeks and 700 grams of grain to 5 rubles and 2 kilograms of grain per day. Factory and white-collar workers get 200 to 500 rubles a month. The cost of living is fantastically high. For example, a pair of dress shoes costs 200 to 400 rubles, the equivalent of 1 month's wages. Higher officials and Communist Party bosses, on the other hand, receive handsome salaries and enjoy all kinds of luxuries.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are victims of rapacious and shameless Soviet imperialism and aggression. There are no other such victim nations after this last war. They are forcibly seized and incorporated into the Soviet Union. The incorporation is not legalized by the free world. The states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are considered by the free world as independent nations occupied by Soviet forces. As such, they put the lie to Soviet leaders' claims to peacefulness and respect for the rights and independence of other nations.

The case of the Baltic States, though brought up by many people, should be raised by many more, with greater firmness and frequency, and directed at the Soviets at every opportunity.

For instance, Khrushchev's right-hand man, Deputy Anastas Mikoyan, visited here recently. While being wine and dined, he boasted and lied to the American people about how good the Soviet Union is, how peace-loving, and how much she wants to be friends with the United States and other nations. At a meeting of the National Press Club in Washington he publicly stated: "It stands to reason one cannot coexist unless international treaties are kept. For that reason we scrupulously keep all commitments."

There is one truth and one untruth in those two sentences. It is true that there can be coexistence without respect for treaties and fulfillment of their respective obligations. It is untrue that the Soviets

scrupulously keep their treaty obligations. A glaring example is the Soviet conduct in Lithuania.

Lithuania and the Soviet Union had freely concluded treaties of peace and nonaggression. In article I of the Peace Treaty signed in Moscow on July 12, 1920, Russia committed herself as follows:

"Russia, without any reservation whatsoever, recognizes Lithuania as a self-governing and independent State with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition and in a spirit of free and good will renounces for all time all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian nation and the Lithuanian territory which previously belonged to her."

The Non-Aggression Pact of September 28, 1926, provided that:

Article 2: "The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other."

Article 3: "Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party. Should a conflict arise and if impossible to settle it in a diplomatic way, both contracting parties agree in such case to nominate conciliatory commissions."

The Mutual Assistance Pact of October 10, 1939, which was forced upon Lithuania by the Soviets after they had colluded with Hitler to seize Lithuania and other neighboring countries, stated:

"The realization of this treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments and altogether the principles of nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of the other state."

These treaties and pacts completely and solemnly provided for peaceful coexistence, nonaggression against one another of the contracting parties and noninterference in one another's internal affairs. By these treaties Lithuania's independence was recognized and her territorial integrity guaranteed. These points were particularly repeated in the Mutual Assistance Pact. In presenting this pact to the Supreme Soviet for ratification on October 31, 1939, Minister of Foreign Affairs Molotov solemnly and publicly proclaimed:

"This treaty stipulates the inviolability of the sovereignty of the signatory states and the principle of noninterference in each other's affairs. We stand for the scrupulous observance of treaties and declare that all nonsense about sovietizing the Baltic countries is only to the interest of our common enemies, and all anti-Soviet provocateurs."

And what, pray tell, happened to all of these solemn agreements and official public pronouncements? Not even 8 months after Molotov's formal statement, the Soviet Union trampled them all underfoot. She executed the criminal secret agreement of September 28, 1939, with Hitler, occupied Lithuania by force, interfered in Lithuania's internal affairs, sovietized Lithuania and, against the people's will, annexed her to the Soviet Empire.

Are these Soviet acts compatible with the high-flown words of Molotov, Mikoyan, Khrushchev, and their comrades?

Of course not. They will be compatible only when they will restore sovereign rights and self-government to Lithuania and other countries which they now occupy and dominate, and abide by their treaties, pledges, and undertakings.

Khrushchev has proposed to withdraw occupation forces from West Berlin and to declare it a free city, guaranteed by the big powers and the United Nations. Why just Berlin? Why this magnanimity to just one-half of one city? Why don't the Soviets

withdraw their occupation forces from the Baltic and other states—restore to them their freedom as provided in their peace treaties, and pledge their future inviolability to them and to the United Nations.

The Lithuanian nation demands that the Soviet Union withdraw its troops, police, agents, and colonists from Lithuania, return Lithuanian deportees from Siberia and elsewhere in Russia and keep its pledges, set forth in the treaties of peace and nonaggression, not in words but in acts.

Medicine and the Conquest of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the U.S. Air Force, the city of San Antonio, in my home district of Texas, is regarded with the affection reserved for the alma mater. And indeed it was there that great numbers of men—commissioned, and noncommissioned, rated and nonrated—began their Air Force careers.

Many years have passed since the establishment of the air training bases near San Antonio. The tremendous pace of progress in the arts and sciences of flight, however, has brought us to the borders of space itself; a logical extension of the conquest of the air.

That such progress was clearly foreseen by the Air Force is attested by an observance on February 9, 1959, at Randolph Air Force Base, in the District I have the honor to represent. This observance was in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the establishment, within the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine, of a Department of Space Medicine.

This was no impractical, visionary step.

Ten years ago, the Air Force scientists realized that with operational altitudes already at 40,000 feet they were within a scant four miles of the beginning of the space environment itself. It was evident that aviation research and development would soon take the earth-adapted human being into an altogether alien environment. The decision was taken, then, 10 years ago, to prepare for that day when man would be expected not only to enter, but to work in, and to return from, the far reaches of the cosmos.

Today we can salute the foresight of Maj. Gen. Harry G. Armstrong, now retired, but then the Commandant of the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine. And we can salute the guidance given to this work toward space by the distinguished physician and physiologist, Dr. Hubertus Strughold.

A recital of their findings through the years would be too long to undertake today. One example out of dozens of projects and studies is the recent experiment in which Airman Donald Ferrell spent 7 days in a sealed cabin in simulated space

flight. This experiment provided valuable data concerning the physiological requirements for one man in a hermetically sealed cabin and vital information relating to performance and behavior under the conditions men will experience when they are actually in space. The studies in the Department of Space Medicine have been directed toward the problem of the human organism in space; however, the earth-bound human has already begun to profit materially from the work of these space medicine pioneers.

A technique developed there, for example, primarily as a research tool, is finding application in operating rooms, where it is used to measure the anesthetic gases absorbed by a patient under surgery. Again and again, humanity benefits from military research.

My specific purpose today is to call attention to the important ongoing work of the Department of Space Medicine in the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine. I wish to commend this group of dedicated workers to the Nation on the 10th anniversary of their work, and to remind all of us that we may be thankful for their farsightedness and intelligent devotion in their self-appointed tasks—work which we must remember was undertaken at a time when there was little support or general comprehension of their purposes. As we peer into the future, awake to the full meaning of our conquest of space, we must resolve for continuing support of these farsighted Air Force scientists who help point the way to our success in space. In addition to commending this group, as responsible citizens we should charge them to pursue this Air Force research so vitally concerned with the practical orientation of man in space.

Integrated Housing Called for in New York To End Discrimination Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the statement of Dr. Gardner C. Taylor, president of the Protestant Council of the City of New York, before the Federal Civil Rights Commission hearing on discrimination in housing on February 3, 1959.

Dr. Taylor's statement appeared in the February 7, 1959, issue of Protestant Church Life:

DR. TAYLOR URGES MORE LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING—PROTESTANT COUNCIL PRESIDENT HEARD BY CIVIL RIGHTS GROUP—INTEGRATED HOUSING CALLED FOR TO END DISCRIMINATION EVIL

I am pleased to speak today in the name of the Protestant community of New York. The very fact that in this greatest city in our Nation, I, the titular leader of one of its three great religious faiths, could be a

member of a racial minority, and the most disadvantaged national minority historically, augurs bright promise for the fulfillment in this country of the purposes for which this commission has been established and for the early resolution of the problems of segregation and discrimination throughout this land.

The home is the basic unit of our society, and in New York City some 600,000 families, or 2 million citizens, occupy dwelling units which are below standard for wholesome and healthy living. These substandard and overcrowded dwelling units are occupied to a marked degree by Negro and Puerto Rican families, and, to a less extent, by Jewish families. All of the reasons why these minorities occupy a disproportionate amount of the substandard dwelling units are not traceable to racial or religious discrimination, but discrimination by race or religion does form entirely too much of the reason. It is a known fact that these racial and religious minorities, easily discernible by color or accent or religious practices, find the greatest difficulty because of irrational prejudices in escaping the ghettos in their quest for better living conditions. Also, the oldest housing falls to those least able to pay for better housing, and those least able to pay, because of economic discrimination, are Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Thus great, dark, depressed, seething geographical and psychological ghettos scar the city and the Nation. Those outside the slum area fear the alien monolith represented by the ghetto and libel and label as inferior or dirty or violent all who live on the racial or religious reservation. The residents of the ghetto, on the other hand, develop angry and bitter resentments toward those who live beyond their ragged, run-down borders, all of whom they feel are somehow responsible for the conditions under which they must live and rear their children.

There are those who say that the people who inhabit the ghettos are dirty people who depress property values wherever they live. It is an open secret, however, among minorities that the suppliers of private housing in our cities, the real estate interests, keep the supply of housing available to minorities at a trickle, while the demand remains enormous, in order to keep the price exorbitant. Thus an area, block by block, is made available to minorities. The great rush for the thin supply inevitably means that overcrowding and excessive purchase price doom the area to blight, if it is not already blighted by the time the minority families secure occupancy.

In such an area, crime increase at a frightening rate. A few years ago, the New York Academy of Medicine reported that the 2½ million people living in substandard areas, and comprising 20 percent of the metropolitan residential area, accounted for 45 percent of our crimes, 55 percent of our juvenile delinquency, and 80 percent of our disease. An overcrowded living condition strains family life, induces frustration, encourages immorality, breeds violence, and cripples the minds and bodies of growing children. This, indeed, is a form of infanticide.

In junior high schools whose population is composed of minority groups the percentage of substitute teachers is 30 percent higher as compared to areas whose school population is not drawn from minority groups. The facilities are often the oldest, the background of the children the poorest, the learning motivation the weakest, the teaching the least efficient.

The city of New York is aware of the problems. Under the courageous leadership of Robert Wagner and the city council this city has begun an honest, forthright war on discrimination in housing. The Brown-Sharkey-Isaacs bill has put the city solidly on the side of integrated housing. The full impact of this legislation cannot yet be

measured, but its effect is bound to change the face of New York in housing time. The Baker-Metcalf bills in State housing promise a far brighter housing picture for all of New York State.

The Federal Government must not only continue but increase its housing programs for low-income and middle-income dwellings if we are to win the battle for good housing for all our citizens. Better, more equitable plans for relocation of tenants in slum clearance areas must be devised. Almost invariably the slum-clearance area is unbelievably overcrowded. Often there have not been dwelling units available for those who are compelled to move. By throwing a number of evicted people into an already inadequate housing market larger than the number for whom housing in the cleared area is provided, the problem's solution becomes a part of the problem itself. Also, many persons operating small business have lost their locations without adequate compensation. There is a question in many minds as to whether the Federal and State and local governments have been as solicitous as they might have been in the equal preservation of the churches and synagogues of the major faiths which are located in housing developments.

The need for federally aided middle-income housing is very great. Since middle-income families are ineligible for low-income publicly supported housing they have been driven to increase the number of slum dwellers or move to the suburbs, thus depriving the city of their great strength, perhaps the chief financial and moral strength of any city. The housing provisions that have been made for these middle-income families are far from adequate.

Gentlemen, the great unsolved riddle of our democracy is the problem of discrimination because of race or religion. This is the dangerous disease in our body politic. The symptoms may vary in intensity in different parts of the body, but the malady is throughout the Republic. The Nation's moral health depends so much on cleansing our Nation of the guilt and shame of segregation and discrimination. In all likelihood, this Nation's permanent appointment with history may well depend on whether or not we free ourselves of these destructive divisions and enmities of color and creed and origin. A fair and freely integrated housing pattern in this city, and all cities, will go far, very far, toward solving America's greatest problem—discrimination.

White Doctors Elect Negro President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I enclose in my extension of remarks a most interesting and informative article appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe of February 15, 1959, relating to Dr. L. M. Donalson of Fayetteville, Tenn., and the understanding and constructive community spirit action of the doctor members of the Lincoln County Medical Association in electing Dr. Donalson as president of their medical association.

More than anything else, nobility of mind such as possessed by Dr. Donalson and what such nobility of mind symbolizes to others is the road to under-

standing and progress in our association with each other. In different spheres of human activity in all parts of our country, and without regard to race, color or creed, there are countless persons who by their fine life are missionaries of understanding, and who reduce areas of misunderstanding and tension by widening areas of understanding and respect.

WHITE DOCTORS ELECT NEGRO PRESIDENT

FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., February 21.—He came to Fayetteville with little more than a diploma and a 98-cent medical bag.

And in those penny-hard depression days, he began his long service ministering to the medical needs of his fellow Negroes.

For his service, Dr. L. M. Donalson, 51, has won praise and recognition.

But no honor can touch the one recently given him. His colleagues—all of them white—picked him to be 1960 president of the Lincoln County Medical Association.

Nowhere else in the southland does a Negro head such a white professional group. How did Donalson react to his election?

He seemed somewhat embarrassed by the attention focused upon him.

"I'm just a country doctor trying to make a living," he says.

The doctor showed similar reticence about having the county's Negro hospital named after him.

When the Lincoln County court announced that it would be known as the Donalson Hospital, he suggested:

"Call it the Booker T. Washington Hospital."

"Booker T. Washington was a fine man," Donalson was told, "but he never did anything for Lincoln County."

Naming the hospital for Donalson as well as his selection as association president-elect were accepted locally as the rightful thing to happen to a man of proved ability.

Thus, white and Negro residents of the county were astonished that there was such widespread attention given Donalson's election.

Negroes in the area are "very, very proud he received such an honor," says James Lemons, Lincoln County Negro leader who is an agriculture teacher at Fayetteville's Negro high school. He adds: "However, Dr. Donalson is high qualified."

Whites and Negroes alike point with pride not only to the Donalson Hospital but to the well equipped Negro high school, a big new Negro elementary school, and a summer recreation program for Negroes.

"Let the preachers handle this," Dr. Donalson, who has a number of white patients, says of integration. "All I can do is practice medicine. I think doctors should stay in their place and let politics alone. We have no problem in this county at all."

The white doctors who elected Donalson call the move routine. Young Dr. Lex Patrick, the current head of the association, explains that Donalson was a qualified member in good standing, and it was about time he took over the president's chores. The election was without opposition.

The doctor's arrival in Fayetteville in 1932 after graduating from Meharry, a highly ranked medical college at Nashville 85 miles away, is something of a local legend.

Donalson picked Fayetteville, because it was small enough so he could walk from patient to patient. He had no car and no hope of getting one.

Before boarding the bus in Nashville, he bought his equipment—a 98-cent medical bag, one 40-cent roll of gauze, a roll of adhesive, 1 artery clamp, and a stethoscope. With that he set up a practice.

That practice led him for 6 months on foot, then in a borrowed car, to Negro homes in the town and for miles around. There were frequent stops at the offices of his new friends, the town's white doctors, who not

only assisted in difficult operations, but opened their supply rooms to him.

Lack of facilities didn't stop the need for operations.

"Most of them took surgery at home," Dr. Donaldson says. It was usually a good choice. The town's first Negro hospital, opened in 1936, was a rundown double tenement house with two beds.

Donaldson put a request before the county court for a real hospital for Negroes. The court gave him an old dormitory from the white hospital, provided the Negroes could raise \$500 to move the structure to the town's Negro section.

The newly established hospital was destroyed by the 1952 tornado.

Donaldson went to the court again. This time it offered to pay rent on a house to be used as a temporary hospital.

Then the court granted the hard-working doctor's biggest dream. A new \$100,000 hospital. Included were an operating room, a delivery room, X-ray room, office, treatment rooms, a laboratory, a small nursery and rooms for about a dozen patients.

Almost as soon as it was built the hospital, which is nearly self-supporting, was overcrowded. Again Donaldson appealed to the county court.

"They've never turned me down," he says. The court authorized a 10-bed wing and construction is already underway. Donaldson gives the court most of the credit for the modern medical service to Negroes in the area.

He plans another appearance there soon. "What I really want," he says, "is a pediatrics wing staffed by interns and resident specialists from Meharry."

When he started his Fayetteville practice, Dr. Donaldson had one thing in mind: Earn enough money to get to New York City and practice there. It wasn't long before local white doctors talked him into staying. Now he is trying to get young Negro doctors to do likewise in places like Fayetteville.

"Everybody's grateful to Dr. Donaldson," says Mrs. Herbert Baker, a patient of Donaldson for 18 years.

And Dr. Donaldson is grateful to everyone. An extremely modest man, his own description of his work consists of credits to others, his college, the Lincoln County Court, Fayetteville's white physicians and the towns' business and civic leaders of both races.

He's not sure he likes the amount of publicity his new medical association office has brought him. Like his fellow townsmen he prefers to take it quietly in this stride. Had he known he was coming, he told one of a recent string of visiting newsmen, "I would have been out somewhere hunting rabbits."

Mayor Hubert Kilgore and "The Need for Federal Aid for Schoolhouse Facilities"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 17, 1959, a fine group of mayors from 35 different Alabama cities and towns came to Washington for a conference with the members of the Alabama congressional delegation. The purpose of the visit was to enable the Alabama League of Municipalities to present its views on 20

separate legislative items presently pending before the Congress.

Twenty mayors each presented the position of the league on a particular field of legislation. Among the 20 was the Honorable Hubert Kilgore, mayor of the progressive and expanding city of Irondale, Ala., in my district, who commented on the subject of "The Need for Federal Aid for Schoolhouse Facilities."

With the thought that Mayor Kilgore's remarks will be of interest to the Members of the Congress, I am privileged to insert them herewith in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLHOUSE FACILITIES

(By Hubert Kilgore)

I am certain that there is no more pressing need in Alabama communities today than that of our schools for adequate classroom facilities. Our school population is increasing at a very rapid rate year by year, and the need for more classrooms increases just as fast—but the supply of decent or standard schoolhouse facilities is falling behind all the time.

This is not a problem just in Alabama. It is Nationwide—no matter how rich or poor the States may be. The problem is that there simply is not the taxing power in the States and local communities to raise anything like the amount of money needed for construction of adequate schoolrooms. Only the Federal Government has that kind of revenue-raising power.

I was impressed by an article that able and far-sighted Congressman CARL ELLIOTT of the Seventh Alabama District wrote back in 1955 for the Alabama Municipal Journal on the subject of education and the need for a Federal-aid program to help solve school-building needs. He quoted Walter Lippmann, famous newspaper columnist, as writing this about our failure to provide national support for education. I quote from that item:

"We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort. That is to say, we must measure it not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but by what is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish. We have learned that we are quite rich enough to defend ourselves, whatever the cost. We must now learn that we are quite rich enough to educate ourselves as we need to be educated."

IS FEDERAL-AID NEEDED?

Mr. ELLIOTT went on to inquire: "Does this mean Federal aid for a school-building program?" He then added: "Yes, it does. It means first of all that the Federal Government is going to give grants-in-aid to the States for highways and hospitals, and I agree that it should. It must be prepared to do the same thing for schoolhouse construction. It is common knowledge that our States are inclined to extend themselves where their efforts are matched by Federal dollars. . . . I feel very strongly that the Federal Government has a definite and measurable responsibility toward providing educational facilities for our Nation's children."

I agree wholeheartedly with Congressman ELLIOTT. To bridge the gap between the need for schoolhouse facilities and the ability of the States and municipalities to finance needed classrooms and related facilities, we simply must have an adequate Federal-aid program. I am not familiar with the details of the proposed school-aid bill recommended last week to Congress by the President, but I can say as a small city mayor that if anything like what is needed in a program of this sort is to be had, Congress needs to look the President's proposal over

with great care because he isn't noted for favoring domestic programs to anything like the size and extent he is foreign aid programs—including the building of all kinds of community facilities in foreign nations while we suffer here for the lack of them.

THE SCHOOLHOUSE SHORTAGE IN ALABAMA TODAY

To give you gentlemen some idea of the school facilities deficiency in our State today, I would like to cite facts and figures made available to us just last week by the State department of education. They are based on a survey conducted in recent months by the Alabama Education Commission, a study group set up by the State legislature to look into education problems in our State.

To bring our schoolhouse program up to a reasonable standard we need 8,000 more classrooms. In addition, the space needed in the school buildings to provide libraries, lunchrooms, cafeterias, auditoriums and gymnasiums would amount to the equivalent of 4,000 more classrooms—making a total of 12,000 classrooms needed. The cost of such a program would amount to \$317 million.

Even though education is a State government function in Alabama under the provisions of our Constitution, you gentlemen will be interested in the fact that the State does not invest one dime in school buildings. All schoolhouse facilities we have are built by municipal governing bodies, county and city school boards. The total annual expenditures of all 300 incorporated towns and cities in Alabama for all municipal purposes amount to \$50 million. So if every dime of our revenue were used for school construction for 6 years—providing no support for police, fire, water, street, sanitation, public works and other municipal services—we still would not be able to build school facilities fast enough to catch up with the demand.

I think it is easy for all of us to see that there must be Federal aid if the local communities are to have the classrooms and related school facilities needed to take care of our ever-expanding school population.

Point of No Return After Planter Takes A or B Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Jackson Daily News of February 15:

POINT OF NO RETURN AFTER PLANTER TAKES A OR B PLAN

(By Florence Sillers Ogden)

The \$64 million question is upon us. Will the cotton planter take the A or the B plan?

Inexorably we move closer and closer to the ides of March, the deadline. The planter must make up his mind by the 16th day of March and sign on the dotted line.

There is no point of return. From then on he is in the hands of the elements and the Government, and may soon be on the welfare.

It's fewer acres under A, with a higher price guarantee, or increased acres and lower price—from 4 to 6 cents a pound less.

Farmers, like merchants, have to have a reasonable turnover. Yet, on the other hand, they can't produce cotton below production cost. They can't pay high for what they have to buy and sell low. They cannot compete with the pauper wages of foreign growers, under a controlled program, while U.S. labor and farm supplies run wide open with the sky as the limit.

Cotton trade advances the theory that cotton is pricing itself out of the market. That really stirs up my red hair. The manufactured good, machinery, etc., the farmer buys, and the labor boys are what is pricing cotton out of the market.

TRADE SUGGESTION

The trade suggests that the farmer reduce by 15 points the parity price. Well, if the farmer has to reduce, why not the warehousemen, the poison dealers, the farm equipment people, labor, compresses, banks, buyers, oil mills, and cotton mills take their share of the reduction? Then the farmer might be able to make a small profit and retain a just share of the world market for the United States.

But no, the cotton grower is the only one anyone ever suggests to take the licking.

When will the farmers ever learn that somebody else is doing their talking for them?

Surely no farmer in his right mind is going to go about crying that cotton is too high, when everything he buys or uses is skyrocketing to the moon.

As for the A and B plan:

To add to the joys of making the great decision on just how you're going broke, on the eve of the day of decision the Department of Agriculture announces a reduction in parity via a new way of figuring parity.

Now this new rule is some strange thing born in the Department—and out of wedlock, I feel sure—the brain child of the bureaucrats. Nobody understands this will-o'-the-wisp called change in parity, least of all the Department of Agriculture, or else they never could have reduced it when everything is selling at the highest prices ever known except farm products.

PARITY FIGURE

Parity is based supposedly on the relative value of farm products and other goods in 1912, or thereabouts.

How they arrived at the present parity reduction, only the bureaucrat knows. How they reduced it in the face of rising prices for everything but farm products, only the Department of Agriculture knows. Where it is taking us only the Lord knows.

When people yell about farmers deliberately building up a cotton surplus for the U.S. Government to hold, I say: "Taint so."

The surplus foundation was built in the fall of 1950 when the Government placed an embargo on American cotton, stopped all shipments to foreign markets, closed down the cotton exchange, put a ceiling on our cotton of around 40 cents a pound.

What happened? Foreign cotton sold in the world market for from 75 cents to \$1 a pound.

That was when we lost our foreign markets.

American capital went to foreign countries, financed foreign production. The U.S. farmers were left holding the bag.

More than that, our Government (and misguided farm organizations) put on a campaign in 1950 marketing season which urged American growers to produce 16 million bales for 1951. This was put on a patriotic basis, a stockpile, because of the Korean war.

The United States lost the Korean war but the farmers came through with the 16 million bales. We've had a surplus ever since.

FARMER IS LAMB

As long as the things the cotton farmer buys are sold in an uncontrolled, protective market through high tariffs, and he sells in a world market in competition to pauper labor, the farmer is a lamb to the slaughter. You can put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Last month in Washington I was reminded of 1929. Everyone is rolling in money up there. Business is swell, money is on the loose, the rich are getting richer every day.

In the late summer of 1929 I went to Chicago on a round trip excursion rate ticket in a last year's dress to visit my husband's kin. Everybody up there was rich but me. At home everybody was poor, including me. But Chicago was crazy with money. Washwomen were making thousands of dollars overnight on stocks, porters and clerks were riding the waves of prosperity. I felt like Little Orphan Annie at Belshazzar's feast.

After I got home it wasn't long before down here in the cotton patch we heard the reverberation of the big guns of the depression as they fired on Chicago. And believe me, it was some reverberation.

I say: Beware of the Ides of March.

Export-Import Picture Has Changed in Last 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of February 17, 1959:

EXPORT-IMPORT PICTURE HAS CHANGED IN LAST 2 YEARS

(By Charles Lucey)

Autos, sewing machines, typewriters, bicycles, steel—almost all the way across the industrial front today the United States is drawing a rising challenge from overseas competitors in export markets.

At one time it must have seemed nobody could peddle sewing machines around the world the way Americans could. But the picture has changed, as shown in our own export-import figures for the last 2 years. In 1956 and 1957 we shipped abroad 80,000 sewing machines; we imported 2 million.

In 1957 we exported about 100,000 typewriters and imported 337,000. In January-September of 1958 we shipped 42,000 typewriters overseas and took in 280,000.

As for bicycles. Arrivals last year—800,000. Exports—negligible.

REPORT

President Eisenhower's economic report to Congress the other day noted our auto exports have shown a pronounced decline, even in the boom overseas selling year 1957. In the first half of 1958 foreign car imports were five times U.S. auto exports.

The overall figures suggest no caveat of U.S. selling abroad. The roughly \$16 billion of exports in 1958 was perhaps \$4 billion under the high rate achieved in the first part of 1957. But due to the Suez crisis and other causes, sales abroad had been abnormally high in the earlier year. Comparison of 1958 with 1956—years not too different—may be fairer.

Yet Mr. Eisenhower told Congress:

"While imports were well maintained, exports declined sharply after mid-1957 . . . From the first half of 1957 to the first half of 1958 the value of U.S. merchandise exports fell more—in relative, as well as in absolute terms—than those of all other countries combined."

"Exports of the industrially developed countries declined relatively little, and unlike those of the United States, remained significantly higher in the first 6 months of 1958 than in the first half of 1956."

SIX MAJOR ITEMS

By far the greater part of the recent fall-off in U.S. exports—and this was true of the 1957 export rise—came in six major commodities. That is, petroleum, cotton, wheat, metals, coal, and autos. The President observed also that the effect of this changed world market situation on U.S. steel exports has been aggravated by intensified price competition from foreign suppliers.

There always must be give and take in foreign trade: old markets and traditional product lines are supplanted by new ones. Western Europe's industrial development may cut into our exports of finished goods but the United States may sell Western Europe more raw materials and machine tools to help make such finished goods.

But overseas competitors, especially Western Europe and the Japanese, have been closing the gap in technology and increasingly exports may rise or fall on superiority of product design or lower prices. Studies made up to now still leave some economists skeptical on how great the advantages really are in favor of lower cost output abroad, yet many businessmen are convinced of the great danger of high U.S. costs.

LABOR VIEW

Labor economists by no means accept the notion that high wage rates here will be the factor to lose export markets for this country—and hence jobs for Americans—in future foreign trade competition.

They insist that placing blame on high wages is a smokescreen, arguing that most of the inflationary price rise of the last 2 or 3 years has come in food increases, advances in costs of services and in other areas quite outside the industries where collective bargaining by unions has forced prices upward.

They contend the greatest danger is likely to come by establishment of United States factories overseas, especially in the new European common market area, to escape tariff and quota discrimination against United States-made products.

The labor people contend also that technology advances abroad are not the only answer. They say availability of raw materials and presence of mass markets, both of which the United States has, still will enable this country to produce goods to compete price-wise with lower labor-cost nations.

CONTENTION

AFL-CIO Secretary James B. Carey, who studied European industry extensively, contends the United States still has the technology and the better work habits of American workers to outproduce them. He contends—as do other labor spokesmen—that prices on too many United States products are set at levels to produce a too-high profit.

He says they reflect low volume production instead of the cheaper unit prices possible with a high consumption, high volume economy.

It's an argument bound to be fought out harder in days to come. The possible loss of a sizable share of our foreign markets—for reasons of inability to compete because of high costs and for other reasons—represents too great a hazard to be accepted without much travail here at home.

Department of Defense Multibillion Dollar Supply Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the past decade, there have been a number of objective studies, investigations, and reports by qualified people which point to the need for better management of the many common supply and service systems in the Department of Defense, which have stock valued at \$46 billion. Within the past year, the Comptroller General of the United States has issued a number of reports which show beyond doubt that much needs to be done to improve these systems.

In 1951 the Secretary of Defense ordered a study to test the feasibility of one service handling medical and dental supplies and equipment for all services. The test, though successful, was terminated in November 1954, over strong protests of many Members of both Houses of Congress and others. A year later, the Secretary of Defense started similar tests along broader lines to handle subsistence, clothing, medical, and petroleum products under a unified approach called single manager plans.

Numerous statements by officials in the Department of Defense during the past 2 years indicate that the single manager plans point to much-needed progress. However, Secretary McNeil seemed to testify to the contrary on February 10, 1959, before the Joint Economic Committee. I have, therefore, requested Secretary McElroy to clarify the matter. My letter to him on February 15, 1959, is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1959.
HON. NEIL H. McELROY,
Secretary of Defense, Department of
Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have reviewed the testimony of Assistant Secretary McNeil before the Joint Economic Committee on February 10, 1959, concerning the effectiveness, economy, and efficiency of the single manager plans for subsistence, clothing, medical, and petroleum products.

It is disturbing to note the wide disparity in Secretary McNeil's testimony with that of other Department of Defense witnesses before congressional committees in recent years.

I would think that sufficient time has elapsed since the plans were initiated to permit the Department of Defense to issue a factual evaluation of them. The enormous overlapping, duplicative and wasteful supply systems in the numerous divisions of the Department of Defense contain stocks valued at \$46,585,403,000 as of June 30, 1958 according to figures you have furnished the Government Operations Committee of the House.

Even a casual review of the distribution and ownership of the staggering total reveals the excesses and duplications within and among the departments. I might add that this inventory of \$46 billion is more than the entire 1960 budget for the Department of Defense, is over 60 percent of the national budget of \$77 billion and is almost one-sixth of the national debt. Yet the supply sys-

tems inventories of \$46 billion are only a portion of the worldwide Department of Defense personal property inventories of \$120 billion from which a \$10 billion surplus disposal program is expected in fiscal 1960.

Furthermore, the many hearings of congressional committees, the Hoover Commission reports, studies of the National Chamber of Commerce, numerous reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and others attest to the degree of waste and the need for much better management in these areas in the Department of Defense. There can be little doubt about it.

This is no new idea, Mr. Secretary, which has been provoked by recent events. The O'Mahoney amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, called upon the Secretary of Defense to develop an integrated supply system. Many Members of Congress from both Houses and parties sponsored the measure, and some early progress was made in implementing it.

After the termination of the Alameda medical supply test, which was a single-manager plan, I wrote to your predecessor on October 24, 1955, and stated, in part:

"The whole story of the Alameda test was detailed to you in Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS' 13-page letter of January 19, 1955. Certain of the Hoover reports confirm the conclusions of the congressional reports and enactments as to the need for more integration among the military services with respect to common supplies and services and as to the necessity of following applicable laws and regulations.

"As I view the situation, Mr. Secretary, not only is the basic problem of constitutional government involved, but many other issues of real concern to the American people. I will comment briefly on some of them.

"The facts are conclusive that our educational facilities—though basic to defense—need great assistance. Large sums are required for the development and conservation of basic natural resources. Billions are needed for highways and public works. Costly outlays for fundamental and applied research are a must if we are to keep ahead in the technological race. Our health institutions are not in the state we desire. Oppressive taxes should be reduced, especially for the low-income groups. The budget requires balancing in its turn and the ever-growing national debt reduced.

"As you know, I am, and have always been, an advocate for a strong national defense upon which to support a foreign policy. It is also essential to our survival. I will not be beguiled into laxity by the palliative tactics now emanating from the Kremlin. No one dares be. I believe that our defenses and basic institutions should be strengthened in every possible way for the long pull ahead.

"But the evidence is conclusive that the overlapping, duplication, and waste is of such magnitude in and among the military services as to make possible enormous savings, with no loss of efficiency or military effectiveness, and thus release funds badly needed for the objectives listed above."

Since that date our fiscal and defensive positions have, in my opinion, worsened. The national debt continues to grow and the budget, if balanced, as some contend, is from the bookkeeping point of view. It does not provide for investment expenditures in many fields.

It was for these reasons that I sponsored the amendment to which you agreed in the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 empowering you to "provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as [you] deem appropriate." I realize that this statute has been in effect for only 6 months, but the single-

manager plans have been operating for a considerable period of time.

I will appreciate an authoritative evaluation from you as to the success of the single-manager plans and what is programmed for the future as to other common classes of supply and service functions. I might add that it is not my contention that the single-manager plans are the ultimate. I can visualize that it may prove to be impracticable to have two or more single managers operating in the same depot under different departments, and that something more general may be required. However, it does seem apparent that steady progress must be made.

This is a subject of wide interest, so I will insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will afford your reply the same consideration.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader.

Mayor Claud Smithson—"The Increasing Importance of Intergovernmental Relations"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 17, 1959, a fine group of mayors from 35 different Alabama cities and towns came to Washington for a conference with the members of the Alabama Congressional Delegation. The purpose of the visit was to enable the Alabama League of Municipalities to present its views on 20 separate legislative items presently pending before the Congress.

Twenty mayors each presented the position of the league on a particular field of legislation. Among the 20 was the Honorable Claud J. Smithson, mayor of the progressive and expanding city of Fairfield, Ala., in my district, who commented on the subject of "The Increasing Importance of Intergovernmental Relations."

With the thought that Mayor Smithson's remarks will be of interest to the Members of the Congress, I am privileged to insert them herewith in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE INCREASING IMPORTANCE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (By Claud J. Smithson)

The relations between the Federal, State, and local governments determine the limits of the ability of municipalities to solve their own problems and to serve their citizens. Therefore, progress in American municipal governments is dependent on a proper relationship and understanding between the various governmental levels and units.

The need for such an understanding is emphasized by looking at the many areas in which questions of intergovernmental policy and action arise. For example:

1. The competition for revenues.
2. The overlapping and duplication of services.
3. The tendency to provide so many independent governmental units in a geographic area that it no longer functions as a recognizable governmental unit.

4. The tremendous effects of State and Federal grants-in-aid on local governments.

5. The impact of State and Federal standards and State and Federal personnel on local affairs.

6. The demand for local services and expenditures growing out of Federal programs.

7. The competition for high grade personnel between the Federal, State, and local governments.

8. The absence of any overall policy on relations between the levels and units of government.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONSTRUCTIVE PUBLIC ACTION

All these relations and problems are also opportunities—opportunities for initiative and constructive public action, serving the general community.

There is no inherent antagonism between the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities. In its overall aspects, government should be conducted as if it were concerned with all of the people and with due regard for its impact on the individual citizen where he lives.

The Alabama League of Municipalities endorses the philosophy expressed in the 30th Report of the Committee on Government Operations in regard to Federal-State-local relations that:

"The interest and initiative for increasing the responsibilities of the States and localities must come from those levels of government. Responsibility cannot be created by a transfer of programs and tax services. It is imperative that the Federal Government do everything possible to promote a favorable climate for the proper functioning of the other levels of government. This includes making available to the States and localities those revenue sources that are not of primary importance to the Federal Government, and which are well adapted for State and local use. Such action should be taken independently of Federal decision concerning particular grant programs."

NEED FOR A PERMANENT NATIONAL COMMISSION

We also agree completely with one of the major recommendations of the Committee namely that: A permanent national commission on all phases of Federal-State-local relations be created pursuant to an act of Congress. Its members should be true representatives of each type of government. Few activities are more urgent or more important as a means of proving that a democratic Federal Government can work effectively and harmoniously.

We also believe that the representatives of municipal interests have long been pretty consistently ignored in the development of national policies and programs which vitally concern them. The role of the cities in the national economy has never been fully evaluated or understood.

To a large extent the problem stems directly from the fact that the representatives of urban interests and affairs are not represented as such in the councils that shape fundamental Federal policy.

No single individual or agency at the Federal level is concerned with urban problems. Nowhere at the Federal level has it been recognized that the many urban problems with which the Federal Government now deals, highways, airports, urban renewal, water-pollution control, advance public facility planning loans, etc., are interrelated and cannot be fully effective unless coordinated with one another. Most of the proponents of Federal programs created along functional lines are too limited in their approach and too preoccupied with the progress of their particular effort to make a case for larger and more fundamental problems of urban community development.

DEVELOPING A NATIONAL URBAN POLICY

A national urban policy must be developed on the part of the Federal Government. Only by way of such policy can the various

functional programs now operative at the Federal level be related and focused in such a way as to take advantage of the full social and economic potential of the Nation's urban areas.

The question is, then, How do we see to it that such a national urban policy is developed on the Federal level?

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs has been proposed by many of us who feel that only through Cabinet rank can the urban problems really get the concentrated attention they need.

Also many urban problems are interstate in nature and cannot be handled effectively by the States. Further, the States themselves are neither willing nor able to promote and develop solutions to urban problems.

Other reasons we have for urging a Department of Urban Affairs are: (1) stronger executive leadership in the Government's housing programs must be secured; (2) we need to do a much better job of coordinating existing Federal programs which affect urban areas and governments; and (3) we must fix responsibility for necessary research and policy recommendations concerning urban problems and their solutions.

The Alabama League of Municipalities finds itself in full accord with a resolution passed in Boston by the American Municipal Congress this last December on the subject.

RESOLUTION DISCUSSING URBAN AFFAIRS

The resolution referred to reads as follows: "Rural areas have been so successful in focusing national attention on the farm problem that our Government today spends more money annually on potatoes than it does on urban renewal of the great metropolitan areas in which more than 70 percent of our people live.

"Unless the city problem is raised to the same level of national consciousness and effective steps taken to halt the steady erosion of our cities, our Nation faces a damaging loss in national strength almost as great as that which could be inflicted by enemy action.

"As a first step in focusing attention on the city problem and granting our urban centers an authoritative voice in the highest levels of our National Government we urge the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, to be headed by an official of Cabinet rank.

"We further urge that the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate create standing committees on urban affairs, to deal with legislative matters affecting our urban areas.

"As a further step in focusing national attention on the vital problems of our urban areas we urge the President to proclaim a White House Conference on Urban Affairs, which conference would be held a year from the time of issuance of said proclamation, and to be preceded by State conferences throughout the Nation. These conferences would draw together Government officials, technical experts, civic leaders, management, and labor officials, as well as leaders in the many fields of activity involved in urban living, and the conferences would culminate in a national White House conference which would recommend a national urban policy to be followed by our Government."

She Wept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit to our country of Deputy Premier

Mikoyan, of Soviet Russia, was received by the American people with mixed feelings. However, the talented Rev. Owen McEnaney, of St. Helena's Church in the Bronx, expressed poetically the feelings of most when he wrote the following poem:

SHE WEPT

Limousines of varied shade
Led the triumphal parade,
"Welcome! Welcome," the Committee cried,
And a voice was heard:
"Because of him my family died."
Everything was sweetness and light
Festive candles shone brilliantly bright,
Empty smiles linked one with another;
And that voice again was heard:
"He killed my brother."
Red carpets lined the way
Rich bankers led the way
To halls of gold and crimson:
And the voice continued on:
"My son's in a Red prison."
O yes,
A city cheered and roared,
Officials the first to applaud
And decree decorum be kept:
And while this was going on—
The Statue of Liberty wept.

Foreign Policy Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. James Reston which appeared in the New York Times on February 11, entitled "Foreign Policy Officials," which I think should be brought to the attention of every Member:

FOREIGN POLICY OFFICIALS—EISENHOWER, IN CONTRAST TO 1952, SEEKS MEN WHO CAN FILL TASKS ADEQUATELY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—President Eisenhower made a comment today that illustrates the change that has gradually developed in the selection of top foreign policy officials of the Government.

He defended at his news conference his record of nominating top officials on the ground that in every vacancy that occurs, we try to find a man that can fill it adequately. Political considerations did enter into his choices, he said, but these were always secondary. Finally, he said that he could not give any more time to the supervision of foreign policy matters than he now did without neglecting his responsibilities in other fields.

President Eisenhower's emphasis today on adequacy was quite different from the theme and tone of the early days of his political career in 1952, when he was talking, not about getting adequate men, but about getting the best men in the country to fill these jobs, regardless of party affiliation.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-TWO SPEECH RECALLED

The single standard for filling top executive posts, he told the voters in Duluth, Minn., a month before his first election, shall be merit and not political reward.

Two weeks later, he told a rally at Bridgeport, Conn., "this problem of bringing peace to the world is one that is going to demand in Washington the finest people that this country affords, men and women of prestige

in their own region, men and women who in their combined selves can command the respect of, and unite the people of the United States behind great programs."

This issue is up again because the new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT of Arkansas charged publicly yesterday that some of the President's ambassadorial appointments had not been up to standard.

Coincidentally, Senator FULBRIGHT and others have complained that partisan political considerations—specifically a protest from the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Meade Alcorn—have blocked the appointment of Henry Labouisse as director of the International Cooperation Administration.

ALCORN PROTESTED

The Acting Secretary of State, C. Douglas Dillon, recommended Mr. Labouisse as the best man for the job, but Mr. Alcorn opposed him on the ground that he registered as a Democrat in one presidential election, 1940.

This is one of those conflicts that might be settled by a little quiet consultation between the President and the Democratic leaders in the Senate, but that could cause considerable trouble in the last 2 years of the Eisenhower administration if it is not resolved.

The President and the Senate share responsibility for appointing ambassadors and other top executive officials. The Democrats, with a 64-34 majority in the Senate, have the power to block the President's appointments, and some of them, particularly Senator FULBRIGHT's colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee, are in a mood to do so if they think the President has reversed his 1952 principle of "merit and not political reward."

The President is in a difficult position in the Labouisse case. The Mutual Security Program, administered by ICA under the State Department, is the President's favorite overseas program. He defended it again today.

ALLOWED EARLIER BLACKBALL

But he permitted Mr. Alcorn to blackball Mr. Labouisse last year for the deputy directorship of the ICA, and he is now seeking the support of a reluctant Congress for another mutual security appropriation while seeming to be indifferent about his own State Department's second attempt to appoint Mr. Labouisse, this time to the directorship.

As a matter of fact, there is a basis for understanding and compromise in this field. The President complained today that he could not appoint anybody but rich men to major ambassadorships because Government allowances for these posts were not high enough.

It is widely believed here, however, that the President could get the support of Speaker SAM RAYBURN in the House, and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate for adequate representation allowances provided he would go back to his original principle of appointing the best men available, regardless of party or financial position.

At most, this would cost under \$5 million a year to provide adequate allowances for superior ambassadors and their aids in London, Paris, Madrid, and the other expensive posts. The main objective of U.S. policy is to deter wars. This is the function of diplomacy and of the so-called bipartisan policy of strength, supported by both parties but not extended to the selection of the men who must administer it.

The Democrats are not asking for equal appointments. They are merely saying that, when the President's own officials in the State Department select an experienced and even distinguished man for a major job, he should not be rejected merely because he registered as a Democrat 19 years ago.

They are also saying that in this day, it is not good enough to have American Ambassadors in Madrid, Paris, Brussels, The Hague, Bonn, Copenhagen, Oslo, Ankara, and Athens—to mention only a few—who have no working knowledge of the language of those capitals.

In short, they are making a fuss, not because they oppose the appointments policy the President defined in 1952, but because they agree with it but do not think he has redeemed his promise.

Army "Firsts"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. D. E. Beach appeared before the Committee on Science and Astronautics on February 9, 1959, and outlined the Army's progress in the field of missiles. The U.S. Army has a commendable record of firsts in this field.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following "Army Firsts" in the field of missiles:

ARMY FIRSTS

1. First U.S. ballistic missile firing, May 1947: On May 22, 1947, the first full-scale flight test of a Corporal missile was entirely successful. The missile was fired by a team from the Jet Propulsion Laboratories, under contract to the Army, with participation by the First Guided Missile Battalion, Fort Bliss, Tex. and U.S. Army Ordnance personnel of White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex. Fired at White Sands, the Corporal responded accurately to guidance commands and reached a range of 63 miles.

2. First penetration of outer space, February 1949: On February 24, 1949, a two-stage missile consisting of a German V-2 with a WAC Corporal as the second stage, was fired by the team of scientists under Dr. Von Braun at White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., as part of the Army missile program. Army personnel of the First Guided Missile Group at Fort Bliss and U.S. Army Ordnance personnel of the White Sands Missile Range participated in the firing of this missile, which achieved an altitude of 250 miles, a world record at that time.

3. First successful intercept of aircraft by guided missile November 1951: The Army R & D contractor (Western Electric) accomplished this on November 27, 1951 at White Sands Proving Ground with the first Nike missile fired at an aerial target. The missile detonated about 25 feet from the target. The target was flying at about 15 miles range, 33,000 feet altitude and at a speed of 300 miles per hour.

4. First operational air defense GM unit December 1953: In December 1953, the U.S. Army Air Defense Command (then called the Army Anti-Aircraft Command) placed the first operational surface-to-air missile system on-site in the continental U.S. air defenses. This unit, a Nike Ajax battalion, was deployed in the Washington-Baltimore defenses.

5. First U.S. operational ballistic missile unit, November 1954: In November 1954 the Army's 259th Field Artillery Missile Battalion (Corporal) completed training at Fort Bliss, Tex., to become the first operational U.S. ballistic missile unit. The battalion was de-

ployed to Europe in February 1955 to provide guided missile support for units in the Seventh U.S. Army.

6. First free world successful IRBM firing May 1957: On May 31, 1957, a full-scale Jupiter missile fired at the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla., was the first successful IRBM of the free world. The firing was conducted by the Army ballistic missile team from the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and the Jet Propulsion Laboratories.

7. First free world solution of reentry problem August 1957: On August 8, 1957, a Jupiter-C ballistic missile, fired at the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla., confirmed the first free world solution to the problem of missile nosecone reentry into the atmosphere. Firing was jointly conducted by personnel of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, both agencies of the U.S. Army Ordnance Corps.

8. First free world satellite in orbit January 1958: On January 31, 1958, the first free world satellite, Explorer I, was placed in orbit by a Jupiter-C missile, fired from the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla. This project, a joint achievement of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and the Jet Propulsion Laboratories, was completed only 84 days after the Army was given the mission.

9. First intercept of very low-altitude aircraft May 1958: In May 1958, a Hawk missile fired by the Army R. & D. contractor (Raytheon) successfully engaged an F80 jet target flying at treetop level at White Sands Proving Ground in New Mexico.

10. First intercept of very high-altitude supersonic target missile November 1958: A Nike Hercules missile, fired by the Army R. & D. contractor (Western Electric) in November 1958, destroyed a supersonic target missile traveling faster than 1,500 miles per hour at an altitude greater than 60,000 feet.

Bill To Permit Use of Social Security Records To Trace Parents of Neglected Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a companion bill to one introduced by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, to permit the use of social security records to trace parents of neglected minor children.

Thousands of parents escape their moral and legal obligations of child support by simply moving to another State and leaving no forwarding address. In the new place of residence the runaway parent simply gets a new job and continues his participation under the social security system with complete protection of social security regulations which prohibit the disclosure of his new residence. Since abandonment of family is a felony in most States, the social security regulations of secrecy protect the potential felon from apprehension.

The interstate escape of runaway parents is costing the States and the Federal Government billions of dollars in public assistance and welfare funds

which must be spent to support abandoned children. In 1958 alone the total bill for aid to dependent children totaled \$902,851,000 for the support of 2,155,151 children. Some runaway fathers are believed to have abandoned different families in several States, compounding the wrong.

Under my bill, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be directed to supply from social security files the most recent address of a father certified as having failed to support his family to a State, or local welfare agency or to a court of competent jurisdiction.

In addition to the neglected children being supported by Federal funds, hundreds of thousands of other abandoned children are being supported through the sole effort of one parent. When the father runs away from his obligation of family support, it is the working mother who single-handedly assumes the burden of child care. Since she usually receives no public help in the support of her family, the effect of social security secrecy regulations is deplorable.

Under present circumstances it is almost impossible for an American to work anywhere without submitting his social security number. It should be equally impossible for such a person to work without contributing to the support of his dependent children. The Social Security Administration should not be a party to the development of an escape route from the legal and natural obligation of parents.

My attention was drawn to the need for this law by a case which arose in my district. Mrs. Irene Bogunlecki, of 3607 East 74th Street, mother of two children, Henry 9 and Marianna 8, filed a claim with the Veterans' Administration as the unremarried widow of her war veteran husband who had disappeared for over 7 years. The Veterans' Administration turned down her claim on the ground that it was in receipt of information from the Social Security Administration that her husband was living and working as of December 31, 1957.

Thus, the regulation opens up social security records for the purpose of rejecting her claim and then denies her an opportunity to use the records to apprehend her runaway husband. Since then scores of mothers of abandoned families have written of their desperate and futile efforts to locate runaway fathers. Last autumn I urged the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to modify social security secrecy regulations, making the new residence of runaway husbands available to the agencies in each community administering the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act. This request has been turned down in order to preserve and maintain confidentiality of old-age and survivors insurance records.

On October 14, 1958, I addressed the following letter to the Honorable Arthur Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

OCTOBER 14, 1958.

HON. ARTHUR FLEMMING,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has recently come to my attention that a resident of my dis-

trict, Mrs. Irene Bogunlecki of 3607 East 74th Street, Cleveland 5, Ohio, has been refused the cooperation of the Social Security Administration in determining the whereabouts of the recent employment of her husband, Anton J. Bogunlecki, who abandoned her and their two children over 7 years ago and apparently is employed with Social Security coverage somewhere in the United States.

Mrs. Bogunlecki recently filed claim on March 28, 1958 with the Veterans' Administration for widow's pension as an unremarried widow, alleging the death of the veteran by reason of his 7 years' unexplained absence. The Veterans' Administration turned down the claim on receipt of information from another governmental agency (the Social Security Administration) that their records indicated the veteran was living as of December 31, 1957. Upon receipt of this information, the Veterans' Administration properly disallowed her claim as an unremarried widow.

Under the code of Federal Regulations, Regulation I, relating to the disclosure of official records and information (part 401, chap. 3, title 20), the employees of the Social Security Administration are precluded from disclosing information relating to the employment or residence of a social security beneficiary or contributor to the fund, unless the information is requested by an agency distributing Federal aid under a public assistance title. Under this provision Mrs. Bogunlecki would be assisted in locating her husband if she were a recipient of Federal aid to dependent children. She did not apply for such aid, because she preferred, upon the failure of her husband, to work and provide for these children through her own efforts. It seems to me that her entitlement to information relating to the whereabouts of her husband is even greater than that of a person receiving the benefits of Federal aid.

In checking with the local agency administering the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act in this community, I find that there must be thousands of mothers supporting their own children who are unable to locate the fathers, also responsible for such care. Insofar as this information is denied to these working mothers or to State or local agencies charged with the administration of the Uniform Support Act, the effect of of this regulation is deplorable. Since in Ohio and many other States failure to support dependent children may constitute a felony, the Social Security Administration, in effect, shelters many likely felons from apprehension, indictment and prosecution.

Under present circumstances it is almost impossible for an American citizen to work anywhere without submitting his social security number. It should be equally impossible for such a person to work without contributing to the support of his dependent children. The Social Security Administration should not be a party to the development of an escape route from the legal and natural obligation of parents.

I respectfully urge that you give prompt consideration to the immediate revision of the social security regulation barring the disclosure of residence or employment of a beneficiary or contributor to the social security fund and permit public agencies charged with administering the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act to obtain such information for the benefit of dependent children, regardless of whether Federal funds are involved in their support.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 1958, I received the following reply from Mr. C. I. Schottland, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
December 2, 1958.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: This is in reply to your letter of October 14 requesting that consideration be given to the revision of the social security regulation barring the disclosure of information to permit public agencies charged with administering the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act to obtain information concerning the residence or employment of a beneficiary or contributor to the social security fund for the benefit of dependent children regardless of whether Federal funds are involved in their support.

As you are no doubt aware, section 1106 of the Social Security Act prohibits disclosure of information from old-age and survivors insurance records except as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may by regulations prescribe. Regulation No. 1, two copies enclosed, sets forth the information which will be disclosed and to whom. As you will note, the regulation does not authorize the disclosure of information in cases such as that of Mrs. Bogunlecki.

However, section 402(a) of the Social Security Act requires that State agencies administering the aid-to-dependent-children program give notice to law enforcement officials where a parent has deserted a child receiving aid to dependent children. In connection with this provision of the law, we are furnishing information as to the whereabouts of a deserting parent of a child receiving aid to dependent children to State assistance agencies on an experimental basis. Under this procedure, however, information is furnished only where the State agency has no recent information as to the parent's whereabouts and has exhausted its other resources for locating the parent. The information provided to the State agency under this procedure may be used only for the purpose of fulfilling its responsibilities under section 402(a) of the Social Security Act.

The confidentiality of old-age and survivors insurance records has been maintained ever since the inception of the old-age and survivors insurance program. It stems from a pledge made publicly by the then Social Security Board, in response to a nationwide public demand, that information obtained from employers and employees for the purpose of administration of the program would be used for that purpose and kept confidential and not made generally available for other purposes. Congress implemented that pledge by enacting section 1106(a) above. Pursuant to the pledge, the regulation which authorizes disclosure does so only in those limited areas which involve the administration of the old-age and survivors insurance and closely related programs, and in certain cases relating to the national security.

It will be noted that section 401.3(f) of regulation No. 1 authorizes disclosure of information to other agencies of the Federal Government lawfully charged with the administration of a law providing for public assistance or work relief, or pension, or retirement, or other benefits for the proper administration of such law. In line with this provision of the regulation, procedures have been established under which information is furnished to the Veterans' Administration where it is needed in determining a claimant's entitlement to payments under a law administered by that agency.

The Social Security Administration has sought and secured the cooperation of the public by continued adherence to the policy that the information furnished us would be used for the administration of the Social Security Act and related programs. The successful administration of the old-age and survivors insurance program is dependent on

a great degree on the accuracy of the information which is voluntarily furnished us by the public.

Aside from the likelihood that a general relaxation of the policy might be considered as a breach of trust on our part with a resultant loss of good will toward the program, the retention of the policy is essential from an administrative standpoint. A general relaxation of the present policy, with respect to the confidentiality of the records, would probably cause account number holders to apply for new numbers under fictitious names and new applicants for account numbers to give misleading information because of the possibility that correct information might some day be used against them. Were many individuals to obtain account numbers under assumed names or to submit incorrect data for our records, a serious disruption of the basic operations and services for the social security program might well be anticipated.

Administration of the social security program does not necessitate the keeping of current address information with respect to the more than 120 million persons who have been issued social security account numbers. Thus, the only address information in our files is generally the individual's address at the time he applied for a social security account number. Frequently this happened many years ago. Thus, a person's current whereabouts could be ascertained only if a recent report of earnings for him has been submitted, and then, the only address available would be the address of his employer or place of self-employment. Because of the length of time it takes to receive and process wage reports, there is generally a lag of about 9 months between the time a person worked and the time his wages are credited to his earnings account. There is an even longer period in the case of self-employed persons who file their returns on an annual basis. Thus, the information we could furnish, if permissible, would never be very current and would probably be of limited value for the purpose of locating the present whereabouts of persons.

Since the inception of the social-security programs, we have received a wide variety of requests from law-enforcement officials for information indicating the whereabouts of persons who have committed or who are suspected of committing various crimes. These requests have been uniformly refused, the only basic exception being in connection with an investigation of major importance relating to the commission of an act of espionage or sabotage inimical to the national security.

We have on several occasions reviewed our policy regarding the disclosure of information and we shall continue to do so. However, in view of the discussion above, we believe that at present there are greater equities in favor of continuing the present policy than in revising our regulation along the lines you propose.

We hope the above explains our position in this matter. If further information is desired, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

C. I. SCHOTTLAND,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time is long overdue for Congress to review the need for surrounding the social security records with secrecy in the face of the increasing incidence and costliness of child neglect and family abandonment.

Sewage Called Damaging to Northeast Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Herald on December 11, 1958, telling more about the danger from pollution to fishing and human beings.

That article was an interesting discussion of how everybody points a finger at everybody else on pollution but very few do much about it.

The citizens of New England point to the Navy's dumping of sewage offshore and the Navy points to citizens dumping sewage into the ocean. The result is a thoroughly unsanitary condition for the people in the area as well as serious danger to the fishing and shell fishing industries in the area.

The article follows:

SEWAGE CALLED DAMAGING TO NORTHEAST FISHING—NAVAL DISTRICT HEAD DENIES HIS VESSELS ADD TO POLLUTION

The chairman of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission charged yesterday that irreparable damage may be caused New England fishing and beaches by the dumping of sewage offshore by naval and merchant vessels.

The commandant of the First Naval District issued a quick denial that the Navy contributed to pollution.

CHARGE MADE IN NEW YORK

Edward T. Dickinson, chairman of the NEIWPCC and a commissioner of the New York Commerce Department, made the charge in a New York speech at a commission meeting.

New England communities spend millions annually, he said, to control water pollution, "yet these efforts are constantly frustrated by the dumping of sewage into offshore waters by vessels with no regard for the efforts and expense of these communities."

"It is highly discouraging," Dickinson added, "for a community to construct with hard-earned tax dollars a facility which will prevent its own sewage from polluting rivers and offshore waters and then to have a vessel—with no apparent concern for pollution—discharge the sewage of hundreds of men."

"There is no excuse for this, when the proper precautions would prevent the pollution of these waters upon which so much of the economy of New England depends."

SAYS PROTESTS IN VAIN

He said the organization has protested to Federal public health authorities oil spills from vessels but that the Commission's attempt to improve the situation have so far been largely in vain.

"It is imperative," he said, "that some action be taken before irreparable damage is done to the beaches of New England and its shellfishing industry."

Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, First Naval District commandant, denied that naval vessels have polluted offshore waters and pointed out that nobody has made any complaints to us.

ONLY FEW SHIPS

"The only possible place that might be affected," he said, "is Newport, and that's deep tidal water which would carry refuse out to sea."

"We have only a few ships at the navy yard, and we have strict regulations that ships must be a certain number of miles offshore when they refuel or clear their bilges."

"By the way," Admiral Espe added, "don't most of these cities dump their own sewage into the ocean?"

Counselor Clifford Responds for Freedom of Research for Krebiozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, my personal correspondence with the Honorable Counselor Thomas N. Clifford and his attitude on the subject of krebiozen after correspondence with the American Cancer Society and the American Medical Association references only goes to prove that you cannot fool all the people all the time. The edict that krebiozen shall not pass is herculean in its strength of purpose. But I can only say that a bad bargain is a bad fight and that justice will prevail in the end—even if we who feel the urge of a righteous cause must go searching in the dark corners of this infamous conspiracy. In the end we find the answer.

The medical benefits of krebiozen, even in its early experimentation in Senator Vandenberg's case, will be the answer to the world—meantime we investigate. I am proud of the efforts of Attorney Clifford to clarify the issue. His interest is the honest citizen's interest in seeing that the poor, ailing, unfortunate victims of this dreaded disease get the best treatment that medical science, under the freedom of research, can give to him.

The correspondence follows:

BALTIMORE, Md., November 26, 1958.
Congressman ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIBONATI: I would appreciate it very much if you could send me a copy of your remarks with respect to the drug, krebiozen.

I wish to congratulate you for your efforts in forcing and prodding a national agency to do its duty.

I merely note, in passing, that these same agencies which must be prodded to investigate possible cures never have to be prodded when it comes to asking the public for money and telling the public how much they are doing.

Please keep up the good work; you are getting nationwide attention.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law.

BALTIMORE, Md., February 12, 1959.

The Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIBONATI: I appreciated your excerpt very much as I had tried to get that issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and was unable to do so. Enclosed please find a copy of my recent correspondence with the American Cancer Society on krebiozen. I have sent copies of this to Senator DOUGLAS but thought you also would be interested.

I commend you and compliment you for the courage you have shown in this matter.
Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law.

FEBRUARY 16, 1959.

Mr. THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney at Law, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR COUNSELOR: I certainly appreciate having the copies, which you recently sent to me, of your correspondence with the American Cancer Society on the subject of krebiozen. I could make use of this material, in order to carry a point, relative to the present controversy between the National Cancer Institute and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy and the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

There is no question but that the American Cancer Society is dominated by the American Medical Association, and the evasive answers to your questions only proved that the board of directors and the various committees which passed upon this request, with their "do nothing" policy, is a result of this vicious pressure. I would like to reprint this correspondence in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your name, if you so desire, deleted. I believe that you realize that you have accomplished a great deal in eliciting answers from them to very pertinent questions, and I believe that it is in the public interest that the public know the attitudes of these individuals who have control over these public funds, and administer these funds in accordance with the whims and caprices of the medical-political professionalists, who dominate the policies of the American Medical Association.

Maybe the raising of millions of dollars of funds for charitable projects has become a "racket," and the longer that they remain in the test-tube stage of development, the longer patronage and job payrollers remain in their soft berths.

Would you please be so kind as to indicate to me your attitude in this matter, as it is important that we trace the malignant job-growth of this charity to its source. They quibble too much over procedures for their honesty of purpose while we seek a cure. They complain too loudly against another who, seemingly, has perfected a work that the public expects its charity dollars to do. Maybe we should investigate the American Cancer Society's operations. At least, their "do nothing" attitude creates a suspicion that they don't want a cure or that their desire is to prolong the agony of others, while they fiddle around, trying to perfect their own cure. Some progress should have been made up to this time in the control of cancer by them. Krebiozen has a record that anyone can read in the reports of the Krebiozen Research Foundation, given by 500 doctors in actual cases which they have treated.

I hope that you will agree with me in permitting me to print all correspondence which you have sent to me in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for Americans to read and understand. I hope that this does not embarrass you.

Sincerely,

ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
Member of Congress.

BALTIMORE, Md., February 17, 1959.

The Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIBONATI: I have received your letter of February 16, 1959, acknowledging receipt of my correspondence with the American Cancer Society and requesting permission to print the same in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I grant you that permission and also permission to use my name and address provided you also print this letter along with the correspondence so that I may make my position clear on, one, the charity funds and, two, the American Medical Association.

With respect to the charity funds, it is now obvious to me that at least some of them are becoming honeycombed with abuses that react to the disadvantage of the entire public.

There is a basically unhealthy condition inherent in all charity foundations. It is that unless all services are on a volunteer basis and are fully explained to the public there is an inevitable tendency by officers and employees to perpetuate their jobs by the simple expedient of becoming skeptical about new ideas for cures. The only way to eradicate this danger is to have everybody serve on a volunteer basis or if some people must be paid, then there should be yearly financial statements of income and disbursements published.

I personally feel that a congressional investigation into this matter would be good since the public would then know which are the worthy charities and which are the unworthy charities and the unworthy ones would be promptly eliminated.

I do not feel that I have the same right to criticize the American Medical Association since they are not soliciting public funds to run their organization, whereas, the American Cancer Society is using public funds for purposes which I feel are quite contrary to the public desire.

Nevertheless, if the American Medical Association has an unhealthy contact or relationship with the American Cancer Society and either of them or both of them are working together in any manner to prevent the testing of any product that might be helpful in fighting cancer then this condition must be corrected.

That this controversy should involve the American Medical Association is distressing to me since I feel that I owe my life to an emergency appendectomy performed on me by a Dr. Hart of Duke University. Furthermore, on other occasions where I have consulted practicing physicians, I feel they always did their best to help me.

However, if there is a group of nonpracticing political physicians who have become powerful in the American Medical Association and are creating abuses in that association then that association must submit to correction just as the bar association or the courts or any other group must yield to the public interest.

It is my sincere hope that you may be successful not only in obtaining a test of krebiozen but also inaugurate a new day in our research era whereby those groups which are soliciting funds will be the very first to seek out any treatment or rumored treatment that has shown any promise, and will submit complete records of their activity including yearly financial statements published in the newspapers.

Enclosed please find and feel free to retain after sending me photostats, the original letter of the American Cancer Society of January 6, 1959, and the original letter of the American Cancer Society of January 30, 1959. The subject matter of their letter of December 9, 1958, is in effect repeated and covered in more detail in their letter of January 6, 1959.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law.

Send Menshikov Home—Recall Our Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to be temperate when I speak of the Soviet regime and its complete disregard for honor and integrity. Their attitude has been one of duplicity at every turn. Another example of the callousness of the Soviet leaders is the case involving the American plane shot down over Russia on September 2, 1958. One begins to wonder: "Why should we continue to try to maintain relations with this country?"

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on this subject from the U.S. News & World Report of February 13, 1959:

SEND MENSHIKOV HOME—RECALL OUR AMBASSADOR

(By David Lawrence)

We have reached the end of the line with the present Government of the Soviet Union. Diplomatic relations no longer are of any practical value.

When a government—through its Deputy Premier, through its Foreign Office and through its accredited Ambassador—lies repeatedly to another government, there can be no trust in any promise or pledge or so-called agreement emanating from such a regime.

Ever since September 2 last, when 17 American airmen were deliberately murdered as their unarmed transport strayed a few miles over Russia due to a navigational error, the United States has been trying to elicit the facts from the Soviet Government.

The Moscow regime, its Deputy Premier and its Ambassador in Washington have persistently disclaimed any knowledge, except that the plane crashed and that six bodies were recovered.

Yet, in an aviation journal published in the Soviet Union, about 2 weeks after the episode last September, there is given in detail an account of a so-called practice mission which parallels in large part what actually happened when the American transport was shot down. The same information and almost identical radio conversations between the attacking pilots were recorded on a tape—obtained by American authorities through its efficient intelligence system—at the exact time and place that the American plane went down.

This tape recording tells in dramatic manner how the American plane was shot down even though it was fully recognized as an unarmed transport, and hence entitled to be guided to a safe landing. But the recording of the conversation of the Soviet flyers shows also how they gloated over the murder of the American airmen. All the evidence and the written transcript of the tape recording was presented last November directly to Soviet Ambassador Menshikov in Washington.

When Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan came to this country in January, he was asked specifically by Vice President Nixon and Secretary Dulles about the facts uncovered in the tape recording. The State Department declared last week in a formal statement concerning the Mikoyan conference with Mr. Dulles:

"Mr. Mikoyan said that the Soviet Government had done all that it could, that all the

bodies had been returned and that the Soviet Government did not know about any other personnel. * * * He denied that the plane had been shot down, asserting that it had crashed."

How can any government in the Western World—in the face of the evidence presented—any longer do business with the Soviet regime? Of what use are "new ideas" or the historic devices of diplomacy itself when dealing with a crooked government? Of what avail are summit conferences or tours of Soviet Russia by high officials of the West?

The time has come for the United States to take the lead in cutting off all diplomatic relations with the barbaric dynasty that rules in Moscow.

The time has come for the United States to urge all its allies to do likewise and to embargo all trade with the Soviet empire.

There is no need to go to war, ostracism is a salutary alternative. There is every reason to isolate the Soviet regime and, applying the words of the late President Franklin Roosevelt, to impose a "quarantine" on the Moscow government. Had such a course been followed by our allies in the 1930's the Hitler government would never have gotten the munitions it needed so acutely in order to build up its war machine.

America has been studiously patient. The facts about the tape recording were available to the Soviet Government as far back as last November. The United States tried for months, quietly and without publicity or the display of public emotion, to get the Soviet Government to cooperate at least in establishing the facts—the discussion of responsibility for the error of the unarmed transport could come later.

Most insulting of all, however, was the attitude of Ambassador Menshikov in his meeting with the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Robert Murphy, on November 13 last. The State Department's indictment says:

"Mr. Murphy said that it was Ambassador Menshikov's responsibility, as Soviet Ambassador to the United States, to listen to the representations that were being made to him. The Soviet Ambassador nonetheless refused to listen to the tape recording."

Why should the United States continue to deal with any Ambassador who shows such discourtesy to the Government to which he is accredited? Why should we keep an American Ambassador in Moscow who is refused information about the cold-blooded murder of 17 American citizens?

Millions of Americans would answer: Send Menshikov home—recall our Ambassador.

Lithuania Has Not Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in addition to my remarks of yesterday on the Lithuanian Independence Day, I would also like to insert a very interesting editorial from my home newspaper, the Bayonne Times:

LITHUANIA HAS NOT DIED

On February 16 in the winter after the Bolshevik revolution, little Lithuania proclaimed her independence, and it is testimony to the eternal strength of the human spirit that Lithuanians in the United States have not forgotten it. They might have become dis-

couraged and disillusioned, and they might have abandoned hope, because in June 1940 the Soviet Union confiscated the tiny neighbor that Lenin had pledged to hold inviolate. Loyal Lithuanian citizens were killed, or arrested and transported to scattered points within the Soviet Union where they could be watched and kept isolated.

At that time Stalin broke the promise made by Stalin by the Lenin he claimed to adore, the Soviet Union could and did plead military necessity. That necessity has long since passed, but now the Kremlin looks upon former Lithuania as an integral part of its dominions. It is the glory of the people of Lithuanian descent, here in Bayonne and elsewhere, that they do not agree, and are determined never to agree. We hope they don't.

It may well be that there will never be a Lithuania in the sense that there was one between 1918 and 1940. But if the spirit that prompts observances of Lithuanian Independence Day in the United States is preserved in the hearts of men, we can be sure that tyranny and tyrants will never be permanently enthroned.

Letter by Hon. John J. Rhodes to the Editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to insert in the RECORD the letter which I have today sent to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1959.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: An editorial in the Washington Post of February 18 is an example of the kind of thinking which many professional budget-stretchers are indulging in at this time to the harm, I think, of our country. Sounding a note of alarm, the Post insists that we have to add billions of dollars to the administration's defense budget or be faced with national catastrophe.

The Post suggests that we are going to sit by and count our dollars while the Russians outproduce us in intercontinental missiles. It also says, "If Members of Congress abhor the prospect that the United States will be reduced to a second-best position as much as they ought to abhor it * * * it is their duty to vote the military appropriations they think the country really needs." And again, "It is time that Congress * * * addressed itself to the vital problem of who is going to save the country in the next 6 years." And again, "The psychological consequences of an inferior missile status could be devastating."

This is precisely the kind of irresponsible comment which does more psychological damage than we can calculate. It used to be that the great American game was keeping up with the Joneses. Now it is keeping up with the Russians. It is manifestly absurd to believe that any nation can stay ahead of any other nation in all categories. I am sure that we do not produce anywhere near

as many drozhkies as the Russians, but who cares? Likewise, as long as we have a Defense Establishment which deters the Russians from attacking us and which will do so for the foreseeable future the possibility that we may be behind in one item of that defense should only bother those who are intent on spreading the psychology of fear among our people.

Nobody ever won a race by looking back over his shoulder continuously. We are ahead in practically every race we are running with the Russians, and we will remain so unless the panic-mongers talk us out of it. One element in winning that race consists of maintaining a strong economy. It has always been the aim of the President to adopt an adequate posture of defense and at the same time maintain the enormous strength of the American economy. He has succeeded beautifully except in the eyes of some individuals who insist on looking at the head of a pin instead of the whole pincushion.

While I have often disagreed with your paper, I have never felt before that an attitude you have taken is so completely detrimental to the welfare of our people. I appreciate the candor with which you have always discussed issues, and the fact that you have always been keenly aware of the responsibility the free press of America owes to our people. It is my hope that you will reexamine your editorial policy in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. RHODES,
Member of Congress.

Resolution Honoring Dr. Malcolm Y. Colby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Malcolm Y. Colby, a citizen of Austin, Tex., for many years, has just retired as professor of physics at the University of Texas after 34 years of dedicated and distinguished service in the field of higher education. During this period, Dr. Colby served as chairman of the department of physics at the university.

Indicating the high respect and regard which Texans have for Dr. Colby, the Senate of Texas passed a resolution by Senator Charles F. Herring, senator from the district in which I have the privilege of residing, honoring Dr. Colby.

The resolution as prepared by Senator Herring and as passed by the Senate of Texas is as follows:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 44

"Whereas the people of the State of Texas wish to acknowledge the debt they owe Dr. Malcomb Y. Colby, distinguished member of the faculty of the University of Texas, who has retired after 34 years of devoted service; and

"Whereby Dr. Colby served as chairman of the department of physics for many years; and

"Whereas in addition to his devoted service to the university, he was executive director of the War Research Laboratory during World War II which pursued research vital to the war effort and also served as counselor for the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies from 1953 to 1957; and

"Whereas Dr. Colby has been a source of inspiration to the many thousands of students who have come under his tutelage and they in turn have been greatly enriched by that association; and

"Whereas the State has derived immeasurable benefits from the many years of dedicated service of this devoted educator; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of 56th Legislature of the State of Texas to acknowledge the contribution to education of this outstanding man: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That when the senate adjourns today, it do so in his honor; and that a page in the permanent senate journal be devoted to the recording of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That an enrolled copy of this resolution be sent to Dr. Colby as a token of deep appreciation for the services he has rendered.

"BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate."

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on February 4, 1959.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Poison in Your Water—No. 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1958, entitled "Troubled Water," which describes the reasons for continuation of full appropriation of \$45 million to carry out the purposes of Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress as well as reasons for further increasing and extending that program.

Remember, this is the water that we drink.

The article is as follows:

TROUBLED WATER

It is astonishing that anyone in Washington with eyes—or a nose—could remain indifferent to the need for expanding pollution controls. The sludgy waters of the Potomac offer a shameful example of the kind of neglect of water resources that is now costing the United States an estimated \$1 billion a year. Yet in some hidden sanctuary of the Bureau of the Budget a decision has been made to terminate the promising Federal water pollution control program by 1960 and then dump the problem in the laps of the States. This would reverse legislation already passed by Congress, with administration support, calling for a 10-year, \$500 million incentive program to help communities develop sewage treatment plants.

Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, author of the pollution control legislation, is properly outraged by this turnabout. Today, Mr. BLATNIK's House Public Works Subcommittee begins hearing on new legislation to double the present grants of \$50 million a year—which would merely bring the program to the size originally contemplated. In the 2 years in which the program has already been operating, Mr. BLATNIK points out, \$76 million in Federal funds has helped finance 930 proj-

ects. State and local governments have put up \$274 million to match the Federal contribution—a ratio of \$5 in local funds for each Federal dollar. Surely this is an impressive demonstration of how badly the Federal incentive program was needed.

There is great need to conserve and cleanse the Nation's precious water resources. The problem is particularly pressing the Washington area, where the Potomac has become, in Mr. BLATNIK's rueful phrase, "the best-dressed cesspool in the country." Mr. BLATNIK's efforts to expand and continue the cleanup program should win wide support in Congress, and perhaps persuade the administration to acknowledge more realistically a problem literally under its nose.

Address by the Honorable Rex Bell, Lieutenant Governor of Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the address given by the Honorable Rex Bell, Lieutenant Governor of Nevada, at the Lincoln Day luncheon in Boise, Idaho, February 14, honoring the sesquicentennial birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.

The address follows:

My friends, it most assuredly is a pleasure for me to be with you, my neighbors, and it is a distinct honor for me to be invited by you to make a Lincoln Day address, for we in this Nation need very badly to refresh our minds on, and dedicate our hearts to, those things for which Abraham Lincoln stood. Returning to that philosophy and to the foundations on which the Republican Party was built, our Nation can remain safe and strong, the haven of the oppressed, the home of free enterprise, and the leader among those who believe in the dignity of man.

I come to you from Nevada, the fastest growing State in our Nation; the State with fewer laws, fewer taxes, fewer restrictions than are to be found in any State in our Union of States. Like you in Idaho, we in Nevada face the future unafraid, because both States are rich in natural resources, both States abound in opportunity for anyone who will work, and both of us are on the threshold of an era of prosperity.

We are pioneer States, frontier States, States where the spirit, the courage, and the fortitude of the men and women who blazed the trails of our Western civilization still abounds. We live close enough to those trailblazers who settled our valleys, crossed our mountains and built our civilization in this frontier to understand that if we fulfill our heritage, if we follow the trails they blazed when they built a State from the vastness of these mountains, if we keep faith with them, we are building a Nation as they built a State, that will be at once an inspiration to those who will follow us, and a safeguard to those who share with us this American way of life.

Abraham Lincoln, too, was a pioneer. He shared the hardships of those who tilled the virgin soils of the West. It was in the log cabin of the early settlers that he first learned those traditions upon which the Republican Party was founded. Abraham Lincoln might have been even closer to us, for he refused the office of secretary and Governor

of Oregon Territory, of which this great State was a part in 1849. Eleven years later he was nominated for the presidency on an anti-slavery platform as the standard bearer of the Republican Party. History tells us that 2 weeks from today, on February 28, the Republican Party will be 105 years old, for it was formed at Ripon, Wis., on February 28, 1854, and the first State organization of our party was at Jackson, Mich., on July 6, of that year.

Abraham Lincoln was the standard bearer of a 5-year-old political party, its first standard bearer when he was elected to the Presidency of the United States. Never before, and never since has a political party had a leader as was the first presidential candidate elected under the banner of the Republican Party.

Through the century of progress of our great Nation since Abraham Lincoln was elected to the Presidency, our party has furnished our country many of its great leaders, and I will have to include among them Dwight D. Eisenhower, who ended the Korean debacle, who brought us peace, who has kept us out of war, and has given our country its greatest era of prosperity. Never in the years that he has been in the White House has Dwight D. Eisenhower sacrificed the principles of freedom and liberty enunciated by the father of our party, Abraham Lincoln. That is a record of which he, we, and all Americans can be proud and one which we, as Republicans, should carry to the farthest corner of this Western country.

Abraham Lincoln was a child of the prairies, of the wide open spaces. The story of his rail-splitting feats is well known, he furnished the foundation on which the tracks were laid to reclaim the wilderness with the iron horse. As his country expanded and became greater and stronger, so did Abraham Lincoln. He typified the spirit of the pioneer, the dogged determination to overcome every obstacle, the determination to make this a country where man might enjoy the benefits of his own labor, and where what he did, not what he had, was the factor that determined his standing in his community and his chapter in the great history of this Nation.

The principles he enunciated, the platform on which he was first elected, and his loyalty to his belief in the dignity of the individual are the principles of the Republican Party, the party he founded, and they are principles upon which rest the very life of the greatest Nation in the world.

My own Nevada was battle born. Lincoln needed the two votes of Nevada's first Senators and the wealth of Nevada's mines to keep this a unified solid Nation. He proclaimed Nevada a State in 1864, we of Nevada are extremely proud of the part, under the guidance and leadership of Abraham Lincoln, we have played in our country's history.

Boise was a city before Virginia City in Nevada was struck. Idaho and Nevada stand side by side physically and in the story of our development. We became great because of the wealth of our natural resources and the determination of our pioneers.

Both of our States have contributed strong men to the development of the West, and both have furnished our legislative branch of the Government with men who left an indelible mark on the history of our country. Your Senator William Borah, "The Dean of the Senate", is one who should not be overlooked when we seek to point to a champion of the people.

My friends, in many spots in our Nation the Republicans were defeated in the elections of last November. In my own State, we have a Democrat as governor, and most of the State offices now are filled by the members of the Democratic Party. As a matter of fact, I was the only one in State government who survived the landslide in Nevada. Don't take the setback of 1958 too much to heart. A century ago, in 1858, Abraham

Lincoln suffered an equally humiliating defeat at the polls. That is right, 2 years before he was elected to the presidency for the first time, Mr. Lincoln was defeated for the U.S. Senate.

Let us here and now take a leaf from the rule book of the father of our party. He did not cry about his defeat, he did not moan, he did not predict either the end of the world or the end of the Nation. He went to work. He went to the people. He carried the cause of freedom and the love of liberty to the average American in his home. He stuck defiantly and bravely to his platform, freedom and the dignity of man. Two years after going down to defeat at the polls in Illinois, he was elected President of the United States of America. He sacrificed neither his principles, which were the principles upon which the Republican Party was born, nor his faith in the people. He knew, as we who follow in his footsteps should know, that freedom flourishes in the environment of peace, but that to remain free, a nation must be prepared to fight for and defend that freedom.

In Idaho, as in Nevada in 1958, the Republicans lost ground. Indeed the same was true throughout the Nation, save in exceptional instances. My friends, you and I, and all of us must be ready for 1960. We must emulate the Republicans of 100 years ago. We are followers of, devotees of, Abraham Lincoln. History must repeat itself in 1960. Defeated and maybe I can say discouraged in 1858, Abraham Lincoln went out and fought, and in 1860 won the shining victory that has meant so much to our Nation and the whole world.

It is a challenge to you in Idaho, it is a challenge to us in Nevada, it is a challenge to Republicans in every State in the Nation. Can we meet that challenge? Will you, each and every one of you, rededicate your lives to your party, as in time of stress and trouble, you dedicate it to your government.

My friends, it is just that serious. The Republican Party is your government. The principles of Abraham Lincoln are the principles which have made this Nation strong, safe, secure.

Your job and mine is to prove this to the people, our fellow Americans, what our party has done for our Nation, our national security, and for them as individuals. I am not afraid of the judgment of my fellow Americans. Nor should you be, my friends. My only fear, your only fear, your country's only danger lies with us, you and me, Republicans, Americans.

Let you and I make a solemn pledge to one another. I'll take the State pledge of Nevada, which is, "All for our country"; you take the State pledge of Idaho, which is, "Exist Forever." Let us join those two pledges under a common banner, the banner of the Republican Party. If we can persuade enough Americans that the principles of Abraham Lincoln that saved this Nation of ours in one of its most severe crises, we can make it exist forever. If we can prove to the people of our Nation that the freedom, prosperity, and equality that they enjoy are the principles of Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party, and they, like you and me, should be all for our country, then in 1960 we can return to the White House in Washington the standard bearer of the party of Abraham Lincoln, and indeed, my fellow Republicans, if we give all for our country it will, indeed, exist forever.

So let the spirit of the pioneers who built a nation from a wilderness give us the strength, the courage and the dogged determination to keep faith with the truly great father of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln. Your State leader, Governor Smylie, shows you that the Republican Party can win, does win, and will win in Idaho. His leadership should inspire you to go into

the farthest corners of your great State to preach the gospel of your party, to expound the principles of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. Study your leaders, remember William Borah and his inspired speeches in the U.S. Senate of which he was the dean when he died. Faith in your leadership, faith in your citizens, faith in yourself will carry your party to victory on every level in 1960.

Thumb through the pages of history, of your Nation and of your State. Your happiest days, the days of your greatest prosperity and progress and peace have been enjoyed when those dedicated to the principles of Abraham Lincoln sat in the White House. Just as truly and as bravely as the pioneers of Lincoln's day blazed the trails through your forests, established your communities that became your cities, fought your enemies and made Idaho a safe State in which to live, a good State in which to bring your children up in the American way of life, so you, inspired by their deeds, encouraged by what they accomplished, can go to your citizens of today and show them how closely this Nation's program of peace and prosperity, of equality and justice, is tied to the principles of Abraham Lincoln, and how, only with those principles to guide us, can we as a Nation of free people hope to live at peace with the world. We need not shed the blood of our sons and daughters on the field of battle to create a false prosperity or a false patriotism. We must be strong, we must be able to defend ourselves from all enemies, within and without. This we can do more readily and more safely if we are guided in our thinking by the principles of Abraham Lincoln. George Washington, the father of our country, created the American way of life. Abraham Lincoln saved it, and it is up to us, to you and to me, to preserve it.

Our task is not an easy one. But we in the West, still living on the frontier of opportunity, still close to the spirit of the pioneers, have the strength, the fortitude, and the ability to do it. Moreover, as Americans, we have a duty to perform, and that duty is to keep alive the American system of free enterprise, to preserve the dignity of our citizens, to offer opportunity to all to enjoy the fruits of his labor.

No clear thinking, honest American would change for 1 minute the motivating principles that inspired Abraham Lincoln to become one of the greatest liberators the world has ever known, a champion of all people. Those principles during the past century have seen kings and dictators overthrown and the entire world reach a new high in living. We, as a Nation are the envy of the world. We, as Americans, enjoy more freedom, a greater prosperity, a higher plane of life, than do the citizens of any nation. We paid a small price for that freedom. Humanity throughout the world struggles day after day to reach that goal, the goal that we sometimes hold too lightly. That goal was very simply stated by Abraham Lincoln as he stood on one of the battlefields of the war that preserved our unity as a Nation. I quote:

"That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

So, my friends, as I say goodbye to you for this time, let me remind you that you and I, as members of the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, have a solemn duty, a difficult task, to perform. Each of us, keeping faith with our country, our party, and our leader, must dedicate ourselves to the task that he so nobly performed, the task of keeping alive the high principles of the party of progress, of prosperity and of peace, the Republican Party. No mountain is too high for us to scale, no

river too swift for us to ford, no valley too wide for us to cross, no mining shaft too deep for us to invade to carry to the men and women of our great country the message of Abraham Lincoln and the principles for which he stood. If each one of us here tonight will do his or her part, if each of us will give the full measure of our devotion to this great cause, then on the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's election to the Presidency of the United States, we shall place in the White House a man of like faith, a man devoted to keeping this country peaceful and prosperous, where the dignity of man is preserved, and where people of all creeds and all faiths can live to enjoy the fruits of their labor, to educate their children, and hold in their hearts this thought from the second inaugural address of Abraham Lincoln:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

They did it a century ago, my fellow Republicans, and we can do it again in 1960. We in Nevada are young as a State, you in Idaho are even younger. We have the strength, the enthusiasm, the vitality of youth. We can point the way. We can, by diligence, perseverance, honest effort and ceaseless toil become the leaders of our party. In us, and those like us, lies the hope of the party of Abraham Lincoln, indeed I might say, the hope of the Nation.

As the pioneers of 1860 won their fight, so can we, the pioneers of 1960, win ours. The principles are the same, the challenge is the same. A united and a prosperous family of States, marching forward proudly and unafraid under a common banner, the Stars and Stripes. Let us beware of the hammer and the sickle, let us protect ourselves from the inroads of a Socialist state. Let us keep America free, by keeping alive within our hearts and our borders the thoughts, the principles, and the inspiration that gave our party Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, the true and faithful preserver of the American way of life, the greatest the world has ever known.

Thank you for bearing with me. We are neighbors. Come to visit Nevada when you will. You of Idaho and we of Nevada have much in common. We both are suffering from growing pains, but together we can become increasingly important to our great Nation. We, of the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, can do much to make the centennial of his first inauguration as important to our Nation as was his ascendancy to the Presidency by returning to the White House in 1860 a man who stands steadfast under his banner, and four square for the principles for which Abraham Lincoln gave the last full measure of his devotion. That is your duty, that is my duty, and with God's help, we shall not fail.

I thank you.

Interparliamentary Union Holds Its 47th Conference in Rio de Janeiro, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION HOLDS ITS 47TH CONFERENCE IN RIO DE JANEIRO, 1958

INTRODUCTION

The Interparliamentary Union which held its 47th Conference in Rio de Janeiro, July 24-August 1, 1958, is an international association which is presently composed of national groups from the parliaments of 55 nations. The object of the Union is to promote personal contacts between members of parliaments and to unite them in common action with a view to strengthening and developing democratic institutions; to advance work on behalf of peace and international collaboration; and to contribute to the development and progress of parliamentary institutions.

PART I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Interparliamentary Union was founded in Paris in 1889. Its first conference was held in June of that year with the participation of 49 deputies representing France, Great Britain, Belgium, Denmark, Hungary, Italy, Liberia, Spain, and the United States of America. In 1892, meeting at Bern, Switzerland, the conference decided to set up a central organ under the name of the "Interparliamentary Bureau for International Arbitration." And in 1894 the fifth Interparliamentary Conference, held at The Hague, adopted the Statutes for the new organization.

The headquarters of the Union were in Bern until 1911, in Brussels from 1911 to 1914, in Oslo from 1914 to 1920, and since 1921 its headquarters have been in Geneva. The permanent secretariat is located at 6 Rue Constantin, Geneva, Switzerland.

Eighteen plenary conferences were held before 1914, and the Union was the guest during this early period of all the great capitals of Europe. From the Bern meeting onward, it met in the Parliament buildings and was soon welcomed by the heads of states and their Ministers. The first meeting on American soil was held at St. Louis, Mo., in 1904. By the time of the outbreak of World War I the Union counted 26 national groups and 3,500 members. Its influence gradually increased over the years, especially in Europe, and its proceedings were followed with attention in governmental circles.

Prior to World War I, during which its activities were suspended, the Interparliamentary Union devoted itself primarily to the cause of peace and international arbitration. After that conflict the Union broadened its activities and undertook, first, to study and seek solutions for all questions of an international character considered suitable for settlement by parliamentary action; and, second, it began to make suggestions for the development of parliamentary institutions with a view to improving their operations and enhancing their prestige.

The Second World War again interrupted the annual conferences of the Interparliamentary Union, but nevertheless the Geneva bureau maintained the structure of the organization. Following the conclusion of that conflict the Union resumed its labors, strengthened by the entry of national groups from 19 countries, some of which had recently obtained their independence. Beginning in 1947 12 annual conferences have been held in the following cities: Cairo, Rome, Stockholm, Dublin, Istanbul, Bern, Washington, Vienna, Helsinki, Bangkok, London, and Rio de Janeiro.

Composition and structure

In 1958 the Interparliamentary Union was composed of 55 national groups constituted within the parliaments of the following countries: Albania, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Ceylon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indo-

nesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Arab Republic, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia. Only groups formed within the framework of a national parliament, or a parliament as an entity, may become members of the Union.

Within the Interparliamentary Union each national group has its own rules, officers, and secretariat. Groups are expected to exert a continuing influence within their respective parliaments in favor of the general objectives of the Union, and to take steps to secure action on the resolutions adopted by the Interparliamentary Conferences. The national groups also make a financial contribution to the Union, in accordance with a scale fixed by the Interparliamentary Council. Apart from their participation in the general activities of the Union, the national groups are encouraged to develop their mutual relations with each other on either a bilateral or a regional basis.

Organizations of a regional character also function within the framework of the Union. Such is the case of the Northern Interparliamentary Union founded in 1907, which comprises the three Scandinavian Kingdoms, Iceland and Finland. This regional Union holds periodic meetings at which questions of mutual interest are studied, but its members are equally active in supporting the work of the Interparliamentary Union itself. After the Second World War a similar regional body was established within what is known as Benelux, uniting the parliamentary groups of Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. At the 47th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, held at Rio de Janeiro in July, 1958, it was decided to constitute a Pan American Parliamentary Group composed of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, subject to their approval, and also a Latin American Parliamentary Group.

Structurally, the Interparliamentary Union operates through the annual Interparliamentary Conferences, which are held in different countries each year on the invitation of their parliaments; the Interparliamentary Council; the Interparliamentary Bureau; the Executive Committee; and seven standing study committees.

The Conferences speak for the Union on all problems falling within their scope. They do so by adopting resolutions which the national groups are expected to bring to the attention of their respective governments and parliaments. The agenda of the Conferences are fixed by the Council. They normally include a debate based on a report prepared by the Secretary General dealing with recent developments in the world situation, and a study of specific questions chosen by the Council. Apart from their deliberative role, the Conferences give their opinion on proposed amendments to the Statutes and are competent to elect the members of the Executive Committee on the basis of proposals made by the Council.

Each national group is entitled to appoint, to attend a conference, a number of delegates equal to a number of votes allocated to it by the Statutes. Article X of the Statutes stipulates in this respect that each group shall have a minimum of eight votes, with supplementary votes added in proportion to the size of the group and the population of the country which it represents. Voting within the union is thus representative of parliamentary opinion. The right to vote belongs to members of the Union who are present in person. They exercise this right individually and the votes can thus be divided within a single delegation.

The Interparliamentary Council, which is the directing organ of the Union, consists of two members from each regularly affiliated

national group. It is the responsibility of the Council to convene Interparliamentary Conferences, to fix their agenda, to approve the annual budget of the Union, to propose to the Conferences candidates for election to the Executive Committee, and to appoint the Secretary General. The President of the Interparliamentary Council is elected for a period of 3 years. He may be reelected for a further term of 2 years, after which he is no longer eligible.

The Executive Committee is the administrative organ of the Union and exercises the functions delegated to it by the Council in conformity with the Statutes. It supervises the work of the Interparliamentary Bureau, and is responsible for examining information received concerning the creation of new groups. The Committee is composed of nine members belonging to different countries. The President of the Council is ex-officio a member and President of the Committee. The eight other members are elected by the plenary conferences for a term of 4 years. The Statutes require that consideration must be given in these elections to the contribution made to the work of the Union by the candidate and his group and that an endeavor be made to ensure a fair geographical distribution.

The Interparliamentary Bureau is the secretariat of the Union. It maintains contact with the national Interparliamentary groups and encourages their formation. It is the responsibility of the Bureau to prepare the questions for submission to the Council and to the Conferences, and to organize all meetings held under the auspices of the Union. It executes the decisions of the Council and the Conferences. Its official organ is the Interparliamentary Bulletin, which appears four times a year in French and in English. In addition to its administrative tasks, the Bureau carries out, according to the instructions of the Council, a program of studies and publications. At the head of the Bureau is a Secretary General who is elected by the Council and who has under him a small permanent staff necessary to carry out the functions of the Bureau.

The work of the plenary Conferences is, as a general rule, prepared by the Standing Study Committees set up within the framework of the Union. There are seven of these committees as follows: Committee on Political and Organization Questions; Committee on Juridical Questions; Committee on Economic and Financial Questions; Committee on Non-Self Governing Territories and Ethnical Questions; Committee on Reduction of Armaments; Committee on Social and Humanitarian Questions; and Committee on Intellectual Questions. These Committees, on which all groups are entitled to be represented, meet some months before the Conferences and draft resolutions for submission to the latter. For the examination of the questions appearing in their agenda, the study committees have before them documents prepared by members of the Union, by the Interparliamentary Bureau, or by international institutions particularly concerned with the subject.

The officers of the Interparliamentary Union are as follows:

Honorary President: Viscount Stansgate, D.S.O., D.F.C. (Great Britain).

President of the Interparliamentary Council and of the Executive Committee: Prof. G. Codacci-Pisanelli (Italy).

Members of the Executive Committee: S. Braga (Brazil), Erik Hagberg (Sweden), N. A. Mikhailov (U.S.S.R.), I. A. Mulla (Iraq), R. G. Senanayake (Ceylon), Col. Sir Malcolm Stoddart-Scott (Great Britain), M. Zarroug (Sudan), A. Wahab Khan (Pakistan).

Secretary General: André De Bionay.

Member groups: Albania, America (United States of), Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France,

Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Great Britain, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Arab Republic, Vietnam, Yugoslavia.

Meetings and activities

Since its first meeting in Paris in 1889, the Interparliamentary Union has held 47 conferences of which the most recent was that in Rio de Janeiro in July 1958. The annual plenary meetings of the conference are open. The meetings of the Council and of the standing study committees (twice yearly) and of the executive committee (three times yearly) are closed. In 1959 the Union will meet in Warsaw and in 1960 in Tokyo. The seven standing subcommittees met at Nice in April 1957 and in Geneva in the spring of 1958.

Since its creation the Interparliamentary Union has examined, studied and debated most of the major problems of international relations. Up to 1914 the Union focused its efforts upon the promotion of arbitration and the rule of law in relations between states. Since World War I the Union has concerned itself with the development of international relations, the codification of international law, the reduction of armaments and the promotion of international security, economic and financial problems such as the control of international trusts and cartels, economic regional agreements, access to raw materials, and currency convertibility; the situation of non-self-governing territories, including the representation of the native population in the deliberative assemblies, and the development of trade unions and labor organizations in non-metropolitan territories; questions of social policy such as immigration and emigration problems, unemployment, the regulation of hours of work and vocational training, and the refugee problem; also cultural exchanges as a means of international understanding, and the removal of barriers to the unimpeded exchange of information; as well as the development and improvement of representative political institutions and parliamentary practices.

The activities of the permanent secretariat of the Union at Geneva include the technical examination of all international questions suitable for settlement by parliamentary action, the preparation of reports for, and the organization of, the annual conference and Council sessions, as well as the production of Union publications.

Publications

The publications of the Interparliamentary Union include the following:

1. Proceedings of Interparliamentary Conferences, published annually.
2. The Interparliamentary Union—Its Organization and Its Work, a 26-page brochure, Geneva, 1957.
3. The Interparliamentary Union: Statutes and Rules, Geneva, 1957.
4. The Annual Report of the Secretary-General.
5. The Interparliamentary Bulletin, a quarterly periodical which is the official organ of the Union.
6. Constitutional and Parliamentary Information, a quarterly review of constitutional law and parliamentary practice, published by the Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments with the collaboration of the Interparliamentary Bureau. Thirty-five numbers of this quarterly review have appeared to date.

Autonomous Section of Secretaries General of Parliaments

Founded in 1938 within the framework of the Union, the Autonomous Section of Secre-

taries General of Parliaments brings together the high officials of legislative assemblies.

The Section has its own organization, but its activities are financed from the Budget of the Union itself. The Statutes of the Section were adopted in Cairo in 1947. Its plenary assemblies and the sessions of its Executive Committee generally take place at the same time and in the same city as the Inter-Parliamentary meetings.

The object of the Section is to establish personal contacts between its members, to insure the regular exchange of information and documentation between them, and to encourage common study of the technical problems of parliamentary life.

The studies of the Section usually take the form of international inquiries, in which the secretariats of the different Parliaments take part. The following are among the subjects that have been treated: "The Administrative Organization of Parliaments"; "Parliamentary Immunity"; "Respect of the Law by Parliaments"; "Control of the Constitutionality of Laws"; "The Powers of the Chair in Legislative Assemblies"; "Parliamentary Committees"; "Delegated Legislation."

The Autonomous Section publishes, in French and English editions, a quarterly bulletin entitled "Constitutional and Parliamentary Information." This contains recent constitutional documents of different countries, as well as the results of inquiries conducted by the Section.

Under the direction of Lord Canning, former Clerk of the House of Commons, a comparative study, entitled "European Parliamentary procedure", was published in England in 1953, and was so successful that a French translation appeared in 1955.

The Section works in close association with the Union itself, which calls upon that body whenever it takes up a problem of parliamentary procedure.

Relations with United Nations and other international institutions

The Union maintains regular official relations with the United Nations Organization and its specialized agencies. It is one of the 10 nongovernmental international organizations upon which the Economic and Social Council has conferred category A consultative status. It also has consultative arrangements with the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

These links do not in any way limit the independence of the Union, but permit it to coordinate its activities with those of other international institutions, which have rapidly multiplied since the Union was created.

The Secretary General of the United Nations and the Directors General of the specialized agencies are regularly represented at the Conferences and working sessions of the Union, and cooperation also takes place at the secretariat level.

In addition, the Union maintains steady relations with regional assemblies of a parliamentary nature, such as the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and the European Coal and Steel Community. It is also in contact with the Organization of American States.

PART II. AMERICAN PARTICIPATION

The United States of America was a charter member of the Interparliamentary Union and has participated in its activities since 1889. The 12th Conference of the Union was held in St. Louis in 1904, and the 42d Conference was held in the Capitol at Washington, October 9-14, 1953.

Every Senator and Representative in Congress is ipso facto a member of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union. A former Member of Congress, who is or has been a member of the Council of the Union, may, on the recommendation of the American group, and the approval of the Council of the Union, become an honorary member

of the group. A former Member of Congress who has rendered distinguished service to the Union, may, upon the recommendation of the American group and the approval of the Council of the Union, become an honorary member of the group.

The officers of the American group, according to its bylaws adopted in 1932, shall be a president, three vice presidents, a secretary, a treasurer, an executive committee of nine members of which the president of the group shall be the chairman and two members of the Council of the Union. These officers hold office for each Congress or until their successors are elected.

In 1958 the officers of the American group were the following:

President: HON. DANIEL A. REED.
Vice presidents: HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY, HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, HON. ALEXANDER WILEY.

Secretary: HON. HENRY O. TALLE.
Treasurer: HON. W. R. POAGE.
Executive committee: HON. ALBERT GORE, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, JOHN M. VORYS, ANTONI N. SADLAK, THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., JOHN J. SPARKMAN, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, W. ROBERT POAGE, and DANIEL A. REED.

Council members: HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY and DANIEL A. REED.

The bylaws of the American group define the duties of its officers and provide for its meetings and activities. The group shall meet at least twice a year, one such meeting being the annual meeting of the group which shall be held on the third Monday of January.

Although all members of the U.S. Congress are ex officio members of the Interparliamentary Union, the American group is composed of a score of members who have taken an active interest in the union and its work. This group is organized with its own bylaws, and it is normally from this group that delegates to the annual conferences have been designated by its president.

For many years the United States has made an annual contribution to the Interparliamentary Union. This contribution now amounts to \$18,000 a year. Under an act of the 85th Congress an appropriation of \$33,000 annually has been authorized, \$18,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union; \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group for each fiscal year. This appropriation is disbursed on vouchers approved by the president and executive secretary of the American group.

PART III. THE RIO DE JANEIRO CONFERENCE

The United States was represented at the 47th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, held at Rio de Janeiro, July 24 to August 1, 1958, by a delegation composed of 4 Senators, 7 Representatives, and former Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan. The senatorial delegates were A. S. Mike Monroney, Francis Case, John D. Hobbittzell, Jr., and J. Allen Frear. The delegates from the House of Representatives were Henry O. Talle, chairman, acting for Daniel A. Reed, Hale Boggs, Kenneth B. Keating, W. Robert Poage, Katharine St. George, Antoni N. Sadlak, and Michael A. Feighan. Dr. Franklin Dunham served as secretary general of the American group and Dr. George B. Galloway as secretary of the delegation. Dr. Carl Marcy, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Dr. Charles J. Zinn, law-revision counsel, House of Representatives, accompanied the U.S. delegation as observers. Col. Charles R. Roderick, Maj. James M. Brower, and Maj. Sidney Kern (medical officer) served as Air Force attachés to the delegation and Mrs. Christine Gallagher as an attaché to the secretariat.

During the conference Representatives TALLE and POAGE represented the American group on the Executive Council of the Union

in the absence of Representatives COOLEY and REED.

Representatives of the American group on the standing study committees were as follows: Committee on Political and Organization Questions, Mr. KEATING; Committee on Juridical Questions, Judge Ferguson; Committee on Economic and Financial Questions, Mr. MONROE; Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and on Ethical Questions, Mrs. ST. GEORGE; Committee on Reduction of Armaments, Mr. CASE; Committee on Social and Humanitarian Questions, Mr. BOGGS; Committee on Intellectual Questions, Mr. FEIGHAN.

The Rio Conference, first of the IPU meetings ever held in South America, was attended by representatives of 47 Parliaments. The Conference was held in the Chamber of Deputies of the Brazilian Parliament and was opened on July 24 by an address of welcome from the President of Brazil, Hon. Juscelino Kubitschek. Prof. G. Codacci-Pisanelli (Italy), President of the Interparliamentary Council, presided at the opening sessions. Mr. Ranieri Mazzilli, Speaker of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies, was elected President of the Conference.

Conference agenda

The first 2 days of the meeting were devoted to general debate on the Secretary General's report. This report dealt in a comprehensive and objective manner with the multifarious developments of international relations in the various parts of the world during the past year.

Following the general debate on the Secretary General's report, the Conference devoted 4 days to the detailed consideration of four topics which had been scheduled for consideration, as follows:

1. "Principles Governing the Investment of Foreign, Private, or Governmental Capital in Countries in Process of Economic Development."
2. "The Strengthening of Peace: (a) The Problem of Atomic Weapons and Nuclear Tests. (b) The Possibility of Establishing an International Police Force."
3. "Cultural Relations Between Countries and Freedom of Information: (a) Cultural Agreements and Their Role in Improving Relations Between Peoples. (b) National and International Aspects of Freedom of the Press and Information."
4. "The Development of Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories."

Under the rules of the Conference each participating group was entitled to two 7½ minute speeches or one 10-minute speech on each agenda topic. The spokesmen for the United States during the debate on the Secretary General's report were Representatives TALLE and ST. GEORGE. On the topic of capital investment abroad Representative TALLE also spoke for the American group. Our second speaker on this topic was to have been Senator MONROE, but his legislative duties in Washington delayed his arrival at the conference beyond the day assigned to this topic. On the topic of "Strengthening the Peace" the American spokesmen were Representatives POAGE and KEATING. On "Cultural Relations Between Countries and Freedom of Information," the U.S. speakers were Representative BOGGS and Senator CASE. On the subject of "Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories" our speakers were Representatives FEIGHAN and SUDLAK. Their speeches are reproduced below.

The seventh day of the Conference was devoted to meetings of the several standing study committees mentioned above. And the final day was taken up with the reports of the study committees and the voting on the resolutions which had been drafted by the Inter-Parliamentary Council. At the conclusion of the Conference on August 1, Judge Ferguson voiced the thanks and ap-

preciation of the congressional delegation for the hospitality of the Government and people of Brazil and evaluated the achievements of the Conference.

Some high spots of the Rio Conference

The Rio Conference was marked by several dramatic episodes. On the first day, as soon as the opening ceremonies were concluded, the chief Soviet delegate, Alexander P. Volkov, a deputy of the Supreme Soviet, raised the Middle East theme on a point of order. On behalf of his delegation he offered a resolution condemning United States and British aggression in the Middle East and insisting that the Middle East question be added to the Conference agenda. On the previous evening the Council of the Union had voted down a Soviet proposal for a resolution demanding measures to safeguard peace in the Middle East. But the Soviet delegation reopened the subject at the plenary session on the first day of the Conference. This proved to be merely a tactical maneuver to gain the spotlight.

The Soviet delegation, which made repeated efforts during the Conference to obtain at least a full debate on, if not approval, of a resolution demanding the withdrawal of United States and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan, failed in that endeavor.

Along with assertions that Moscow had unilaterally halted nuclear weapons tests, the Soviet group made the Middle East question a major propaganda theme in the Conference. In a farewell speech on the final day the chief Soviet delegate, Mr. Volkov, said that he "regretted" that the meeting had failed to say anything about this "most acute problem of the day."

On the final morning of the Conference delegates from 47 Parliaments on both sides of the Iron Curtain unanimously approved a resolution urging the speedy resumption of big power disarmament talks, preferably within the United Nations, stressing that one of the most urgent aims would be the ending of nuclear weapons tests under proper international control.

They also approved a resolution calling for the establishment on a permanent basis of an international police force. This proposal was opposed, however, by the Soviet Union and Soviet satellites as well as by Yugoslavia and a number of individual delegates. The vote was 371 to 104 with 50 abstentions.

In all its resolutions the Conference addressed an appeal to the national parliaments belonging to the Union to urge their governments to carry out the Rio resolutions.

Over the opposition of the British and Australian groups and a majority of the French delegation, the Conference approved an "anticolonialist" amendment by Chile to a resolution on the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories.

In this connection one of the most dramatic events of the Conference was the address by Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, who spoke on the draft resolution concerning the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories. Mr. FEIGHAN called attention to "the new colonialism," under the yoke of which, he said, "a long array of politically mature and well established nations, which today are non-self-governing, have been deprived of their free political institutions and whose representative parliamentary bodies have been destroyed." Mr. FEIGHAN charged that "this new colonialism, this new imperialism, has forcefully incorporated no less than 20 once free, democratic and independent nations into its empire. This new imperialism," he said, "seeks to accommodate the rising tide of nationalism by spuriously proclaiming that these nations are independent." After calling attention to the recent popular uprisings in three of these non-self-governing nations—East Germany, Poland, and Hungary—Mr. FEIGHAN proposed

that the draft resolution "be amended to reflect the urgent need for developing procedures whereby the people of these once free and independent nations might be accorded the opportunity, under the supervision of the United Nations, freely to determine the substance as well as the form of their government." Subsequently, Mr. FEIGHAN's amendment was considered at length in the standing committee having jurisdiction of that subject, but further action on it was deferred to the Warsaw Conference next year.

The Rio Conference also unanimously approved a resolution urging greater international cultural relations and exchanges. The Soviet bloc and French Communist deputies abstained on sections of this resolution on freedom of the press and information.

Another development of special interest to the nations of the Western Hemisphere was a special meeting held during the Conference and attended by members of the delegations of the parliamentary groups from the Argentine, Brazil, Chile, United States of America, Haiti, Panama, Paraguay, and Peru. This meeting was called to consider the desirability of the formation of a regional Pan American Parliamentary Group within the framework of the Interparliamentary Union. It was argued that the formation of such a Pan American Parliamentary Group would improve the participation of the Western Hemisphere at the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union and, furthermore, that it would provide a medium for the advance study of the topics on the agenda of the annual conferences of the Union. It was urged, on the one hand, that the new regional group should be confined to the nations of Central and South America and, on the other hand, that it should include the United States and Canada. The first viewpoint was expressed by spokesmen from the Argentine and Chile. The chairman of the United States Group assured those present that the United States group would not be offended if it were not invited to participate in a new Pan American parliamentary body. It was finally decided to call together both a Pan American and a Latin American Parliamentary Group, subject to the approval of their respective governments, and that both groups should meet in Lima, Peru, if possible, within 90 days after the conclusion of the 47th Interparliamentary Conference. There is no assurance that the Interparliamentary Union will accept the affiliation of any limited regional group. In 1956 an attempt was made to organize such a group in the Far East, but it never received recognition as an affiliate of the Union and was subsequently disbanded.

However, an American Interparliamentary group representing all the countries of the Western Hemisphere, apparently, is looked upon favorably by the Interparliamentary Union and a call has gone out to form such a group at Lima, Peru, meeting to take place March 5-10, 1959. The U.S. group has been asked to send at least one voting delegate.

Resolutions adopted

"I. On the Necessity To Convene a Summit Conference To Relax International Tension

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Noting the urgent need to lessen the threat of a new war and to improve the prospects for a lasting peace;

"Considering that the fulfillment of this task largely depends on statesmen of all countries and above all on those of the great powers;

"Wholeheartedly supports the idea of holding, after adequate preparation, a summit conference of representatives of states to discuss the most urgent international problems in the interest of easing international tension;

"Calls upon the parliaments of all countries to take the necessary measures facilitating an early convocation of such a conference.

"II. The Principles Governing the Investment of Foreign Private or Governmental Capital in Countries in Process of Economic Development"

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Recognizing the fact that some countries in process of economic development, more especially those which have recently achieved their independence, have not adequate capital to carry out the task of developing their economic resources to the full;

"Conscious of the reality that, within the next few years, proper development of many countries of the world toward economic independence will require investment of vast amounts of foreign capital, and realizing that no nation alone is capable of properly financing either the funds or goods required to carry out such a program over many years, which would be the best means of securing solidarity between the developed and underdeveloped countries;

"Recognizing the fact that assistance to underdeveloped countries must always be provided in the interests of the indigenous peoples themselves and must therefore be free from strings and conditions which in any way limit the sovereignties of such peoples;

"Considering that foreign capital, private or governmental, must serve as an auxiliary source for financing the economic development of underdeveloped countries while the basic role for providing such facilities belongs to their own resources, and only in the latter case can the economically underdeveloped countries genuinely insure the independent development answering their national interests;

"Considering that loans and financing, either through international sources, government to government, or private investment at fixed terms and at reasonably low bank rates, for the building up of basic resources and facilities, and for the development of industry, are the best means of achieving a mutually beneficial result;

"Appreciating the assistance which has been forthcoming through the specialized agencies of the United Nations and through various bilateral aid and loan programs, but regretting that these programs have been uncertain as to their continuation and scope, thereby making long-range planning and practical financing difficult;

"Realizing that an essential preliminary to large-scale investment is the carrying out of financial and technical studies of projects and resources;

"Conscious of the decision taken by the United Nations at the 12th session of the General Assembly in December 1957 to set up a special fund specifically for such preliminary surveys to facilitate new capital investment;

"Conscious of the need to follow up such surveys in appropriate cases by the large-scale provision of financial aid and long-term loans at low rates of interest, by means of international banking mechanisms, through existing auxiliary organs of the United Nations, on a government-to-government basis or in other ways;

"Conscious also of the need to create an atmosphere of mutual confidence between lending and borrowing countries, its lack having heretofore prevented as adequate an increase as desirable of the flow of capital to the underdeveloped countries;

"Calls upon parliaments of all members of the IPU to urge upon their governments—

"1. That the fullest support should be given to the work of the United Nations in this field;

"2. That, wherever required, financial and technical surveys and studies of projects and resources be provided to the less developed countries with a view to enabling their development along healthy and sound lines;

"3. That multilateral financing of long-term development projects of underdeveloped nations is to be recommended over such financing on a bilateral basis;

"4. That, wherever feasible, such financing should be arranged through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and/or through other international banking institutions to be established for such purpose, either as auxiliary organs of the UN or otherwise;

"5. That the conclusion, between all the countries concerned, of an 'International Code of Investments' defining the conditions of equitable treatment for both lenders and borrowers, should at the same time be sought for the protection of private investment;

"6. That respect of the provisions of this code be assured by recourse of private investment, in case of dispute, to an international court of justice and guaranteed by the creation of an International Fund set up under the auspices of the United Nations.

"III. The Strengthening of Peace

"(a) The Problem of atomic weapons and nuclear tests

"The 47th Inter-Parliamentary Conference—

"Conscious of the overwhelming desire of all peoples for an honorable and lasting settlement of the grave differences that intensify distrust, anxiety and tension between nations;

"Believing that the continuing accumulation of armaments of all types, nuclear and conventional, represents a serious threat to security and peace; and

"Noting the profound concern of the peoples of the world about the continuing nuclear weapons tests;

"Believing also that nuclear energy should be developed exclusively for peaceful purposes;

"Taking into consideration the urgent necessity of eliminating all harmful consequences of nuclear tests for human life and health;

"Stressing the great responsibility for the people's future which rests with the Parliaments of various states and with the Inter-Parliamentary Union;

"Recalling the resolution adopted unanimously by the 45th Interparliamentary Conference at Bangkok in 1956;

"Reaffirming in particular the belief that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive disarmament agreement, including measures of conventional and nuclear disarmament and the reduction of armed forces under effective international inspection and control, attention should be given to the possibility of agreeing on the first installment of internationally controlled disarmament which could be put into effect with the least possible delay;

"Deeply regretting that no resolution containing proposals which were in harmony with that belief, submitted to the 12th Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, commanded unanimous support;

"Taking into account also that the cessation of nuclear tests might slow the arms race and would further a solution of the entire problem of disarmament;

"Appeals urgently to parliaments of all members of the IPU to recommend to governments in the strongest possible terms that speedy action be taken to secure resumption of disarmament negotiations, preferably within the framework of the United

Nations, and that one of the most urgent aims of such negotiations should be to secure without delay the cessation, under proper international control, of nuclear weapons tests.

"(b) The possibility of establishing an International Police force

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Believing that the institution of a permanent International Police force charged with the task of insuring collective security is highly desirable;

"Is of the opinion that the establishment of such a force should be effected under the aegis of the United Nations;

"And urgently appeals to all parliaments represented within the Union to recommend that their respective governments take all possible steps to establish an International Police force on a permanent basis.

"IV. Cultural Exchanges Between Countries and Freedom of Information

"(a) Cultural agreements and their role in improving relations between peoples

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Recognizing the importance and growing volume of international cultural relations, as well as the interest which is shown in their development, and with the object of reaching a better understanding between different countries so as to facilitate the establishment of favorable conditions for peace and for durable friendship between them;

"Stressing the need for eliminating all obstacles which hamper the freedom of cultural exchanges;

"Considering that men living in all countries of the world, by reciprocal appreciation of their cultural achievements and by assimilating the best and most progressive of them in the various national cultures, can learn to understand more completely and deeply the life of other peoples, to respect their originality and national traditions, and to enrich each other spiritually;

"Upholding the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on February 21 and November 28, 1957, stating that wider international cooperation in cultural and scientific matters must be encouraged by agreements and other means, and that no effort should be spared to achieve those noble objectives;

"Taking note of the resolution adopted by the 44th Interparliamentary Conference on the conditions for a true peaceful coexistence between the nations and the resolution adopted at the Ninth General Conference of UNESCO;

"Appeals to all Interparliamentary groups to work for the realization of the UNESCO project on mutual appreciation of cultural values of countries of the East and West;

"Invites all Interparliamentary groups to contribute to the furtherance of regular intellectual exchanges between states as a means toward the conclusion of bilateral, regional, and multilateral agreements on cultural and scientific relations, and also on other forms of cultural exchanges, such as visits and sojourns of students, pupils, and young workers;

"Recommends the creation of administrative bodies and special parliamentary groups for the promotion of a reciprocal policy of cultural relations in those countries where such organs do not already exist;

"Hopes that the member groups of the Inter-Parliamentary Union will use their influence on their respective governments in the sense of the present resolution.

"(b) National and international aspects of freedom of the press and information

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Desiring to safeguard the right to freedom of expression and opinion as defined in article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

"Recalling the previous resolutions adopted on the subject by the Interparliamentary Union, the United Nations General Assembly, particularly on November 3, 1947, and the Ninth General Conference of Unesco.

"Declaring that this liberty implies the right, either active or passive, to information through radio, film, television, as well as by books, gramophone records and the press itself;

"Considering that it is of importance to guarantee more effectively the free exchange of objective and nondistorted news, the protection of sources of information, the liberty of movement of foreign correspondents and the physical, social and spiritual security of personnel in the information services;

"Believing that it is necessary to guard against the maltreatment of news by a more equitable distribution of those means which guarantee the full right to information, impartially disseminated, by the development of professional techniques and by national and regional information bodies, which act as important auxiliaries in promoting economic and social progress in those countries which are lacking in this respect, as well as by the creation of councils, both national and international, for purposes of control and arbitration, and designed to bring about respect for different shades of opinion and to eliminate all abuses and rectify errors;

"Stressing the necessity for encouraging the development of intellectual exchanges, the formation of specialized personnel, the creation of educational centers and the consolidation of scientific, cultural, technical and sporting links;

"Affirming the desire to continue its efforts toward the removal of obstacles hampering the free flow and integrity of information;

"Condemning the use of false news which would be its very nature encourage hatred and provoke war, or would lead to the use of nuclear energy for other than peaceful purposes;

"Appeals to its member groups to have adopted in their respective parliaments the necessary measures for a free exchange of news, of information and publications between research institutes, libraries and cultural associations, as well as the free circulation of educational material and travel of persons journeying for journalistic or scholarly ends;

"Invites the representatives of the different countries to approach the competent authorities with a view to putting an end to all restrictions on the exchange of ideas, particularly by aiding in the intensification of action already taken by United Nations organs and specialized agencies in the technical field, and to achieve durable cooperation between the Governments and the professions in question;

"Requests that everything possible be done, either by adherence to international agreements or modification of national laws, to facilitate, in conditions of loyal reciprocity, exchanges of information likely to serve the cause of international peace and promote better understanding among nations as well as among individuals;

"Resolves to appeal to the members of the Union to adopt, in their respective parliaments, the necessary measures to make means of communication accessible to all branches of opinion in such a way that information does not become a privilege or a way of controlling public opinion.

"V. The Development of Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories

"The 47th Interparliamentary conference—

"Believing that the progressive development of representative democratic institu-

tions in non-self-governing territories is of the highest importance for the emancipation of the peoples of those territories;

"Underlining the importance of the obligations laid down in chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations in which states administering such territories are required to 'develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions';

"Convinced that the aim of extending universal suffrage to all non-self-governing territories is directly in line with the ideals and aims of the Interparliamentary Union;

"Appeals to the National Parliamentary Groups of the States responsible for the government of such territories to promote and encourage within their respective parliaments legislation which would have as its object the building up of truly democratic assemblies in non-self-governing territories;

"And proposes:

"1. Rejection of all forms of colonial rule and subjection exercised by force upon the independence and freedom of another country;

"2. Solidarity with all colonized countries which have already obtained their freedom, as well as with all who still fight for their autonomy;

"3. Establishment of an international procedure which would guarantee to peoples desiring to become free of foreign tutelage that the substitution of foreign authorities by self-government would not be detrimental to human rights and the institutional forms of coexistence;

"4. Necessity for those governments, and particularly their parliaments, to be formed as the result of free elections—the only way in which legitimate power can be conferred and the people represented."

GENERAL DEBATE ON THE SECRETARY GENERAL'S REPORT

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE (United States of America). Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, this is indeed a very proud moment for me, a moment which I regard as something of the order of a day of fulfillment. From my childhood days I read about South America and her fascinating history and her remarkable people. Seven years ago I had the opportunity to visit every country in this great continent, and I was so pleased with all I saw of resources, and especially of the people, of this great country that I redoubled my efforts in the hope that the day might not be far away when the countries in this great continent would be a stimulating force in the Inter-Parliamentary Union. I must therefore say to Senhor Braga that I owe him a very great debt of gratitude for his remarkable endeavors in this field.

I want to say "thank you" for myself and for the delegates of the United States of North America to everyone who has had a part in making this conference possible; and I bring to you the cordial greetings of my dear and beloved friend, DANIEL A. REED, of New York, who is serving his fourth year as president of the U.S. group. For very good reasons it is not possible for him to appear here, and so I speak on his behalf in bringing to you greetings and all good wishes for the improvement and lasting future of our great organization.

I should like to say that when your distinguished President who addressed us in an inspiring manner this morning visited the Capital of the United States he left an excellent impression and we hope that he will return to us, for we are glad to have him as a visitor.

It would, of course, be very easy, were there time for it, to rhapsodize about the beauty of this country and especially this city, your beaches, your buildings, and all of these beautiful things we see by day and

night, and, of course, it would be very easy to speak in hushed tones about the reverence which is exuded by the sacred statue of the Redeemer high on your mountain top. There is not time for that and I will proceed with my message.

The people of Brazil and, indeed, all of the Latin American countries, and the people of the United States of North America have many common historic ties. All of us were colonists of European powers, most of us share the traditions of a struggle for independence, we adhere to the same spiritual and moral principles and we share the same aspirations. We all have republican governments, and our constitutions are similar. In many ways we share a common ambition for the New World from which so many vigorous ideas have sprung. Indeed, today we are equal partners in a 21-nation organization, the Organization of American States, and we are good partners, friends, and neighbors. President Eisenhower once characterized our Pan American system, and I quote, as "the most successfully sustained venture in international community living the world has ever known."

I must, at this point, say "Thank you," to our Secretary General and his staff. The task they perform is an exceedingly difficult one, they do their work well. Obviously not all of us can be pleased with everything we read in this remarkable report, but I should not like to compete with him in his difficult work. In the Interparliamentary Union the cultivation of better understanding between nations is the ideal for which we strive. To achieve such understanding we must largely rely on the free flow of information within our respective states, and among our states.

I am immensely pleased to find on the agenda two topics which interest me very much. In the first place, national and international aspects of freedom of the press and information. Having devoted many years of my life to the field of education, I am also deeply interested in cultural exchanges, another item on the agenda. At no time in our country has it been so easy for the American citizen, indeed any citizen, to acquire information and wider knowledge of the world and deeper understanding of its problems. He can sit in his easy chair and listen to discussions of the critical issues by some of the country's most astute thinkers. By such listening he can evaluate and compare. This is true not only of my own country but of many other countries. Referring specifically to my own, there are about 11,500 daily and weekly newspapers and about 6,000 weekly, monthly, and quarterly periodicals, there are 2 nationwide press associations, there are 4 radio networks, 3,000 radio and television stations. These media are not in any single ownership by no manner of means; the ownership is widely diversified and there is no monopoly of ownership or control. Under our own Constitution Congress is prevented from interfering with freedom of speech, there are various State constitutions which stipulate that every citizen has the right to speak freely on any subject matter whatsoever, and the history of freedom of the press of the United States antedated the adoption of the U.S. Constitution.

I regret that there is so little time, but I do not want to take time from anyone else and so I close with cordial greetings to all of you and look forward to a very happy conference.

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE (United States of America). Mr. President and fellow delegates, those of us who come from the Western Hemisphere are especially proud and happy to be here at the first Conference ever to be held in one of our great sister Republics of South America. The friendship and hospitality of the Government and people of Brazil will long be remembered by all members of this Inter-Parliamentary Union, but

especially by those members who belong to other American Republics.

Again this year we come to the Conference fortified by the report of our distinguished Secretary General. I have now attended three of these Conferences and I am more amazed today than ever at this report and all that it covers. Almost every detail of the history and the politics of the nations who are members of this Conference is covered. It is true that world history is moving with great rapidity today and that some extremely significant events have happened since the report was written. At the very opening of the report the Secretary General writes:

"Considering the world situation from the point of view of relations between the great powers an impression of stability is gained, albeit of a superficial nature only. No sign can be seen of any sustained rapprochement, but neither has any direct initiative been taken affecting a status quo which, for the time being, the parties concerned seem to have tacitly accepted."

This situation has changed for the worse and it is devoutly to be hoped that out of the deliberations of this Conference we can achieve a "modus vivendi" that will gradually bring the nations of the world to a true belief that peace cannot be achieved without understanding and tolerance. All nations yearn for peace and it is for us who are members of this Conference to strive mightily for this end.

The Report deals at some length with the problems of atomic tests. Here misunderstandings still prevail and are perhaps those most conducive to disaster. In this field real discipline and self-control must be created. It is impossible to expect one side to abandon tests until positively assured that the other side will do likewise. This is a poor time and place to indulge in demagoguery, and it was disappointing yesterday to hear accusations that the United States and Great Britain were threatening to use atomic bombs. We know of no such threat but we do know that the present head of the Soviet Union said: "We will bury you," to an interviewer from the West. This may have been meant as a joke, but some of us may not find it very funny.

The situation in the Middle East is threatening, but American and British troops are in Lebanon and Jordan only because they were called upon by those two small and free nations for the protection which had been promised them in case of need. We are taking nothing from Lebanon or Jordan. We will not murder people to whom safe conducts have been given. We will help them to maintain their freedom, at their request, because we gave them a solemn promise to that effect and we will keep that pledge. As to oil interests, it is almost silly to mention them. The United States and South America have enough petroleum products to supply the free world for years, if not centuries, to come.

The fact that so many nations today are mere satellites is disheartening in the extreme. The Report quotes Mr. Spaak in reference to NATO in the following words:

"The day when there were no longer any discussions between them would be the day when, having accepted one government as leader, the other governments would be no more than mere satellites—and the alliance would have no further reason for existing."

Again we are confronted by the fact that words do not mean the same thing to all people. Even such words as peace and freedom are not the same in all languages.

Our Secretary General is impartial in his thinking and his writing. This, of course, brings us sometimes to the philosophy of "a plague on both your houses," which is not what we enjoy hearing even though it may be good for the soul.

This report is a great document not only today but for the future when many of us, we hope many of a younger generation, will read and study it with interest and profit as a true and impartial picture of our times. The report also includes the preliminary documents that make up the agenda that we, in this year of grace 1958, considered of the greatest importance.

Since our last Conference in London the clouds that menace and surround parliamentary governments all over the world have not lifted. On the contrary, they have become blacker and more dangerous. On that occasion I spoke somewhat pessimistically about the future of our parliamentary systems. I regret that very little has happened since the London Conference to alter any of these opinions. One thing did happen, however, at our Geneva Conference, which I feel was encouraging, and to which I intend to address myself at this time. On this occasion the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories, presented in the name of the Committee a resolution on "the Development of Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories" and this item has been put on the agenda for this Conference. Now, why can we feel that this resolution is an encouraging sign? First, because it shows the world that we believe in representative government as the ultimate toward which all peoples strive. Secondly, because we believe that representative government is capable of growth and improvement. And this is perhaps the most important part of all. Any philosophy, whether of government or of any other science, that becomes static and incapable of change or growth is destined to wither and die.

Finally, I would recommend to you the words of a former President of my country, Herbert Hoover, who said recently in Brussels:

"We must unceasingly strive by all peaceable means to make the world safe for representative government. From representative government alone can come respect for your dignity as men and women, your flowering as individuals, your rights to a rising chance in life, to self-expression, and to security from sodden uniformity."

Foreign investment in underdeveloped countries

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE (United States of America). We are gathered today to consider basic issues relating to the role of foreign investment in economic development. I submit that the most direct and significant point of reference for the formulation of a set of principles of foreign investment is to be found in the last four words of the topic of this session. The principles we arrive at will depend in large measure upon our understanding and interpretation of the phrase "process of economic development."

There is the totalitarian road to development. Countries that follow this path seek to advance industrially at the expense of the freedom and liberties of their peoples. Through propaganda, subversion, and more recently, through ostensibly favorable credit terms, they pursue international policies designed to weaken and undermine the independent sovereignty of other nations.

Very different is the democratic process of development based on individual freedom to work, to spend, to save, and to invest. With the demands of modern life and unsettled world conditions, the governments of democratic countries have come to play a much larger role than in earlier periods in promoting economic progress. But this role continues to be nourished in the traditions of free institutions.

All countries, from the most industrially advanced to the relatively backward, are confronted with the problem of obtaining an adequate supply of savings for capital expansion, without which economic progress is

not possible. It is to the interest of all the nations of the free world, since they are economically interdependent, that favorable conditions are created for tapping the sources of savings at home and abroad with which to assure economic growth. These conditions must meet the varying needs of countries in different states of development.

The foreign economic policies and programs of the United States recognize the importance both of the principle of interdependence and the principle of diversity of countries in various stages of economic development.

In the interests of our own economy and those of the rest of the free world, we have endeavored to stimulate foreign investment through such a governmentally owned corporation as the Export-Import Bank. Our oldest public institution in this field, it has loaned over \$9 billion for development purposes in more than 50 countries. These loans, both to private borrowers and governments, have helped finance, on a sound business basis mutually beneficial to borrower and lender, power-generating installations, transportation facilities, manufacturing plants, and the extraction industries. Only recently the lending authorization of the Export-Import Bank was increased by \$2 billion.

The United States is proud of the role it has played in promoting the flow of foreign investment through its participation in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and in strengthening the international currency system through its membership in the International Monetary Fund. The World Bank has successfully promoted the international flow of capital for productive projects either by lending funds directly, guaranteeing loans made by others, or by participating in such loans. The gross total of loans that the Bank has made to 46 countries amounts to \$3.5 billion.

Closely affiliated with the World Bank is the International Finance Corporation. It was established in 1956 to overcome two limitations on the Bank's ability to finance a greater number of private development projects—the lack of equity investment in projects and the requirement that loans made to a private firm be guaranteed by the government of its country. With the removal of these obstacles, the International Finance Corporation aims to demonstrate that soundly conceived private investment projects in less-developed areas can be sufficiently attractive to stimulate a much larger flow of private capital into these areas.

About a year ago the United States set up the Development Loan Fund to extend long-range financing to underdeveloped countries. The Fund is not in competition with private investment, nor is it competing with the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank. It aims to facilitate the financing of meritorious developmental projects that have difficulty in obtaining the necessary funds. Many of the less-developed countries have a limited capacity to service dollar loans on the terms required by the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank. Under the more flexible terms of the Loan Fund, repayments can be made in local currencies as well as dollars. It can operate with greater flexibility not only because it recognizes the necessity of repayments in terms of local currencies, but because it can also finance either private or governmental projects on an adjustable basis for as long as 40 years.

This brief review of the major governmental programs to stimulate the flow of investment into developmental projects serves to remind us that a variety of financial tools, public and private, has been proved necessary to meet diverse capital needs. But experience has also shown that in the interests of all of the countries of the free world it is imperative that the economic growth of the underdeveloped areas be ac-

celerated. Such advance depends not only on the readiness of the more industrialized nations to expand the flow of capital to these areas, but also on what the peoples of these countries do for themselves. Their progress depends on the adoption of measures which would encourage investment from inside as well as from outside the country. I have in mind control of inflation, planning for balanced economic growth and administrative and legislative actions that permit the inflow of capital, equipment and services and the outflow of reasonable earnings.

The technically less advanced countries appreciate more than ever before the importance of capital investment in promotion of economic progress. They frequently place their main hope for such progress on the obtaining of capital from abroad. But the flow of capital depends on the existence of certain basic political and social conditions without which private investment cannot operate. In addition, capital requires technical and managerial skills for effective utilization, a working force that is adaptable to changes in technology, and the development of adequate marketing and credit institutions.

The more advanced industrial nations must also provide more favorable conditions for expanding the role of private domestic investment in underdeveloped areas. The United States has taken a number of steps in this direction. These include the maintenance of information and counseling services for potential investors, as well as strengthened government staffs overseas, equipped to understand the importance of foreign investment. The International Cooperation Administration, which provides insurance against loss arising from inconvertibility of local currency earnings, expropriation and war risks, has been steadily expanding its guarantee program. The Government has also negotiated an increasing number of bilateral treaties designed to protect more adequately the interests of private investors. It has also provided tax incentives for overseas investment, although more can be done in this field.

In closing, I should like to refer briefly to the draft resolutions relating to the agenda for this session. The recent events in the Middle East point up all the more the need for strengthening the economies of underdeveloped areas, especially those which have recently achieved their independence. The draft resolution calls upon the Parliaments to adopt the principle of multilateral financing of long-term development projects of underdeveloped nations as against such financing on a bilateral basis. The implications of Resolution No. 3 are far-reaching. The proposal involves the establishment of another international organization with subscription of a substantial amount of funds by many different countries. There are many practical difficulties in the creation of additional institutions for multilateral financing, which require further study if we are to build solidly. Also, may I remind you that there are many experts in the field of foreign investment, including many in the countries receiving investments, who are equally convinced that in the present stage of assistance to underdeveloped areas the bilateral approach has so much merit that it should not deliberately be consigned to a place of secondary importance, as is implied in the draft resolution before us. I, therefore, suggest for your consideration that this resolution be modified to provide for further study of the subject.

The problems of atomic weapons and nuclear tests

Hon. W. R. POAGE, Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, everyone seems to agree that it would be highly desirable for all nations to suspend further atomic tests, and indeed to agree to forego the use of nuclear weapons. I think we can also agree on the desirability

of greatly reducing and eventually eliminating all of the military establishments of all types and character throughout the world. In fact, my own country, the United States of America, at the close of World War II, demobilized more than 10 million men. No nation has ever carried out such an extensive demobilization, nor has the Soviet Union, the only other great power with such a large establishment, demobilized to a comparable extent, even though more than a dozen years have now elapsed. We do not know the exact size of the Russian military establishment today, but it is undoubtedly comparable, or even larger than the establishment of all the balance of the world combined. Possibly this tremendous manpower is locked up in unproductive work, because the communistic rulers feel that they do not need to devote the skills and labor of this great force for the improvement of the standard of living of their people. In my country we feel that we need to devote the labor and the skill of our young men to constructive undertakings—to the further improvement of the standards of living of our people and of all the people of the world.

Indeed, it seems to us that, desirable as it may be to limit the testing and the use of atomic weapons, it is even more desirable to reduce the wasteful use of manpower through the maintenance of conventional weapons.

The United States of America has repeatedly expressed its willingness and desire to restrict all types of armaments—both atomic and conventional—but no intelligent person could expect or want us to abandon any weapons without some dependable assurance that the U.S.S.R. will do likewise, and will do it at the same time. Nor do we ask of the Soviet anything which we are unwilling to extend to them. We would no more think of asking the U.S.S.R. to accept our unsupported promises to abandon weapons than we would accept their unsupported promises.

We recognize that the whole buildup of men and weapons throughout the world is the result of lack of confidence in the sincerity and good will of our neighbors. We hope that the time may soon come when all people will feel as secure against their neighbors as I believe the United States and the people of Canada feel, each as regards the other, but until that ideal situation arrives, there can be no substitute for full and unlimited inspection, to assure the compliance of mutual promises. Such acceptance of mutual inspection is an absolute prerequisite to any effective disarmament, or any control of either use or testing of atomic or nuclear weapons.

Nor is it any answer to say that one of the great powers says that it will forego the use of testing of any type of weapons but demands that its possible victims should accept its unsupported promise. This is particularly true in the face of a long record of the use of force wherever and whenever it seemed expedient. And the very refusal to accept the principle of unrestricted inspection can do nothing but strengthen those doubts.

Let me repeat: the United States of America welcomes any practicable program of mutual control of our reduction in all kinds of armaments, but the control must be mutual. We invite complete inspection of our own arms, even of our atomic development, but that inspection must be mutual. Nor does the United States of America wait until it has just completed its annual series of atomic tests and then suggest a period of suspension of such tests. Such obvious insincerity can do nothing but increase the determination of all other countries to see for themselves that all promises are being fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to emphasize or widen this mistrust, but I feel that the people of the world should clearly

understand that mere words will never take the place of deeds. There have been charges of aggression hurled at my country and at Great Britain at this very conference. These charges stem from the fact that the two great powers have carried out their commitments to protect two small nations from destruction. Of course, we recognize that it would have been far more desirable had the United Nations gone to the protection of these small countries, but the very people who condemn us have stood in the way and refused to allow action by the United Nations. The United States and Great Britain stand ready, as we have always stood, to move out of Lebanon and out of Jordan any day the Soviet is willing to let the United Nations protect these lands. Did Russia make any such offer when she moved troops into Hungary? Let the small nations of the world judge the large powers by their actions, not their words, and let the small nations recognize that it is the military power, and especially the atomic power, of the United States of America, which stands between them and the type of aggression we have witnessed in Korea and Vietnam. We of the United States will not impose our rule on anyone. Ask our neighbors. Ask Canada. Ask Cuba. We want to hold no people under our control. Ask the Philippines. We want to engage in no armament or atomic race. We want to beat our swords into plowshares but we can only do so when we know that others are doing likewise.

We challenge the sincere cooperation of the U.S.S.R. to join in a real, completely inspected program of disarmament. We will meet you halfway, but we have no intention of disarming ourselves without absolute assurance that others are doing likewise.

Establishing international police force

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York. The possibility of establishing an international police force is a particularly pertinent and timely topic for the troubled times in which we live. Perhaps never before in the history of the world was there greater need for calm, objective, and broadminded thought on this possible avenue for helping to achieve a more just and secure international order.

Not only is this topic timely. The place in which it is raised is—in a twofold manner—an eminently suitable one for such a discussion. First, as representatives of the legislative bodies of our respective nations, each of us is in a strong position to urge directly the participation of our governments in some kind of an international police group. Second, in no other region on earth are the lessons of international security better exemplified than in Latin America.

Indeed, all the peace-loving nations of the world would do well to examine with care the experience of the nations of South America in carrying out their self-imposed system of inter-American policing. Operating through a collective defense pact, commonly known as the Rio Treaty, and through the machinery of the Organization of American States, this policing program has been in large measure both effective and generally acceptable. By means of voting sanctions, of dispatching investigating committees, and of careful use of military observers, the nations of Latin America have successfully nipped in the bud a number of potentially incendiary situations among nations of this area.

One reason the Rio Treaty has operated so successfully is that it provides a flexible system of inter-American policing which tailors the means to the situation. The fact that sanctions can be imposed up to and including the use of collective armed forces has had the effect of eliminating the danger of aggression among the neighbors of this section of the world. In addition, the

Americas have coordinated their policies to defend themselves against any extra-hemispheric threat. Since the end of World War II no other nations in the world have enjoyed the freedom from fear of aggression from their neighbors and the world as have the Americas.

When the United Nations was organized in 1945 procedures similar in many respects to the inter-American system were envisaged for maintaining peace. The U.N. idea, based on certain fundamental principles, provided procedures for peaceful settlement and for arriving at decisions to enforce the peace. This idea also anticipated the creation of forces to maintain the peace when the use of force became necessary.

It soon became apparent, however, that there was a fundamental division within the United Nations between nations which cherished their independence and desired a stable international order, and the power ambitions and aggressive ideology of the Soviet bloc. This expansionist combination succeeded in subverting and taking over a long list of independent governments. The result was that political consensus, the necessary base for any international policing action, was absent in the world community. Attempts to create world collective security by agreement among the great powers were thus doomed to failure from the start.

However, repeated efforts were made to gain approval of some sort of worldwide army to help maintain order and security. Whenever fighting has started or is threatened in some sector of the world, agitation has begun afresh for the creation of a U.N. army to be dispatched to the scene to calm the troubled situation. These proposals always revive whenever—as in the instance of Korea, Hungary, Egypt, or the present Middle East crisis—the need becomes too obvious and too urgent to ignore.

One extremely useful precedent has been provided in the case of the United Nations Emergency Force, which has done so much to maintain stability and peace in areas of acute tension between Egypt and Israel. The relative success of this Force in patrolling the uneasy cease-fire has drawn praise from many governments. Its long-range value, however, can only be measured in terms of the use to which the time gained will be put to solve the complex problems afflicting that area, and the use to which we can put the experience gained by this adventure in international policing.

The 13 years of experience in the United Nations has demonstrated conclusively that politically speaking, it is a house divided. A gulf separates those nations which believe in the U.N. Charter principle of independence and those which in practice deny that principle—which really believe in a Communist world hegemony, controlled and directed from Moscow and Peking. The Soviet Union has demonstrated it will do all within its power to exclude from its captive domain any international policing action, even to the extent of barring an investigating committee, such as in the case of Hungary in 1956.

Most recently, of course, the Soviet conspiracy has blocked efforts to organize and dispatch a U.N. peace force to the troubled Middle East, in an effort to calm the potentially explosive situation there. However, this barrier to world unanimity on an international police force should not discourage us. We should not regard the opposition of the Soviet Union to these peace efforts as an insurmountable barrier. We should press forward with all the vigor at our command to gain support for this principle from all men of good will who sincerely desire peace. On the other hand, I believe we are completely justified in questioning the motives of those nations of the world who, by their intransigent attitude, have repeatedly blocked attempts to create the international force which may well represent a key to the future peace of the world.

The United States has repeatedly demonstrated its willingness to participate in an international army for peace. The Congress of the United States today is in the process of officially going on record as approving this principle.

Certainly recent developments in the Near East provide sufficient demonstration of the tremendous need for some sort of a peace force. It should, of course, be under the control of the United Nations, ready to move instantly in case of an international emergency at the request of a member government which believes itself threatened by outside aggression.

In a world contracted by speedy communications, in a world in which even the smallest nations possess the terribly destructive weapons of modern war, any international disturbance—however localized—can spread like a plague and thus present a real threat to world stability. The only feasible answer to this challenge to the peace of the world is to provide a U.N. force capable of so spreading a U.N. mantle over an embattled state as to inhibit—if not directly to prevent—a coup d'état, infiltration by indirect aggression, or other untoward pressures from outside the nation, such as we have witnessed recently in the Near East.

A U.N. police force need not be a huge, all-powerful army. It might not number more than 50,000 or 60,000. It might perhaps be found best to establish a firm nucleus at all times centered under one command, with other forces in the individual countries, available upon call.

It is my firm conviction that the smaller nations of the world must form the backbone of any international force. This will prevent the bigger powers running the risk of being dragged into a nuclear conflict which could doom all mankind.

Such an international police army could not—and should not—fight wars. It could not prevent isolated assassinations planned by outside aggressors such as we have recently witnessed.

But a permanent U.N. police force can serve as an effective deterrent to hostilities, could be a focus for the moral opinion of the world, and could serve numerous practical uses in observation, patrol, and guard duty between potentially hostile states.

Certainly, in the light of the dangers inherent in man's vast technological and material progress, we must search with imagination and foresight for the answers to the enigmas of world peace. Today we have too little of either—at a time when we stand in desperate need of both.

There has been sufficient study and experience concerning an international police force. There is plenty of evidence to show how great a factor it could be in preserving peace. No nation of good will can in good conscience oppose the creation of such a force.

The time is running short. Each new crisis brings us closer to the potential horrors of a world war III. The next international brush fire may set off that worldwide conflagration if the nations of the world do not rise to the occasion.

A permanent United Nations police force provides a new, decisive means by which the nations of the world which sincerely believe in peace can provide the machinery to quarantine regional conflicts and thus better insure their solution. The resolution before us provides a tangible means for each of us, in behalf of his people back home, to signify support of this key means to preserve the peace of the world. I urge each of you, in your respective countries and respective legislative bodies, to work for this goal. It is one of the strong, sure hopes for the peace for which all men of good will hope and pray.

Cultural exchange and freedom of the press

Hon. HALE BOGGS (United States of America). Mr. President, fellow delegates, the

story of Brazil excites sympathetic understanding and respect and admiration from all citizens of the United States. Here the struggle for independence and freedom was much like that struggle in my country. Indeed, like the struggle of free nations everywhere.

Yes, Mr. President, we of the United States are proud to be here with our old friends, the great people of Brazil. We salute our years of uninterrupted friendship.

Brazil and her sister American states—north and south—constitute the greatest regional area for mutually profitable investment and trade. Such mutual confidence as has been demonstrated hemispherewide could well be the pattern for world understanding.

It is this philosophy of mutuality, without sacrifice of any nation's individuality, which is at the heart of our deliberations for a world anchored in peace, in freedom, in progress, and in prosperity for all. To this philosophy Brazil has made tremendous contributions, showing magnificent leadership, particularly in the vital field of international law.

In discussing cultural exchanges and freedom of information I think that I can say without being immodest that the United States has been a major force in the world for the promotion of both concepts. We are attempting to take to heart the admonition of H. G. Wells when he said: "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." I hope, too, that you will agree that these exchanges have planted the seeds of amity and understanding among peoples and are of immense potential good in preventing that ultimate catastrophe of which Mr. Wells spoke.

The United States has concluded negotiations with the Soviet Union expanding exchanges of information and ideas and of technical, scientific and cultural delegations between the two countries. Only recently the Soviet Union made one of its highest cultural awards to a brilliant young pianist from Texas, and American audiences, on their part, applauded enthusiastically a very skillful Russian ballet group from Moscow. The Philadelphia Symphony has been in Russia and another famous Russian ballet is expected in the United States early in 1959. Under the new program a top-flight delegation of American educators has already visited the Soviet Union and studied its educational structure throughout. Soviet educators are now to visit the United States in turn. The agreements contemplate programs by American industry to be offered to the Soviet Government for sale or for exchange through the Department of State of the United States. A meeting this summer in Moscow is aimed at implementing this phase of the negotiations. There is contemplated an exchange of groups of specialists in industry, agriculture, and medicine.

Cultural exchange in our time is the most fruitful and the most effective form of education and perhaps the most indispensable, in the atomic age. How are we to estimate the immense value to international goodwill and international education resulting from the program of scholarships identified all over the world with the name of the United States Senator from Arkansas, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT? Who can say how much good has been accomplished by 33,000 Fulbright scholars from 39 countries in 10 years? This is probably the largest educational exchange in the history of civilization.

The Soviet Union, we are told, has put its mightiest thrust behind the education of Soviet youth. It is my conviction that an educated people, no matter how indoctrinated will demand freedom. Police state doctrines are ultimately doomed in an educated society. Moreover, if the exchange programs do anything, they throw into open contrast the philosophies of the Soviet and Western World. Once that competition of ideas is

free and unrestrained I have only the most optimistic prophecies for the future. What we seek is not coexistence in an atmosphere of atomic hostility, but understanding in an atmosphere of mutual trust.

In the minutes remaining I should like to turn to freedom of the press. Freedom of the press cannot be dissociated from free government. There is no such thing as one without the other. Even benevolent despotisms, however altruistic, cannot abide a free press. Free government—government by consent of the governed—cannot exist without a free press. Unless public expression of private views is untrammelled and unimpeded, the heartbeat goes out of government by the people. Total freedom sometimes leads to abuses, of course. But as between the death of free government and journalistic abuses, which are in any event under free government easily counteracted, the choice is clear. The Constitution of the United States, which is the basic law of our land, asserts in the first of the 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights, that Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech or of the press. With us this is sacred and inviolable. It is the keystone of our democracy. President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave this principle a worldwide significance when he solemnly told the Congress of the United States that of the four freedoms the first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

To the American mind freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world cannot be separated from free government. We believe that the citizen is free—subject to laws of libel, slander and obscenity, and of sedition and national security—to say and print what he likes for or against government, his own and others. Because the United Nations Convention on Freedom of Information went too far, in their opinion, it was rejected by the Soviet bloc. And precisely because, in the view of my Government, it did not go far enough and might be used as an instrument for the restriction of information, the United States also opposed the convention.

In America the struggle for a free press goes on ceaselessly. It sometimes becomes necessary to fight against forces seeking to stop the flow of information from government and about government to the people. But we have a long-established tradition of vigilance, and no public reaction is so swift as that against any effort to impede the flow of information to the people. Congressional committees are constantly vigilant to efforts to suppress information.

And so, Mr. President, it is my conviction that together—cultural exchange and freedom of the press and information—hold within themselves the key to a free world of free men living in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and peace, under enlightened democratic governments freely chosen by them and governing with their consent.

National and international aspects of freedom of the press and information

Senator FRANCIS CASE (United States of America). Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen of the Conference, if the desires of mankind are what we have heard expressed, the people of the world do not want an atomic war—they do not want any war.

The men and the women who have spoken here have spoken as one on that point. They have differed only on the ways in which we can make the desire for peace come true with liberty and justice for all.

Of all groups of men and women who might be brought together, this Conference of members of parliamentary bodies should be the most accurate in reflecting what is in the hearts and minds of men and women everywhere because each of us comes as the representative of a constituency. Most of

us are elected by the votes of that constituency, but whether elected or appointed, each of us is here to speak for the people we were chosen to represent.

To this Conference, then, of parliamentary delegates, I speak on freedom of information with the conviction that on this freedom all other freedoms depend.

To this Conference, I would say that the right to know the truth is a right of the people and is not a proper monopoly of any government.

Our agenda item No. 5 divides the topic into two parts: Exchanges of Culture, and Exchanges of News as Information. I address my remarks to the latter—the exchange of news at home and abroad.

In passing, however, I testify to the good that is accomplished by the exchange of cultures.

It was good for the people of my country to learn of the appreciation accorded in Russia to a great pianist from the State of Texas, Mr. Ciliburn. It has been good for the people of my country to learn of good sportsmanship and courtesy when athletes from my country compete with athletes of other lands, regardless of political ideologies. And I trust the ladies at home will forgive me if, in Rio de Janeiro and this atmosphere of Latin American beauty, I confess there may be dividends for international appreciation from the victory by lovely Miss Colombia, in the competition for the title of "Miss Universe" held in the United States of North America only a few days ago.

Such exchanges of culture and skill, of talent and beauty to increase understanding among the people of the world.

The free exchange of other news and information, however, sometimes runs into trouble. This happens most often when the news relates to political programs and ambitions.

Those governments which see the state as the goal of every endeavor are inclined to seize control of information as a tool for the attainment of their ends regardless of the imprisonment which that decrees for honest, clear-minded judgment. Those one-man governments who dare not trust the people with the truth deprive the people of the facts to which every citizen has a right. This practice defeats the hopes in the hearts of mankind for freedom and understanding.

My country's independence began with a declaration that governments are formed to bring life and liberty and to permit people to pursue happiness. We hold that the state belongs to the people, that people are not the chattels of the state.

Consequently, we believe that the people are entitled to have uncensored news. When Premier Khrushchev wrote his letter to President Eisenhower about the situation in the Middle East, a few days ago, the newspapers of my country were free to print every word of the Khrushchev letter. The radio and the television carried whatever portions of the letter they desired to use and that their time permitted. The people of my country reached their judgments on the basis of the statement itself, and in the light of past events in Warsaw, Leipzig, and Budapest, as they had been freely reported insofar as the facts from those places were permitted to get to the world.

Someone once said that religion was an opiate for the people which I do not accept. True religion brings hope and purpose to human life. But there is something which does drug justice and put freedom to sleep. That is the sugar coating of selfish political opinion in the name of news by governments which denies to their people the free exchange of information with other peoples of the world.

There is no colonialism so enslaving as that which imprisons the minds of men and makes them the mental chattels of the state.

As Mr. Philip Klutznick, U.S. representative to the General Assembly of the United Nations, said as lately as December 6, 1957:

"The freest and fullest flow of information is basic to a democratic system of government. . . . In time of peace it is never safe to trust any man or institution of men with the power to decide for others what is good and what is bad information There may be times when the majority will be mistaken . . . but . . . the truth eventually becomes apparent and right judgments will be made."

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen of the Conference, on the 14th of December 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved that: "Freedom of information is a fundamental right, and the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is consecrated."

Therefore, I would wish that this Conference of the Interparliamentary Union "urge that the free exchange of information be recognized as a right of the people and not as a property of any government."

Those who themselves are the mouthpieces for the people in representative government should be the first to proclaim the importance of the freedom of information. Unless the door is open for the free flow of news, we can never be sure of what is truth. The people must have their right to know recognized if there are to be governments of the people, by the people and for the people.

Draft resolution concerning the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories

Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, U.S. Representative from Ohio. The quest for peace engages the attention and efforts of men of good will in all parts of the world. All humanity is today beset by strife and tensions which, if allowed to persist, will plunge the world into the disaster of another war. This is the overriding challenge of our times. The question before all of us is: How can we remove the strife and tensions which give rise to war?

One of the outstanding causes of strife and tension is injustice. That is, injustice against people and nations.

In our times it is injustices against entire nations which cause unrest on a scale unparalleled in the history of mankind and thereby retards the winning of a lasting peace. The demand for genuine, representative self-government is heard from the people of all nations who are today the victims of colonialism or imperialism in any form.

The old colonialism is giving way to the rising tide of nationalism as the empires of the past are becoming reconciled to the need for a new world order in which all nations shall govern their own affairs and live at peace with their neighbors. This reconciliation carries with it the high responsibility for assisting the people of the old colonial territories in the task of building free political institutions which will assure representative parliamentary bodies. Only through the exercise of a universal vote, free and secret ballots, the right of multiple political parties which take their case to the electorate at fixed intervals, and parliamentary bodies which adhere to the right of the opposition to dissent, can such free political institutions be built and preserved. In turn this requires responsible local leadership which is responsive to the will of the electorate.

This, then, is the challenge which confronts both the statesmen of the administering power of the non-self-governing territories and the people of such territories. It is a common task in which both interests must assume equal responsibility. There is sufficient good will on all sides to assure success once the objectives are clearly de-

fixed and a time set for the accomplishment of the task.

Significant and praiseworthy steps have already been taken by the administering powers in many of the non-self-governing territories. In some, democratic and representative parliamentary bodies are in the process of forming, others are undergoing adjustments to make direct representation of the people a reality. In some the tempo of constructive change is not keeping pace with the popular demands of the politically awakened people. But in practically all these territories the need for a change is recognized and the reconciliation which accompanies it provides the necessary basis for a bright and orderly future.

Turning to the new colonialism, one immediately sees under the yoke of this new imperialism a long array of politically mature and well-established nations which today are non-self-governing, which have been deprived of their free political institutions and whose representative parliamentary bodies have been destroyed. These ancient and proud nations, surely no less than the newly awakened nations of Asia and Africa, are worthy of the considerate and continuing interest of this Conference.

During the past 40 years this new colonialism, this new imperialism has forcibly incorporated once free democratic and independent nations into its empire. This new imperialism seeks to accommodate the rising tide of nationalism by spuriously proclaiming that these nations are independent. However, by its own definition the new imperialism limits this independence to hollow form while the substance of the state, that is the very life of the state and its people, is completely controlled by an alien, unwanted and predatory power. Clearly, no nation or territory can be self-governing unless the people therein exercise complete control over the internal affairs of the nation and are undisturbed masters of their destiny. The record of the past 40 years demonstrates that the people of these non-self-governing nations will never be satisfied with national independence which is limited to meaningless forms. So long as they are deprived of the essential substance of national independence, which is the right to govern their own affairs free from alien control or direction, they will continue to exercise the only opportunities open to them to dissent, that is, by internal revolts and freedom revolutions.

Within the past 5 years we have witnessed three outstanding expressions of violent dissent by the people within the orbit of Russian influence. In 1953 there was the mass uprising in East Germany in which the workers and peasants sought to throw off alien rule. This was followed in 1956 by the popular revolts in Poland in which all the people of Poland were in sympathy. Then in October of 1956 the entire Hungarian nation, workers, peasants, soldiers, intellectuals and even some of the new ruling class rose up in a bloody revolution which resulted in the restoration for 5 historic days of national independence in substance as well as in form. All the people of the world know that it took a major military campaign by the Red army to return Hungary to the status of a non-self-governing nation. Time does not permit a full recount of the many popular uprisings which have taken place over a period of many years in Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan, the Baltic States, and in other non-Russian nations. However, the implicit warning carried by these events urges us to find an honorable remedy to end the human strife and dangerous international tensions which they create.

To that end I propose that the draft resolution now before this Conference be amended to reflect the urgent need for developing procedures whereby the people of once free and independent nations which have been reduced to the status of non-self-

governing territories shall be accorded the opportunity, under the United Nations supervision, to freely determine substance as well as the form of their government. Such steps would be in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter.

Allow me to make one point clear, beyond any doubt. I do not include in my proposal the Russian nation itself which, as is well known, is only one of many nations which will make up the Soviet Union and its population constitutes a minority. It is strictly an internal matter for the Russian people to determine whether their nation is self-governing. This is not a concern of this Conference or should it be a concern of the United Nations.

It has always appeared to me to be grossly unjust that in any consideration of the colonial or dependent territory problem that the burden is placed only upon the old colonialism, which as I have said has largely reconciled itself to the inevitable changes taking place in the world. The new colonialism, the new imperialism carries with it a far greater threat to the winning of the peace. Surely the non-Communist world in and of itself cannot expect to eliminate the dangerous international tensions which give rise to war. These tensions can be eliminated only by an equal amount of good will and desire for changes on the part of the ruling class of the new colonialism. That is, changes which accord with the freely expressed will of the people. The cause of peace and amity among nations requires that this burden be borne by all forms of colonialism and imperialism.

To that end I urge this Conference now and in the future to give equal consideration and attention to the problems of non-self-governing nations as that given to non-self-governing territories.

The development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories

Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK (United States of America). Mr. President, in behalf of the delegation from the United States of North America I wish to emphasize some actual results, some recent accomplishments from our encouragement in the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories. My remarks will, I hope, confirm that we mean whatever we say when the United States participates in the attainment of this worthy goal by a territory. Our deeds, I feel, will speak better than volumes of words on this process of self government to the territories.

Before I make specific mention of the examples, may I stress an obvious truth concerning all territories; namely, that the people of the territories demand freedom because they are not now free and because the governing powers have made them aware of the Western traditions of freedom, of democracy, and of the wealth that has come from industrial civilization.

Often, however, the people of the self-governing areas do not realize that democracy developed slowly in the West over several centuries as the people gradually won greater freedom for themselves and learned how to use it responsibly so that the freedom of their neighbors was not threatened. Today the non-self-governing areas cannot be told to wait 300 years for freedom to come to them. Many demand it now. Others will soon add their voices to the call for liberty. But we know, too, that democracy will probably not work unless the people can receive some training in the democratic process before they become completely self-governing. Thus, democracy today faces a difficult and deeply trying period and, I trust, we parliamentarians have a like and equal and similar understanding of the definition and meaning of the word "democracy."

After all, the representative assembly is one of the most important devices available

in trying to solve this seemingly impossible problem of how to create as it were, "instant democracy." The representative assembly provides an opportunity to give the people of the territory experience in the elective process, in enacting laws and administering the nation without giving them full responsibility and power all at once. As it becomes apparent that each new grant of power is used responsibly, the governing nation should increase the powers of the representative assembly and thus gradually bring the territory to self-determination by peaceful means.

May I here insert my complete, unqualified endorsement of the proposed amendment of my colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN, of the United States, who cites his concern and vigorously protests the deprivation of once free, independent nations which successfully attained complete freedom, and have been reduced to the status of non-self-governing nations by a new colonialism or imperialism.

Now for my examples: The Philippine Islands became independent in 1946 by the mutual consent of the Filipinos and the Americans after a lengthy process in which more and more power was gradually extended to a representative Filipino assembly. Today the Philippines are a republic with a working democracy, and have an outstanding delegation here in Rio. They also maintain a close and friendly relationship with the United States. On the other hand Puerto Rico rejected independence from the United States and chose to become a commonwealth in 1952. Puerto Rico has the same autonomy in local affairs as one of the United States and its citizens are also United States citizens, but it neither contributes much to the Treasury of the United States, nor has voting representation in our Congress. The Puerto Ricans are free to change their status and apply either for full statehood in the United States, or to become completely independent. Finally, I would point out that Alaska has just been made our 49th State and the people of Hawaii are also seeking statehood rather than independence. I cite these examples, my fellow delegates, to demonstrate that the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories does not necessarily lead to the independence of the territory or become a device for the expression of hatred toward the governing power if a territory does choose independence. Much depends on the character of the past relationship between the territory and the governing power and the compatibility of their interests.

The United States is even beginning the processes of self-government on the 2,000 scattered islands of Micronesia in the South Pacific, which we hold under a U.N. trusteeship agreement. Thus far we have given the islanders a sense of unity that they have never experienced previously. The natives of the more than 1,000 Marshall Islands govern themselves under American guidance by a system of elected officials and a two-house congress, with the upper chamber consisting of hereditary nobles. A constitution is now being drafted for the Ponape district of the Caroline Islands and these same things are taking place for the first time elsewhere in Micronesia which has known only rule by foreign powers for hundreds of years. The goal of the United States is an independent Micronesian federation. I might add that the United States has even permitted the natives of Okinawa and the Bonin Islands to assume a significant degree of local self-government even though these are strategic trusts which we hold under the Japanese Peace Treaty and which will one day be returned to Japan.

In conclusion, I would like to stress once again what the United States feels to be one of the central truths of our time. The peoples of the non-self-governing territories are

demanding self-determination in ever-increasing numbers today and if they are to develop as democracies rather than as totalitarian governments, the Western nations must speed up the process of laying the basis for democracy including the development of responsible representative assemblies. Encouragement from the Interparliamentary Union could play a significant part in increasing the number of such assemblies. I hope this will be one result of our meeting here this year.

And, Mr. President, permit me to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for the courtesies, for the warmth, and genuine reception by our Brazilian hosts. For me and mine I say—Muito obrigado, caros vizinhos.

Farwell remarks by Hon. Homer Ferguson, United States of America

HON. HOMER FERGUSON, United States of America. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words to the delegates before I am compelled to leave. Our delegation is required to return to the States because Congress is in session and important matters are on. May I have the permission of the chairman and the delegates to say a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, fellow delegates, and friends, I first want to thank the delegates and the Interparliamentary Union for the fact that they have named me as an honorary member of this organization. I spent many years while in the Senate of the United States as a delegate to these meetings and I valued that privilege highly. I met my old friends here again and, being greatly interested in foreign policy, it is a great honor for me to be an honorary member of this organization; and may I compliment the Secretary General on his marvelous report to the delegates.

As we depart from this famous and fabulous city, this happy and historic land, we want to voice our great appreciation of the wonderful hospitality of our Brazilian hosts. I know you all agree with me as delegates that nothing has been left undone to minister to our pleasure and to our comfort. We are deeply grateful to everyone who has been responsible for the arrangements of the facilities for this Conference. The reception last evening at the Yacht Club was to all of us the brilliant climax to our visit. We shall always remember this hospitality.

The discussion and the debates of the 47th Conference have revealed, I think, a wide consensus of agreement among the delegates of all nations regarding the matters of expanding capital investments abroad under appropriate conditions, the need of strengthening and implementing the peace of the world, the value of cultural exchanges between nations and the acquisition and defense of freedom of information, as well as the importance of pushing ahead with the development of representative political institutions in the non-self-governing territories.

This Conference also has demonstrated by its own performance its belief in the essential role of the legislature in the conduct of public affairs, whose high function in our respective countries is, I believe further, to make the laws, and to make them by elected representatives of the people who are to be governed by those laws, to watch and control the conduct of elected executive officials and, as far as humanly possible, to represent and carry out the will of their constituents.

Mr. President, we think that one of the principal values of this Conference has been the opportunity we have had for forming closer person-to-person contacts between the lawmakers from many lands. We find that differences of language, culture, and political institutions are overshadowed by our basic common needs and aspirations. Above all, in our opinion, we have the humanity question, we have to consider the souls and as-

pirations of our people. And so, Mr. President, I know we are going to return to our respective homes with hearts full of gratitude to the Government and the people of Brazil, with deep understanding of each other's problems and viewpoints and with renewed faith in the value of representative government in the world today.

May I wish you all Godspeed in your return to your respective homes.

A Wisconsin Tribute to Carl Sandburg, Edward Steichen, and Fredric March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Wisconsin, with its worldwide reputation as producer of the best cheese, milk, butter and—of course—beer, sometimes gets insufficient credit as the producer, or at least contributing producer, of great men.

I am prompted to mention this subject by the memorable appearance in this Chamber, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, of the renowned poet and biographer, Carl Sandburg, and the famous actor, Fredric March; and by an article in the Washington Post of last Sunday telling of the coming trip to Russia by Mr. Sandburg and his brother-in-law, artist-photographer Edward Steichen, as cultural ambassadors for our country.

All three of these distinguished gentlemen are Wisconsin sons—one by birth, and two by past residence. Wisconsin is proud of them, and regards them as her own.

Edward Steichen began his artistic and photographic career in Milwaukee, where he was sent in 1888—at the age of 9—to be educated. His artistic appreciation and mechanical ability were developed there, and at the age of 15, he was signed as a 4-year apprentice with the American Lithographing Co., of Milwaukee. He supplemented his meager income by drawing program designs, painting watercolors, and becoming unofficial photographer to all picnics and outings in the vicinity.

He organized the Milwaukee Art Students League and directed activities as its president. The league employed instructors, held art classes, and exhibitions. His apprenticeship over, Steichen was promoted to the drafting room, and because of his talent for designing posters, he was soon earning \$50 a week.

Steichen divided his spare time between the artist's palette and the camera. His experiments in photography, then hardly recognized as an art, gained as much recognition as his painting.

After having his photographs accepted by the Philadelphia Photographic Salon, and some by the Chicago Art Institute, Steichen gave up his job, took his savings, paintings, and photographs, and about the turn of the century left Mil-

waukee to pursue his art studies in New York and Europe.

Carl Sandburg spent several years in Milwaukee in the early 1900's, gaining a good deal of practical political experience, and adding to his store of knowledge about men.

Sandburg worked for a year as district organizer for the Wisconsin Socialist Party, and from 1910 to 1912 was secretary to Mayor Emil Seidel of Milwaukee. He was associate editor of System Magazine in 1913, before moving on into the newspaper world in Chicago.

Fredric March was born in Racine, Wis., in 1897, educated in the Racine public schools, and graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1920. It was at the university that he became interested in the acting career upon which he embarked professionally soon after his graduation, and during which he has given the world so many great performances.

Life in Wisconsin had a profound influence on the directions, the philosophies, the talents, the careers of these three outstanding Americans. It is appropriate for Wisconsin to call them her sons, and for the people of Wisconsin to delight in their accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following article from the Washington Post of Sunday, February 15, 1959, by Jean White:

SANDBURG, STEICHEN TO EXPLAIN MAN'S UNIVERSALITY TO RUSSIANS

(By Jean White)

Two of America's most distinguished men of arts and letters are ready to go overseas this summer to take the message of the universality of "The Family of Man" to Russia.

The two—Poet-Biographer Carl Sandburg, 81, and Artist-Photographer Edward Steichen, 79—will make a striking pair of cultural ambassadors for the United States.

"The Family of Man," the moving camera testament to mankind created by Steichen from 503 photographs, already has been seen by more than 5 million persons around the world. On tour overseas, it has become one of the most successful shows mounted by the U.S. Information Agency. Everywhere the exhibit has gone, in 28 countries, it has been drawing record crowds.

WILL GO TO MOSCOW

The trip of Sandburg and Steichen, at the invitation of USIA, will take them to Moscow for the premier of "The Family of Man" in the Soviet Union.

The photographic exhibit will be one showcase of a big American fair in Moscow's Sokolniki Park to display the technological, educational, and cultural accomplishments of this country. USIA hopes to open the \$5 million show around July 4 for a 6-week stand.

In turn, the Russians are to stage their own exhibit in New York City's Coliseum this summer. The exchange of fairs comes under a cultural-exchange agreement signed last year.

Sandburg, who was in Washington last week to address Congress on the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, spoke enthusiastically about his plans to go to Russia with "The Family of Man." As a part-time traveling troubadour, he feels deeply that the photographic collection has something very important to tell.

KINSHIP OF FAMILY

"The people of Russia will be able to feel their kinship to the whole family of man

over the earth," the poet explained in his rich, mellow voice and then paused in thought.

"It's the great epic poem about mankind that mankind everywhere can read and feel. The realities are before their eyes and need no translation * * * It isn't an exhibit of photographs or prize pictures. It's what the camera saw, and you are there where the camera is and you see life. The theme is that people shall see people and people of one country shall see people of another country."

That, from the testimony of personal letters and newspaper comment overseas, is what "The Family of Man" has accomplished on its tours of Asia, Africa, South America, and Europe.

In India, the Bombay Chronicle wrote of its visit: "The greatest single thing the United States has done for India. Not money, not the wheat, not the gift packages. But the exhibition of 'The Family of Man.'"

PRaise FROM ALL LANDS

In Japan, Mrs. Chimi Baba, president of the Osaka Housewives Association, wrote: "I saw the real meaning of the words of the United Nations Charter."

In South Africa, a Johannesburg Sunday Times writer commented: "I am writing this under the spell of an exhibition that could change the face of South Africa if it were seen and felt and understood by the right people * * * and I say it could change the face of South Africa because no human being seeing it and understanding its message could ever hold race hatred in his heart again."

In Guatemala, Indians came from the mountains to see the exhibit. In sophisticated Paris, the French press turned to superlatives to praise the show. In Seoul, Korea, 420,000 persons came to see the exhibit.

Steichen, with sensitive soul and artistic eye, combed through 2 million photographs before choosing the 503 that best "mirrored the essential oneness of mankind throughout the world." Under his guiding hand, the work of 273 photographers from 68 countries became a moving human document.

The USIA has put nine duplicate versions of "The Family of Man"—first created by Steichen for the Museum of Modern Art—on the road. Three wore out on the heavily booked circuit. The other six still are on tour.

DEDICATED TO DIGNITY

The original dedication of "The Family of Man," in Steichen's words, was "to the dignity of man."

For the Moscow exhibit, he now is planning an addition to express that dedication through the life of one of the greatest Americans, Abraham Lincoln. And no one can speak more eloquently of Lincoln than his traveling companion. For his mighty Lincoln biography, Sandburg won a Pulitzer prize in history and then added one for poetry a few years later.

To be added to "The Family of Man" for the Moscow showing is Steichen's own deeply sensed photographic rendering of the Lincoln life mask in the Meserve collection.

Steichen took the photograph the year Sandburg published "The War Years" of Lincoln's life. For two months the artist-photographer, searching for artistic truth, studied the mask. Often he arose at night to light a candle to study the play of light and shadow on the bronze mask.

Sandburg and Steichen make a remarkable set of brothers-in-law (Sandburg has been married to Steichen's sister, Lillian, for 50 years). Sandburg, the white-haired goat raiser, and Steichen, the handsomely bearded delphinium breeder, also should prove a winning pair of personal ambassadors for the United States.

FULLER BRUSH MEN

"We'll be Fuller brush men," said Steichen, a merry light in his blue eyes.

"Together, side by side, we'll go," intoned his poet companion.

And then added the guitar-playing Sandburg mischievously: "I think I'll go off and take some lessons on the balalaika when we're in Moscow."

When he received the USIA invitation last fall to go to Moscow with "The Family of Man," Sandburg said he answered with alacrity—"Yes."

"The Family of Man," he explained, "is so important."

"All these themes are universal. They run through the 500-or-so-odd photographs like the recurring themes of a symphony. Certain important events in the life of people everywhere are there: love—love is there; weddings, birth, food, children at the breast of the mother; then growth, the growing of the child, school; work—work everywhere—if they don't work they don't eat; and then play, children around the world playing quarrel-around-the-rosy in the same way; quarrels, wars, dancing—everywhere they dance; death, hunger, hope, fear, dreams. Here is set forth all."

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, California's now senior Senator, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, is rising to new prominence in the affairs of the Nation. The Kuchel story was recounted in an article by columnist William Broom, syndicated recently in the Long Beach Press Telegram and other newspapers.

Text of the Broom column is as follows:

NEW TOM KUCHEL EMERGES AS KNOWLAND'S SHADOW REEDEES

WASHINGTON.—In 5 short months, Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL has stepped out of the shadow of ex-Senator William F. Knowland into the bright sunshine of political prominence.

KUCHEL's climb was compounded of many elements. But the major of these was an adroit ability to arrive at the proper place at the proper time. And to disagree without making enemies.

There's a growing suspicion on Capitol Hill that KUCHEL's political skills have been underrated. A case for that view can be made from the record. Since Knowland's footsteps disappeared over the horizon toward his ill-starred gubernatorial campaign, KUCHEL has:

Won election as GOP whip in the Senate, the No. 2 position of responsibility in that body's party leadership.

Captured after vigorous infighting, a seat on the Senate Appropriations Committee, from which all money and therefore much power flows.

As a perquisite of his whip's job, been included in the select band of legislators who have the President's ear at weekly White House meetings.

Emerging as a chief spokesman, if not a leader, of the Senate's GOP liberals who advocate a new image for the party more attractive to the electorate.

Bolstered by those accomplishments, KUCHEL now speaks with more confidence and authority. Californians will get a glimpse of the new KUCHEL when he returns next week for about 10 days of speechmaking in connection with the party's Lincoln Day celebration.

These will urge the California GOP to cast away all anti-labor bias in its effort to reclaim its fortunes and may even go so far as to blame right to work support for a big share of the 1958 reversals.

A roundhouse swing also is in the arsenal for Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona, who recently offered the view that liberals ought to get out of the Republican party. GOLDWATER's remarks left the liberals less than happy and KUCHEL's speeches probably will offer their first public rebuttal.

Chance and the elephantine eminence of Knowland kept KUCHEL in the background during his first 5 years in the Senate. Even the alphabet served to deepen the obscurity. On Senate rollcalls, KUCHEL's name followed that of his senior, so that his vote often sounded like an echo of the then GOP Senate leader. When they voted differently, Knowland invariably seemed startled.

Knowland's departure was the signal for feverish KUCHEL activity. With the senior Californian now out of the picture, it was obvious the Republican leadership in the Senate would be reshuffled.

KUCHEL made no overt move—a practice, incidentally, which has marked his intraparty political career—until GOP candidates fell like wheat in a hailstorm in November. Then he started working both sides of the street, gaining commitments for the whip's job from liberals like GEORGE AIKEN of Vermont and CLIFF CASE of New Jersey, and conservatives such as MILT YOUNG of North Dakota and GOLDWATER.

Later, GOLDWATER withdrew his support, and a pronounced chill set in on relations between the two westerners.

Throughout the bitter jockeying over the leadership jobs, KUCHEL never let an opportunity pass to point out that California will soon be the largest State in the Union and that the GOP should include a member of its fast-receding western representation in the leadership.

With California Republicans threshing about for new leadership, the question of KUCHEL's role naturally arises. Thus far, he has kept silent; but he is aware that he and Vice President NIXON are the only statewide officeholders still on their feet. The relationship between the two has never been particularly close, but neither have there been any clashes.

If KUCHEL follows past practice, he probably will wait for an opportunity to come to him. But meanwhile, he shows every indication of wanting to impress his brand of progressivism and friendship for labor on the new California elephant.

Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years the American farmers have patiently endured an unhealthy condition existing in the agriculture industry. This condition is general in its nature and could be said to be caused by many

different factors or combination thereof, which have been allowed to creep into the industry through an unsympathetic administration of the farm programs as written in the law.

Much has been said and written about this situation and we are all aware that a farm problem exists but one of the best reports I have read on the actual depth and breadth of the deterioration of the farm economy was compiled by E. E. Manuel, president of the George State Bank, George, Iowa. Mr. Manuel's report was made a part of the annual report to the stockholders of the George State Bank. The report follows:

FARM SITUATION

(By E. E. Manuel)

Farmers of the Nation have suffered a loss of income of more than \$20 billion in the first 5 years of Mr. Benson's tenure as Secretary of Agriculture.

When this administration came into power in 1953, Benson took over a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years—1942–1952, inclusive—our farmers had enjoyed their greatest prosperity in history. Farm prices in each of those 11 years were at or about 100 percent of parity. During these years, our consumers bought food at fair and reasonable prices. Mr. Benson in 5 years, with the backing of the President, has reduced this program to a shambles.

Here are the figures on the deterioration of farm income under Mr. Benson, taken from the books of the Department of Agriculture:

Total realized net income of farmers (after deducting agricultural production expenses from the total of cash income from farm marketings, Government payments to farmers, value of home consumption of farm-produced foods, and computed rental value of farm dwellings):

Five pre-Benson years

1948	\$16,057,000,000
1949	13,789,000,000
1950	13,185,000,000
1951	15,158,000,000
1952	14,416,000,000

Total..... 72,605,000,000

Five Benson years

1953	\$13,899,000,000
1954	12,201,000,000
1955	11,470,000,000
1956	12,111,000,000
1957	10,840,000,000

Total..... 60,521,000,000

The Department records show that during the last 5 Benson years farmers produced and sold 11 percent more food and nonfood products than in the 5 years, 1948–1952, inclusive. Had our farmers been paid for the larger volume of food and nonfood products marketed in the last 5 years at the same rate as in the 5 years preceding, their net income would have been \$80.5 billion or more than \$20 billion more than they actually received under Benson.

If farm prices, instead of declining, had increased in proportion to all other prices during these last 5 years, farmers' income would have been much more even than \$80 billion. However, under Mr. Benson's constant pressure for lower farm prices, the income aggregated only \$60,521 million.

Those who seek an excuse for the farm income debacle in the last 5 years often resort to a contention that prior to Mr. Benson's tenure farm prices were influenced and sustained by the demands of the post-World War II years and by the Korean conflict. It should be pointed out that the demand for feed has been greater in these last 5 years

than in any similar period in history, and consumers, during these 5 years, purchased 11 percent more products of our farms than during the 5 preceding years. The difference between the Benson years and previous years is that before Mr. Benson took office the farm program was in sympathetic hands and supplies were kept within reasonable balance with market outlets; while in these recent years Mr. Benson has been tearing down the program, telling both producers and consumers that farm prices are too high, with the result that farmers have suffered a loss in income of at least \$20 billion.

Here is a brief summary of the last 5 years, comparing 1957 to 1952:

Farm prices: Down 16 percent.
Farm parity ratio: Down 18 percent.
Realized net farm income: Down 25 percent, lowest point since 1942.

Purchasing power of that farm income: Down 29 percent, lowest since 1940.

Farm debt: At a record high of \$22.6 billion.

Farm population: Declined from 24,283,000 in 1952 to 20,396,000 in 1957.

In 1957 the returns to farmworkers for their labor and management reached a low of 69 cents an hour, while the average wage of industrial workers climbed to a high of \$2.07 an hour.

Moreover, farm surpluses have trebled, increasing from \$2,452 million in 1952 to more than \$7 billion today.

Appropriations and authorizations to the Department of Agriculture for all purposes amounted to \$6,794 million for fiscal 1958, whereas all such appropriations and authorizations for all the 5 years immediately preceding Mr. Benson's tenure—including the Korean conflict—amounted to only \$7,391 million; and employees in the Department of Agriculture have increased more than 17,000 since 1952—from 67,406 as of December 31, 1952, to 85,107 as of January 1, 1958.

Since Mr. Benson began to bring down farm prices 5 years ago, farm income has dropped about \$1 billion a year, the cost of farm programs has increased by about \$1 billion a year, farm debt has climbed about \$1 billion a year, and farm people have been leaving the farms at the rate of about 1 million a year.

It is my opinion that we, who are directly dependent upon farm income, should tell our story—tell two true stories: First, the Benson story; second, the story of the years of agriculture's rise from the great depression to a place of parity and equal economic stature with labor, industry, and business—until the time Mr. Benson took over.

The story of agriculture (pre-Benson) is an account of triumph of the parity principle—agriculture's magna carta. This is the story of 20 pre-Benson years.

Farm income multiplied sixfold, sevenfold, and eightfold in those two decades. As stated previously, for 11 consecutive years prior to 1953, the average prices paid to farmers were at or above 100 percent of parity. Rural people became able to buy the conveniences and comforts hitherto available only to our citizens in the cities. The blessings of electricity were taken to the rural areas. Farmers became financially able to mechanize their farms and to apply new sciences, to bring the blessings of food abundance at low cost to the consumers of the Nation. Now, with the means to do it, farmers devoted their energies to the restoration and conservation of the Nation's most precious resource—the soil. Prosperity on the farms created greater markets for industries in the cities, made jobs, and kept factory wheels turning.

The output per farm worker doubled in those 20 years, and now each farm worker feeds 20 persons. This new efficiency in agriculture made available to American families more and better food for an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than in any other period in history.

Although retail prices have increased while farm prices declined in the last 5 years, the average hourly wage of industrial workers will buy twice as much food as in 1929.

Costs: The Commodity Credit Corporation supported the prices of major storable crops for 20 years prior to 1953, and at the end of these two decades this program actually showed a 20-year profit of \$13 million. For those 20 years, the CCC programs for all crops, including a number of perishables, lost only \$1,064 million, and CCC investments in surpluses on January 1, 1953 (inventory and loans) amounted to only \$2,452 million.

In contrast, during the 5 Benson years, due primarily to the unsympathetic administration of the farm program, CCC deficits in farm price support operations have amounted to four times as much as was lost in the preceding 20 years—or, more than \$4 billion in the last 5 years compared to slightly more than \$1 billion in 20 years. Meanwhile, CCC investments in surpluses have increased threefold, from \$2,452 million in 1952 to more than \$7 billion in the most recent report.

It is indeed a melancholy record that Mr. Benson has compiled in the years he should have been the chief champion of our farm people before the Nation. And in my opinion, the worst seems yet ahead. The handwriting is on the wall. Out of his great and dedicated drive for lower and lower farm prices, based upon an extraordinary theory that a poor price will make better income, Mr. Benson has set the stage for an even greater farm debacle within the next 2 years. The reduction in price supports will encourage larger crop outputs as farmers seek to make up in volume what they lose in unit price—all these factors clearly foreshadow these distressing developments: Farm surpluses will mount to a new record high; farm program costs will climb to new heights; meat animal prices and the income of feed and livestock producers will decline sharply. We may see hogs selling at \$10 or \$12 per hundredweight, and we surely cannot forget the \$9–\$10 prices of just a couple of years ago. Farm debt will set a new high record. And finally, unless an effective farm program is developed by the next Congress and put into operation in spite of Mr. Benson's objections and threat of veto, farm income will establish a new postwar low, and the effects will be felt not only by our farm people but also by the Nation's total economy.

As you probably know, there were two or more agricultural bills passed by the House and the Senate during the last 5 years to improve the parity ratio for farmers, but they were vetoed twice by the President, so Congress was confronted with the reality that it must give Mr. Benson further price cutting powers or he would impose such short acreages upon cotton and rice crops as to mean ruin for many farmers and many communities which depend on production of these crops for their economic existence. It was in this situation that the top brass of the American Farm Bureau Federation brought forward a proposition to kill the parity principle completely and thus destroy the very foundation of the farm program. Mr. Benson endorsed legislation embracing the farm bureau proposal. It would have provided price supports for major crops at 90 percent of the average market prices of the previous 3 years, thus removing farm prices entirely from any fair relationship to costs and prices in the rest of the economy and providing a price-support system for farmers at approximately 10 percent less than they could expect to get in the marketplaces anyway. I certainly do not believe the parity killing proposition introduced by the headquarters officials and employees of the American farm bureau in any way whatsoever represented the thinking

and the will of the good farm people who are members of that great organization.

Edward A. O'Neal, late president of the federation, was one of the principal architects of the program to bring farmers into a parity position in our free enterprise economy. He personally welded the farm interest into a united front and was the great leader of agriculture in those pre-Benson days. I cannot believe the present members of that organization would deny and defame the philosophy of Ed O'Neal, destroy the advantages his dedicated life brought to agriculture, and work against their own interests by repealing the parity concept, on which all of agriculture's aspirations and hopes are founded.

The Senate passed S. 4071, embracing the farm bureau proposal to kill the parity principle for cotton, corn, rice, and feed grains. The Senate took this action when it seemed that this was the only way to gain enactment and White House approval of a bill to forestall devastating acreage cuts in 1959, which was the major objective of the sponsors of S. 4071.

However, when this bill came to the House for its consideration, the committee unanimously opposed the destruction of the parity principle. Democrats and Republicans stood solidly against this. The House would have no bill at all if it would destroy parity. The committee of the House won the confidence and support of the Senate, and parity was put back into the law, but of course at a lesser percentage. But the principle was retained with all its dignity and as the foundation on which the subsequent Congresses will rebuild a farm program, fair to farmers and consumers alike, when we can have in Washington a Secretary of Agriculture and an administration that is sympathetic to the principle and cause that the farm families of this Nation have a right to be equal partners in the rewards and blessings of free enterprise and are entitled to a parity position in this Nation's growth and prosperity.

The bill is not what farmers desire or want. The bill is not what any friend of agriculture wanted. It is an offspring of necessity and of the veto power. It protects producers from something worse in 1959, but unless it is repealed or changed it will create greater problems in the years ahead.

The farm program, based on the parity principle, was erected out of an awareness in the Congress that agriculture is the only major element of our total economy that has no device outside of the help of the Government to pattern its production to market needs; that farmers have no way of measuring what should be their individual contribution to a balanced national supply of food and fiber without Government help; that farmers have virtually no bargaining power in the commerce they conduct; that agriculture is the only major industry that does not set its prices to cover costs and reasonable profits, but goes into the marketplace and asks: "What will you give me?"

National propaganda has been trained against the operation of an effective farm program. Four great myths have been planted on the farms of America and have yielded a crop of confusion, uncertainty, and doubt around the future of agriculture. Mistrust has been created among farmers themselves in their own program: (1) Farmers are told that lower prices will solve their problems—prices going down each year; (2) farmers are told that increased efficiency will solve their problems, but efficiency in production has not solved but has intensified the farm problem; (3) farmers are told that movement of people out of agriculture will solve their problems—that is, the prob-

lems of those who are left. This, in my opinion, is very dangerous, because the farm family in these United States is actually the backbone of our democracy; (4) farmers and the Nation at large are told that the price-support program is responsible for surplus farm production. But farm output is too great for available market outlets primarily because the technological revolution in agriculture, in the absence of a sympathetically administered farm program, is increasing total output faster than commercial markets can absorb it. I am not too sure but that the abundance of food and fiber in the United States probably is the best insurance policy we could have to avoid war, especially in our present situation with Russia.

As I have said and now repeat again: The land is the source of life itself. Its ownership by fewer and fewer individuals is a dangerous thing. All history testifies to the upheaval, the decline of nations and of peoples, where control of land was concentrated in the hands of a privileged few and the many were denied its access and possession.

Mr. Benson has used his office and his time, not as a chief spokesman for and champion of agriculture; but to sow the seeds of prejudice among city people against our farmers; he has aligned one farm group, one crop, one region against another to divide and confuse our farm people; he has turned the power of government against the small farmer, condemning him as inefficient and unworthy of a place on the land.

When a Minnesota farm wife asked Mr. Benson, "What shall we do?" he replied, "Find other employment."

The unemployment lines and relief rolls in the cities now are packed with people who once enjoyed security and a good life on our farms. I just heard over the radio last night that our unemployed right now aggregates over 4 billion which is about the same number of unemployed during the recent recession of 1958.

The American free-enterprise system was built upon a foundation of free and independent and numerous family-operated farms and I think the Nation needs to take a fresh free-enterprise look at the family farm. It will be a sad day for America if giant corporate farmers supplant our family system in agriculture.

Free enterprise does not live on profits, interest, and rentals alone. It prospers by the incentive to every young man that by devotion to his job and good management of his affairs, some day he may be his own boss—may own his own farm or business.

It is my feeling and my fear that by the proportion we reduce the number of individual units of enterprise we weaken the American individual free-enterprise system; and it is my conviction that for agriculture we cannot afford to substitute a hired hand, corporate-managed system for the independent, free-enterprise family farm operation.

We must protect the agricultural establishment that serves this Nation so well. We cannot forfeit our farmers to an alien philosophy of concentration and bigness.

We must begin in the next Congress to repair the damage that Mr. Benson has done—to build a new and effective farm program with parity as the basic concept.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent; *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbt, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio.-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio.-----
Bailey, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.-----
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and
Glen Mill Rd.,
Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio.-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio.-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.-----
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.-----
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.-----
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3606 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio.-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broynhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho.-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----

Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa.-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.-----
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chiperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt 2122 Mass. Ave.
(Mrs.), Ill.-----
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa.-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine.-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio.-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio.-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----1817 N. Quinn St.,
Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.-----
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Kilgus St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio.-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Alme J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Fairfax Hotel
Tenn.-----
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.
N. J.-----
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.-----

Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.-----
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.-----
Gross, H. R., Iowa.-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio.-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio.-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio.-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.-----
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben P., Iowa.-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.-----
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.-----
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah.-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio.-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

Senator Neuberger's Return to the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we are happy that our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], has returned to us. We rejoice that he is with us. His return has been made possible because of his fortitude and his courage, and because of the knowledge gained and the progress made in medicine through medical research.

Senator NEUBERGER is an outstanding leader in fighting the battles for more medical research and for the health of our people. He has noted that the United States now spends more on chewing gum and permanent waves than on cancer research.

Inspired by Senator NEUBERGER's return and the distressing condition of Secretary Dulles, and by the fact that every 2 minutes a man, woman, or child in the United States dies an agonized death from cancer, we must press forward all the more relentlessly to advance the cause of medical research, which is our hope and our promise to find the answer to the crippling and killing diseases that have baffled and plagued mankind through the centuries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials on Senator NEUBERGER and his return to the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 13, 1959]

MR. NEUBERGER'S RETURN

It is altogether gratifying to see that Oregon's likable junior Senator has been able to return to his chores at the Capitol after a courageous bout with cancer. Despite his ordeal, DICK NEUBERGER's spirits remain chipper, and it is characteristic that he is seeking to turn his private misfortune into an affirmative public purpose. Long before he was stricken, Mr. NEUBERGER had been an eloquent advocate of increased Federal aid to medical research. Now, through the caprices of fortune, Mr. NEUBERGER speaks with poignant personal authority that ought to help bestir his colleagues to greater action against the disease which has felled such noted Senators as Vandenberg, Taft, McNary, Neely, and McMahon. Mr. NEUBERGER points out that he owes the prospects for his recovery to the fruits of the medical laboratories. He also notes that the United States now spends more on chewing gum and permanent waves than on cancer research. The

campaign to alter this situation ought to win new support.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Feb. 11, 1959]

LONG ILLNESS MAKES ONE THINK

A generation ago, when tuberculosis was rampant in this area, patients even formed a club and had a camaraderie among themselves. One of the things they most often said was that one never developed a philosophy until he had been ill over a long period.

Modern advances against tuberculosis have virtually licked that disease; but the comment still applies to sufferers from other ailments. A recent evidence of it comes in the Associated Press story from Portland, Oreg., interviewing Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who said that after his long and apparently successful bout with cancer he did not know where his future career might lie except that he feels a great obligation to further medical research.

It was less than a decade and a half ago that DICK NEUBERGER came in from Alaska, a husky, vigorous captain who was to feel keenly the confining and often frustrating experience of serving in the Pentagon. Time passed and he made what to many would be a fortune, writing books and magazine articles. He married a lovely woman, Maurine, who joined him in a political career which began in the Oregon Legislature and which now has taken him to the junior senatorship from Oregon. This career suddenly went under the knife and the cobalt gun when it was found that NEUBERGER had cancer.

"It would be almost impossible for me now to get angry over a political difference," NEUBERGER, who had plenty of chance to think while he was wondering whether he would die, told the AP. That change in his personality makes politics seem less attractive, even though "I'm always going to be a Democrat."

But like many others who have undergone long and fretful illnesses, who have suffered pain and worry, NEUBERGER has come out of it with a feeling that the medical research which apparently has saved him from an early death should be broadened to save others. He has gone through what he describes as "a maturing experience."

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 5, 1959]

SENATOR'S RECOVERY

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER will return to the Senate next week with a confident report from his physicians that his cancer operation and radiation treatment have been successful. Oregon's citizens join his doctors in gratification that he can resume his normal activities.

One of Senator NEUBERGER's declared goals is to influence the United States to take leadership in calling for an International Medical Year comparable in organization and scope to the recently concluded International Geophysical Year. The purpose would be a worldwide attack on the diseases, some of obscure or unknown causes, which still assail mankind everywhere despite remarkable progress in medical and surgical research and practices.

This is one field of endeavor in which international politics, fears and ambitions should give way to the common aim of health and security. The Geophysical Year broke down some barriers among the nations. The

Medical Year could do more. Thus it could serve a valuable purpose in discouraging mass destruction by war, as well as making man's normal lot easier to bear. Senator NEUBERGER's own frightening experience with cancer gives him the insight to lead.

[From the Oregon Journal, Feb. 6, 1959]

OREGON PEOPLE WISH SENATOR WELL

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER will return to Washington, following an extended and intensive course of radiation treatment, with the good wishes of the great majority of the people of Oregon, including those who differ with him politically.

It is the best of news that his doctors have stated their belief he is cured of the malignancy which not many months ago threatened his career.

The Senator is the first to say that his experience in the valley of the shadow has helped to mature him and to some degree change the direction of his life. It is fair to add that NEUBERGER had begun to mature in Washington long before he was aware of the malignancy.

He returns to the Senate with interest intensified in medical research. He feels that what has happened to him is almost a mandate to help hasten the day when others can be assured of a cancer cure. He plans to stimulate interest in an International Medical Year, a project he has urged in the past.

NEUBERGER's interest will not be lessened, we suspect, in countless other projects on which he has spent his energy in the past. But he believes in his own mind his greatest contribution now can be in the medical field. Certainly medicine is an area where all the nations, including Russia, can cooperate, as they have done in the recently ended International Geophysical Year, with lasting gains in understanding as well as medical advance.

In the last session of Congress, Senator NEUBERGER expended himself to the point of exhaustion. His many friends will hope he now recognizes that his illness must of necessity put some limitation on his future activities and that he cannot work as hard as he did before without jeopardizing his health.

The Senator has not decided whether to seek reelection in 1960. But whatever his future he will have a great contribution to make. He must guard his future by taking reasonable care of himself.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 6, 1959]

BACK TO WORK

DICK NEUBERGER, whom even his enemies call DICK, is going back to work, back to Washington where a unique challenge awaits him. So well has the cancer been arrested that Oregon's junior Senator now speaks of himself as "recovered" from the malignancy discovered last August.

Naturally, his interest in medical research, always strong, was increased as he underwent a long series of radiation treatments and contemplated the miracles of science which enable him to be alive and well today. He has indicated now that he will press even harder for Federal help in the many research projects that are focused on cancer. And he can speak, as no other Senator can, from the heart and from his own experience as one might have fallen, as Senator Robert Taft fell a few years earlier, to the ailment.

He will make another contribution, too. He is nationally known figure, probably held in higher esteem elsewhere in the Nation than he is at home. And there he stands, a man who licked cancer—by the grace of God and radiation. Thus he will be an inspiration and a symbol of hope to millions.

[From the Greater Oregon, Feb. 13, 1959]
BACK IN WASHINGTON

Our newspaper staff joins with more than a million other Oregonians in thankfulness that our Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER is fully recovered from his recent illness, and is now back at his desk in Washington, D.C.

Our Senator's physicians report that his cancer operation and the radiation treatments for the past several months have been entirely successful and that he can now resume his duties at our National Capital without any injury to his health.

Senator NEUBERGER is one of the greatest Senators Oregon has ever had.

One of Senator NEUBERGER's declared goals is to influence the United States to take leadership in calling for an International Medical Year comparable in organization and scope to the recently concluded International Geophysical Year. The purpose would be a worldwide attack on the diseases, some of obscure or unknown causes, which still assail mankind everywhere despite remarkable progress in medical and surgical research and practices.

This is one field of endeavor in which international politics, fears, and ambitions should give way to the common aim of health and security. The Geophysical Year broke down some barriers among nations. The Medical Year could do more. Thus it could serve a valuable purpose in discouraging mass destruction by war, as well as making man's normal lot easier to bear. Senator NEUBERGER's own frightening experience with cancer gives him the insight to lead.

Pope John XXIII and His Role in Resisting Persecution During World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, understanding among religions and among nations is one of the great hopes for enduring world peace.

A most heartening article has been written by Mr. William Zukerman describing how Msgr. Angelo Roncalli, during World War II, played a major role in helping thousands of Jews to escape from the butchery and tyranny of nazism to a haven in Palestine.

The episode takes on special significance today because the former Msgr. Angelo Roncalli is now Pope John XXIII, spiritual leader of the world's 495 million men and women of the Catholic faith.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article from the Jewish Newsletter by William Zukerman, entitled "A Story of Good Will: What Pope John XXIII Did for the Persecuted Jews of Europe," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STORY OF GOOD WILL: WHAT POPE JOHN XXIII DID FOR THE PERSECUTED JEWS OF EUROPE

(By William Zukerman)

This is a story of good will which was enacted during World War II. It seems worthwhile retelling now because it is also the story of a man of great goodness and compassion who has now been elevated to the position of one of the world's great leaders who affect the course of history—Pope John XXIII.

During World War II, Msgr. Angelo Roncalli who is now Pope John XXIII was the papal nuncio in Istanbul, Turkey, a highly important diplomatic post during the war because Turkey was then one of the few neutral countries in Europe. The period was also the darkest in the persecution of European Jews, when hundreds of thousands of them from all over Nazi-occupied territory were being daily deported to concentration and death camps in Poland for extermination.

The Jewish Agency of Jerusalem, which made desperate efforts to remove as many Jews as possible to Palestine, had then concentrated most of its work in Istanbul for the same reason. The head of the immigration department of the agency, Chaim Barlas, who was in charge of that work, had many occasions to meet the present Pope, and he now relates some little known historic facts about the role that Monsignor Roncalli played in that rescue work which throw a fascinating light on the personality of the new Pope.

THOSE MOST TRAGIC YEARS

Among the many pious and good Christians who have helped the Jews during those most tragic years of Nazi persecution, Monsignor Roncalli stands out above others, states Barlas in an article in Davar, official organ of the Israeli Government party Mapai (reprinted in the New York Zionist daily, Journal-Tog Dec. 9).

From the very first meeting with Monsignor Roncalli, Barlas writes, he felt that he was in the presence of a lofty personality whose interest in the Jewish tragedy of the time was not merely formal and superficial. He was deeply and sincerely moved by the suffering of the Jews and showed an eagerness to be of help in every way possible.

"It would often happen that when I would tell him some sad news I had received from Poland, Hungary or Slovakia, Monsignor Roncalli would fold his hands in prayer and tears would appear in his eyes," Barlas writes.

PRESENT POPE IN ACTION

He would always follow with profound interest the tragic stories he was told; he would ask all the particulars, which he would carefully mark down in his own hand. He would never turn over these matters to his secretary or assistant, but would personally attend to everything that had to be done and that he could do.

Barlas describes three important interviews he had with the present Pope in times of great emergency which show the greatness of the man in action. One day Barlas received an urgent report about the planned deportation of all Jews from Slovakia to the death camps of Poland. The Premier of Slovakia at the time was a Catholic priest named Tiso. There were many interventions to save the Slovakian Jews, but they did not help.

Barlas then appealed to Monsignor Roncalli as a last resort. The nuncio received the Jewish representative, as always, with warm friendship and sincere readiness to be of help. As he read the telegrams which Barlas had brought with him, he became greatly disturbed and called out in despair, "What is to be done?"

Barlas then suggested he should appeal directly to the Pope and ask the Holy Father to intervene. Monsignor Roncalli immedi-

ately agreed. A few weeks later reports arrived from Switzerland and Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia, that the deportation order had been considerably eased.

A second emergency arose when a report arrived about the planned deportation of Bulgarian Jews. Before coming to Istanbul, Monsignor Roncalli had been papal nuncio in Sofia, and it was, therefore, natural for Barlas to appeal to him for help once more. This time the man who is now Pope John XXIII, after hearing the report, sat down at his typewriter and personally typed a telegram to some friends in high position in Sofia, asking them to do everything possible to avert this deportation.

Barlas relates that he was deeply moved by the promptness and personal interest of the man; that he told him that this telegram would become a historic document in the dark period of the Jews. "If the telegram will accomplish anything," the nuncio replied modestly.

There can be no doubt about the accomplishments. The order for the deportation of the Bulgarian Jews was revoked. They were sent instead to provincial cities in Bulgaria, and thus the entire Jewish community of Bulgaria was saved from death.

The third intervention took place later when the Jews of Hungary were threatened with similar deportation. This time it was Cardinal Spellman who, through the intermediacy of Roncalli, intervened. The cardinal had come to Istanbul for a 1-day visit with the papal nuncio. Barlas asked Monsignor Roncalli to arrange an interview between himself and the cardinal in order to ask him to intervene. Monsignor Roncalli readily agreed to act as an intermediary and carried out his mission with much grace.

When Barlas arrived the next day at the nuncio's home, the house was filled with high diplomatic and church dignitaries who were waiting to see Cardinal Spellman. To Barlas' amazement, he was among the first to be ushered in to see the cardinal. Monsignor Roncalli himself introduced him as "a representative of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem" who has come on an important mission.

The cardinal listened attentively to Barlas' plea and promised to do everything he could. Barlas was later told by the American Ambassador to Turkey, the late Lawrence Steinhardt, that the cardinal's intervention was successful in averting the deportation.

Milk Prices Cut Severely Under Benson Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the subject of the prices actually received for milk, I have received a letter and factual records which tell with exceptional clarity and force the story of the tragic decline in returns to Wisconsin farmers during recent years.

Mr. and Mrs. L. J. Totten, of Route 1, Box 95, Delavan, Wis., operate a typical family-sized farm, located in one of the best dairy sections of America's dairyland; and this family has been selling milk to the Chicago market, for fluid consumption. The prices quoted, therefore, represent relatively good prices, in comparison to those received by farmers

who sell milk to be manufactured into butter, cheese, and other products.

These records show that the prices received by farmers for their milk have declined sharply—more than 25 percent—since 10 years ago. At the same time, it should be remembered, the farm family's cost of living has been increasing, just as the cost of living of other families has been increasing.

Mr. President, this letter and the records which accompanied it, which tell the story of what the Benson program has done to Wisconsin dairy farmers' incomes, should have the attention of every Member of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the letter and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO SENATOR PROXMIER AND GOVERNOR NELSON

FEBRUARY 3, 1959.

Our farm is really a description of thousands of Wisconsin dairy farms. It is 120 acres, in size, and composed of rolling prairie, 19 acres of hilly woodland and cut up into small fields, with a gravel ridge through it. This was adapted, by nature, to dairying and the type of farm that has made Wisconsin a dairy State, the type which the rabid anti-agriculturist Benson, is destroying. We are typical of uncounted numbers and it is our wish to show how Benson's policies really operate. After studying the attached statistics (all backed by our own records), you will agree that we are not receiving a hand-out from the Agriculture Department but being deprived of basic freedoms.

It is our belief that the bulk of the 4½ million unemployed reflect farmers pushed out of farming. It is to be remembered that farmers who have lost their work do not have seniority in unions and are the last to be put to work when so many are unemployed.

The attached statistics show a month-to-month report of what Wisconsin dairy farmers have actually been paid for their milk, since 1948. This is for grade A, so you can imagine how others have fared. Newspapers report one figure paid while our milk checks show another. It is to be understood that the figures shown represent 3.5 milk (a strong argument for fixing that butterfat content to the consumer per Wisconsin's bill). For as much as half a point below that test we are penalized about 7 cents per point. The 3.5 milk is skimmed of two points of butterfat in Wisconsin (much more elsewhere) before it is sold, adding to butterfat surplus. It is understood that the test above 3.5 rates the same amount of increase per point.

In the past, we wrote Benson regarding dairying. We got a reply to one of our letters (from the Wisconsin Agriculture Department) telling us all about brucellosis. (We had cleared our herd years before at our own expense.) This seems typical of the situation.

You will readily see that to figure dairy farm prices on prices paid recently would be intolerable. The drop from last April is also plainly seen. Dairies, however, have paid less but raised prices. Another increase was announced last week in Milwaukee papers. In the same period companies like Borden, National Dairy Sales, etc., have had the highest profit periods in their history.

From 1947 to 1958 our personal and real estate property tax, on the farm, has risen 400 percent. Our school tax 700 percent. Suburban residents are crowding our schools and the farmer's land is carrying the load, while only the farmer pays personal property

tax. Illinois residents pay personal property tax. Why not Wisconsin residents? We lived there (Illinois) many years and feel it a fair way to raise taxes. The class of people who pay only income tax are filling the schools. Has it been considered?

During this same period, that our income has been so drastically reduced, it is interesting to note the amount services and supplies, to us, have risen. We advocate the cause of democracy, yet farming in this country, under Benson, is reverting to the old feudal state. When corporation farming becomes a reality, throughout our land, the feudal state will have arrived. Farming has never been a way of life since the pioneer period, when the farmer was self-sustaining. As soon as he raised crops for export and to build factories it became a business, not a way of life. Businessmen are buying farms everywhere; then putting as much money as possible into them, pulling up trees, refencing, erecting new buildings, etc., and taking farm operations as a loss on income tax returns, thus building up land empires from money that should be paid into the State and U.S. Government as business profits on city income. (It is in our neighborhood, too).

A congressional investigation of the Agricultural Department itself is warranted. Who is actually getting all this \$8 billion? Because of our biased publicity, city people often think a farmer gets a big fat subsidy check each month from the Government,

which he spends for Cadillacs to pull his manure spreader. Everything written always states that subsidies are used to support "the artificially high prices of farm products." Does not the attached show the lie? They are actually forcing abnormally low prices and thinking men must admit the only thing that has held back runaway inflation is the farmer subsidizing the Nation's food bill in lost income. It is not the farmer who farms for a living who creates the surpluses; it is the wheat and cotton barons, etc., the business friends of our present administration.

We know the stockpile of agricultural products was first built as a patriotic gesture during World War II, by hard labor. After the war was over other war materials were scrapped but farmers are still paying, in lost income. Each night half the world goes to bed hungry. Our surplus food is a blessing that could save the world for democracy, if America would use the common sense of our forefathers who established this country as a democracy.

Farmers protested at the polls but are still told that small farmers must get off the farm. Do the Republicans want 10 million unemployed in the country?

You have our sincere wishes for a successful term of office.

Respectfully,

LYMAN AND MAUDE TOTTEN.
Mr. and Mrs. L. J. Totten.

DELAVER, WIS.

Prices Wisconsin dairymen received for milk 3.5 test on Chicago market (proof can be furnished)—Grade A milk

DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
1948.....	4.75	4.78	4.60	4.47	4.39	4.47	4.67	4.95	4.94	4.65	4.20	3.86
1949.....	3.84	3.62	3.39	3.26	3.13	3.17	3.34	3.60	3.71	3.79	3.76	3.55
1950.....	3.51	3.46	3.35	3.23	3.13	3.11	3.21	3.42	3.57	3.69	3.74	3.65
1951.....	3.88	4.04	4.04	4.03	3.88	3.84	4.15	4.18	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.25
1952.....	4.39	4.47	4.54	4.34	4.08	4.08	4.42	4.75	4.93	4.80	4.80	4.37

REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
1953.....	4.11	3.96	3.89	3.78	3.57	3.57	3.84	3.93	3.98	3.91	3.91	3.43
1954.....	3.25	3.12	3.10	2.92	3.09	2.80	2.84	2.75	3.59	3.64	3.70	3.72
1955.....	3.47	3.43	3.42	3.41	3.36	3.42	3.44	3.77	3.85	3.88	3.87	3.66
1956.....	3.66	3.63	3.51	3.59	3.67	3.54	3.67	3.77	3.99	4.15	3.92	3.68
1957.....	3.63	3.60	3.26	3.28	3.15	3.21	3.37	3.62	3.68	3.70	3.91	3.65
1958.....	3.63	3.61	3.05	2.98	2.88	2.83	3.40	3.55	3.64	3.55	3.00	3.47

¹ In 1954 had to send milk for several months as grade B as an inspector did not approve of our new well. He had originally approved the design. This was same year had built a \$2,000 new milk house and bought a \$700 cooler.

² Price received for milk sold in excess of base. We are forced to set base for 3 months in fall but it is in effect for 4 months. We must set base at the time of year when pasture is always the shortest.

NOTE.—Above prices are net to farmer. We have a 5 cents per hundredweight check off to PMA; 2 cents less because of zone, pay hauler for taking milk to milk depot (plus 3 percent of hauling charge as tax for using the public roads). The premium Pure Milk Association pays on a farm of our size would amount to less than \$10 a month.

Address by Hon. Hugh G. Grant on
School Integration in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Honorable Hugh G. Grant, former United States Minister to Albania and Thailand, made a most enlightening address in Atlanta, Ga., on February 11, 1959. I request unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens of the South, the South's resistance forces against the conspiracy to force racial integration in the public schools and elsewhere are in retreat.

The front battlelines in Virginia against race mixing in the public schools have crumbled. The Old Dominion's strategy of massive resistance has collapsed, leaving only six Southern States with segregated public schools, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, and South Carolina. True, there's only limited or token integration in the schools in the South, but when the bars are down the floods will follow. There's talk of "local option" as a solution, but this spells disaster, too.

Georgia appears to be pinpointed for the next major assault, following two Federal

court edicts—mixing the races on the Atlanta trolleys and banning racial bars at Georgia State colleges, with a threat of integration of Atlanta's public schools next September. As the Georgia General Assembly adopted new defensive measures, some authorities predicted that Georgia's battlelines against race mixing would also crumble under the impact of court decrees, as they have in Virginia.

Both Virginia and Georgia appear to be headed for the ultimate abandonment of their public schools. This has resulted in a rising tide of opposition in both States on the part of many white people who do not appear to be willing to pay this price for the retention of segregation. This was reflected at the State level in the remarks of Governor Vandiver's house floor leader, Frank Twitty, indicating the possibility of both segregated and integrated public schools in Georgia.

This opposition to closing the public schools was also reflected at the national level in Senator HERMAN TALMADGE's switch from his previous sponsorship of private schools, as a means of blocking integration, to his proposal of a constitutional amendment. Said the Senator: "The destruction of public education in an entire region of our Nation would be an unparalleled catastrophe."

The result—the white people of Georgia and her sister States of the South are in a deep fog. There is much confused thinking. Retreat, retreat could mean ultimate defeat. What led up to this deplorable state of affairs?

The answer—the failure of the leaders of the resistance movement in the Southern States to adopt a unified plan of political action—the failure to face up to realities.

For a period of nearly 5 years billions of words have been written and spoken against the infamous sociological, unconstitutional segregation decisions of the Supreme Court and the unwarranted collaboration of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Ninety-six Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the South issued the "Southern Manifesto" against the usurpation of the Constitution by the Federal judiciary and then filed it away in the congressional archives.

In the States, conferences were held on interposition—nullification of the unconstitutional Supreme Court edicts. Interposition resolutions were subsequently adopted by the legislatures of practically every Southern State and then filed away in the archives of the States.

Georgia has an interposition resolution, approved March 9, 1956, by the overwhelming vote of 218 ayes and 1 nay. Two excerpts reveal its purpose as follows:

"That the State of Georgia has the right to operate and maintain a public school system—and her rights in this respect have not in any wise been delegated to the General Government—that said decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to separation of the races in the public institutions of a State as announced and promulgated by said Court on May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, are null, void, and of no force or effect."

Was this resolution and others like it simply flamboyant gestures? So it would appear, since practically every official act against racial integration so far has been a delaying action, involving legal quibbling, subterfuge, even denial in the Federal courts on the part of State officials that the question of race has entered into the methods and policies of the State in maintaining segregation. Questions about the morality of the applicants for admission to State colleges have been raised as justification for barring the Negroes. Elaborate tests and

measurements have been established under certain State public school placement laws: A new Georgia law provides for low age restrictions for admission to State colleges. In brief, all sorts of devices have been framed to prevent integration but race, which is the fundamental factor, has not been mentioned or has been denied as a factor. These measures will not insure the maintenance of segregation. They serve only to postpone the evil day. Furthermore, they are negative and, indirectly, constitute a surrender of the sovereign State to the unconstitutional edicts of the Federal judiciary.

Surely the time has come—the hour is late—for the officials of our States to assert boldly and with forthrightness, in court and out of court, that the State has the constitutional right to separate the races within its boundaries, if it chooses to do so. This is interposition, which has ample historic precedent, and it is significant that the cases have not been restricted to the South. (Read "The Sovereign States," by James Jackson Kilpatrick.)

Finally, we don't need an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Since 1791, we have had the Bill of Rights with its famous article X, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." What more do we need to justify nullification of the unconstitutional decrees of the Supreme Court and its agents, the Federal judges?

Let one, or two, or three southern governors—say, the chief executives of Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina, backed by their respective legislatures, stand up and proclaim to the Federal usurpers of the constitutional rights of the sovereign States—and to the Nation—"We are going to keep our institutions functioning and segregated as heretofore. That is our constitutional right. That is in conformity with the law of the land."

Such direct political action would bring the millions of grassroots folk throughout the South, who believe in the separation of the races, out of the fog. It would serve to alert the people of the entire Nation to the fact that State sovereignty is not yet dead, is very much alive. It could turn the tide. Let's try it, my fellow citizens.

Reds Dedicated to Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article written by Dr. Ruth Alexander, and published in the New York Sunday Mirror of February 8, 1959. Dr. Alexander is a keen student of current affairs, especially in the field of international relations. Under the heading, "Reds Dedicated to Violence," Dr. Alexander gives us information and suggestions which will be of great interest to the Members of the Senate and to the country as a whole.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS DEDICATED TO VIOLENCE

(By Dr. Ruth Alexander)

Conceivably, the United States may go down in history as the first great nation to be the passive spectator of its own destruction.

The Communists are fighting us in unbroken continuity on four fronts—political, economic, ideological, and military. But, by all odds, their greatest victory has been to sell us on the idea that they want peace. Their influential apologists here have successfully equated peace with nonshooting war.

But let's look at the record. In this tinder-box world, there is no such thing as an unimportant war, and in the 13 years since World War II, 18 important wars have occurred.

In every one, the pressure or the presence of Communists was involved, directly or indirectly, officially or unofficially. Each of these wars constituted a grave risk to us and our allies with whom we are inextricably identified. Because of this, we contributed men and munitions directly, as in Korea, or to our allies, as in other areas. Hence, we, as an integral part of the free world, have been involved in 18 shooting wars. What's peaceful about that?

It has become customary to call old-fashioned wars limited wars, as opposed to total unlimited war of the nuclear variety. But limited war does not mean small wars and some of these 18 limited wars demanded significant military operations and caused tragic destruction of American lives. Yet, because we must, of necessity, recognize the primacy of nuclear retaliation in major wars, we tend to brush off limited wars as brush fires of no importance and to provide inadequate forces and equipment with which to fight them.

Limited war is new only in the sense that it now serves as a convenient device for Communists to conquer the world piecemeal, on a military basis, where subversive tactics fail. Obviously, there is an enormous area of conflict between the cold war, itself a dangerous and false concept, and all-out nuclear war. Within this area, any aggression against any member of the free world involves immediate risks for the United States militarily, and forces to meet these risks instantaneously are imperative.

Do we have these forces? If not, why not? The piecemeal destructiveness of limited wars can be as devastating in the long run as the immediate destruction of nuclear war. Both darken our horizon and peace is but an illusion in this century of violence.

The sooner we recognize that communism is irrevocably dedicated to permanent revolution on a global scale, the better our chances for survival. Otherwise, our placid indifference to our predictable fate will cast us in the suicidal role of spectators at our own destruction.

South Carolina's Young Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the South Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce has selected as South Carolina's Young Man of the Year the distinguished editor of the Orangeburg Times and Democrat, Mr. Edward H. Sims.

Mr. Sims is a noted and able author of the recent book "American Aces," a story of fighter pilots in World War II. Mr. Sims is a most outstanding young man and is very deserving of this fine honor. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the State, a newspaper of Columbia, S.C., on February 18, 1959, commending Mr. Sim's selection, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF THE YEAR

South Carolina's Young Man of the Year is Edward H. Sims, editor of the Times and Democrat in Orangeburg.

A World War II fighter pilot with many missions to his credit, he is author of "American Aces," a book which was published and went into extra editions in 1958. It is of particular significance since technical developments probably have made aerial dogfighting a thing of the past.

Ed made several trips across the Atlantic and into the Pacific to interview individual heroes for his book, and it is the most authoritative work in its field. He flew his own plane to gather some of the information in this country.

He has a long list of civic achievements and is listed in "Who's Who in America." He heads Editor's Copy, a syndicate that supplies more than 500 newspapers, and the Sims News Service of Washington.

The State takes special pride in the statewide honor conferred upon him by the junior chamber of commerce as he also heads this newspaper's Washington news bureau.

Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorials entitled, "Why Pick on the Farmer?" from the February 6, 1959, issue of the Moultrie, Ga., Weekly Observer; "Talmadge May Prove We Can Learn From History," from the February 5, 1959, issue of the Baxley, Ga., News-Banner; "Just as Communistic," from the February 6, 1959, issue of the Lavaca County Tribune of Hallettsville, Tex.; and the column by Hon. Joe F. Combs in the February 6, 1959, issue of the Beaumont, Tex., Enterprise.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Moultrie (Ga.) Weekly Observer, Feb. 6, 1959]

WHY PICK ON THE FARMER?

Secretary Benson has done it again. He appears determined to reduce the economy of agricultural sections with arbitrary price support decisions within the scope of his administration.

While the Government is giving lip service to a program for bolstering all forms of economy, Secretary Benson is working overtime on methods of figuring parity which will

mean loss of farm income running into many millions.

If there is any form of the national economy which needs stabilizing at a fair level, it is agriculture. Farming has been something of a redheaded stepchild which has been forced to take the brunt of drastic actions.

The national farm program was conceived and put into operation in the mid-1930's when it became evident that agriculture was the backbone of the country's economy. A soil conservation program, acreage controls and other measures were put into effect in a move to stabilize agriculture and give the farmer a fair share of the trade dollar. Much progress was made, even though farmers were forced to give up their freedom and adhere strictly to various practices, allocations, and quotas. This they accepted, however, in the hope of achieving a good balance.

Growers still would prefer to be on a free enterprise plan, but they have recognized the economic factors involved in the natural law of supply and demand, and have cooperated to the best of their ability.

Secretary Benson, in the face of a figured formula which has ruled for years, suddenly has come up with a new way of figuring parity which will mean tremendous losses to farmers.

Why pick on the farmer when every effort is being banded to give the economy impetus rather than strangle it? Instead of giving an ear to the farm program proposed by Georgia's Senator TALMADGE, Secretary Benson is taking a drastic course of action to reduce supports and income. It won't be done, however, without bitter protest from the agricultural areas.

[From the Baxley (Ga.) News-Banner, Feb. 5, 1959]

TALMADGE MAY PROVE WE CAN LEARN FROM HISTORY

Senator TALMADGE may prove by his farm bill entitled the "Agricultural Income Equalization Act of 1959," that we can learn from history. A similar bill, then known as the Domestic Allotment plan, by a Republican administration was refused in the twenties and the greatest depression of all time followed.

Like the Domestic Allotment plan, Senator TALMADGE's plan is designed to accomplish basic controls with a minimum of redtape. It has five easily understood points as follows:

1. Eliminate all acreage controls and Government loans.
2. Assign each farmer growing basic commodities a domestic production quota based on his average production for the preceding 5 years.
3. Guarantee and pay to each farmer a sales price support of the difference between the price he receives for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity.
4. Require each farmer to submit a bill of sale with his application for sales price support payments.
5. Impose a maximum of \$25,000 on the amount of sales price support that any individual farmer may receive.

Senator TALMADGE states that agricultural marketing experts have estimated that the program he has proposed would save the taxpayers between \$2 billion and \$3 billion a year and would accomplish the following:

It would let the farmer plant what he wants and sell it as he pleases.

It would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, storing, and selling farm commodities and place the responsibility for marketing with the farmer and private enterprise where it belongs.

It would guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national purchasing power and restore agriculture to a free enterprise, competitive base.

It would end the accumulation of the national farm surplus which has glutted the Nation's markets and stagnated its economy.

It would make the national farm program an estimable budget item which would remain relatively stable over the years.

It would mean lower prices to both the consumer and industry and would put American agricultural products, both raw and processed, back on the world markets at competitive prices.

It would give the farmer protection equivalent to labor's minimum wage and industry's tariff.

And it would mark a new and fresh start which would get away from the stereotyped concepts and failures of the past.

[From the Lavaca County (Tex.) Tribune, of Feb. 6, 1959]

JUST AS COMMUNISTIC

Nothing would benefit the farmers and the whole country more than free farming with direct subsidies, the plan already before the Congress.

This is urged by Congressman W. R. POAGE, of Waco, in the House, and by Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, in the Senate.

The plan is very simple:

1. Take Government out of farming.
2. Domestic allotment would be assigned to every farm, based on the 5-year average of his crop.
3. On this allotment the farmer would get a direct payment, the difference between the market price and the 100 percent parity.
4. He would only submit his sale receipt for the sales sold to get his direct payment.
5. The amount would be limited to \$25,000 per farm.

Senator TALMADGE mentioned how a Mississippi planter got in 1 year more than a million dollars. Another, in Kansas, got over \$600,000. That's also where most of this money went—to a few percent of the big planters.

Right along the farm programs were slanted for the benefit of the commercial farms—which prospered, while the small farmers were driven out. They talk of their inefficiency, of the marginal farmers, etc. If so, why did they take from them the cotton acreage when they never produced any surpluses and needed every acre to make a living?

President Eisenhower in his farm message is quite right: the farm policies benefited only the commercial farms. This because of the triumvirate: The Extension Service, Farm Bureau, and the agriculture colleges, as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., tells also in his "The Coming of the New Deal."

As also the Houston Chronicle comments, "These are, in actuality, private corporate organizations which are increasing their riches at the expense of the taxpaying workman"—while the small farmer is sacrificed.

The triumvirate blames it on mechanization and other excuses. Did these take the cotton acreage away from the small farmers?

Are the farm machines any excuse for piling the farm people into the cities and producing unemployment of millions, wrecking the country?

As declared by Senator LONG, of Louisiana: "Unless something is done along the line suggested by the Senator from Georgia, millions of small farmers, the backbone of America, will be forced out of farming."

A better plan than the \$25,000 limit would be in limiting direct payments to so many bales per farm. Any other allotment would again make small farmers the chief victims. Even if limited to 50 to 100 bales, would it not be cheaper than the present hopeless and destructive spending?

A real menace is in the idea that it's good for the country to drive farm people into the cities, denying them, by allotments, their

right to make a living on the land; then calling them inefficient.

Right from the very beginning, what the farmers and the country needed was very simple, as Senator TALMADGE and Congressman POAGE show—just free farming and direct payments, as also a reimbursement for tariff.

Throwing farmers back to where they were, selling at the market price and buying at the protected prices, would lead to nothing better than was the big depression of 1929.

Favoring only big-scale farming, subsidizing it through producing surpluses, is just as communistic as what goes on behind the Iron Curtain.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, Feb. 6, 1959]

ENTERPRISE FARM CORNER

(By Joe F. Combs)

The farm program will have special attention by the present Congress and some sort of legislation will most likely come out of the caucuses and conferences being held both in Washington and throughout the farm belt.

One of the most interesting developments so far is the bill introduced by Georgia's Senator HERMAN TALMADGE and cosponsored by Senator OLIN JOHNSTON of South Carolina. These men are both from important agricultural regions and it stands to reason that they are representing the feelings and sentiments of their constituencies when they introduce or support legislation of any kind.

The writer has not seen this bill. From press reports it appears that it provides for some of the things that were included in the old Brannan plan, advocated by certain politicians in the Truman administration.

However, on first thought the Talmadge bill sounds fairly reasonable and it may gain support. It is in conflict with the suggestions made by the American Farm Bureau Federation in their recent national membership meeting in Boston.

This need not necessarily cause any alarm, since the Farm Bureau has taken some peculiar stands in recent months. That is, peculiar to those of us who do not exactly understand what they are driving at.

Some of their recent public utterances, for example, do not explain themselves. The official newsletter of the Farm Bureau says among other things, in discussing the Talmadge bill, "But the biggest objection of all will come, for obvious reasons, from the American taxpayer."

The trouble with the Farm Bureau statement is that it implies that farmers are on one side and taxpayers on the other, the latter being the payers and the former being the receivers. That is manifestly unfair to farmers, all of whom are taxpayers.

It stands to reason that if the biggest objection comes from taxpayers then the farmers will be entering the biggest objection, for they are taxpayers. The writer questions the right of any farm organization to profess to speak in that manner for farmers.

To be frank about it there is entirely too much loose talk about farm programs and too little to back it up. What we need is a workable farm program and not a lot of baloney.

Briefly, here is what the Talmadge bill would do, judging from the press reports that have come to my attention. It would assign to all farmers who grow basic commodities a domestic production quota, in pounds, bales, or bushels.

It would eliminate price support loans and eliminate acreage allotment. It applies to rice, wheat, corn, peanuts, cotton, and tobacco, and provides compensatory payments only on the domestically-consumed portion of each commodity under its regulations.

That doesn't appear to be such a grave threat to taxpayers, as compared to the mul-

tibillion program of the present. It may be that the writer cannot form a fair appraisal with the information at hand. But it looks as of now, that it might be possible to amend it to include ideas advanced by leading rice men a few years ago, as regards the domestically consumed portion of each commodity. In seeking a way out of the present predicament, farm leaders will do well to look into every proposal in an effort to find something better than we have.

Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Lauds Senate Leadership of Senator Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on December 15, 1958, the Oregon Daily Journal, which is published in my home community of Portland, paid high tribute to the able senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] as being the Member of this body who has accomplished more constructively for the Pacific Northwest than any other.

Because I share this favorable opinion of the influence and prestige of our distinguished colleague, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I feel certain it will elicit similar endorsement from many other Members of the Senate who have been impressed with the diligence and effectiveness of Senator MAGNUSON.

I particularly desire to confirm what the Oregon Journal's editors have written about the tolerance, patience, friendliness, and understanding of our friend, the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MAGGIE'S" INFLUENCE ON CAPITOL HILL

Whatever one may think of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, there are few who question his ability to get things done for his constituents.

Those who heard him at the Thursday noon luncheon session of the Inland Empire Waterways Association convention can better understand why he has this capacity.

Senator MAGNUSON has views on water resource development which are very similar, we suspect, to those of the senior Senator from Oregon.

Yet he freely concedes the right of other people to have different views, and he does not call them names for thinking differently than he does.

He is a staunch defender of public works spending for water resource development, and he can present convincing figures as to why such spending is good business, not only for this region but for the country.

Yet he recognizes the place which private utilities have in our economy. And he counts private utility executives among his personal friends.

Douglas McKay is a bad name in some Democratic circles, but MAGNUSON was able to speak of "my good friend, Doug McKay" (who was sitting in the audience).

MAGNUSON predicted that the administration may attempt, because of budget problems, to cut back on the construction schedule of some Northwest projects. He said he thought this would be foolhardy and would seek to resist cutbacks which he thinks will mean economic loss in the long run. But he did not rant and rave or accuse the administration of trying to put the Pacific Northwest in an economic straitjacket.

He said there are some things in the Corps of Engineers 308 review report with which he disagrees, but he did not criticize the engineers. Instead, he gave them credit for doing a thorough, competent job.

The Journal has not always agreed with Senator MAGNUSON. It has sometimes thought his diligence in behalf of Seattle was at Portland's expense.

But it has recognized that no other figure in Congress now is more influential in obtaining funds for Columbia basin resource development which benefit Oregon as well as Washington.

(This is not intended to belittle the growing influence of Oregon's Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, attained in the relatively short time he has been in Congress.)

MAGNUSON'S accomplishments, it must be acknowledged, are due in part to his membership on the important Senate Appropriations Committee, but he gets things done too by not being a prima donna, by getting along with others and by conceding the fact there is room for all kinds of people with all kinds of ideas.

New Industry in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an article entitled "Start of Scobey Firm Brings New Industry to Northeast Montana," published in the Poplar (Mont.) Standard of recent date.

The article points out how energetic individuals in my home State are starting successful, practical, and needed new industries. I am proud of their accomplishment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

START OF SCOBEEY FIRM BRINGS NEW INDUSTRY TO NORTHEAST MONTANA

Another small business with growth potential for Montana.

Incorporation of the Montana Air-Reel Co., of Scobey on November 27 culminated several years of effort to find a local manufacturer for a Montana invention to serve regional agricultural markets.

The story goes like this, a Rudyard farmer named Curt Phillips invented an attachment for combine harvesters to replace the old bat type reel, which is inefficient when used in short grain. Jet blasts of air on the air-reel force the grain toward the cutting bar and thence, into the combine. The air-reel meets an age-old problem of harvesting by preventing the loss which occurs at the cutting bar when cutting short grain.

WIND-REEL PROVES UP IN FIELD

Actual performance records in the field show average savings of 1.5 bushels of wheat per acre, and two bushels of barley, accord-

ing to Charles Bowman, assistant professor of agricultural engineering at Montana State College. Bowman became interested in the product after Phillips contacted the endowment and research foundation at MSC for help in improving and marketing the product. The MSC team undertook an extensive testing and feasibility study of the product, especially emphasizing its performance in actual harvesting operations.

Finding the wind-reel, as it was then called, a product with potential, the MSC people and the owners of the patent endeavored to find a manufacturer for the product. A midwestern manufacturer was found, but the search was continued for a manufacturer closer to the primary marketing area in the Great Plains.

At the same time, a small Montana manufacturer of another agricultural product was looking for other products to make and sell.

GRAIN BLOWER MADE IN FINE BUILDING

The Truck Grain Blower Co., had been started in 1930 by G. E. and E. J. Schlechter of Whitetail to manufacture their device to blow grain into storage bins and boxcars. An excellent 5,800-square-foot concrete building was built in Whitetail in 1941 and equipped with modern machine tools to manufacture the product. The firm was purchased in 1954 by Harold and Stella Barenz, and the office was moved to Scobey.

The new owners expanded markets to include materials-handling operations all over the country. The blower, renamed the Montana Grain and Feed Blower, is now in regular use from Oregon to New York. Specialized uses include delivery of sawdust and other building materials into two-story broiler houses, handling of bulk salt, and elevating dry ingredients to the mixer in a dog-food factory in Brooklyn. Advantages of this blower over other materials-handling methods are straight-up delivery, nonseparation of ingredients and almost complete lack of damage to pelleted feeds.

STATE BOARD ARRANGES MEETING

Both parties—wind reel and truck grain-blower had contacted the State planning board about their problems. Acting in a liaison function, the State planning board sponsored a meeting in Helena on November 18. From this meeting arose the new Montana Air-Reel Co.

The owners emphasize several positive features of a semirural Montana location for their manufacturing operation:

1. Large quantities of surplus labor are available from October through May, when seasonal farming operations shut down.
2. Much of this labor is mechanically skilled and permanently resident.
3. There is good transportation and a market within a few hundred miles.
4. Small towns make good places to live.

The State board said, "We wish this new firm good luck. It's another attempt to provide more employment opportunities in Montana by making a product for local and national markets. This is a small business that may grow into an important agricultural implement company."

USIA Cultural Spree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a most in-

formative and thought-provoking article by Hon. Eugene W. Castle, of New York—banker, author, world traveler, and one of the Nation's most knowledgeable authorities on the excesses of the U.S. foreign aid and propaganda programs—entitled "A Transfer of Funds," which appears in the March 1959 issue of the American Mercury.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A TRANSFER OF FUNDS

(By Eugene W. Castle)

When the Congress responded again to the urgent pleas of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and voted new billions for mutual security, it assumed that these vast sums would be used exclusively to safeguard the United States from the menace of world communism.

The Congress and 175 million American taxpayers were unaware of the fact that the funds demanded to defend our country against world communism would be utilized, in part, to promote cultural exchange with the Soviet Union.

Now it has been revealed that, with the approval of the President, \$3,600,000 of mutual security funds have been transferred to finance the building of an American exhibit in Sokolniki Park, in the heart of Moscow. This exhibit is to open on July 4, 1959. It is, perhaps, a strange coincidence that the U.S. Department of Commerce spent exactly this amount to produce U.S. trade fairs in not 1 but 18 different locations throughout the world last year.

However, Mr. George V. Allen, the fourth chief press agent to head the U.S. Information Agency since Mr. Eisenhower became President, was selected for his present post chiefly because the White House urgently needed a skillful fund promoter to confront hostile and suspicious congressional appropriations committees.

According to Congressman OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, Mr. Allen tried to obtain \$7,200,000 for the forthcoming Moscow jamboree to be charged in full to the American taxpayers. But, Assistant Secretary of State Christian Herter, who usually responds to White House demands, would not go along with this excessive request and all too obvious open handed switch of mutual security funds. Mr. Herter firmly rejected USIA Director Allen's \$7,200,000 demand, backed by the power and prestige of the White House, and the State Department official insisted that the taxpayers could not be imposed upon for more than \$3,600,000 to bring the American way of life to all the free citizens in the very heart of godless Russia.

Also, it should be recalled that 100,000 of these very same Soviet citizens stormed the American Embassy in Moscow several months ago and broke every window in our diplomatic establishment in the Red capital. Many of these same citizens are likely to be our guests in Sokolniki Park next July.

Simultaneously with the staging of the American exhibit in Moscow, the Soviets will stage a similar fair in New York. An eight-man delegation, headed by Deputy Trade Minister I. G. Bashahov, left Moscow, November 29, to complete plans here for the presentation of a favorable picture of the abundant and peaceful Soviet way of life. The Soviets, however, are not building an exhibition hall but will lease two floors of the Coliseum in Columbus Circle, New York.

Most of the \$3,600,000 to be expended for this newest cultural relations project in Moscow will be utilized to pay for the building to house the exhibits. At the close of the fair's 6-week run, the Soviets will get the building (paid for by the American taxpayers) at a price which will only represent a fraction of the construction cost. Provision

for the Russian acquisition of the building was concluded in Washington, D.C., November 9, but no purchase price was mentioned in the agreement. Under Secretary of State William S. B. Lacey, who was originally responsible for the consummation of the now highly questionable cultural exchange agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, finalized January 27, 1958, was the first to report that the American exhibition hall will go to Russia and at a price that they will determine. It is possible, too, that this newest multimillion-dollar cultural spree may, in the end, prove to be the wrong exhibit, in the wrong country, to the wrong people at the wrong time. This is so because, on November 10, Khrushchev announced to the world from Moscow that the deadline—for the United States, British, and French forces to leave West Berlin—would be about July 1, 1959. Three days later, on July 4, 1959, the U.S. Government-sponsored fair is scheduled to begin a 6-week run in Moscow.

A staunch foe of our Government's mutual security and cultural excesses, Congressman PASSMAN, has challenged the improper use of mutual security funds to promote Russia, rather than to defend the United States, as Congress intended. Mr. PASSMAN, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, in a letter to C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for economic affairs, protested against dillydallying with funds in a manner not intended by Congress.

Mr. Dillon, replying to the Congressman's protest, contended that construction funds had to be committed now and that there was no time to go before Congress to request an extra or supplemental appropriation to cover the Moscow fair.

Mr. Dillon is now the principal White House proponent for an additional billion dollars, over last year's appropriation, for the new foreign aid budget to be presented to Congress in January. He stated that the only money immediately available for this project is \$300,000, left over from the 1957 appropriation for an American exhibit in Gorki Park, Moscow, a previous cultural exchange project, which failed to materialize.

"In view of the impossibility of securing supplemental funds through the normal appropriation procedures," Undersecretary Dillon stated, "the executive branch proposes to utilize the authority of section 451 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended, to finance the cost."

"This use of mutual security funds, while entirely appropriate under the above cited authority, is considered to be exceptional. We do not have any additional plans for such financing of similar programs, and it would be our intention to continue to finance exhibitions under the appropriations for the President's special international program."

Undersecretary C. Douglas Dillon did not mention the fact that the \$3,600,000 for the Moscow fair was transferred from the mutual security fund almost at the same hour that President Eisenhower issued a stern directive to all Government department heads ordering them to cut their respective budget requests to the bone because of the serious inflationary dangers resulting from the \$12 billion deficit now confronting the Nation.

Our Progress in Ballistic Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States, a few

weeks ago, referred to the deep concern many of us share over this Nation's apparent lag in missile development; he called it hangdog humiliation.

This was an unfortunate and inaccurate description of what is really and simply a facing up to an important problem. This was the subject of an excellent editorial published in the Friday, January 30, issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RIGHT TO ASK

President Eisenhower used an unfortunate phrase in his press conference Wednesday when he said Americans have no cause for hangdog humiliation over our progress in ballistic missiles.

We could not agree more. But where is the hangdog humiliation? We have seen no evidence of it.

By inference, it is bound to be accepted as an administration label on responsible men like Senator STUART SYMINGTON who are genuinely concerned by what they believe to be a dangerous lag in our missile development against that of Russia.

Although there is undoubtedly an undertow of politics in the differences between Senator SYMINGTON (a hot-so-dark presidential horse) and the administration, the Missouri Democrat is neither hangdog nor petty faultfinding. He speaks with a background experience of former Secretary of the Air Force.

The President's remark was in reference to Premier Khrushchev's statement that Russia now has intercontinental ballistic missiles in production. The Russian words Khrushchev used could be taken to mean either serial or mass production.

The main point is that ICBMs, according to Khrushchev, are in production. On the record, Soviet announcements of missile or rocket developments have been found to be accurate. In addition, it is much more in the interest of our security to take it as a fact than to dismiss it as an idle boast.

In contrast, Hanson W. Baldwin, military writer of the New York Times, reports that our first operational Atlas missile is now programmed for July. Assuming that the Soviet Premier was announcing a fact, there is obviously a lag.

How serious it is, we do not pretend to know, nor do we dispute the President's assertion that remarkable progress has been made in catching up.

Spendthrift panic is not the answer. Neither is equating honest criticism with hangdog humiliation. We are confident that the administration's program is designed to give us a missile deterrent strength to Communist conquest. We are equally sure that Senator SYMINGTON, and men like him, have the right to question whether the program is good or fast enough.

Indian Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial

entitled "Where Infants Die," published in the Ogden Standard-Examiner of January 15, 1959.

The editorial supports the bill (S. 56) introduced by me and cosponsored by a number of other Senators, which would authorize the Public Health Service to provide basic sanitation facilities on Indian reservations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHERE INFANTS DIE

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, announced in the Senate last week that Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, and other Senators had joined with him to introduce a bill for Indian welfare. The bill authorizes the Public Health Service to provide basic sanitation on Indian reservations. The Indians favor the bill, and so does the administration. So do all informed American men and women. The reasons are plain.

The U.S. Public Health Service reports that more than a fourth of the Indian babies born in the Dakotas and Nebraska die before they are a year old. Most of the deaths occur in the first months as the babies are taken from the warmth and safety of hospitals to the cold and often unsanitary homes.

The Indian rate for tuberculosis is four times higher than the rate for the general population. The death rate of gastroenteric diseases is six times greater, from influenza and pneumonia four times greater. Indians for the most part are too poor to provide sanitary facilities and decent homes.

We wish the Senators interested in improving the Indians' health would investigate charges that hunger often prevails among Indian groups. It is fantastic to think that impoverished Indians, including children, can go hungry in this land of great food surpluses, but such appears to be the case, to our shame.

Views of McMinnville (Oreg.) News-Register on the Nation's Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the crucial question of a sound farm program has troubled many of us. We are worried over a policy which spends nearly \$5 billion for direct payments to the growers of six so-called basics, and which passes by the vast majority of the Nation's farmers—especially the small family-sized farmer who is most in need of succor.

I have done some speaking on this issue in my home State, and I am pleased that a thoughtful and analytical editorial on these speeches was published in the McMinnville (Oreg.) News-Register of December 5, 1958.

Because many Members of the Senate share my desire to have a new farm program which would be less costly to the taxpayers and more fair to average farmers, I ask unanimous consent that

the editorial of the McMinnville News-Register be printed in the Appendix of the Record—and I would call particular attention to its approval of the two-price plan for wheat, which would not only lower support costs but also channel wheat into feed uses at a price which poultry raisers can afford. This editorial is especially timely now because the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], an outstanding leader in farm legislation, has just introduced his bill for the domestic parity wheat program, and I am pleased to have been invited by him to be a cosponsor of the bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR NEUBERGER'S FARM POLICY

It is said that some persons, on being given responsibility, grow—others just swell. We think that the first part of this description applies well to Oregon's junior Senator, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. If he keeps moving in his present direction he will reach McNary-like stature.

This was impressed upon us once again by a report in the Oregon Farmer about a speech NEUBERGER made recently to the annual meeting of the Pacific Northwest Farm Council. He urged a thorough revamping of our national farm policy and charged that continuing crop surpluses, record U.S. Department of Agriculture budgets and the lack of any help for the majority of farm families spells out the dismal failure of the present basic Federal farm program.

NEUBERGER pointed out that of the six basic supported crops—corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—only wheat is grown in this region. "And the absurdity of this conception of what is basic," he said, "is illustrated by the inclusion of peanuts and tobacco, while such necessities as meats, vegetables, and fruits are not deemed worthy of Federal attention."

NEUBERGER suggested that wheatgrowers of the Northwest would benefit far more from a truly bold and imaginative trial of the domestic parity or so-called two-price plan, than from continuous desperate, annual manipulations of parity price support levels and production control quotas under the established program. He indicated that this plan would both help to eliminate the tax costs of the present program and would make lower-priced wheat available as feed to benefit farmers who raise chickens, turkeys, and livestock, as well as the region's wheat farmers.

"To my mind," said the Senator, "a meaningful social policy for farms, must focus on people rather than products, on farm income rather than farm prices. Not only is farm income the point of real significance to farm families, but it is also obvious that a program which stresses farm prices can be divisive between farmers and city consumers."

According to the Oregon Farmer's report, Senator NEUBERGER suggested further that "in the current period of great technological change, both in agriculture itself and in food processing for consumption, the true test of a program for any branch of agriculture should be that it aids farm families—individually or cooperatively—to have the access of capital, the stable markets and the insurance against unforeseeable natural or economic blows, that are needed to keep the family farm operation the basic producing unit in modern agriculture."

It is our opinion that certainly the present farm program is catawampous and that Senator NEUBERGER is moving in the right direction. He may not have a hold on the entire answer, but at least he is reaching for the right end of the stick.

Forty-ninth Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, throughout the Nation last week, February 7 through 13 to be specific, the 49th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America was celebrated with proper and impressive ceremonies and activities manifestly appropriate in recognition of that good and constructive organization.

Of coincidental significance, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a very impressive assembly held in the public square in Newark, Ohio, and in which participated 600 uniformed Boy Scouts from central Ohio, where an American flag bearing the 49th star representing the admission of Alaska into the Union was briefly displayed by a Boy Scout honor guard, with special permission.

The master of ceremonies, Common Pleas Judge Charles R. Holsberry of Newark, Ohio, who is Boy Scout counselor on citizenship of the Newark troop, was told by representatives of the Ohio press witnessing this impressive ceremony that to their knowledge, this was the first ceremony in Ohio, and probably in the Nation, wherein the new flag bearing the 49th star was displayed for such a dual commemorative purpose.

Belatedly, but manifestly not lacking in importance and significance, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record this very commendatory article on Boy Scout Week which has been called to my attention by the National Council of Boy Scouts of America, of New Brunswick, N.J.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BOY SCOUT WEEK

Founded in 1910 the Boy Scouts of America is 49 years old. Today nearly 5 million boys and adults are participating in the Boy Scout program and, since 1910, the number of boys and adults who have been or are now members totals more than 28 million.

Starting in the United States in the early years of the 20th century, when the frontier period had drawn to a close, Boy Scouting, based on many of the frontier concepts which had welded the United States of America into a hardy and resilient nation, faced a tremendous period of development, industrialization, urbanization, growth, and scientific exploration. These years have perhaps been the most unique in all history.

Each period in history has its special challenge for youth, and today this challenge is as complex as the complicated world in which we live. It is not the purpose of Boy Scouting to remove the hurdles from the pathway of youth, nor to lessen the challenge which confronts them. Rather, it is the purpose of Scouting to help boys recognize the challenge and accept it, to surmount the hurdles.

What is this challenge, and how can we help boys meet it? Isn't the challenge today to live productively in a world of science and

rapid change? Movement and change are two elements that characterize the period in which we live. These factors will have a profound effect upon all of us, but particularly upon youth.

We must help youth see that in today's world change must be sought, not fought. We must help youth become adaptable and flexible as they are confronted with change. We must help youth develop inquiring minds—the urge to explore new fields of thought and action. These qualities of thought and spirit are needed by all young Americans who grow to manhood in today's world, and especially in the exploration of new worlds of engineering and science.

But as we strive to meet this challenge we must recognize that it is not our function to determine which boys should undertake scientific careers. However, we should open doors for all boys to have experience in science-related fields and help those who have strong interests to seek and obtain the guidance of local experts in scientific fields.

More than ever before, all boys need the help and encouragement of capable adults in exploring the worlds of work and learning.

It is of the utmost importance, therefore, for boys to learn to understand adults and to learn new and better methods of working with adults. Adults, on their part, must learn to relate themselves to youth and to understand the changing needs of youth.

There is another great challenge today. Although boys live in a rapidly changing world, they need a type of moral stability that can only come from a personal scale of values. This cannot be merely imposed upon them. It must be a way of thinking and living which they build for themselves with the guidance and help of thinking adults.

Boy Scouting has the program, and through the sponsoring bodies of America—120,000 of them—it mobilizes the facilities and the leadership necessary to help youth meet these challenges. Scouting begins with the Cub Scout program, where 8-, 9-, and 10-year-old boys have an opportunity to explore such science-related subjects as radio, machinery, photography, aircraft, electricity, mechanics, conservation, and wheel power.

Cub Scouting also contributes significantly to a wholesome attitude toward adults. This starts at home where Cub Scouts and their parents participate in the program together. The contacts with adults gradually widen as the Cub Scouts work with den mothers, den dads, and other Cub Scout leaders. Through intelligent use of the ideals of Cub Scouting, boys begin to strengthen their code of ethics, a first step toward the development of a stable scale of values.

The Boy Scout program, for boys 11 to 18, opens doors to a much wider exploration of science-related subjects through the merit badge fields—agriculture, astronomy, automobile, aviation, machinery, metalwork, mechanical drawing, photography, botany, chemistry, electricity, geology, radio, soil and water conservation, surveying, weather, and zoology, to name a few.

Merit badge requirements are constantly being brought up to date with the help of outstanding authorities in special fields. Through the merit badge counseling system boys can be brought into contact with fine local men who are authorities in their fields.

The exploring program, for young men of high school age, goes still further in opening doors in career possibilities. Explorer activities are self-initiated, planned, and carried out by the Explorers themselves, with the help of adult advisers and consultants. This is the age when a job future and the need to make a job choice are of paramount importance. Exploring leads young men toward the development of special interests, radio, archeology, the sciences, visits to industrial plants and laboratories, sessions to spotlight careers, all of which bring them into contact, through advisers and consult-

ants, with adults who can help them develop such interests.

Local experts give Explorers valuable technical advice, and help them develop productive working relationships with interested adults. Thus Exploring provides a new adult-youth relationship, with emphasis on adult coaching. Such a program also gives Explorers opportunities to test their rapidly forming scales of values. This is important when boys are in their final transition to adulthood.

The world has changed a lot since Boy Scouting was founded in the United States a half century ago. The frontier concepts of those days have changed to new frontiers in speed, in scientific change, and in space.

So, in this Boy Scout Week, the 49th anniversary of a great movement which has touched and influenced the lives of more than 28 million boys and adults, scouting is equipped to assist boys to explore this new world and to help them acquire the character habits which will make it a wholesome world in which to live.

The Boy Scout program needs your help as adult members of the community. It needs your financial support, your understanding, and your help as leaders, advisers, and as consultants in special fields of interest.

Use of Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a few days ago the Milwaukee Journal paid a high and well-deserved compliment to Dr. George W. Calver, the chief medical officer in the Capitol. The Journal editorial complimented the vigor and fitness of the Members of the Senate, too, and noted—quite properly—that Dr. Calver deserves at least some of the credit. Certainly each one of us is grateful to Dr. Calver for the conscientious concern with which he helps to guard the health and fitness of members of the legislative branch of our Government.

The Journal editorial, however, was somewhat inaccurate on one point—namely, in stating that "Dr. Calver is telling Congressmen to avoid cream and butter." I have checked with Dr. Calver, who tells me that this is not his general advice to his patients. In fact, only in special, individual cases in which the patients are suffering from specific problems of high blood cholesterol content does Dr. Calver warn his patients to avoid foods having a high content of animal fat and hydrolyzed vegetable fats, as well.

Specifically, Dr. Calver tells me, he advises patients to avoid all rich foods, such as gravies, sauces, fried foods, and so forth. He emphasizes that vegetable fats, when used in the preparation of foods, such as in frying, become hydrolyzed, and, therefore, contribute as seriously to the blood cholesterol problem as do animal fats. Finally, Dr. Calver emphasizes that it is the manner of life of the individual patients—rather than the characteristics of these foods—that is the determining factor as to whether they should avoid them. The fact of

the matter is that fats are extremely high in energy—much higher than are proteins or carbohydrates. As Dr. Calver says, if a man is digging ditches or engaging in some other strenuous form of activity and exercise, he will readily burn up as much energy as he can consume; but a man who spends long hours of work at a desk, with little exercise, does not require a high-energy diet.

I am sure the Milwaukee Journal's editorial writer was being primarily facetious when he suggested that Wisconsin politicians might wish to suppress sound medical advice concerning the effects of diet upon health. Neither Wisconsin's dairy industry nor Wisconsin's official representatives would be party to encouraging individuals who have special health problems to consume foods which are not good for them. But on the other hand, it is important to have a clear and fair picture of precisely what the facts are—as fully as they are known to responsible medical authorities. Without this clarification, I fear that the Milwaukee Journal's editorial may have left its readers with a completely unintended, but nevertheless false, impression of the true health considerations in respect to dairy products. The fact is that milk and milk products are wholesome, nutritious, and health-giving foods; and any suggestion that this is not so would be a greater disservice to the American public than even to the dairy farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

-dangerous Diet Advice

Watching the United States Senate in action recently we were struck by the physical vigor and trimness of the Members of that venerable body. Many of them had obviously been dieting. Many of them showed the results of exercise. Even 90-year-old Senator GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, seemed physically spry—resulting in part from the fact that he walks to work every day and takes other forms of exercise.

Credit for some of this physical fitness must go to Dr. George W. Calver, resident physician to Congress. He's a great man for exercise—says a Congressman should take a brisk hour's walk before breakfast. And he's a great man for dieting, too. But he's going to have some trouble with Wisconsin's congressional delegation.

Dr. Calver is telling Congressmen to avoid cream and butter. He tells them they can eat oleomargarine. If these are requirements for physical fitness, Wisconsin's delegation won't carry off any fitness prizes. A diet restriction like that would be treason.

And it might—in Wisconsin—even be political suicide.

Electing Fighters for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a column published in the February 1959 issue of the South Dakota Bureau Farming. It is entitled "How I Helped Elect Fighters for Freedom," and was written by Mrs. Ernest Telkamp, Route 1, Brookings, S. Dak. The article won for Mrs. Telkamp the national award in competition among farm bureau women.

Mrs. Telkamp points out how, as a farm wife she activated herself in politics as vice chairman of a county committee of one of our great political parties. She does not mention the party in her article, as is appropriate, because the South Dakota Farm Bureau, as is true of all good farm organizations, is not engaged in politics in a partisan manner. However, I can add parenthetically, here in the confidence of the Senate Chamber, that Mrs. Ernest Telkamp is a Republican county vice chairman in the Republican county of Brookings, S. Dak. And—I should add—she is a mighty good and effective worker and leader.

She points out in her article something which I believe all of us would like to have our constituents read, namely, the responsibility of a farm wife to activate herself in the public affairs of her community and to participate in the activities of the party of her choice in a capacity of leadership. It is a most inspiring article, and certainly merits the award which it received. Therefore I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues by having it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW I HELPED ELECT FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM (By Mrs. Ernest Telkamp)

A few short months ago party platforms were quite uninteresting to me. The two words sounded dull; words which would require much study about tiresome issues of which I thought I knew little.

Then I was appointed the woman member of our State's Farm Bureau resolutions committee. I sat at these meetings hearing resolution after resolution from the counties being read. There was discussion after each reading. I awoke to the fact that laws were created by us, the people, about things that were near us, things that we wanted changed for the betterment of ourselves and our communities. These laws weren't dull. I found that I had opinions about them, even a small degree of knowledge about some. I found that it was a pleasant feeling to have a meeting of minds in this committee, out of which came betterment for mankind.

I began to realize that the type of people I was associating with mostly, had a common philosophy of life. This was synonymous with my idea of Americanism. This idea I was ready to go to bat for. It also fit in with my religious beliefs. I had always believed that America was God's gift to a people that sincerely desired to worship Him. A people that were trying to live by His precept "Love thy neighbors." Making resolutions to become laws that would help these neighbors was a way of being a good American.

Soon after this I was asked to become county vice chairman of a political party. I spent the summer working, almost full time, organizing the county women of this party to get out the vote.

Survey cards, with places to mark if the voters needed assistance of any kind to vote, were taken from house to house all over the county. Coffee parties were held in most

every precinct to interest more people. Amendments and party platforms were explained at these. More coffee parties were held to introduce the candidates. Rallies, dinners, and picnics were the order of the day. Publicity was used wherever possible. Absentee ballots were sent, registration was urged, ballots were taken to sick people and folks in rest homes. On election day transportation and babysitters were furnished. Workers through the county called neighbors and urged them to vote.

Meanwhile the campaign had been progressing. Accusations and counteraccusations were being hurled at us through all mediums. I began to realize that a party platform wasn't hard to understand when it was interpreted as laws that my neighbors and I would have to live by. I found that the choice lay in a self-government with a competitive enterprise under which the God-given rights of men are protected or a centralized government which controlled and supported the people. The knowledge that this kind of government would control me and my helpers gave us a double incentive, to work for the candidates we believed would give us the kind of government we believed in, and to get out the vote—the vote for free American government.

Judge Oscar C. Dancy, "the Country Judge From Texas," Reflects Credit on His State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, down in southern Texas people will tell you the initial "C." in the name of Oscar C. Dancy stands for "Concrete." They mean it as a compliment.

They mean that Oscar C. Dancy, who calls himself "just a country judge from Texas," is a man of the highest principles and ideals and has never wavered from his beliefs.

The people of Cameron County and of Texas have a right to be proud of Judge Dancy. This man has served them faithfully and unselfishly for almost 27 years.

All example of his devotion to duty is the fact that he is at his desk and working by 5:30 a.m. each day.

But it is the type of work he does that distinguishes this great man. Today, there are more than 360 miles of all-weather, class A highways in Cameron County, which contains only 857 square miles in all. One of the men mainly responsible for this is Judge Oscar C. Dancy. What makes his interest in highway development unusual is that he does not drive an automobile himself.

Since Judge Dancy took office, about \$10 million has been spent on various public works in his county.

The judge has been active in other development projects for the good of his home area and the good of the State. For example, he has been extremely active in projects for the conservation of our natural resources, particularly in irrigation and other water problems

which have beset Texas and the Southwest.

Another thing I particularly value from Judge Dancy in his wise counsel. I am proud to say that the judge and I have been friends for many years, and his advice and wisdom have often helped me in making decisions. I value his friendship highly.

Mr. President, as a tribute to Oscar C. Dancy, the "country judge from Texas," a man of character, wisdom, and farsighted and unselfish service, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the well written article "The Country Judge From Texas," written by Clarence Laroche, and published in a recent issue of the San Antonio Express magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNTRY JUDGE FROM TEXAS

(By Clarence Laroche)

"I have absolutely no business to warrant such a call," the polite white haired gentleman told the young woman secretary, "but I just want to meet a county judge who spent more money than I did."

The young lady made a brave attempt to present the usual cold front to would-be callers, but she was completely disarmed by the warm, frank glow of the elderly but rugged man. The hard lines on her face thawed and melted into a smile. She asked the gentleman to wait while she checked.

In a few minutes, the President of the United States walked out, face beaming and arm outstretched, as he grabbed for the hand of Oscar C. Dancy, "the country judge from Texas."

"I meant what I told that young lady," Oscar Dancy explained later. "Harry Truman, as county judge of Jackson County, Mo., is the only county judge who outspent me when it came to putting out public funds. Of course, Truman had a bigger and richer county, and the reason I came in second is because I've been doing my spending over a quarter of a century."

After comparing notes that morning, Harry Truman and Oscar Dancy found the former had spent \$20 million in bond money during his terms as county judge while the latter had spent about \$10 million.

Down in the Rio Grande Valley, they'll tell you the "C" in Judge Dancy's name stands for "Concrete." The quip is a tribute to the judge who has been a pioneer in road construction not only in his own country and section but in the State as well. Today, Cameron County has a total of 363.32 miles of all-weather class A highways, and Oscar "Concrete" Dancy is key figure who helped bring that program about.

Oddly enough, this man who has brought about a great modern paving program to his county and section has never himself driven over the highways he helped build. He has never owned an automobile and has never learned to drive one.

But the lack of an automobile has not stopped this ex-North Carolinian. If anything, the walking he has been reduced to, played a role in keeping him healthy. Despite the exercise, he gets lifts either by regular bus service or by friends. He is usually home by 5:30 in the evening and in bed by 8 p.m. Next morning, if you should happen to be in the Texas Cafe about 5 o'clock, you will probably see one of the waiters looking through the big plate glass up the street. He will turn, draw a cup of coffee and place it before a nonexistent customer. A minute later, Judge Dancy will come through the door and sit before the

coffee. He's at his desk in his office at the courthouse by 5:30 a.m.

His trips are frequent to Austin, Washington, and other cities where important measures and policies are formed. Phoenix and Denver, Albuquerque and El Paso know him from the Reclamation Bureau meetings he has attended in regard to valley water projects. He knows his way around Austin about as well as Mayor Tom Miller, and long ago threw away his guide to the Nation's Capital.

In fact, it was at a Washington congressional committee hearing that his "country judge from Texas" tag took hold. His extreme air of honesty and straightforwardness caught fire with a newspaper reporter, who promptly tagged the judge with the colorful—but very fitting—sobriquet in a report of the day's committee activities.

It is this same air of frankness, coupled with his complete honesty and integrity, that have contributed to his success as a politician, helping him to retain his office almost continuously for almost 27 years. The lone break in this long tenure came in 1932.

"It seems I got blamed, along with Hoover, for the depression," the judge explains wryly, "and was forced to take an involuntary leave of absence for a couple of years." It is noteworthy that he was returned to office in 1934 and has been in office ever since.

Still in full harness after over a quarter of a century as Cameron County judge, Dancy is definitely a throwback to a type of statesman of a century ago. In fact, one of the major compliments recently paid him was the reference to him as a "backwoodsman." He considers that a tribute.

Today, at an age when most men become conservative in both their physical and mental attitudes, "the country judge from Texas" refuses to take things easy. He has an open mind, is tolerant and would be classified as a liberal. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, he believes, was the greatest President the country ever had; he's wholeheartedly in favor of many New Deal projects and philosophies, and is bitterly against any attempts by big business to run the country. He is equally as bitter against communism and its potential menace to America.

tees as a result of the seniority system, study this list of committees and chairmen:

Space, JOHNSON, Texas; Agriculture, ELLENDER, Louisiana; Appropriations, HAYDEN, Arizona; Armed Services, RUSSELL, Georgia; Banking and Currency, ROBERTSON, Virginia; Finance, BYRD, Virginia; Foreign Relations, FULBRIGHT, Arkansas; Government Operations, MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; Interior and Insular Affairs, MURRAY, Montana; Interstate and Foreign Commerce, MAGNUSON, Washington; Judiciary, EASTLAND, Mississippi; Labor, HILL, Alabama; Post Office and Civil Service, JOHNSON, South Carolina; Public Works, CHAVEZ, New Mexico; Rules and Administration, HENNING, Missouri.

There is not a chairman from the Northwest, the Great Lakes area, or the Middle West. Yet Georgia, Virginia, and Arkansas each have two. Some of these southern Senators are well qualified. Some are not.

Here is why the South does not want to break with the Democratic Party (as is often threatened) or carry the segregation fight too far. It would only risk losing its vast influence in Congress.

The seniority rule—some call it senility rule—provides that committee members rank in accordance with years of continuous service and that the member of the majority party having the longest uninterrupted service shall be chairman.

It's a bad system. It can put time serving incompetents in chairmanships. It frequently keeps the best men out of top jobs. It mocks principles of responsible party government. It is contrary to the idea of a legislature responsible to the electoral mandate.

PROXMIER's proposal for geographical distribution of chairmanships is no answer, of course. The accident of geography no more assures competency than that of seniority. Committee chairmen should be chosen on the basis of all-around ability—nothing else. But, even as PROXMIER, we have no illusions that changes will be made.

Seniority provides an escalator for all. Get on it, stay on it, keep moving up and you eventually reach the top. Senators may hate it at first. But they come to like it after a term or two.

Senate Seniority System Defeats Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the question of committee domination by the South, through the seniority system, which I have discussed on this floor, has been dealt with in clear and comprehensive fashion by the Milwaukee Journal, one of the leading newspapers of the Nation, in an editorial published on February 10. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Senate Seniority System Defeats Good Government," be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SENIORITY SYSTEM DEFEATS GOOD GOVERNMENT

If you question the accuracy or justice of Senator PROXMIER's protest against southern Democratic domination of Senate commit-

Legislative Program of the National Federation of Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it has been my privilege as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business to work with many good organizations that are interested in the problems of small business. I am sure that other Senators have found, as I have, the recommendations of these organizations to be extremely helpful in connection with the needs of small business. Among these is the National Federation of Independent Business.

The federation's president is Mr. C. Wilson Harder. Its legislative vice president is Mr. George Burger, whom I believe most Senators know. He is an eager and aggressive advocate for small business.

Recently these gentlemen, George Burger and Wilson Harder, presented to

me the federation's legislative program for 1959.

While Senators may not agree with every item of the program, I feel sure that they will agree with most of the recommendations. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the program be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

To Members of the 86th Congress:

We think you will be interested in the following measures. Federation members have already sent their signed mandate ballots to Congressmen during the last congressional session favoring action on these matters which need your attention:

Stronger enforcement of antitrust laws which promote fairer price competition and break up monopoly-creating mergers.

Enactment of law requiring manufacturers who sell through factory-owned stores and independent dealers, to put their independents on the same overall buying basis as their stores.

Further tax revisions to provide bigger depreciation allowances on new and used equipment bought by small business, to provide encouragement for building private retirement plans, to secure same tax benefits for unincorporated businesses equivalent to those granted corporate enterprise.

Enactment of laws requiring fairer dealings by unions with small business.

Curtailment of Government competition with small business.

Enactment of strong fair trade laws.

Require cooperatives to pay taxes on same basis as privately operated independent business competitors.

Reduction of Government redtape and reporting burdens on independent business.

Further streamlining of rules to give small firms a fairer share of Government contracts and Government financing help.

Provide stronger representation for small business in Congress by making the House Small Business Committee permanent, same as the Senate Small Business Committee.

Educational Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently there has been a great deal said about our educational program and what should be done to strengthen it and to remedy some of its so-called defects. Many suggestions have been made, including the introduction of bills which would grant a great number of scholarships, and dealing with other phases of the program.

I have in my hand an article published in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, February 17, 1959, entitled "Education in Revolution—Indianapolis Aims To Restore Excellence to High Schools."

I have stated publicly many times that I thought changes must be brought about first in the living rooms from which the children come, and right on up through grammar school, high school, and college.

The editorial, I am sure, does not have all the answers, and I do not approve of all the points it makes; however, I am sure the suggestions which are made in the article will go a long way toward making worth-while contributions to our program.

I call it particularly to the attention of Members of Congress, and also to the attention of the people of the Nation. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

EDUCATION REVOLUTION—INDIANAPOLIS AIMS TO RESTORE EXCELLENCE TO HIGH SCHOOLS

(By John Chamberlain)

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind.—Shortridge High, one of Indianapolis' eight high schools, has an old tradition of excellence. In the past it has sent as many as 70 percent of a senior class on to college.

Today, amid changing population patterns in this city of 460,000, Shortridge's share of college-bound students is no longer what it used to be. The local board of education does not like the trend—which is even more pronounced at other Indianapolis high schools. But instead of deploring the laziness of modern students, the board is busy doing something about the situation. With the diploma credit system being upgraded as a starter, Indianapolis is in the throes of an educational revolution designed to restore excellence to its old standing as a desirable commodity. This contrasts with the effort imputed by critics to the progressive, to adjust everybody to mediocrity.

At Shortridge High the revolution cannot go fast enough to satisfy the principal, Dr. Hadley, who remembers the great days of his school. Through years of general apathy about classical tradition, Shortridge has continued to offer courses in Greek and in Hebrew. Since not enough students normally elect these subjects to justify them in the budget, the principal has used ingenious makeshifts to keep them in the catalog. The Greek teacher remains on the payroll by conducting classes in Latin. The Hebrew teacher is a local rabbi who lacks the requisite Indiana credits in educational methodology; he remains on the payroll by virtue of a special certificate which waives the usual board of education teacher requirements.

Shortridge is forced to battle for its ancient tradition because, as a comprehensive high school, it must take IQ's as they come, whether low or high. What saves it is the system known as multiple track. In its English courses, for example, the students are grouped in five separate levels in accordance with their abilities. In a top English class you will hear a boy offering such obiter dicta as "The whole science of war is logistics"—this as a response to a question about Emil Ludwig's biography of Napoleon.

Teachers at Shortridge use their common sense in shutting back and forth between older methods of instruction and the modern encouragement of learning by doing, which means letting the student set the class pace. A day's assignment of the literature of Puritan New England, for example, will allow for plenty of student talk about the Puritans. But the practice of letting students conduct their own class will be interrupted from time to time as the teacher takes off on some old-fashioned information-giving. At Shortridge the teacher is not only on tap, he is also occasionally on top.

CONCESSIONS IN SCIENCE

Science at Shortridge must make some concessions to the lower IQ student who wants to take his math as general arith-

metic and his biology as life science. But multiple track again saves the day for excellence: the brainy student can choose the advanced placement programs in math and science, doubling up on intermediate algebra and solid geometry in 1 year, and taking analytical geometry and calculus (the ordinary college freshman math course) as a senior.

Dr. Herman L. Shibley, Indianapolis' general superintendent of education, believes in ability grouping and enriched programs for students of high aptitude ratings. At Shortridge they have even managed to exceed the range of Dr. Shibley's permissiveness. They have done this by establishing voluntary after-hours classes in the great books of the Western World.

The fact that Shortridge offers good courses, however, has not exempted the school from the general leveling atmosphere which causes even first-rate human material to pick the easy way. In Indiana, the State minimum requirements for the ubiquitous general diploma are set at 16 units, only 9 of which have to be taken in such basic subjects as English, math, and history.

There is no State compulsion in Indiana to take a foreign language—and high school math need be no more than a review of grade school arithmetic plus some instruction in household budgeting and the art of balancing a checkbook. Even in Shortridge it has been possible for a bright boy or girl to laze through 4 years of driver training, home economics and other concessions to the rage for life adjustment.

Inasmuch as some students in any general educational profile are all but ineducable, there can be little argument against the Indiana State minimum. But the local Indianapolis school board observed a year or two ago that the minimum was tending to become synonymous with the maximum. Local high school graduates, armed only with the general diploma units (no foreign language, no solid geometry or trigonometry), were going on to the State universities—and flunking out.

Some members of the local board decided the college preparatory courses must be changed even before Sputnik woke the United States up to the need for better training in fundamentals. Within a year there were some drastic innovations.

The first thing to fall was the general diploma system. To Ralph Husted, an Indianapolis Power & Light Co. official who is currently the head of the school board, it seemed pointless to award the same certificate to a boy who had met the rigorous standards of the Latin and Greek curriculum at Shortridge High and a boy who had all but majored in basketball at one of the other Indianapolis high schools. Mr. Husted offered the idea of the differentiated diploma as a cure which was intended not only to reward the student but to prod Indianapolis parents into making Johnny pick more difficult subjects.

The differentiated diploma idea strikes hard at the basic noncompetitive fetish of the progressive educators. It implies a hierarchy of educational values. But to General Superintendent Shibley, though his own training had been in modern methodology, the break seemed worth making. Accordingly, the new system of rewards went into effect last September without a hitch.

NEW ACADEMIC COURSE

Beginning with the high school class which will be graduated in 1962, the Indianapolis student who wishes to take the academic course must enroll for more of the basic academic subjects—English, French, algebra, physics, etc.—and, what is more, he must maintain a C-plus average in them. Upon completion of 18 units of work (two more than State minimal requirements) at considerably better than passing average, the student will receive the academic diploma.

Separate diplomas will be given for the fine and the practical arts courses and the semi-

vocational courses (17 units of work required), and for the general course (16 points, without algebra or a foreign language). In case the academic course student fails to maintain the C-plus average throughout 4 years, he will qualify only for the general diploma.

Besides taking more compulsory courses and being held to a higher standard of marking, the college-bound Indianapolis student may shortly be faced with more difficult work. At any rate, the Indianapolis School Board has ordered a far-reaching reevaluation of local curricula. Instead of calling in professional educators from the teachers' colleges to pass muster on the instruction from the standpoint of educational method, the school board has asked professors from Indiana liberal arts colleges to rate the courses on the basis of their content.

It is still too early to get a line on the results of the investigation. But the school board hasn't waited for the report on Indianapolis English classes to make some changes in the teaching of English rhetoric. Last September the board added 20 new English teachers to the high-school faculties and asked that the average English class be reduced from 35 to 20. With more teachers and smaller classes, the schools were able to start a theme-a-week program which is designed to restore English composition to its old high estate.

There are other innovations in the making at Indianapolis. Students in local high schools may take a bona fide course in economics (not a mere social-study smattering) using a good text by Fred Fairchild and Thomas Shelley or by J. H. Dodd. With funds raised by Indianapolis private industry, high school teachers have recently been sent to M.I.T. for summer mathematics and science courses.

MERIT PAY FOR TEACHERS

Finally, the Indianapolis school board is looking into the feasibility of paying local teachers in accordance with their merit. There is still a good deal of opposition to this particular idea, but it will not be abandoned until (and unless) the school board is satisfied that it would create too much bad blood among Indianapolis' 3,200 teachers.

Indianapolis offers merely one instance of the yeast that is currently rising in the educational world. Though the results of the differentiated diploma system won't be known for a year or so, it is already attracting attention elsewhere. The advisory committee of the Ohio State Board of Education, for example, has recommended looking into the desirability of separate diplomas for academic and vocational degrees.

What Indianapolis has at least done is to return the spotlight to the idea of encouraging excellence. It has resolved to spread the Shortridge High tradition to all of the Indianapolis schools. And this in itself is a far more important phenomenon than anything that may happen to be written on a diploma.

Tax Relief for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, S. 1011 is one of four small business tax relief bills which I have introduced this

year. This bill would compel the Internal Revenue Service to accept the decisions of the Federal courts as binding on the Service unless it appeals those decisions.

Recently, I received a letter which illustrates quite well the need for S. 1011. The letter was written to me by Mr. George L. Scott, Jr., Alabaster Lime Co., Alabaster, Ala. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ALABASTER LIME CO.,

Alabaster, Ala., February 10, 1959.

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: I note from a press release, dated February 9, that you have introduced three bills in the Senate which are designed to help small businessmen, and I am very grateful for your interest in this matter. I am, of course, interested in all three of the bills but am particularly interested in the one at this time that would compel the Treasury Department to accept court decisions in tax matters or take appeal.

We have been in a controversy with the Internal Revenue Service for several years in connection with the method of taking percentage depletion on limestone, and several months ago we filed a claim for a refund which we think is due us, based on several court decisions. So far, this claim has been denied and I presume it would be necessary for us to go to the trouble and expense of entering suit to recover this money, which seems very unfair and very unnecessary. I am enclosing a copy of these decisions with which you are, no doubt, familiar and some of the cases involved are similar if not identical to ours. You will note a recent case decided in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, involving a case for the California Portland Cement Co. in which the court decided in favor of the taxpayer. This company manufactures portland cement, lime, and crushed limestone, and the court ruled that the stone, when calcined and sold as lime that the percentage depletion should apply on the lime and not limestone, as lime was the first finished product.

Our principal business is manufacturing lime, although we sell some limestone most of which is a byproduct and which is too small to be burned on our kilns. We are contending that the depletion allowed on the stone, when calcined, should apply on lime and it is not marketable until calcined.

As you are well aware it becomes increasingly difficult for small manufacturers to compete with national concerns as through pricing policies, reciprocal deals, and other devices, they have advantages which small concerns do not enjoy, and in our particular industry there is much more lime produced today than there was 20 years ago, although there are not near as many companies now in existence. Some of them have gone out of business through bankruptcy or have been purchased by larger concerns and the tendency for this situation seems to get worse.

I thought this information might be helpful to you and I again assure you that I appreciate your efforts along this line.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE SCOTT, Jr.

Collegiate Nurse Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is not only yesterday's headlines about a new weather satellite, the headlines of a few months ago about artificial planets, the fantastic growth and increasing complexity of our techniques of production which give evidence of an ever-changing world. The arts of death, it is true, are rapidly making science fiction novels read like historical romances. But, thanks to the efforts of thousands and thousands of unsung men and women, the arts of life are advancing, too.

Today's nurse, though imbued with the same spirit that led Florence Nightingale to the Crimea, and Clara Barton to the battlefields of the Civil War, must operate in an entirely different context. In a former era, the American nurse gave baths, changed bed linen, cleaned up the hospital wards and performed other such vital but nonprofessional labors. It was not every many years ago that a nurse was not authorized to even give injections. But today the heroic figure of the woman—and man—in nurses' white symbolizes not only a person who is willing to give of her time and energy to care for the immediate needs of the sickroom, but in addition a person whose professional, technical, and scientific training is of a quality comparable with that of any profession.

Today's nurse cannot be a high school graduate, whose spirit of applied Christianity alone qualifies her for this service. She is a skilled technician in the war against disease. In her hands any of our own lives may rest some day soon. To her education we should give careful and conscientious study.

Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this 86th Congress, I introduced a bill—H.R. 1251—designed to assist in meeting the serious shortage of college-trained nurses. Today, in a nearby legislative body, a similar bill is being introduced by an American statesman whose leadership in the fight for adequate health facilities for the American people is unexcelled—the distinguished and able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUBERT HUMPHREY]. I have asked leave of the House to address myself to this legislation, and to the needs which prompted it.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958, within its own compass, was a major step forward in meeting the needs of American higher education. But the victory gained by the passage of that act was not solely in terms of its substantive content. It was equally significant as a symbol of the recognition by the Congress and by the American people that higher education is a vital part of this Nation's strength. I do not

refer solely, or even mostly to our military strength, although this is not unimportant. The 1958 act indicated to the Nation and to the world that we again asserted the Jeffersonian belief that an uneducated nation could not long be a free nation. This belief has been a keystone of the American system since our birth as a nation. It is as demonstrably true today as it has always been.

But the National Defense Education Act of 1958 did not have an even effect on all types of higher education. It emphasized science and mathematics, at the expense of other disciplines; and in terms of the context of the bill, this was perhaps justified. But there remains a shadow field, at the margins of science, as that term is used. There remain the healing arts, medicine and nursing. These are not considered as scientific fields within the meaning of the National Defense Education Act. Yet they are professions in which the paraphernalia and techniques of science are of the greatest importance. And they are fields which we must develop for the same reasons that we must develop the fields of science and mathematics. Our national supply of college-trained doctors and nurses—and especially the latter—must be strengthened if we are to meet the demands of the time, if we are to be adequately prepared for the possible needs of a civil defense emergency, if we are to meet the health needs of an evergrowing Nation.

The bill to which I address myself provides for grants-in-aid for the construction of teaching facilities for nursing education at the college level, in the amount of \$20 million per year for each of 5 fiscal years; for grants-in-aid to help meet the costs of collegiate nursing instruction in the amount of \$10 million per year for the same period, for \$10 million yearly for scholarships for college training of nurses, both those just entering the profession and graduate nurses, and for the creation of an advisory committee appointed by the Surgeon General, to assist in the administration of the act. The bill contains appropriate safeguards against the intrusion of Federal control into the field of curriculum, personnel, and administration of the collegiate schools.

What evidence have we of a need for such legislation? To fully explain the desirability of an act such as I have proposed, it is necessary to speak at some length about the present state of nursing education.

In the first place, it is a surprising and sobering fact that of the 430,000 professional graduate nurses in the Nation in 1956, only 30,000—some 7 percent—have bachelor's degrees from an accredited college. One and five-tenths percent of the total number of nurses have master's degrees. In spite of the excellent working of Public Law 911, which the Congress enacted in 1956, the general picture has not changed. The latter act, designed to equip graduate professional nurses for supervisory duties, through assistance in the obtaining of master's degrees, has been less successful than was hoped, largely because of the serious

shortage in some areas of nurses who have baccalaureate degrees, and who would thus be eligible for work on advanced degrees.

In the fields of teaching, administration, and supervision the picture is even more discouraging. In these three areas of nursing activity, where one might legitimately expect the percentage of nurses holding bachelor's degrees to be very large, the statistics indicate that only 22.4 percent are actually so prepared. In the very field of nursing education, where the possession of a college degree might legitimately be considered as absolutely essential, we find that only 77 percent of the nurses involved hold bachelor's degrees. I ask unanimous consent that two tables, showing the per-

centages of degree-holding nurses be inserted at this point in the RECORD, together with explanatory material from the U.S. Public Health Service.

TABLE 1.—Estimated number and percentage of active graduate nurses holding academic degrees, in the United States, 1952 and 1956

Degrees held	Number		Percentage	
	1952	1956	1952	1956
Total.....	374,600	430,000	100.0	100.0
No degree.....	343,750	393,000	91.8	91.5
Bachelors degree.....	27,050	30,000	7.2	7.0
Masters degree.....	3,800	6,400	1.0	1.5

¹ Includes an estimated 75 nurses in 1952 and 125 in 1956 who hold doctorates.

Source: 1952 figures, "How many nurses have college degrees?" by Eugene Levine, Nursing Outlook, January 1954, p. 23; 1956 figures, table 2, this article.

TABLE 2.—Estimated percentage of active graduate nurses holding academic degrees, by field of nursing, in the United States, in 1956

Occupational field	Number of nurses			Percentage of nurses		
	Total	Holding bachelors degree	Holding masters degree	Holding no degree	Holding bachelors degree	Holding masters degree
All fields.....	430,000	30,000	6,400	393,600	7.0	1.5
Hospitals.....	265,800	14,700	2,200	248,900	5.5	.8
Directors.....	11,400	2,600	1,300	7,500	22.8	11.4
Supervisors and assistants.....	23,900	3,100	600	20,200	13.0	2.5
Head nurses and assistants.....	44,000	2,800	200	41,000	6.4	.4
General duty and others.....	186,500	6,200	100	180,200	3.3	.1
Public health.....	27,200	6,900	1,300	19,000	25.4	4.8
Supervisors.....	3,100	1,400	800	900	45.2	25.8
Staff nurses.....	24,100	5,500	500	18,100	22.8	2.1
Nursing education.....	10,400	5,300	2,700	2,400	51.0	26.0
Industry.....	17,000	800	100	16,100	4.7	.6
Doctors' offices, private duty, and other.....	109,600	2,300	100	107,200	2.1	.1

Source: Figures shown in this table are estimates based on published and unpublished sources. A description of the methods used in making these estimates and a list of source references can be obtained from the Division of Nursing Resources, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. From Nursing Outlook, vol. 6, December 1958.

Explanation of sources of data used in table 2 of article "How Many Nurses Now Have College Degrees?" published in Nursing Outlook, vol. 6, p. 689, December 1958

Occupational field	Source of data
Hospitals, all categories of personnel.....	Survey of 682 hospitals in the United States, conducted by the Division of Nursing Resources, Public Health Service, in the early part of 1958. The 682 hospitals represent a random sample of the 6,158 hospitals in the United States listed by the American Hospital Association.
Public health.....	Based on reports received from State health departments in the United States, as of Jan. 1, 1957. Tabulation prepared by Division of Public Health Nursing, Public Health Service.
Nursing education.....	Based on a 1957 survey of teachers in nursing education programs conducted by the American Nurses Association, a 1956 survey of schools of nursing conducted by the National League for Nursing, and on data collected in State surveys of nursing needs and resources conducted by Division of Nursing Resources during years 1955 to 1958.
Industry.....	Based on reports gathered by State health departments, Jan. 1, 1957, by occupational health program, Public Health Service.
Doctors' offices, private duty, and other.....	Projected from data collected in State surveys of nursing needs and resources conducted by Division of Nursing Resources during years 1955 to 1958.

In an effort to meet the growing needs for college-trained nurses, the nursing profession itself, in the best traditions of American professionalism, has undertaken rigorous self-analysis, and has established a system of priorities, which I ask unanimous consent be printed at this point.

STATEMENT OF PRIORITIES—ADOPTED BY THE ANA BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FEBRUARY 1959

The ANA is concerned with providing the best possible nursing service for the American people. If this is to be accomplished, there must be an adequate supply of qualified professional practitioners of nursing.

The members of the association believe that the public must share in the responsibility of providing adequate financial support for nursing education.

Through its 1958-60 platform, the association is committed to promote legislation which will provide public funds for research, scholarships, and continued improvement in nursing education. At this time, primary needs for public support are in these two areas:

1. Traineeships, or scholarships for nurses in advanced programs preparing for teaching, administration and supervision.
2. Expansion of collegiate programs in nursing through assistance with costs of construction and instruction; and through scholarships for students in supplemental and basic programs leading to the baccalaureate degree.

The first of these has been partially fulfilled by the passage of Public Law 911. The objectives stated in the second priority can be met, at least in part, by the subject legislation.

What are the needs that have called forth this bill? Why are we especially in need of college-trained nurses? In view of the fact that we have managed to get along with a nursing profession in which only a tiny fraction are college trained, why do we now emphasize this type of training instead of asking for assistance, if assistance is needed, for the traditional hospital-based nurse training facilities? These are all questions which may legitimately be asked, and they are questions which I hope the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will put to the nursing profession when this bill is brought up for hearings.

But let me, from the information I have at hand, briefly discuss the needs for more nurses and the reasons why training at the college level is urged by the leaders of the nursing profession. The most reliable figures available indicate that the number of professional nurses in the Nation today is at an all-time high. In January 1956, there were about 430,000 professional nurses employed in the United States. This figure shows a ratio of 259 nurses to every 100,000 population. In a past era when few Americans could afford hospitalization, and even fewer availed themselves of it, this might have been an adequate ratio. But today the situation is vastly different. In 1957, 13 out of every 100 Americans went to a hospital. The growth of hospital insurance, the increasing public concern with health, the growth of other demands on the nursing profession such as industrial nursing, public health nursing, and similar nursing activities outside of the hospitals, the increase in the number of hospitals themselves, the prolonged demand for nurses by the Armed Forces—all these factors have combined to bring the supply of trained professional nurses below the demand. The need for additional nurses is well documented and undeniable. At the insistence of the profession itself, the standards for nurse training, both in and out of the colleges, have been kept at a high level. This fact, of deep comfort to members of the public, whose very lives may some day rest in the hands of a trained nurse, has kept the supply of nurses from growing as it otherwise might.

With the growing gap between the public demand for nursing services and the limited supply of professional nurses, our hospitals have had to resort to varied techniques to fulfill their mission. The priceless skills of the professional nurse have had to be rationed, as it were, and the nonprofessional aspects of what were once the duties of the nurses have had to be handed over to nurses' aides, to practical nurses, and to hospital orderlies. But even with these techniques of stretching available skills, the need for professional nurses remains unfilled.

But, as I suggested earlier, why is it necessary to demand college training when the hospital-trained nurses now comprise such a vast portion of the profession?

Let me say first that no question can be posed as to the great work being done by hospitals in training nurses, nor as

to the quality of the work done by these nurses. They are not second-best, they are not in some shadowy area of competence. The professional nurse today, whether hospital trained or college trained, deserves the highest praise and the deepest admiration of her fellow citizens. They are not overpaid by any stretch of the imagination, and they are far from underworked. For most people, the constant strain of the nursing profession, the intimacy with death and disease, the responsibilities that fall upon these dedicated men and women, put nurses in the same category as the members of other professions whose choice of a lifework can only be attributed to the overriding power of conscience and the will to self-sacrifice on behalf of humanity that characterizes, for example, the clergy, or the underpaid school teacher. It is not from any dissatisfaction with the caliber of the work being done by the average nurse today that the nursing profession itself has urged the expansion of college training programs.

First, the nurse today is being called upon increasingly to perform work of a scientific and technical nature which is a far different thing from the job given to the nurse of a generation ago. Let me quote from an article appearing in the New York Times of August 25, 1957, written by Wayne Phillips, a journalist of several years' experience on hospital staffs:

Besides the basic subjects she is expected to have studied in high school—biology, chemistry, mathematics—the professional nurse today must have a good foundation in anatomy, physiology, microbiology, and nutrition. Through training in the specific needs of different types of patients, she is introduced to the principles not only of simple medicine and surgery, but also of urology, neurology, geriatrics, pediatrics, obstetrics, orthopedics, psychiatry, sociology, gynecology, ophthalmology, and otolaryngology. And she must learn the techniques of her profession as practiced in public health and clinical and industrial nursing as well as in hospitals.

The registered nurse today must prepare medications, assist at surgery, and carry out professional duties which not very many years ago were restricted to the medical profession itself. Here is the basic reason for the demands of America's nurses that the newcomers to the profession be encouraged and enabled to pursue their education to the collegiate level.

Today's nurse is doing a magnificent job for inadequate salaries, on the basis of preparation which is not always able to keep up with the increasing complexities of the nurse's job. She is being given more and more responsibility of a supervisory and educational capacity. The demands for a broader based, more professional training program are urgent. The willingness of the persons engaged in the profession is manifest. The time for action, Mr. Speaker, is now.

Mr. Speaker, in the days since H.R. 1251 was introduced, I have received from nurses' associations and from nursing educators, considerable mail in support of this bill. I ask unanimous consent that selections from this mail be printed at this point in the Record.

FEBRUARY 14, 1959.

The Honorable EDITH S. GREEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.
DEAR MRS. GREEN: District 12 of the Idaho State Nurses Association wishes to inform you that we are very much in favor of bill H.R. 1251, Collegiate Nursing Education Act. Will you please send me a copy of the bill?

Mrs. BARBARA JOHANSEN, R.N.,
Legislative Committee, Route 1, Jerome,
Idaho.

NEW YORK STATE NURSES ASSOCIATION,
Albany, N.Y., February 17, 1959.

Hon. EDITH S. GREEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am writing to you on behalf of the New York State Nurses Association in support of H.R. 1251, the Collegiate Nursing Education Act of 1959.

It is a well recognized fact in this State that if we are to meet the nursing shortage we must have better qualified teaching and administrative personnel as well as more students entering the nursing profession. If we can increase the number of students entering baccalaureate degree programs we will have taken a step toward remedying both the shortage in bedside nursing and teaching personnel as graduates of these programs may either remain in bedside nursing or in less time than it takes graduates of diploma school programs to prepare themselves for teaching and administrative posts.

The board of regents of the University of the State of New York being cognizant of the nursing shortage appointed a nurse resources study group for the purpose of surveying nursing personnel resources and needs and facilities in professional nursing education. These studies have now been completed, the first one published in 1956, the second only just released and now awaiting publication. Copies of both of these studies are enclosed for your information.

Acting on the recommendations of the nurse resources study group, the regents sponsored the following bills in the State legislature:

Senate Int. 1846, Brydges; Assembly Int. 2563 D. B. Lawrence: It would amend sections 601 and 611 of the education law, to establish 150 additional regents scholarships for basic professional education in nursing, to be awarded on statewide basis to pupils having highest standing on State list arranged in order of merit regardless of residence. The measure, which was referred to the Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means Committees carries an appropriation of \$46,200.

Senate Int. 2429, Brydges; Assembly Int. 3091, Brady: Adds new section 626, repeals section 613, education law, to change and extend provisions relating to scholarships for advance professional educational nursing to provide for 60 regents fellowships for teachers and administrators of nursing, with awards to be based upon competitive examinations and entitle holder to \$2,500 if income is \$1,000 or less, and if income exceeds such amount, award shall be diminished by \$1 for each \$4 over \$1,000, with no grant to be less than \$500; provides for payments, fixes conditions of awards and appropriates \$132,000. Assembly Ways and Means Committee.

Comment: Under the present law, New York State annually grants 30 State scholarships for advanced nursing education. Each such scholarship is for \$750 for 1 year of study.

While both of these measures, if passed and signed into law, would be of tremendous assistance to us in this State they would not nearly meet the real need as evidenced in the reports of the nurse resources study group, so you see that even though on a

State level we are making every attempt to secure financial assistance we also need the kind of help proposed in your bill.

We are, therefore, urging you to do all in your power to secure passage of H.R. 1251 not only because it will help to prepare more nurses but because it will be reflected in the kind of care the public deserves.

May we also take this opportunity to thank you for your interest in our profession. Having had the pleasure of hearing you address our group in Washington last year we now feel more than ever indebted to you.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KATHERINE E. REHDER, R.N.,
Executive Director.

ALABAMA STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
Montgomery, Ala., February 17, 1959.

Hon. EDITH S. GREEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Mrs. GREEN: As executive director of the Alabama State Nurses' Association, I wish to express the appreciation of Alabama nurses for your interest in nursing education and your efforts in expanding opportunities for this education in colleges and universities throughout the United States in the introduction of H.R. 1251 in the House of Representatives to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing. Members of the Alabama State Nurses' Association are cognizant of the vital need in this State for the expansion of collegiate educational facilities and for scholarship assistance.

There is a critical need in Alabama for qualified teachers, supervisors and consultants in nursing if the people of the State are to receive optimum nursing care. Because of the high cost of education and the relatively low salaries in the nursing profession few Alabama nurses can afford to leave their jobs for an extended period of time, obtaining their advanced preparation on a sporadic, piecemeal basis—night classes combined with full or part time employment. According to a recent survey 25 percent of the active nurses in Alabama have earned some credits toward a degree. Every available scholarship on the baccalaureate level is being used and requests for additional scholarship assistance are frequent.

Preparation beyond the basic level is generally considered necessary for nursing education, public health nursing, occupational health nursing, anesthesia and certain levels in institutional nursing. Alabama nurses, however, have been handicapped in securing nursing education to fit them adequately for positions in these fields as indicated by the results of a 1958 Study of Nursing Needs in the State. In the field of nursing education 5 percent are shown to have no preparation beyond the basic level while 29 percent have some hours toward a degree. Approximately 25 percent of the public health nurses, 64 percent of the institutional nurses, 67 percent of occupational health nurses and 20 percent of the anesthetists have no additional education beyond the R.N.

There are two collegiate nursing programs in the State, one at the University of Alabama headed by Dr. Florence Hixson as Dean, the other at Tuskegee Institute, where Mrs. Lillian Harvey is Dean. Both of these schools have limited facilities at present, a problem, which will naturally be emphasized as the student body increases.

Alabama during the past year was unable to use several of the traineeships granted under title II of Public Law 911 as we did not have graduates holding baccalaureate degrees eligible for admission to the master's program.

Assuring you of the full cooperation of the nurses of Alabama, I am,

Sincerely,

Mrs. WALTER BRAGG SMITH, R.N.

KANSAS STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans., February 16, 1959.

Hon. EDITH S. GREEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: We are pleased to learn of the bill you are introducing in the House of Representatives which will provide grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing. We appreciate your concern and your practical efforts to provide opportunities for programs in nursing education in colleges and universities throughout the United States.

The University of Kansas, department of nursing, is the only collegiate program for nursing education in Kansas. One of the great needs at this school is for qualified faculty to teach the students seeking entrance to the program. This year there were more applicants for this particular school of nursing than could be accepted with the limited number of faculty for the school of nursing. We believe that this bill which you are introducing will assist directly with this critical need in our State.

Sincerely yours,

HULDA O. WEGENER, R.N.,
Executive Secretary.

THE CONNECTICUT
STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
Hartford Conn., February 13, 1959.

Representative EDITH S. GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: We are a constituent of the American Nurses' Association and speak for the graduate nurse population in Connecticut. In this State there are 15,000 active practitioners in professional nursing. Because of the demands of our numerous urban centers, nursing in Connecticut presents a complex picture.

We have just learned through the American Nurses' Association that you have introduced H.R. 1251, to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes.

We should like to express sincere appreciation to you on behalf of the nurses of Connecticut for this fine evidence of your public interest. Favorable action on this bill will benefit not only nurses but through them, all citizens in the United States. To increase our schools by at least 40 percent in the next decade and to meet increased demands for nursing service, we too, concur with you that favorable consideration be given to this bill.

We in Connecticut feel very strongly as to the need for such a law. At present we have only two collegiate schools of nursing in our State, the University of Connecticut under the guidance of Dean Carolyn L. Widmer (who is also the president of the Connecticut Nurses' Association) and the University of Bridgeport under the leadership of Dean Marth P. Jayne.

Two additional collegiate schools in Connecticut have closed because of lack of funds, one connected with a liberal arts college (St. Joseph's) and the second a post baccalaureate program at Yale. We in Connecticut have felt the loss of these schools most keenly. Although we know we need 33 percent of our people prepared on a bachelor's level in Connecticut, only 10 percent of our students are enrolled in schools with bachelor's level preparation.

Nursing studies in Connecticut have shown that present faculty members of several of our nursing schools are inadequately prepared for teaching. And not only is there

a shortage of teachers, but there is a shortage of qualified supervisory personnel and of professional registered nurses in Connecticut also. The public health nurses in our State ranked 39th nationally in a 1957 survey made by the USPHS in the number of nurses in public health positions who have had at least 1 year of approved preparation in public health nursing.

We are grateful for the Federal traineeships granted in the last legislative session. These have been helpful, but they are only the beginning. Because our need is so great we in Connecticut are taking every opportunity of improving our local area—we have introduced a bill in our 1959 State legislature asking for scholarship aid to registered nurses on a baccalaureate level—but we also need Federal assistance.

We must have well-prepared faculty in order to increase our student nurse enrollment. If we can do this, we can thus offer optimum care to the increased number of patients our ever-increasing lifespan and growing population presage.

We hope sincerely that it will be possible for you to lend your support for an early hearing. We, in turn, shall be happy to submit more detail as the time for the hearing approaches.

Sincerely yours,

ELEANOR LUNDBLAD, R.N.,
Executive Secretary.

COLORADO NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
Denver, Colo., February 18, 1959.

Representative EDITH S. GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The Colorado Nurses' Association is vitally interested in your bill, H.R. 1251, and is most grateful to you for your interest in the nursing profession. Nursing education is greatly in need of the help that interested and willing persons such as you can give, and we're deeply appreciative.

Since the introduction of your bill, we have discussed it with the directors of the baccalaureate programs in nursing in this State, and all have expressed the same problems.

These boil down to the extreme need for well-qualified teachers and supervisors, and for funds to obtain facilities and instructors to provide these people.

The directors in Colorado feel that persons with adequate preparation in curriculum-building, in supervision, in present-day concepts of how to teach, are sadly lacking, and that the present Federal traineeships help only the students, not the schools of nursing, since the tuition does not begin to meet the cost of obtaining such adequately prepared personnel.

Those with whom we have discussed the situation feel very strongly that there should be a pool of baccalaureate degree people, from which can be prepared in the master's program the teachers, administrators, and supervisors so badly needed. They believe that such a program might encourage a survey of the present master's degree curriculum which presently seems lacking in a number of areas, especially those of outright teaching methods and certain clinical areas, as well as administrative techniques.

We have in Colorado three schools of nursing offering baccalaureate programs. Following is a list of these schools with the names of the directors of the programs. We believe that you will hear from these people, too, about their needs.

Mrs. Henrietta Loughran, Dean, School of Nursing, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Miss Louise Golden, Director, School of Nursing, University of Denver, Denver, Colo.; Miss Margaret Metzger, Director, Division of Nursing, Loretto Heights College, Loretto, Colo.

A check with the director of public health nursing in Colorado brought to light the fact that only about 50 percent of the public health supervisors have degrees, and only about 45 percent of the staff nurses in local health units are graduates of degree programs although 80 percent of these nurses have public health preparation. The great need in Colorado is for trained public health nurses for the rural areas. About 4 percent of the Colorado population has no generalized public health nursing service whatever. We were told that about 12-20 qualified public health nurses could be used throughout the State, particularly in the rural areas.

Again, we express our very great appreciation for the work you are doing on behalf of the nursing profession, and assure you of our cooperation and help wherever possible.

Very sincerely,

MARGARET LEWIS,
Chairman, Committee on Legislation.

TENNESSEE NURSES' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Nashville, Tenn., February 16, 1959.

HON. EDITH S. GREEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Those of us present at the ANA conference on legislation in Washington last year still recall your stimulating keynote address with enthusiasm. It is with much satisfaction that we have learned of your introduction of the Collegiate Nursing Education Act of 1959 in this session of Congress.

Since a resurvey of nursing needs and resources in this State in 1955 revealed our critical shortage of adequately prepared nursing personnel, we have been working diligently to bring about solutions to some of our problems. At the moment we have two bills in the State legislature and a third to be introduced. Because of this activity, we have certain reports containing data about nursing needs in Tennessee that will interest you. Also, this information will indicate to you that the enactment of your bill, H.R. 1251, would help to meet the health needs of this particular State.

We deeply appreciate your continued interest in nursing and your willingness to work for expanding opportunities in nursing education in colleges and universities. If we can be of any assistance to you, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

MARY ELIZABETH DUNN,
Registered Nurse.

Forty-first Anniversary of Restoration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Monday marked the 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independence of the nation of Lithuania.

This normally happy occasion is cloaked in sadness, for this is a nation enslaved—not just dominated and controlled, as in the case of the satellite countries, but a nation actually seized and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet system.

Let the indomitable spirit and abiding hope of the Lithuanian people serve as an inspiration to us all, for here is

a nation, only slightly larger in size and population than West Virginia, that has been subjected to two of the greatest tidal waves of tyranny in our times, the columns of Nazi Germany and the armed might of Soviet Russia.

As we of the United States have already joined with the Lithuanian people in refusing to recognize the illegal annexation of that country by Russia, let us join with them today in solemn observance of their independence day and in prayerful hope for future freedom for Lithuania and all subject peoples in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, in observance of this anniversary, a resolution unanimously adopted early this month at a mass meeting of American citizens of Lithuanian descent in the city of Racine, Wis., be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,
Racine, Wis.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Lithuania, ancestral home of millions of American citizens, is and has been since 1940, under the occupation and subjugation of Soviet Union; and

Whereas the resistance to this Russian oppression has been carried on constantly and continuously by the Lithuanian people; and

Whereas no real peace or security can be achieved in the world while the entire Eastern Europe remains subjugated by the Soviet Union; and

Whereas America joins with Lithuanians everywhere in reasserting the God-given right of all men to be free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this mass meeting of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of this community commemorating the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania urges the Government of the United States not to trust the talks of peaceful coexistence of the Soviet Union leaders while at the same time unarmed American planes are attacked and personnel killed by their order; and be it further

Resolved, That this mass meeting express its sincere gratitude to the executive and legislative branches of our Government for its efforts to aid all people seeking freedom from communism; and be it finally

Resolved, That this mass meeting urges the Government of the United States to insist on withdrawal of Soviet troops, free elections and restoration of liberty to Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia to implement existing treaties, if a summit conference is called in the near future.

GEORGE KAPOCIUS, Chairman,
STANLEY P. BUDRYS, Secretary.

The Government's \$10 Billion Gift to the Private Banks Last Year, and How Such Gifts Can Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year the Government of the United States made a free gift of slightly more than \$10 billion worth of U.S. Government

securities to the private commercial banks of this country.

This will be a surprising statement to some people. If the Government gave away \$10 billion under most of the methods of gift-giving, the country would hear a great deal about it, and we would normally debate such a matter in this Chamber at considerable length.

The statement is, however, in no sense a surprise to people versed in the banking system. This sort of thing has happened many times before. Indeed, the amount of the gift of last year is well known in banking circles.

Now, of course, using the term "gift" may seem to exaggerate the matter, because the methods by which \$10.4 billion of interest-bearing securities were transferred from the Treasury of the United States into the vaults of the private banks are slightly complex. If this were not so, then, of course, the general public would already know about the matter; and we could expect that a great number of people would be considerably exercised about it. But the term "gift" is literally correct. The Government of the United States gave away these bonds and other interest-bearing securities just as surely as if a convoy of trucks had hauled them from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing directly to the vaults of the private banks.

The more exact amount of this gift is \$10,410 million. It was made in several lots between November 27, 1957, and November 26, 1958. The source of my figure is the Federal Reserve Bulletin for January 1959, page 33. This is an official publication of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and it is available to all Members as well as to the general public. By reference to page 33, one may see that at the end of November 1957, all commercial banks in the United States held \$56,910 million in U.S. Government obligations. A year later, at the end of November 1958, these banks held \$67,320 million of Government securities. Thus the commercial banks increased their holdings of these obligations by \$10,410 million within the 12-month period.

Before coming to the mechanics of how the Government put this \$10.4 billion of Government securities into the hands of the banks, let me point out how the gift was distributed among the banks.

First, all classes of commercial banks shared to some extent in this gift. These include the New York and Chicago banks, the Reserve city banks, and the country banks. But 72 percent of these securities went to only 2 percent of all the banks in the country. And consider this—\$2.3 billion went to only 18 New York City banks.

Now, how did the commercial banks of the country acquire this \$10.4 billion of Government securities?

In a nutshell, they created the money with which to buy them. They created new money in this amount on the credit of the United States, which cost them not one penny. The Federal Reserve System gave the banks the wherewithal to create the money, and this meant that the banks could create the money automatically.

GOLDSMITHS OF OLD MANUFACTURED MONEY

More specifically, the Federal Reserve gave its member banks additional "reserves," and because of the fractional-reserve system on which the commercial banks operate, this meant that the banks could create several dollars of new money for each dollar of new reserves.

Now, for those who may not know about the fractional-reserve system, and how money is created under it, let me point out the elementary principles.

The best way to understand the fractional-reserve system is to begin with the operations of the goldsmiths who were the forerunners of our modern banking system.

There was a time—before there were any banks—when people who had gold usually took the gold into the goldsmith and left it with him for safekeeping. When a man left his gold with a goldsmith, the goldsmith would, of course, give the man a receipt, or claim check, for his gold. This receipt was supposed to mean that the depositor could come back and get his gold at any time. The receipts were transferable, so anyone having possession of a goldsmith's receipt was supposed to be able to present it to the goldsmith and obtain the gold.

What happened, of course, was that people who had these receipts found they could use them as money. In other words, people passed them from hand to hand in commercial transactions, without going back to the goldsmith to obtain the actual gold.

Furthermore, the goldsmith soon learned that the people holding these receipts rarely came in and asked for the gold, so he discovered that he could issue more receipts than he had gold. In short, the goldsmith began making "loans," and issuing receipts to people who had no gold on deposit. These receipts went into circulation as money, just as though the goldsmith had enough gold to back them up.

Each goldsmith was operating on the probability that all the people holding his receipts would not come in at one time and demand the gold.

As experience proved, the goldsmith could usually issue receipts in amounts several times the amount of the gold in his vault. The gold in his vault served the purpose of what today is called the bank's reserves. At least a little gold had to be in reserve to cover the possibility that some of the people holding his receipts would come in and demand the gold.

A pamphlet recently circulated by one of the big business associations claims that experience proved these goldsmiths could safely issue \$10 in receipts for every dollar of gold. This is presumptive history, however, and is part of the bankers' current campaign to sell the idea that their own required reserves can safely be reduced to 10 percent. Actually, no one can say just how long the odds were that the old goldsmiths could safely play on. But we do know that this system of fractional reserves has given a great deal of trouble throughout its use. Most of the banking reforms and regulations which had

been added over the years—including the Federal Deposit Insurance System—have been designed as safeguards against the trouble this system can cause.

PRIVATE BANKS MANUFACTURE MONEY

Today the private commercial banks create money in the same way as did the goldsmiths of old. The banks receive their reserves from the Federal Reserve System—not in the form of gold, but merely as bookkeeping credits. The actual gold is owned by the U.S. Government, buried at Fort Knox, and the Treasury simply issues certificates to the Federal Reserve System to back up whatever money the Federal Reserve System creates.

The Federal Reserve System operates on a fractional-reserve system, too. Under present law it can create money up to \$4 for each dollar's worth of gold, or gold certificate. Under present Federal Reserve regulations, the private commercial banks can, in turn, create \$7 on each dollar of reserves received from the Federal Reserve System. So, the potential money-creating ability of the whole banking system is \$32 for each dollar's worth of gold—\$4 created by the Federal Reserve plus \$28 created on these \$4 by the private commercial banks.

In considering how the commercial banks create money today, we must keep in mind that most of the money in use is in the form of bank deposits. This is what is sometimes called check-book money.

Each time a commercial bank makes a loan or invests in a security, it creates money. It creates new deposits to the account of the person who receives the loan or sells the security. But the bank does not, of course, make any offsetting reduction in my account, your account, or the accounts of any other depositor. The bank that makes the loan may not, of course, be the same one to enjoy the increased deposits. The new deposits may go to some other bank or banks. But deposits in the banking system as a whole are increased. Furthermore, the person to whom the loan is made may immediately pay out the funds, but someone else's deposit account is increased, so the result is the same. New money has been created. The making of a loan or the purchase of a security by a commercial bank creates new money by that amount.

FEDERAL RESERVE GIVES PRIVATE BANKS RAW MATERIALS FOR MANUFACTURING MONEY

Last year, the percentage of deposits which the Federal Reserve System required its member banks to keep in reserve, on the average, allowed the banking system to create money up to \$7, approximately, for each dollar of bank reserves.

As a part of its antirecession program of last year, the Federal Reserve System gave its member banks additional reserves on three different occasions. In February, the Federal Reserve Board reduced required reserves of all member banks by one-half of 1 percent. This gave these banks \$191 million of added reserves, on which they could create

new money at the rate of 7 to 1. In other words, on the basis of these added reserves the banks could create up to \$3.4 billion of new money—by making loans or purchasing securities in this amount.

Then, at the end of March and the beginning of April last year, the Board reduced required reserves another one-half of 1 percent. This gave the member banks more reserves, amounting in this instance, to \$495 million. This one-half of 1 percent reduction was also given to all classes of member banks.

Finally, later in April, the Board made another reduction for the banks in New York and Chicago and in the Reserve cities—which accounts for only 5 percent of all the member banks. This time the Board passed over the country banks. Reserves of banks in New York and Chicago were reduced by another 1 percent, and reserves of the Reserve city banks, by another one-half of 1 percent, giving these banks additional reserves of \$462 million, which meant they could expand the money supply up to another \$3.2 billion.

All of these reserves handed out to the member banks last year came to a total of \$1.5 billion, on which the commercial banking system could create new money in an amount up to \$14.5 billion.

In addition to these reserves which the Federal Reserve System gave the banks through reductions in required reserves last year, the System also gave these banks other great quantities of reserves through the System's Open Market Committee. But for our present purposes it will not be necessary to discuss these.

It is enough to point out that the \$14.5 billion of money-creating power given the banks through reductions in their required reserves were substantially all used by the banks to acquire and hold an added \$10.4 billion of U.S. Government obligations.

PRIVATE BANKS SHOULD NOT BE GIVEN USE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S CREDIT TO LEND TO THE GOVERNMENT

The official reason stated for giving out these reserves is that they were intended to help the banks meet business needs for credit. Actually, there was no expansion of business loans during the year, but rather a reduction of \$1.5 billion. The money which the banks created was, as I have indicated, substantially all used to acquire interest-bearing obligations of the United States. If these obligations draw interest at an average rate of 3 percent, it will mean that this \$10.4 billion gift to the banks will cost the taxpayers about \$350 million each year in interest payments, plus, of course \$10.4 billion if and when the debt is retired.

Now, I doubt if many serious students of our banking system object to the practice of allowing the private banks to create money to be used to meet the credit needs of business. True, the Federal Reserve has the power to create the money, and to some extent uses it. But when money is created through loans to business or individuals, some risk is involved. The creator of the money assumes a risk in making the loan, and this

is a matter which should be left to private banking decisions. We would not like the Federal Reserve System, a Government-owned agency, to have the job of deciding for which companies or individuals money will be created, and for which would-be borrowers money will not be created. It is better to delegate the Government's money-creating power to the private banks and let them use it for these purposes—within limits, of course, and with proper safeguards.

Personally, however, I have never been able to see any reason for allowing the private banks to create money on the credit of the United States to purchase interest-bearing obligations of the United States. In the purchase of U.S. Government obligations there is no function to be performed in separating the good credit risk from the poor credit risk. And the Government's credit which backs up its interest-bearing obligations is no better or worse than its credit on which the money is created. Finally, in creating money to buy Government obligations, the private banks perform no service for the Government which the Government cannot perform for itself—and without incurring interest charges.

Consequently, I am proposing that Congress take action to eliminate the abuses in this system which resulted in giving away \$10.4 billion last year.

Recently I had a note from the research director of a large organization who asked for details about my proposal for eliminating the abuses in the private banks' use of the Government's power of creating money.

I have written the gentleman on this subject, and I hope the Members will be interested in my proposal. Certainly this abuse is no small matter. The \$10.4 billion gift to the private banks last year was, for example, about the same as the total Federal deficit expected in the present fiscal year. As another example, it is a great deal more than the cost to the Government of all the farm price-support programs in the whole quarter-century such programs have been in effect.

Consequently, I invite the Members' attention to my letter as follows. I have not asked permission to use the gentleman's name, so I omit that.

FEBRUARY 17, 1959.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your note of February 11 concerning my proposal for raising interest-free funds.

Let me put the matter in its proper context. First of all, let me emphasize that Government securities should, to the maximum extent possible, be paid for out of savings. This means that every effort should be made to sell the securities to individuals and groups who have the money to pay for them, such as individuals, insurance companies, savings banks, pension funds, and so on. In other words, the securities should be sold to anybody and everybody except the commercial banks. Ideally all securities should be paid for out of savings, except to the extent that increases in the money supply are desirable to meet the needs of the economic system.

The practice in recent years has been, however, to sell a large percentage of the new security issues to the commercial banks, which means that the private banking system creates the money with which to buy these securities. For example, in 1958 the

Federal Reserve gave member banks additional reserves sufficient to allow them to create up to about \$14 billion of new money. About \$12 billion was actually created; and \$10 billion of this was used by the banks to increase their holdings of interest-bearing Government securities.

In every practical respect we can say that the Federal Government made a gift of \$10 billion in Government securities to private banks last year; and this gift, which cost the private banks nothing, will cost the taxpayers about \$300 million a year to meet interest charges.

The Constitution reserves to Congress the power of creating and regulating money. There is no doubt about this. The power upheld in the legal tender cases decided by the Supreme Court in 1871 and 1874, and upheld again in the New Deal gold clause cases of 1935.

Congress has, however, delegated this power. It has delegated it primarily to the Federal Reserve System. And it has given the Federal Reserve System authority to delegate the money creating power, within wide limits, to the private banking system. The power to create money is inherent in the fractional-reserve system of the commercial banks and this system is authorized by law. More specifically, however, the Federal Reserve has authority to change, within limits, the fraction of reserves on which the banks may operate. At present, money can be, and is, created both by the Federal Reserve and the private banks. The Federal Reserve may give private banks additional reserves, which automatically allows these banks to create money—at the present time up to a maximum of \$7 per dollar of additional reserves.

Or the Federal Reserve can itself create the money in any of several ways. Its principal mechanism is the Open Market Committee, which operates a trading center at the New York Bank. The Open Market Committee may buy Government securities, in which case the Federal Reserve System gives the private banks added reserves in exchange for them.

I have dwelt on the mechanics for this reason. My suggestion, that when money is created to buy Government bonds it ought to be created by the Federal Reserve, is frequently met with the statement that it would be much more "inflationary" for the Federal Reserve to buy a given quantity of bonds than for the private banks to do it. Such statements are only intended to confuse the issue. The statement would be entirely true if the Federal Reserve simply bought the bonds and took no action to offset the added reserves given the private banks, but it is not sensible to think that it would not take such action. It could, for example, use its everyday mechanism of raising reserve requirements to offset the effects, or even more than offset the effects.

My point is that I can see no reason why the private banks should be allowed to create money on the credit of the United States to buy interest-bearing obligations of the United States.

The Federal Reserve System is owned by the Government and its income, including the interest received on Government securities, flows back into the Treasury. At least its net income, after expenses, flows back to the Treasury. Its principal expenses are about \$130 million a year for free services—such as cashing checks—to the private banks.

The simplest and the most practical way of accomplishing what I propose is to pass an outright prohibition against commercial banks increasing their holdings of Government securities beyond what they have held in a base period—say the date on which the prohibition is passed. In order to take care of changes in the asset positions of individual banks, the prohibition would need to contain a proviso for individual adjustments. In other words, an individual bank

could be allowed to acquire more Government securities as its capital account is increased.

In addition, another new authority would be needed. While the Open Market Committee can purchase and hold an unlimited quantity of Government securities, it must purchase these from the open market, not directly from the Treasury. The Federal Reserve Board, on the other hand, has authority in law to purchase securities directly from the Treasury, but this is limited to a maximum of \$5 billion and, furthermore, this authority is intended for use only on a temporary basis. The Federal Reserve Board should then be given enlarged authority for purchasing Government securities directly from the Treasury.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

Troubles Galore That Only Work Will Solve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment, underemployment, depressed economy, distressed families, all existing in various parts of our country at the present time, should engage our earnest attention and demand our best legislative talents until these problems are all solved by the Congress for the permanent benefit of our people.

My own bill, H.R. 3696, would tend to solve all these problems successfully, in my opinion, through bringing work into the affected areas. And work, not gifts or doles, is what our people need. Besides, my bill would require no appropriation whatever. Not one dime would the taxpayers have to put up to place my bill in operation. Still further, my bill would require no added bureaucracy. Not one added Federal employee would the taxpayers have on their payroll through operation of my bill.

And now, as an indication of the severe need of work and the existence of want in some of these depressed areas, I invite you to read the following article appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal on February 17, 1959, written by John Ed Pearce about Harlan County, Ky. The article is as follows:

TROUBLE, HUMAN MISERY HANG OVER COAL CAMPS

(By John Ed Pearce)

Until a year ago, the Reverend Willard E. Smith spent his evenings visiting the sick or preparing Sunday's sermon for his Baptist church at Ages, a small mining town near Harlan. But these days Mr. Smith has little time for meditation, and his evenings, like his days, are spent in good works of a different sort. Seldom does he finish his evening meal before there is a knock on the door, and then Mr. Smith sighs, knowing the nature of the call, and feels again the helplessness that he has come to know so well.

The door opens on a spare figure in overalls and worn, shapeless jacket, hunched against the cold of the rain-whipped evening. "Evening, Tom," says Mr. Smith.

"Howdy, preacher," the man replies, his voice the soft twang of the mountains. "I was wonderin' if you * * * if you had anything. * * *

He hesitates, not wanting to put into words his plea for food, and Mr. Smith, knowing this, interrupts.

"I'm sorry, Tom. We just haven't received anything. There's some volunteer firemen from Louisville coming with some things next week, but right now * * *. Your commodities gone?"

"We got some flour," says Tom (he pronounces it "flar.") "And some of that dried milk."

FIVE DOLLARS, FIVE CHILDREN

Once a month Tom lines up and draws his ration of surplus commodities from the county welfare department—some flour, corn meal, rice and dried milk, and occasionally some butter and cheese. According to Federal calculations, these are worth about \$5.20 a month. Tom has five children at home.

"The young uns," he says, "they * * * I was hopin'."

Beyond him, a car splashes down the worn road to Harlan, a momentary invasion of light and sound in the quiet, dark camp, and when it is gone there is only the sound of the cold wind and the dim bulk of mountains looming black against the wet sky.

Five years ago the coal towns around Harlan throbbed at night with noise and light. There were 13,000 men working in Harlan mines then, each bringing home from \$22 to \$27 a day, and there was money for new cars and good food and things for the house. The kids had new jackets and blue jeans and there was money for black skirts and bobby socks and for picture shows and the juke boxes.

But now the camps are in trouble. Since 1934 mine employment has slowly dropped (though it bounced back some in 1958) to about 5,500. Some of the big outfits, like Peabody, have shut down and moved away, and along the hollows around Everts the camps—Verda and Shields, Benito and Kenvir—are idle.

To make matters worse, there is unemployment nationally, and where 5 years ago laid-off miners could go north to look for work, today laid-off factory workers are coming home to Harlan from Detroit and Hamilton and Gary and Cleveland, to draw their unemployment pay for 26 weeks and then join the long lines of job seekers. No one seems sure how many unemployed men there are in Harlan just now. The unemployment office says 2,700. State Representative Nick Johnson says 6,781, and his estimate seems more likely correct.

For Tom and his hungry children and the thousands of others like them are victims of deep changes in our national technology. Private homes have switched from coal to gas for heating. Railroads have gone to diesel. European countries are mining their own coal, and only the continued expansion of the electric-power industry keeps the coal industry in its presently static condition.

Competition for the tightening markets is keen. Only efficient producers, who can afford costly machinery, can survive. And Harlan operators, having no access to water transportation, are caught between high shipping rates and rising costs of production forced on them by John L. Lewis' increasing contract demands. It is this squeeze that has forced them to consider nonunion operation, and today the threat of a prolonged strike in the Harlan field hangs grimly over the coal camps, adding to the despair of men like Mr. Smith and the hungry members of his congregation.

For these men know that their troubles lie deeper than the greed or hostility of operators or union officials. Efficient production demands mechanization of the mines. Higher union wages, in the years following World

War II, forced even small operators to replace men with machines, and today a man using modern coal-mining equipment can produce as much coal as 10 men did before the war. It will take a tremendous expansion of the coal industry to reemploy the nine men thus replaced by machines.

In the meantime, men like the Reverend Willard Smith struggle to solve a problem to which there is no local solution. Since December 4, as head of the United Church Relief, Mr. Smith has distributed 120 tons of food and clothing, and whatever cash has been contributed by fellow Kentuckians. But now he finds his supplies exhausted, just at a time when a new demand threatens.

"Come in, Tom," he says wearily, and the man steps reluctantly in from the wet porch. "I think I can find you a can or two of something."

He goes through the kitchen and returns with some cans of beans and a single can of tomatoes.

"It's about all we have left of the donations," he says. "I'm sorry."

Tom accepts them gratefully. Mr. Smith is a man of the Lord, but Tom knows that he is lying, and that the cans of food came from Mr. Smith's own pantry. He knows, too, that Mr. Smith cannot afford to give them, for the church can no longer afford to employ a full-time preacher, with so many of its congregation out of work, and Mr. Smith now runs a garage to make a living, though he spends most of his time "out begging," as he puts it, for food for his hungry people. But then Tom has five children at home, and they are, as he says, awful hungry. They've had nothing but flour biscuits and dried milk for 3 days.

SUFFERING HERE AT HOME

Mr. Smith sags into a chair and wipes his rimless glasses. He is a heavy-set, middle-aged man with thinning blonde hair. The trials of his fellow men have hit him with the shock that people feel who come into social work late in life, unprepared for its desperate realities and unable to view suffering objectively.

"I tell you, they come up to me and they say, 'Preacher, we gotta have something down our house to eat,' and you see those children's hungry faces, and the women with tears running down their faces, all tired and beaten and hating to have to ask for things, and I tell you, I don't sleep nights. My wife, she keeps my records and helps me out, and last night she just sat down at the table and cried."

There may be reasons why, in this land of farm surpluses, the people in the coal camps must starve. Secretary Benson may have sound fiscal reason for insisting that the surplus commodity program be used not as a relief measure but as a means of balancing our warehouse surplus. But the reasons are not convincing in Harlan County.

"I just can't believe that Kentuckians will let other Kentuckians starve to death," says Mr. Smith. "I know that our economy here in the coalfields can't be righted with food and clothes. We need a lot of things. But right now we need help for hungry, cold people."

Let's Not Forget Power of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Fred Sparks in the New York World-Telegram and Sun, of Friday, January 30, 1959:

LET'S NOT FORGET POWER OF FAITH

(By Fred Sparks)

Pope John XXIII has called the leaders of different Christian denominations to meet and discuss church unity. Perhaps it is presumptuous for a layman, but I pray if they meet they unite for the deepening ideological war against the Communist anti-Christ.

This could take precedence over ancient schisms. On this every minister and priest can unite in brotherly dedication.

The struggle against the regimented atheist is the most important item of free man's business in this century. Politicians might compromise with communism. Men of God, never.

To our shame the religious factor has been neglected recently as opponents of communism concern themselves with economic and political issues. Is the materialist forcing us to battle on this ground?

True, the Soviet and Red Chinese campaign against God has moved off page one, from violent killings to a more subtle slow death. This because Communists in absolute power no longer fear churches within.

Russia profits by allowing several kept, show churches to operate for foreign observation. They're kept because the minister is a public employee like a postal clerk. His sermons are censored.

China's Mao Tse-tung uses his kept show church to advertise his tyranny. He allows Moslems to tell the story of the prophet Mohammed—if they also tell the story of the prophet Marx. Church Christmas displays can feature Mary in the manger—next to Lenin in Red Square.

Today's naive American tourists are led by the hand like so many school children to witness Sunday services at a Moscow-kept show church. Then these innocents return, insisting communism allows religious freedom. They recall the blind man who grabbed the elephant's tail and said: "An elephant is shaped like a snake."

Tragically, few substantial voices are raised to give the lie.

A massive international conclave of Christian leaders could put the free world back on the spiritual level in its defense against creeping communism.

Flood Stresses Dam Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the Bradford Era]

FLOOD STRESSES DAM NEED

As angry, icy waters swept destructively through western Pennsylvania's river towns and on down the Ohio, the public was reminded again that the flood-control program undertaken for this area 22 years ago is still incomplete.

In the aftermath of the historic flood of March 1936, the Federal Government planned a system of integrated dams and reservoirs extending into the headwaters of the Allegheny and the Monongahela Rivers.

Much of the work has been completed, with enormous benefits to the residents and

industries along the rivers. Army Engineers have constructed 10 dams and reservoirs in western Pennsylvania, 8 of them above Pittsburgh.

But one of the most important links in the chain of control remains to be forged. That is the Allegheny River reservoir above Warren, more commonly designated as Kinzua Dam. Congress first authorized this project in 1938 and a year ago appropriated \$1 million to begin construction.

Work has been obstructed, however, by a long and tenacious fight against the project by various interests, including the Seneca Indians, who argue that the reservoir would deprive them of land in violation of a treaty. Valuable time is being lost pending a Supreme Court review of lower court decisions sustaining the Government's right to take the land in the public interest. The Indians would, of course, be compensated like any other American citizens whose property is taken for public purposes.

We are not prepared to argue the extent of which the flood's crest at Pittsburgh—29.21 feet—or at any other point along the Allegheny or Ohio might have been diminished if Kinzua Dam were in operation. That can be left to the estimates of the experts.

It is safe to say, however, that Pittsburgh and other communities would have suffered much greater damage this week if the Government had not undertaken its program 22 years ago. It seems equally plain that danger will remain until the program is completed.

The most important project in the uncompleted part of the flood-control system is Kinzua Dam. Anyone who doubts the urgency or the importance of completing the system needs only to look at the swollen rivers rolling ominously through the Allegheny and Ohio valleys.—Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

One Hundred and Thirteenth Anniversary of Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the great cities of our Nation, and the largest community in my own State of Wisconsin, the city of Milwaukee, recently celebrated its 113th birthday anniversary.

The milestone was appropriately observed by an editorial in the Milwaukee Sentinel, a newspaper whose 122d birthday will be celebrated this summer. I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Sentinel's editorial entitled "113 Years Old," which was published on Monday, February 2, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN YEARS OLD

Saturday was the 113th birthday anniversary of the city of Milwaukee. Incorporated on January 31, 1846, Milwaukee has grown from a village of less than 10,000 population to the 13th largest city in the United States with a population of over 700,000 and an area of some 80 square miles.

Yes, Milwaukee has grown in size and population and commerce and wealth, and it will continue to grow in these respects in the years ahead.

But the thing that makes the Milwaukee Sentinel—founded June 27, 1837, and thus 8½ years the city's senior—most proud at this birthday observation is the fact that Milwaukee, with all its growth, has retained a paramount interest in human values.

For all its size, it has retained the warmth and friendliness of the small town. Perhaps more than anything else, this is what makes Milwaukee unique.

Happy birthday, Milwaukee.

A Bill To Amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 To Encourage Basic Research in Science by the Allowance of a Tax Credit for Contributions and Other Expenditures for Basic Research in Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to permit an allowance of a tax credit for contributions and other expenditures for basic research in science. The bill which I propose would provide a tax concession with respect to contributions to universities and nonprofit organizations for basic research in science as well as a tax concession to industry for basic research in science.

The tax concession in the case of contributions to universities and nonprofit organizations would take the form of a credit against tax to the extent of 90 percent of the contributions made with a further limitation that the credit shall not exceed 5 percent of the tax. In the case of basic research activities by industry the credit would be limited to 75 percent of the expenditures with a further limitation that the credit shall not exceed 3 percent of the tax.

It will be recalled that the report to the President on basic research by the National Science Foundation, dated October 19, 1957, indicated that the Nation's basic research effort must be substantially increased. This bill, I believe, would give effect to the recommendation made by the National Science Foundation by providing increased financial resources for basic science research on the part of universities and other nonprofit organizations as well as providing a positive encouragement to similar efforts on the part of industry.

It is my firm conviction that encouragement of basic research by inducing contributions to organizations covered under this bill and by encouraging industrial expenditures for such purpose is preferable to a system of governmental grants. Under the provisions of the bill interference in research programs by the

Federal Government would be kept to a minimum. In the case of contributions to universities and nonprofit institutions, there would be no interference in that under the bill a determination of what constitutes basic research in science would be left to the conducting institution. In the case of expenditures by industry the bill would provide for the establishment of a certifying authority consisting of a board of eminent scientists appointed by the President on the recommendation of the National Science Foundation. Thus, there will be preserved in the Federal participation in the program, the point of view of the active scientific researcher rather than the point of view of an administrator of a Government agency.

It is my conviction that favorable action on this legislation designed to enhance basic scientific research in the United States would do much to assure the maintenance of our country's scientific and industrial world preeminence and is in the interest of fostering the improvement of humanity and the cause of peace.

Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959

SPEECH

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4245) relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I support the bill H.R. 4245. I do not contend that it is a perfect bill.

I was a member of the subcommittee which conducted hearings on the bill last fall. I know that we did our best in the subcommittee. I know the full committee has done its best to develop a bill which was fair to all segments of the insurance industry and to the policyholders and to the Government.

I hope this bill works. I hope it will be fair and equitable to all concerned. It is the best we could do, at least at this moment.

It was my privilege to be one of the principal advocates and sponsors of the provision in the bill which allows a deduction against operating gains for nonparticipating insurance equal to 10 percent of the increase in life insurance reserves attributable to such nonparticipating life insurance. It is my belief that this proposal will help stock life insurance companies to accumulate appropriate surplus and capital account that are necessary to provide solvency and financial strength to a growing insurance company.

In addition to this 10 percent adjustment it is possible that other similar adjustments should have been included in

this bill. However, I am sure that I speak for the entire committee membership when I assure my colleagues in the House that the Committee on Ways and Means will continue its study of this problem and will watch carefully the impact of this legislation on the life insurance industry and its policyholders.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Proposed Senate Committee on Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, impressive support has come for the resolution submitted by the two able Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD] to establish a Senate Committee on Water Resources.

The latest evidence of this support is from one of Oregon's outstanding editors, former Gov. Charles A. Sprague, editor of the Oregon Daily Statesman in Salem, as expressed in his column of February 11, 1959. I think all Senators will be interested in the views of ex-Governor Sprague, as they apply to the Murray-Mansfield resolution for a Senate committee devoted exclusively to water resources.

I ask unanimous consent, that the article written by Charles A. Sprague be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Senators MANSFIELD and MURRAY of Montana have introduced a resolution to set up a Senate Committee on Water Resources. It would be composed of three members each from Committees on Interior and Public Works and two from the Committee on Interstate Commerce which reviews fishery legislation. The resolution authorizes the Commission to make studies on the following:

"(a) The character and extent of water resource projects that will be needed to be in operation between the present time and 1980 in order to supply the water use requirements of population, agriculture, and industry, including but not limited to navigation development and hydroelectric power generation, and with appropriate provision for flood control, and the realization of recreational and wildlife values.

"(b) The character of legislation that may encourage the adoption of new technical methods and improved process for increasing the usefulness of available water resources, including but not limited to weather modification, evaporation reduction, desalination of saline and brackish waters, seepage control, waste-water salvage, and the application of nuclear energy."

Previously America's waters have been run through many filters, both public and private. President Truman set up a committee, headed by Morris Cooke of Philadelphia, to study and report on our rivers. President Eisenhower set up a cabinet committee with the assigned task of tracing the use of waters

from the mountaintops to the ocean. After much delay its report was submitted, which was the end of that. Resources for the future gave water resource problems a prominent place in its program for the Mid-Century Conference in 1953. The Hoover Commissions and their task forces studied and reported on the role of government in water resource development and on the designation of administrative responsibility therefor. Many private bodies and groups have wrestled with the problem of insuring an abundance of water for domestic use, farming and mining and manufacturing. The Montana Senators now propose a congressional inquiry, with a report to be made by 1961.

One thing is true; we can't increase the available supply of H₂O. The oceans have vast quantities of water, but it is salty. Ice covers at the poles lock up water in frozen form. Many humid areas have an excess of water, while deserts are parched for lack of it.

Another thing is true: water is used over and over again. It is not "consumed." Its form may be altered—it may go up in water vapor—or it may be contaminated; but in the natural cycle it comes back suitable for human use.

The real problem is one of obtaining water at low cost for use where people want to use it.

What has developed is a sharp conflict over how to use our waters and who shall use them for special purposes. Much of this controversy heads up in Congress or in administrative agencies like the Department of Interior, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture. Similar controversies arise in States as groups become rivals for control of the use of water.

Whether the Senate committee can do much more than update the data and rehearse the proposals over water control is doubtful. If it could just write a satisfactory law dividing the authority between the States and the Federal Government that would be a worthwhile accomplishment.

So maybe the Senate should have its turn at the waterholes of the Nation, to see if it can find how to satisfy the growing demand for water at reasonable cost.

Spending and the Taxpayers' Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the public is becoming more and more conscious of the necessity for curtailing excessive expenditures by our Federal Government, thereby paving the way for balancing the budget.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial by Lowell Nye, editor of the Harvard Herald of Harvard, Ill.:

ARE YOU GOING TO LET IT GO ON?

(By Lowell Nye)

Two big spending bills breezed through the U.S. Senate during the weekend past—both of them far beyond the "balanced" budget offered to the Nation by President Eisenhower. One was \$2½ billion for housing and the other \$465 millions for airport subsidy. Three billion dollars—just like that.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, voted for the housing bill; Senator

E. M. DIRKSEN, Republican, against it. Thus Mr. DOUGLAS demonstrates that he was not sincere when he championed the cause of economy in his utterances of the past few months.

If the Democrats in the Senate, led much too ably by LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, are doing all this merely to put a Republican administration on the spot so that some of this action will have to be vetoed, they are being completely irresponsible. They are betraying their trust to the Nation.

Do the people care? Is it the lot of this country to go through wild, unbridled inflation, merely because we won't write letters to our Congressmen and Senators asking them to vote no on this senseless spending?

Fortunately, the people still have a chance. Both measures referred to above now go to the House, where the citizen has more influence. Your new Congressman for this district is ELMER J. HOFFMAN, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

We are finding out—if we are capable of learning anything at all—that this policy of reckless U.S. spending is coming right back to our own pocketbooks. More money for postage; more money for social security; more money for income tax; as we say, right out of paychecks and our checking accounts and our billfolds. Can you deny it?

Major Amendments Needed in Davis-Bacon Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my able colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], in offering a bill to amend the so-called Davis-Bacon Act, relating to the payment of prevailing wages on Federal construction work. A companion measure is being introduced today in the other body by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator McNAMARA, of Michigan.

This law was first enacted in 1931, and was considerably revised in 1935 to represent what was then a comparatively effective instrument for preventing the purchasing power of the Federal Government from undermining existing labor conditions in the construction industry.

Since 1935, however, experience has revealed many drawbacks in the framework for administering the Davis-Bacon Act. In fact, changing conditions in the construction industry, and in the methods of Federal financing, has required a new look at the way the act operates today. That is the purpose of this bill; namely, to provide a basis for taking a new and more realistic look at the Davis-Bacon Act.

May I say at the outset, that major defects in the Davis-Bacon Act have become apparent over the years.

FIRST ADMINISTRATION

It has been shown time and time again that the Secretary of Labor does not possess the necessary authority and responsibility to see that the Davis-Bacon Act is properly enforced. No right to

enter and inspect for violations now exists, as it does under similar labor standards laws such as the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act, granting the Secretary of Labor full power to investigate to see that there is compliance with these laws. Furthermore, the Davis-Bacon Act now fails expressly to charge the Secretary with the duty to find violations and to bar contractors from Government work for the prescribed 3-year period. Instead, these powers rest with the contracting officer or with the Comptroller General, with resulting failure in effective enforcement because of diffusion of responsibility.

SECOND. WAGE DETERMINATIONS

Since 1935, the Secretary of Labor has confined himself to determining the basic hourly wage rate as the only prevailing rate required by the act. Nowadays, however, this basic hourly wage rate falls far short of reflecting the actual hourly labor costs on construction jobs. Collective bargaining agreements throughout the industry now cover many additional payments for the welfare of workers—payments which did not exist in 1935. For example, most agreements in many areas of the country now provide for payments, on an hourly or payroll basis, to health and welfare funds, in order to provide much needed sick and hospital and medical benefits to construction workers and their families. Payments are also frequently required for pension funds, for vacation funds and for supplementary unemployment benefit funds. Many agreements also require payments to various training funds of direct benefit to journeymen and apprentices whose skills are the lifeblood of the construction industry and the mainstay of those who depend upon this great industry for their livelihood.

Recent surveys have shown that the payments to these funds are not only a substitute for direct wage increases which workers would otherwise have received as a part of their basic hourly wage rate, but in addition, that these payments now are a very large part of the hourly wage costs in the construction industry.

In the plumbing and pipefitting branches of the construction industry alone, there are funds in more than 68 of 100 cities surveyed by the U.S. Department of Labor. Payments to these funds run as high as 46½ cents per straight-time hour or as high as 12 percent of the basic hourly wage. Other crafts in other cities have negotiated even higher payments.

These payments cannot be ignored or discouraged because they exist to benefit workers for whom they are made. Yet they are ignored and discouraged. In fact they are completely overlooked in the present administration of the Davis-Bacon Act; the Department of Labor is telling the various contracting agencies that the prevailing rate, in one area after another, is as much as 12 percent less than the actual rate. Thus the Department of Labor is extending an open invitation to outside contractors to bring low wages and cheap labor into higher

wage communities because these lower labor costs give them a successful bidding advantage on Government work.

This type of unfair wage competition was the very reason for the enactment of the Davis-Bacon Act in the first place. It is the purpose of these amendments to upgrade the act so that it will once more carry out its original purpose.

THIRD. OVERTIME AND PREMIUM PAY

Going hand in hand with fringe benefit payments are overtime and premium pay provisions now prevailing in most labor market areas across the country. These payments and all overtime, Sunday or holiday work were practically unheard of on Government work in 1935. Both the depression and the rigid 8-hour law combined to restrict all work to straight time hours during the normal working day.

But times have changed. The construction industry has been booming ever since the beginning of World War II and the 8-hour law has been waived on Government work wherever time and one-half is paid for overtime work each day. Common practice in almost all major cities in the country has been to pay double the straight time rates for overtime work and for work on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. These practices provide still another aggravating factor which the Labor Department has ignored in determining the prevailing wage rate under the Davis-Bacon Act.

FOURTH. COVERAGE

Today, and for more than 25 years, the Davis-Bacon Act has only covered direct construction contracts of the Federal Government. All other types of federally assisted construction have not been protected by the Davis-Bacon Act, except in those cases where the act has been extended to cover special Federal aid programs. Examples of this type of extension are the Hospital Survey and Construction Act—grants to States and local organizations for hospitals—the Federal Airport Act—grants to local agencies for airport construction—and various Federal housing acts—insuring loans or otherwise aiding multiple housing projects constructed locally. These extensions have been made largely on a "hit or miss" basis.

When the Davis-Bacon Act first became law, Federal aid to local construction did not exist the way it does today. At that time it was not important to cover all federally assisted construction. Nowadays, however, a very large share of the Federal construction dollar is spent by means of various types of grants, loans, payments, or guarantees given to local agencies of one type or another, and it has become increasingly necessary to cover these types of construction expenditures on a fair and permanent basis in order to make the Davis-Bacon Act once more fully operative in accordance with its original purpose.

To remedy these many defects, the bill I am introducing has four major objectives. They are:

First. To broaden the coverage of the present act to include: (a) All nonfarm construction in excess of \$25,000 in val-

ue, at least one-third of which is financed by Federal funds, loans, payments, grants, or contributions; and (b) all federally insured or guaranteed loans for the purpose of financing any nonfarm construction program other than housing developments of less than 10 units.

Second. To modernize the term "prevailing wage": The Secretary of Labor would be required to predetermine, and Government contractors would be required to pay, not only the prevailing hourly rate as presently specified in the Davis-Bacon Act but also prevailing contractor payments to (a) health and welfare funds, (b) retirement funds, (c) vacation funds, (d) apprenticeship funds.

Third. To put hours of work and overtime on a prevailing basis: The Secretary of Labor would be required to predetermine, and Government contractors would be required to pay, the prevailing overtime rate for each construction craft on a daily and weekly basis including prevailing overtime practice on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

In addition, as a minimum requirement, contractors would be required to pay not less than time and one-half for hours worked over 8 per day, over 40 hours per week, over 5 consecutive days, and on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

Fourth. To centralize enforcement and create a construction appeals board: under this particular amendment, the Secretary of Labor would have (a) Authority to make uniform enforcement procedures for all Federal Government contracting agencies; (b) direct power—including the use of subpoena—to investigate violations; and (c) authority to apply violation penalties, including authority to black list.

In addition, this bill provides for the creation of a Construction Appeals Board, appointed by the President, consisting of one representative from the public, one from contractors, and one from labor. This three-man independent board would be required to review and issue, as expeditiously as possible, final decisions on appeal from the (a) Secretary's wage predeterminations; and (b) the Secretary's findings of violations.

These four major amendments are necessary so that Federal money will not be used to destroy prevailing wages, hours of work and working conditions and to eliminate the present bidding advantage of unfair contractors in those areas where union building trades conditions are in fact the prevailing practice.

An Address on Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the leaders and outstanding workers

in the field of human rights and understanding in the State of Nebraska is a young man of boundless energy and enthusiasm by the name of Neil B. Danberg.

Mr. Danberg is regional director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Omaha, and is active in working with the city government in its efforts to promote understanding and tolerance of all people.

Recently Mr. Danberg addressed the students at Westside High School in Omaha and spoke of the work of the NCCJ and Brotherhood Week, sponsored by this organization. Under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Danberg's address, and I recommend it to my colleagues and to all the readers of this Record:

ADDRESS BY NEIL B. DANBERG, REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, DELIVERED AT CONVOCATION, WESTSIDE HIGH SCHOOL, OMAHA, NEBR., FEBRUARY 17, 1959

Today, with the whole earth a single neighborhood, we must find a way to realize in concrete terms our ideal of brotherhood. The distance between the ideal and reality can be measured in the numerous injustices that plague society. Injustices reinforce prejudices and discriminations. They are supported in the main by a mass of indifference and lack of concern. Persons who keep saying there are no problems show this height of insensitiveness.

On the other hand a person like myself who is constantly working with human relations problems may gain a perspective that overlooks the countless thousands who are good neighbors in daily experience. Each year, the National Conference of Christians and Jews makes three good neighbor awards in Omaha. The hundreds of nominations attest to the fact that many unknown persons do go out of their way for their fellowman. Their moral insight of compassion brings justice.

I am glad that in this school many have joined in our intergroup youth work. During the past year we centered our attention on the Indians living on reservations in our State. In our Nation's history no other racial group are forced to live apart on reservations. Here the moral wrong of segregation has taken its toll. The reservation at Macy, Nebr., has been described as one of the most destitute in the entire Nation.

Our youth group has made trips to the reservation. We have entertained the reservation youth both here in Omaha and at the State university in Lincoln, Nebr. Through this modest program many of you have come to know the modern Indian. The myths and misconceptions about the Indian of today have been dispersed. The stereotypes and prejudgments about the Indian, Negro, and other groups are tested out against a background of reality. Experiencing that it is not wrong to be different and feeling secure enough to be free to differ. Unity in diversity is possible as freedom is given in the programs of creative decisions on the part of the participants.

Through such experiences an awareness and sensitiveness to the needs of our neighbor is gained. At Christmastime 52 families on the reservation were directly aided by NCCJ. A workshop was held in the fall to deal with the lawless aspect of the Macy community. Unfolding are a host of opportunities for service, for action, toward correcting injustices.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM has recently lent his support to correcting the overcrowding on the reservations. Similar work and projects are carried out with other racial and religious groups. Intergroup

youth is a widening horizon for its participants.

In our State, hate literature has hit an alltime high, an anti-Semitic editor keeps up his devious writings, discrimination in employment drains off talent and serves as a gate stop for incentive. These and other problems make mockery of the religious truth that proclaims the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

We need to enlist more in our roll of persons of good will who work at various means to correct injustices. I am glad that on this Brotherhood Week that here in this school we have such a roll.

Brotherhood is more than a luxury, more than platitude, it has become a practical necessity. We have been increasing our control over the forces of nature but man has not learned to love his neighbor.

Why are men quick to believe the worst about their fellow man, to hold on to misconceptions, to accept injustices? I have found in countless talks given about our Indian neighbors that most persons do not want to accept their responsibility because it would make them feel guilty or uncomfortable.

Perhaps this is one of our tasks today, to present enough information at various levels to make people uncomfortable in prejudice and to make persons take responsibility for acts of bigotry.

Translating this great ideal of brotherhood into life is our great task, our main unfinished business that becomes everybody's business; peace and freedom itself depends upon it.

Speech by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, at the Annual Saginaw County Lincoln Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I would like to submit the speech given in Saginaw, Mich., at the annual Saginaw County Lincoln Day Dinner by Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. Senator GOLDWATER presented the citizens of Saginaw with a powerful explanation of the damage done to our State by a labor dominated and controlled State government. The results of Mr. Reuther's handiwork has been the destruction of the very thing on which his strength is based, the industrial job opportunities available in our State.

The speech follows:

SAGINAW LINCOLN DAY SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, FEBRUARY 9, 1959

It is a real pleasure to be back in Michigan.

This is a State of great beginnings—of great achievements.

As a youngster in Arizona I remember reading about the energy and initiative, the inventiveness of Michigan.

For years I have been driving your great automobiles across rough desert trails. I have been giving them mountain road tests that would make your proving-ground courses seem like Sunday afternoon drives.

And they stand up to it.

Yes, it's a wonderful State.

As I flew in it seemed there must be thousands of lakes here.

Water everywhere.

When I think of what we could do in Arizona with some of this water.

Solidarity House and its landlord you can keep. Just let us have some of the water.

In this month, when we are thinking especially of the name of Lincoln, we Republicans look back to the origins of the Republican Party here in your State. You are citizens of Michigan; I know you love this State. But perhaps you will allow us Republicans from other parts of the country to look with some affection and pride toward the State where began the party of Lincoln—this party of ours which has stood from the beginning for liberty, for the concept of the individual as sacred, this party of ours which has always believed in the full exercise of citizenship rights, without obstruction, without surrender of any part of these rights to any person, or to any group.

I am proud especially to be talking to Saginaw Republicans.

As chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, I watch political trends down into the counties and into the townships. In the recent November election, you Saginaw Republicans showed vitality and a comeback power that made us proud of you.

In most areas of the Middle West, the Republican Party did not sell itself to the voters. Here in the Saginaw area, you did, and you did it very well. In Michigan, generally, the Republican Party was much better than nearby States where, in some cases, the party lost a Senator, a Governor, and control of both houses in the State capitol.

Your candidate for governor, Paul Bagwell, fought a great battle to turn back a trend. He was backed by a party finance organization which did a great job in the face of adverse economic conditions, and by very effective staff assistance.

Above all, Paul Bagwell struck at a very real issue—the destruction of jobs in Michigan—a loss of jobs which has resulted from the flight of industry to other States. Gradually the realization has spread in this State that industry is fleeing from a hostile business climate created by a Democrat Governor's alliance with a powerful and ruthless union politician.

Was the issue effective? Well, Paul did not overcome this 10-year cumulative trend at a single blow, but he took on a Governor who ordinarily runs ahead of his ticket by a quarter of a million votes, and when Paul was through with him, he stood a poor fifth on the ticket.

Political observers were watching the Governor's race in Michigan with special interest. It was thought that the Governor, whose eagerness to be President is well known, would have to run a very strong race if he were to be considered a serious contender for the Democrat nomination in 1960.

Political observers were looking at this race as a sort of popularity index.

When the election was over, political reporters across the country looked at the Governor's poor result and then marked him off the list of Presidential contenders.

Just a week ago, in Washington, their judgment has again been confirmed. A non-partisan research agency took a poll of all the Democrats elected to Congress to find what man these leading Democrats would like to see as Democrat candidate for president in 1960. Two hundred and eighty-three Democrat Representatives and 64 Senators were asked the question. The man who looked so eagerly toward the 1960 nomination before the race for the governor's chair now is favored by only two of these

hundreds of national leaders of the Democratic Party.

The fact is, there are seven Democrat Representatives and two Senators in all, nine Michigan Democrats in the Congress. There seems to have been seven who did not express a preference for your Governor.

I believe that is as close to the bottom as you can get, without an absolute zero.

Bagwell was a great candidate, and he had a sound issue.

He took on Walter Reuther's candidate for governor and cut him to size. A fifth-place man in his own state. The fact is, Paul Bagwell seems to have put Walter Reuther's candidate for president completely out of the running.

For this, Michigan citizens owe Paul Bagwell a great vote of thanks. The rest of us, across the nation, owe Paul Bagwell and you Republican workers an even greater vote of thanks.

Now let us look a little more closely at the issue you Republicans had here in Michigan.

On the face of it, the issue looks like a simple bread-and-butter problem, something directly connected with the everyday problems of anyone in Michigan who works for a living.

Some who thought about the importance of this issue went no further in their thinking. They saw that the issue was genuine, and also that it spoke importantly to every man and woman in Michigan who worked, or who depended upon someone who worked. This was enough.

Now I invite you to review again with me, briefly, the genuineness of this issue, considered as a purely economic matter, for a constant effort is being made by the union political propagandists and the Governor to blur and confuse these facts.

Let me say now that the issue here in Michigan has two major aspects, as I see it. On the surface, and very immediately, it is an economic problem—one, as I have said, which touches very directly every citizen of the State. Underneath, and more important, it is a profoundly moral problem—one which touches vitally upon the civil rights of Michigan citizens.

As I talk to you tonight I am reminded of an evening more than a year ago when I stood before an audience of Michigan Republicans in Detroit. Will you forgive me if I recall briefly several things I mentioned that night, because they seem just as pertinent now?

A few years ago, in Washington, as some of us were reviewing the economic trends of the country as a whole, we were paying special attention to the great economic expansion in the country during the period 1950 to 1956, after the Korean war and under the new Republican administration. This period was before the recent recession from which the country is presently recovering.

Now, looking again at the period of great national economic expansion, from 1950 to 1956, we find that 46 States, big and small, increased their number of factory jobs. Almost no State was so backward that it was not carried along by the tremendous expansion.

Only two States in that period lost factory jobs. One was little Rhode Island. The other, surprisingly enough, was Michigan, a great industrial State which we in the rest of the country had come to look upon as a leader, certainly not as a backward and weak State.

Let me remind you that 1955 was the greatest year for the production of automobiles in the history of the industry. The whole Nation was reaching hungrily toward Michigan for more and more automobiles and trucks. Even 1956 was one of the best years in history for automobile sales.

This enormous national demand was directed right at Michigan and should have

produced an unprecedented prosperity in the State.

Why, then, did the exact opposite take place? Why, instead of a great gain in factory jobs, was there an actual loss in jobs?

What sickness in this State could be so acute that even a great economic "blood transfusion" from the rest of the Nation would still leave Michigan anemic?

What was so unique about this sickness that not one other large industrial State was affected? Why, too, were even small and relatively undeveloped rural States, with no industry like automobiles to attract a national demand, nevertheless increasing factory jobs, while Michigan limped along at the end of the procession?

There was something profoundly wrong with Michigan's economy. That was clear.

We looked with surprise at this State of Michigan, propped up on all sides by the greatest demand for automobiles in the history of the country. How could Michigan be the only State in the whole Middle West to lose factory jobs, almost the only State in this country?

This was almost unbelievable, but it was true.

Now I have, for some years, had a special interest in the State of Michigan. Five years ago a group of Michigan union men came to see me in Washington, because I was on the Senate Labor Committee. They asked for help in solving some of their problems. They told me their civil rights were being undermined by certain politically ambitious union leaders in Michigan.

Now these men were strongly loyal to their union's economic objectives. But they felt that meddling in politics was not the job for union leaders, and they were afraid that they would end up by jeopardizing their economic gains unless certain ambitious union leaders could be kept out of politics.

Deeper still, these men resented having their union-dues money diverted into political slush funds. They had to pay dues to hold their jobs, but they did not believe they ought to have to pay dues money which their union leaders would use for politics, sometimes for candidates actually opposed at the polls by their own union members.

This, the union men told me, was an immoral thing. This, they said, was a basic attack on their civil rights.

I was impressed by the sincerity of these men from Michigan. They were not crackpots or union soreheads. They were solid, family men, one of them a member of the United Automobile Workers for 18 years. As Senator Curren and I listened, we could see their problem was real, and it was important.

As I began then to study the Michigan situation, I became more and more struck by the fact that there were elements in your problem here which were national in importance. Since then I have followed developments here very closely. I am convinced now that Michigan is being used as a laboratory, a testing ground, for something new in America, something, in my opinion, that is potentially deadly. And I believe this statement is conservative, based on a compelling array of facts.

The methods used in Michigan, and the results of these methods on the economy and especially on the civil rights of Michigan citizens give us a preview. A preview of what we may expect if these forces in Michigan spread their methods to the rest of the country.

It is Michigan's problem now, but it threatens to be soon the problem of the Nation. In fact, it has already spread to many parts of the country, but only in Michigan do we see this thing in its mature form. We can study here not only cause; we can study some of the results. Not all the results, mind you, because you may have worse to come in this State, if some strong measures are not taken.

Now we are talking about results. Let us look again at the disastrous economic record of Michigan in recent years.

We know that Michigan was the only State in the Middle West, one of only two States in the whole Nation which lost factory jobs between 1950 and 1956. I would remind you again that this was a period of unprecedented economic expansion throughout the Nation. I would remind you again, too, that Michigan's greatest industry, automobiles, was receiving an unheard of stimulus from a prosperous Nation at the very time jobs were disappearing from the State.

While the whole Nation was going forward, Michigan was going backward.

Why?

I believe I know the cause. Paul Bagwell spelled it out. But in the heat of a campaign a picture can be blurred. Statements and counterstatements can lead to confusion, doubt.

The political campaign is over, and it is time now to review again the facts.

Even now there are those who would deliberately confuse this picture. There are those, I regret to say, who have much at stake in covering up or distorting the actual facts.

The simple fact is that industry is fleeing from Michigan. And new industry which the State needs so badly is avoiding the State.

This is no temporary condition. This flight of industry is so great and so swift that it more than made up for the enormous demands made upon the automotive industry in 1955 and 1956. Some people who wish to confuse this picture for political purposes have tried to blame Michigan's economic predicament upon last year's national recession. How do these people account for the very great loss of jobs at the height of the national boom, before there was any sign of a national recession?

Michigan's problem arose before the recession. When the recession came, Michigan was the worst spot in the country. And now, with the rest of the Nation climbing swiftly again, a professor in your State university predicts that Michigan will still continue to have a large pool of unemployed. And for how long? For an indefinite period of time.

Michigan's problem arises within the State itself. That is clear. The attempt to blame Michigan's problem on the national administration was a shoddy political trick.

Nor can the problem, it seems, be related to the large role which the automobile industry plays in the Michigan economy. If this were true the State should have made great increases in factory jobs when the auto industry was at its peak in 1955, 1956, and 1957, which were respectively the first, the fourth, and the third best years in more than a half century of the automobile business. Instead, as we have seen, Michigan was losing jobs at this time.

What then is the cause?

Is this flight of industry and jobs due to an attempt by industry to escape paying Michigan's high wages? Well, it may be true in some cases that a combination of high wages and fringe benefits have put some Michigan business out of competition.

Such is not the case with the major losses you have suffered. The great automobile industry is moving out of Michigan to Ohio and Indiana. These are not low-wage States. Ohio, in fact, was the third highest wage-level in the United States.

I have read that the automobile industry has built 29 new plants in Ohio alone since the war. The industry is certainly not moving to Ohio and Indiana to escape high wages.

No, except for a few marginal cases, wage differential is not the cause for this flight of industry and jobs from Michigan.

Now, finally, there are some who deny entirely that Michigan industry is actually leaving the State. They claim that the

whole issue is artificial. They say it is a trumped-up political issue, without any real substance.

Now I have received a very interesting study by Professor Jamison of the University of Michigan. Professor Jamison shows beyond question that Michigan, once a national leader, has, since 1948, been falling behind the Nation in many types of industry—in furniture manufacture, in pulp paper and paper products, in chemicals, in petroleum and coal products, in rubber products, in leather and leather goods, in stone clay and glass, in primary metal products, in fabricated metal products, in electrical machinery and in transportation equipment.

According to Professor Jamison's report, Michigan not only has lost leadership in industries for which the State was once famous. It goes far deeper than that, Michigan is steadily losing across a broad front, big industries, small industries, and across a broad range of manufacturing.

What is wrong with Michigan's economy is not limited to any special size or type of industry. No, this sickness is general.

Only a few miles from Saginaw you have a great chemical manufacturer, Dow, one of the greatest in the country. Once this was a Michigan industry. You know that this great company has expanded its facilities not so much in Michigan, but outside the State. So great has this outstate expansion been that now less than half of the total assets of the company remain in the State.

You all know this company. You know this outstate expansion to be true. Only recently in my study of your State did I learn of this fact.

No amount of political propaganda can hide facts of such magnitude and importance.

Now we have talked of industry leaving Michigan. What of industry searching for a location?

Is the sickness which is driving industry and jobs out of Michigan also keeping industry from coming into the State?

Since I last spoke in your State, somewhat more than a year ago, several studies have been developed which seem relevant. One was produced by an independent research organization in Chicago, Market Facts, Inc.; another was developed by McGraw-Hill Research for the magazine, *Business Week*. I found these studies told me a great deal about the attitudes of manufacturers toward coming into Michigan.

In each case the research organizations asked top manufacturing executives to list specific States they would consider if their company were going to select a site for a new plant.

The McGraw-Hill study received replies from 283 executives.

Now how did Michigan compare with other sites as a desirable plant site?

Of the 283 executives expressing an opinion only 3 considered Michigan a first-choice location. Only 19 would give Michigan any consideration at all. When the size and importance and industrial history of Michigan is considered, I believe you will agree this reflects an attitude toward Michigan which could be disastrous to the economy of your State.

My own State of Arizona, relatively new in manufacturing, received almost twice as many first-choice mentions as did industrial Michigan.

Now let us turn to the Chicago study. Market Facts, Inc., interviewed 113 top manufacturing executives. They were asked to compare five Great Lakes States as desirable plant locations, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

Market Facts asked the executives, as one question, to rate any one of the States as "worst." Do you know that every executive who gave a "worst" rating gave this rating to Michigan?

Now there is no doubt of the objectivity or the competence of either of these research organizations. Each has a national reputation, and each conducted their investigations with great safeguards to avoid bias of any kind.

Let us look at the opinions of these executives. Is there a possibility that their opinions would not necessarily be the same as their actions?

Well, there is a simple way to test their actions. We can look at actual plant construction in Michigan, and compare it with nearby States like Ohio and Indiana.

In the 2-year period, 1956-57, industrial contracts for construction in Indiana were a little short of \$1 billion, \$889,123,000. Ohio was larger with \$921,678,000. This was a plant construction at the rate of \$201 for each person in Indiana, \$101 for each person in Ohio.

Michigan? Well Michigan's total plant construction in 1956 and 1957 was little more than a fifth that of Indiana or Ohio, and amounted to only \$27 for each person in Michigan.

What does this mean to citizens of Michigan? It means that the plants not being built today will be the jobs that will die unborn tomorrow.

To the man looking for a job in Michigan today, this means no hope for new job opportunities tomorrow.

To the man who is paying taxes, the flight of industry and this failure of new industry to come into the States means this: The higher and higher taxes of Michigan will not be shouldered by a growing industry. The taxpayer will have to carry the additional burden which an expanding or incoming industry would otherwise have shared.

Now this is a bitter set of facts. And I hesitated long before deciding to address such an audience on facts which many of you must know better than I.

Yet I felt it might be useful for you to hear how these facts appear to an outsider—not entirely an outsider, I hope, since I have good friends in your State—but to one, not embroiled in the politics of your State, nor with any business interests here.

What facts I have seen convince me that your predicament is a matter not only of concern to Michigan but to the Nation. You are a great State, and what happens to you cannot be a matter of indifference to the rest of us.

Now, if you will be patient with me, I should like to proceed to the next step.

We have seen that the Michigan predicament is not due to the shore-lived national recession, nor to the dominance of one industry in Michigan nor even to the lure of low-wage structures in other States.

We have seen that the Michigan predicament is very real and that there is a widespread conviction in the rest of the country that Michigan is no longer a good place in which to expand or to enter with a new manufacturing business. The McGraw-Hill and Market Facts studies clearly substantiate the fact that these opinions are widespread among manufacturing executives whose job it is to locate plant sites.

It does no good to try to hide these facts. Such facts cannot be hidden.

A doctor who tells a patient with cancer that he is suffering only from a slight stomach ache, to forget it, and it will go away, is doing his patient no favor.

The doctor who tells his patient the cold truth about the cancer gives the patient an opportunity to take realistic measures for a cure.

Now I would not presume to take the role of doctor for the State of Michigan. You have men here in this State who have been telling you the hard truth about your problem. Men who know a great deal more about your State than anyone from the outside could ever know.

It is very difficult for men who live here, who love this State, who have known its greatness, to tell the hard story of its present condition. It takes courage, and it takes integrity.

It is easier by far, especially for men who have more ambition than integrity, to repeat the empty optimistic things. Easier by far, and more popular, to say it is just a little passing stomach ache, or to pretend even that it does not exist at all.

To have a leader who takes this line is to have no leader at all, if the sickness is really acute. Such leadership is a kind of betrayal of trust.

Paul Bagwell said the hard things to the citizens of Michigan. He ran better in the recent election, not worse, because of this. He did not win, but he ran better than any Republican gubernatorial candidate in years. He will win the next time, because he deserves to.

As a man of integrity, as a responsible leader, he spoke the hard truths. The citizens of Michigan can trust a man like that.

We come then to the big question.

We know the great natural advantages of Michigan. We know of the great resources, the power, the skilled men. We know Michigan industry is close to great natural markets.

None of these economic advantages has disappeared.

Now, what has happened in Michigan? Your State has not lost any of the great resources, the great economic advantages it had 10 and 20 years ago.

I'll say tonight again what I said in Detroit over a year ago:

What is wrong with this State is not economic. It is political.

Some politicians in your State have feared that the real facts—the truth—might become apparent to the citizens of the State. Not only have they, in turn, denied the problem exists, they have also set up false causes, and then, finally, they have turned to deliberate obfuscation.

They have tried to make this problem look mysterious. I have read how they set up study committees ostensibly to find out what is causing the disastrous Michigan decline, but I cannot believe they are actually mystified by this problem. They know all too well the cause.

Well-intentioned people seem to have lent their names to these committees and, without intending to do so, have helped politicians to keep alive the myth that this is a mysterious thing. What do these committees accomplish? They have one major, but unexpressed objective—"to take the heat off" the politician.

Now it is not actually very difficult to find out why industry is leaving Michigan, and why other industry is staying out of the State.

In each of these industrial organizations there is a small group of responsible executives at the top who make such decisions. They know why they decide one way or the other. There is nothing mysterious about the process.

And I can tell you this. Their decisions have nothing to do with political partisanship. In my own State of Arizona, both houses of the legislature have heavy Democrat majorities. Yet Arizona is the most swiftly growing State in the Union, industrially. At the same time Michigan was declining in the number of factory jobs, between 1950 and 1956, the State of Arizona was increasing 130 percent.

No, responsible business leaders cannot afford the luxury of party bias when it comes to economic decisions. It is their responsibility to go where the business will thrive, stay out of areas where the business will be harmed.

It is not because your State administration is Democrat. It is because the Demo-

crat Party in your State is a shell—merely a label—taken over by a special interest. That special interest is the United Automobile Workers. And I am not referring to the rank-and-file union members. I am referring to a few politically ambitious union leaders, men with a Socialist background.

These men own and operate the shell of a political party. They have retained only the Democrat label.

The key points in the party are manned by their crew. The machinery is fueled with union dues money from the general treasury of the United Automobile Workers.

This party in Michigan which still carries the label "Democrat" is so far to the left, so irresponsible, that even regular New Deal style Democrats find it very hard to accept.

Only last Friday Governor Docking, Democrat Governor of Kansas, made a public statement about the plight of Michigan. I saw the statement as reported in a Detroit paper. Docking said Michigan is completely broke because of a "bureaucracy" which has "run wild."

Now I ask you this, How bad does the situation have to be, for a New Deal Democrat to describe it as a bureaucracy which is running wild?

No, there is no mystery, no mystery at all, about the decision of business executives to move from this State, or to avoid the State, if they are already outside. No responsible executive could conscientiously expose his business to the hazards of a "bureaucracy running wild."

And I shall venture to suggest, furthermore, that businessmen would be better advised to avoid lending their names to committees set up to "take the heat off" leading politicians who are undermining a State's economy. May I suggest that such businessmen might better serve their State and their business by coming at once to grips with the real problem, which is political, and carrying the actual facts to the people. There is a responsibility to carry the whole story to the citizens of this State so that, better informed, they may make political decisions that are appropriate to the actual facts of their situation.

It can be understood why men in the business, for example, of selling industrial real estate might believe it in their short-run interest to obscure the real facts of Michigan's plight. It can also be understood why utilities executives whose rates are set by the State government, or leading educators on the State payroll, might find it difficult to resist an invitation from the executive office in Lansing to be listed on a committee, which is helpful to the public relations needs of the Governor.

How does any other businessman explain his presence on such a committee?

I have observed with interest the public statements of businessmen who declare their intention to get into politics. These expressions are very commendable. Businessmen, like all other citizens, should be informed and active citizens.

May I suggest as an elementary first step that these businessmen stop playing "foot-sie" with the forces of destruction? May I suggest that a little intestinal fortitude might be in order at this point?

Across America, in the fast-growing States, businessmen are getting into politics.

In my own State a successful businessman who had never held any political office ran for Governor and was elected Governor.

He fought a clean, hard fight, on principle. Imported union politicians threw everything they had at him and walked off the field with a bloody nose.

You are faced here in Michigan by a labor party, run by a small coterie of labor politicians, and disguised as the Democrat Party.

This political organization is completely ruthless and thoroughly irresponsible. The leaders of the organization make vital political decisions for this State, yet almost none of these decisions can be reached or influenced either by the voters, or by the union members.

Walter Reuther ran for public office only once. The voters had only one chance at him.

It was in 1937. Fresh from the violence of the sitdown strikes, flushed with victory, Reuther thought his prestige as a union leader could be transformed into political power.

Reuther and four other top officials of the union decided to run for city council in Detroit. And what happened? All were defeated.

Reuther ran 15th, out of 18 candidates. I don't know what was wrong with the three who ran behind him. They must have been objectionable in the extreme.

The union members in Detroit wanted Reuther as union leader; they rejected him as a political leader. This same Walter Reuther who could not be elected to the city council of Detroit, now goes to the national convention of the Democrat Party and exercises a veto over the nominations to the Democrat national ticket.

His is the hidden hand behind the policies in the State of Michigan which have brought this great industrial State to its knees, on the verge of bankruptcy.

The stranglehold of the labor politicians on the State of Michigan is a well known fact to businessmen across the country.

Just a year ago the representative of one of the greatest industrial organizations in America cleared the air—took all the supposed mystery out of this situation. The occasion was a meeting of industrial development people and manufacturers from five neighboring States of Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Michigan.

This industrialist told how industry is searching all over the United States for good plant sites. In Ohio, his company has built no less than 19 new plants in the last 5 years. In Michigan they have built only one. They are not planning, he said, to build any more in Michigan.

When he was asked why his company had decided not to build further in Michigan, he said, "Because of your labor government."

There was nothing mysterious about this decision.

Nor is there any doubt that this one industrial decision alone cost Michigan tens of thousands of jobs.

It does not seem to me to be necessary to set up a committee in an effort to discover what this man meant.

It is there, on the face of it. What is necessary, is that the people of Michigan be given the facts.

Representative government is only sound when the political decisions are made by informed voters.

The great State of Michigan is bankrupt.

The executive is asking for new taxes which are estimated to add \$38 to \$40 million in taxes to the burden already carried by business and industry. How many more industries will decide to leave because of this new tax burden, no one can say.

The supreme court of your State of Michigan is adding its own special kind of nightmare to the businessman. A former United Automobile Workers organizer, now a justice on your supreme court bench, has just written an opinion which may, in effect, compel industry to finance strikes out of unemployment compensation funds.

This is the final touch. To convert the unemployment compensation fund into a strike fund, financed by industry.

If this trend continues, I venture to predict an increase in the departure of industry from Michigan. As your budgets and your

debt become steadily larger, the industrial base which should provide tax revenue will grow smaller.

You will have larger and larger budgets on a smaller and smaller industrial base.

The man whose birthday we are honoring once spoke of such a situation.

Lincoln put it this way: "As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from; so must it be with a government."

It was true when Lincoln said it; the same is true today.

Lincoln Day is a mighty good time for us to be honest with ourselves. We must face and acknowledge our problems—not only in Michigan but across the Nation—if we are to solve them.

I can think of no better resolution for today in Michigan than to carry out to the people this idea of the greatest Republican of them all.

You have a great worthwhile task. The future of your State is truly at stake.

The economic problems of this State have an evil political root and it might well be the dedicated purpose of you all here tonight, as citizens first, and secondly as Republicans, to root out this evil cause of your great State's present discontent.

Every natural economic advantage which Michigan ever had, it still has. The economic problem of Michigan originates in a perversion of Michigan politics.

The problem can only be cured by sound political leadership.

In the final analysis, each citizen will solve the economic problem of Michigan alone—in the voting booth.

I wish you well. For success you will need some of the firmness, the devotion to truth, the dedication we knew in Lincoln.

Your task is formidable.

But the energy, the spirit, the inventiveness that always has characterized Michigan—this has not left the State of Michigan. You have not exported your courage.

The character it took to build this great State, will not fail to meet the present challenge.

You can do it.

Across the Nation, we others who are proud to follow in the tradition of Lincoln will be with you in spirit.

A great responsibility rests on you here in Michigan. For what happens here today can happen to the whole Nation tomorrow.

A Joint Economic Mission to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER W. BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the following joint statement issued today by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], and myself concerning the concurrent resolution which we have joined in introducing in this body and the other body today:

We are today introducing in both the House of Representatives and the Senate a concurrent resolution urging our Government to take the initiative in consulting other nations of the free world, including

India, about the appropriateness and usefulness of a joint economic mission to India.

This is the great moment of assessment, appraisal, and forward planning for India as it seeks means to complete its second 5-year plan and to set in motion its third plan scheduled to begin in 1961.

There is a wide measure of support for these dramatic and critically important efforts, not only in the United States, but also among other nations of the free world. The 86th Congress, acting on a bipartisan basis in both Houses, can give timely assurances to India of our willingness to explore with other free nations all effective means for joint assistance to India in meeting her vital needs for long term democratic growth. The text of the concurrent resolution follows:

"Whereas the continued vitality and success of the Republic of India is a matter of common free world interest, politically because of her 400 million people and vast land area; strategically because of her commanding geographic location; economically because of her organized national development effort; and morally because of her heartening commitment to the goals and institutions of democracy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved: That it is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should invite other friendly and democratic nations to join in a free world mission to consult with India on the detailed possibilities for joint action to assure the fulfillment of India's second five-year plan and the effective design of its third plan; and that the Secretary of State report to the Congress on the feasibility of such a mission after consultation with interested governments and with the Republic of India."

Bank Credit Expansion and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, readers of the New York Times may have noted a letter to the editor by Dr. Elgin Groseclose in the issue of February 3, 1959. Dr. Groseclose is a noted writer and recognized authority on economics. The American Banker was quick to note the analysis of bank credit which Dr. Groseclose treated in his letter to the Times and has acknowledged the recognition it deserves in the following editorial of February 6, 1959:

BANK CREDIT EXPANSION AND INFLATION—A MORAL ISSUE

In the letters column of the New York Times during the past few days an exchange of letters has appeared dealing with inflation from two radically differing viewpoints.

First appeared a letter from Professor Emeritus Alvin H. Hansen, of Harvard University in which he pointed out that a characteristic of the American economy is that wholesale prices have been rising for a good many decades, and the prospect that they may continue to rise a couple of percentage points more or less annually should not be regarded as abnormal or unduly disconcerting.

In reply there came to the Times a letter from Dr. Elgin Groseclose, also an economist of national stature, in which he discusses the Hansen thesis of complacency and remarks that "a disease is not the less serious because it is chronic."

Then in an enlightening discussion of the underlying causes of this disease, Dr. Groseclose puts the finger of blame upon our predilection for expansion of bank credit in a degree which has exceeded the rate of the Nation's growth. Commercial bank deposits, he notes, increased 17½ times between 1890 and 1930, while pig iron production rose 4½ times; exports 5 times, coal production 5 times, and freight traffic 5 times.

CREDIT UP; GOLD RATIO DOWN

The increase in bank credit was accompanied by a lessening of the ratio of our gold stock to bank deposits, which had dropped from 23.9 percent in 1880 to 20.4 percent in 1900, 14.2 percent in 1910, and 10.4 percent in 1930.

Other fuels than coal, of course, have entered our economy, and other metals besides iron and other transportation besides freight. But still the spread between the rate of growth of the 3 basic industries cited, which was 4 or 5 times in the 50-year period, and the 17½ times growth of bank deposits appears excessive. It is more than a coincidence that in the same period, prices of things were rising along with our supply of bank credit.

Dr. Groseclose does not pursue this point further, but any one familiar with the history of the years since 1930 knows that the expansion of bank credit since the devaluation of the dollar in 1933-34 has been at an accelerated rate, and that prices generally have more than doubled.

A dwindling of our gold ratio below 14 percent has been pointed to in the past as a danger sign, and so it proved in the early 1930's. Whether it may prove so again if present trends of bank credit inflation and gold outflow continue is one of those questions about which we can speculate but never surely predict.

Meanwhile, it is true that we progressively have monetized an increasing volume of capital credits in our banking system. Inflation has been the inevitable attendant effect. And we continue to do so in the degree that U.S. Government securities, other governmental bonds, stock collateral loans, mortgages, consumer credit, industrial long-term credits, and other capital loans, become part of our commercial banking structure in excess of the true savings balances of these banks. In Europe, after the inflations of the 1920's, the currency devaluative effect of wartime monetization of capital assets became recognized clearly as an evil which banking systems must avoid. But how easy it has been to fall back on the opiate of increase in bank credit as a substitute for increase in savings capital.

THE MORAL QUESTION

In his letter's close Dr. Groseclose writes: "Regardless of whether rising prices, with their stimulus to business venture, or cheapening prices, with the incentives to consumption and their distributive effects on the possession of goods, is the better condition for the economy, it seems to many that the issue must be decided on other grounds: any process that is morally dishonest cannot be good in the long run for the economy or for the people of the country, and deliberate inflation is morally indefensible."

In any case, we have again the historical record of the effects of the inflationary process in the repeated breakdowns of the credit mechanism, the successive panics, crises and depressions with their consequences of bankruptcies, foreclosures, unemployment, breadlines and social unrest. We may mention those of 1873, 1879, 1890, 1893, 1907, and that of 1930, to which many serious historians attribute the onset of World War II and its fatal consequences."

The points made by Professor Hansen and Dr. Groseclose are basic to the policy decisions which are being made in Washington this year. The President's new Committee

on Inflation, which Vice President Nixon has been named to head, is throwing its weight on the side of a stable dollar and viewpoint which Dr. Groseclose voices. We do not believe that every thinking banker needs must uphold this new committee's hand.

A Bill Which Proposes Congressional Procedures for Handling Contempt of Congress Citations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will amend section 194 of title II of the United States Code to provide in substance that all contempt citations which issue out of a House committee will be referred to the House Judiciary Committee for its study, recommendations and report to the House. Contempt proceedings are serious and should not be lightly entertained. If the present House procedures which treat them casually without adequate study are not changed the House will continue to find it difficult to have contempt citations enforced by the courts in judicial proceedings. The result will be that the investigating powers of the House will continue to be badly weakened. It is the basic prerogative of the Congress to investigate and legislate in legitimate areas of inquiry. This is not an unlimited right. It is subject to reasonable and necessary restraints which are contained in the same instrument which created this legislative prerogative, the Constitution. In its search for information it is necessary for the Congress to bring before its committee forums hundreds of citizens to testify and to relate their experiences pertinent to the legislative matter in question. If we in the Congress are to perform the duties prescribed for us by the Constitution, it is essential that we have the help and cooperation of all our citizens. We must have respect from the people for our congressional investigative committees for from a healthy respect comes the necessary cooperation. To gain this respect, we in the Congress must in turn respect the individual rights of all citizens who appear before our fact-finding committees to encourage the necessary rapport between the investigator and the witness. It is absolutely essential that we set up proper procedures that will strike a proper balance between committee rights and obligations arising from its legislative power and the rights and obligations of our individual citizen. The very nature of a contempt proceeding denotes disagreement between the investigator and the witness. This disagreement could be the result of one or many complex reasons. It could result from a disregard and disrespect for a duly constituted legislative investigative body. The question then arises what has occasioned this disrespect

for a particular committee. When allegations are made that a committee has itself violated the individual and constitutional rights of a citizen who has appeared before its committee then a legitimate point of inquiry is raised which forms a very important part of the bundle of facts leading up to the request by the committee for a contempt citation.

Is the citing committee an appropriate judge of its alleged abuse and disregard of the rights of the individual witness? I submit that it is not. Is it consistent with our basic sense of fair play to permit the accuser to try and find guilty the accused of an act which may have been the consequence of the accuser's act? To ask the question is to answer it. What then is the solution? A possible solution lies in a fair and impartial congressional review by an appropriate House committee. I submit that the House Judiciary Committee in this instance would be an appropriate committee for review. Under present House rules it is possible for the particular committee in question to come before the House with its request for the contempt citation of an allegedly recalcitrant witness to present the matter under a rule limiting debate where only one point of view is presented and to secure House action on such a serious matter without a full inquiry into all of the facts leading up to the committee's request for such citation. The allegation has been made that a particular House committee has violated House rules of procedure and disregarded the individual rights of the particular witness. Then it is appropriate and necessary for the House of Representatives to make inquiry into these charges to determine their validity or invalidity as the case may be. The House must determine for itself whether one of its committees has exceeded the bounds when a report and resolution for a contempt citation is presented to it by one of its committees. It should consider among other things, first, what are the limits of the constitutional authorities of the Congress to investigate; second, what is the extent of the jurisdiction that the House granted to the committee involved; third, has the committee followed the rules of procedure established by the Congress in conducting the investigation and which gave rise to the alleged contempt. The failure of the House of Representatives to thoroughly consider each request for a contempt citation has resulted in the judicial reprimands contained in the Watkins decision and the Arthur Miller case and others. The review of each request for a contempt citation by an impartial third party will make each of us more aware of the constitutional rights of our citizens who appear before our committees and the duties which they demand for their protection and preservation. It will then be self-discipline that will thwart possible congressional committee abuses rather than attempt by the judiciary to discipline the Congress. If this is done the constitutional rights of our citizens will be preserved and the dignity and integrity and powers of the Congress will be maintained. I earnestly suggest, Mr.

Speaker, that my proposed bill will fill the obvious needs as above outlined. I am hopeful that the Congress will act upon this bill this year.

The Filibuster Debate—Barrier Against Steamrollers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the January 8 issue of the Reporter there appeared an article entitled "The Filibuster Debate—Barrier Against Steamrollers." This most objective analysis was written by Mr. Lindsay Rogers, who has been the Burgess professor of public law and government at Columbia University since 1929. I request unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record, since it makes a distinct contribution to the debates on this issue which took place earlier this year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FILIBUSTER DEBATE—BARRIER AGAINST STEAMROLLERS

(By Lindsay Rogers)

"The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action." Thus Woodrow Wilson early in 1917 when a Senate filibuster killed his proposal to arm American merchant ships. The "little group of willful men" were successful only because we then had "short sessions" of Congress that had to come to an end on March 4. The check was not a catastrophe. The ships were armed under authority conferred by an old statute that had been forgotten.

In 1917 the Senate was powerless to end a debate so long as any Senator insisted on holding the floor, but debate can now be ended by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn. It is this much debated rule XXII that the northern liberals hope to change in order to prevent southern Senators from using a filibuster to prevent the passage of drastic civil-rights legislation.

The northern liberals proposed two amendments. The first of these is that 2 days after a petition has been filed to end debate, two-thirds of the Senate present and voting may so decree. This is not very important; if such a cloture resolution were up, practically all of the Senators duly chosen and sworn would be present and vote. But the northern liberals have a further proposal; that 15 days after the filing of a petition to end debate, a majority of the entire Senate may so decree. Garrulity would still be permitted; each Senator could speak for an hour, but under such circumstances only the filibusterers would do so. Then a vote. No longer could a filibusterer interpose a veto as it is sometimes done in the past.

Such a change in the rule would, I think, be a mistake. Not so, says retiring Senator Irving M. Ives, Republican, of New York, who maintains that the principle of majority rule is at stake. It is only in the Senate of the United States, exclaims Senator CLIF-

FORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, that an opposition must be beaten down by physical exhaustion and where the medieval practice of trial by ordeal still survives.

With great respect to Senator Ives, the term "majority rule" is meaningless as he uses it. Does he want to amend the Constitution so that the Senate would advise and consent to the ratification of a treaty by a majority instead of a two-thirds vote? Is he uneasy because of the theoretical possibility that the minority which defeats a treaty (or a proposed constitutional amendment) might come from the 17 smallest States with a total population less than that of New York? Or that a Senate majority might be drawn from 25 States with a population of less than 29 millions? We elect Presidents not by a national popular majority or even plurality, but by counting the ballots federally; each State's presidential electors do the choosing. Fifty-one percent may be a numerical majority, but in many cases it is not the majority that our constitutional practices contemplate. Our Federal arrangements take account of what has been called "the gravity and the impact of the decision." Thus, when one great section of our country opposes a proposed decision, attention may well be paid to gravity and impact.

And when Senator CASE brands the Senate as the only legislative assembly in which verbal avoirdupois plays a role along with numbers, so what? The northern liberals have sometimes insisted on trial by ordeal. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, boasts that in 1954 he "spoke for 3 days against the offshore oil bill and in 1956 for 4 days against the natural gas bill. In each case, with my colleagues of the so-called liberal group, we kept the discussion going for approximately a month." Mr. DOUGLAS applauds "stunts such as Senator MOSS's record-breaking 22½-hour speech delivered without sitting down or leaving the chamber." The stunts were not attempting to prevent a vote from being taken. They simply believed that in these cases many of our colleagues were not fully acquainted with the real issues which were at stake. This is not a veto, Mr. DOUGLAS insists, but only an endeavor to educate Senators who were poorly informed. I would allow a substantial group of Senators who are well informed who come from a great section of the country, and who are united in purpose, to impose a veto unless two-thirds of their colleagues are prepared to overrule them.

BLOCKING THE STEAMROLLER

Gladstone called the Senate the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics, and it has remained remarkable in that, contrary to the fate of practically every other upper chamber, it has not become secondary and suffered a loss of authority either by constitutional amendment or by custom. It is the only legislative body in the world made up of representatives from commonwealths no one of which, without its consent, can be deprived of its equal representation and whose rights, even though steadily dwindling, still remain substantial. Where in other assemblies is there anything resembling our Senate's rule that its Members must not refer offensively to any State of the Union?

The filibuster is a weapon that the constitutional framers who constructed the Senate failed to anticipate but one that they would view with favor. "A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the Government," No. 51 of "The Federalist" tells us, "but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions." The framers sought to have "in the society so many separate descriptions of citizens as will render an unjust combination of the majority of the whole very improbable, if not impracticable." The filibuster is no more

than a modern auxiliary precaution against what one more than one-third of the Senators may consider an unjust combination of the majority; and I am not impressed when I am told that no other legislative body in the world allows a minority to have such a formidable weapon of defense.

With us the Executive office for a fixed term and never appears before the Legislature to account for his actions. Hence, it is an auxiliary precaution that there be some place in the congressional system at which a party steamroller will meet an effective barrier. The House of Representatives cannot serve this purpose. There, debate is often more severely limited and freedom of decision is more restricted than in any other legislative chamber in the world. A two-thirds majority can suspend the rules, and after 40 minutes of discussion, it can pass a measure with no opportunity to offer amendments. A special order from the Rules Committee can allocate time for debate between the majority and minority and require that the House can say only "Yes" or "No." Since the Senators number only 98 and show more qualities of prima donnas than do Representatives, they would refuse to shackle themselves as do Members of the House when they approve a special order from the Committee on Rules; Senators would insist that they be permitted to vote on amendments. But without the possibility of parliamentary obstruction—that is, filibustering—a party steamroller, driven by a President and party leaders, could on occasion move almost as ruthlessly on the Senate side as it does on the House side of the Capitol.

Thirty-odd years ago in a book called "The American Senate," which now occasionally enjoys what William James called the immortality of a footnote, I argued the case for the filibuster. I began the book during the Harding administration and finished when Coolidge was in the White House—the era of the Teapot Dome scandals. The Republican Party machine was then powerful enough to prevent any investigation by a House committee, and Republicans in the Senate were not anxious to uncover wrongdoing. The Republican leaders knew that Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, and other Democrats could hold up important business; hence they had to consent to the thoroughgoing inquiry that was demanded. As to whether the threatened filibuster that brought about this result was in the public interest, it is sufficient to remark that 3 out of 10 Cabinet members were permitted or pressed to resign, and that there were several indictments and 2 suicides.

Those desiring Federal civil-rights legislation talk a great deal about the high-handed behavior of a minority. The Southern Senators, it is charged, are able to defy not only a majority in the Senate, but a majority in the country at large. Probably a majority in the country at large is willing for more civil-rights legislation to be passed, but we must not forget that one of the main reasons the framers of the Constitution provided two Senators for each State, large or small, was precisely in order to protect the rights of sections against a majority in the country at large.

December 5, 1958, marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of an event on which the Northern liberals might pause to reflect: the end of national prohibition, which was, perhaps, in President Herbert Hoover's phrase, an experiment noble in motive but which was certainly a spectacular and disastrous failure. In 1918, when the State legislatures began to vote on the proposed prohibition amendment, saloons were illegal in approximately 90 percent of the area of the Nation, which contained nearly two-thirds of the population of the country. Temperance societies and the Anti-Saloon League (the most powerful pressure group that ever worked on

Congress and State legislatures) insisted that aridity be complete. The dries marched to a battle that they won. Then they lost the war.

One concluding observation. Ours is the only major country with a two-party system where the laws that get on the Federal statute books, or that fail to get there, usually have bipartisan support and bipartisan opposition. In academic quarters one sometimes hears laments that American political parties are not "disciplined"; that their leadership is sometimes shadowy or undiscoverable, and that they do not present to the electorate clashing bodies of doctrine. But in a country as vast as the United States, with different sectional interests, a political providence has been good in seeing to it that a party majority does not pass party legislation which is opposed by a powerful and determined party minority; that on policies our parties prefer concessions to Pyrrhic victories. The filibuster is undemocratic if democracy means that anywhere, and particularly in a Federal system, any majority should be able to do what it wishes on any issue at any time. Do the northern liberals thus define democracy? Federalism was the means of forming the Nation and it remains the means of preserving it. Congress, as well as the Supreme Court, is the Federal system's manager, and a Senate filibuster, is well worthwhile if, on occasion, it prevents the congressional manager from being tyrannical.

Social Security Benefits Should Be Tailored to Current Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include the text of an excellent editorial which appeared in the January 29 issue of the Gratiot County Herald, a weekly newspaper in my district, commenting on the social security program as well as one of the bills I recently introduced to amend the Social Security Act:

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS SHOULD BE TAILORED TO CURRENT CONDITIONS

Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY took another look at the social security legislation he had introduced early in the present session of Congress and decided to withdraw it and substitute a bill incorporating only the second section of his original proposal.

The section which he deleted would have required all income, from whatever source, to be included in the earned income subject to limitation. The second section raised the maximum earned income of a person drawing social security benefits from \$1,200 per year to \$1,800.

What apparently happened was that BENTLEY felt that the social security program was primarily an insurance program, that an arbitrary and fixed retirement age was not sound or realistic and that there was a question of whether people of sound mind and body should be forced to retire from gainful employment upon reaching their 65th birthday, if they desired to avail themselves of the benefits of social security. He stated that his original bill was primarily for the purpose of focusing attention of Congress on what he believed to be inequities and unsound concepts of the present law.

In some respects we agree with him. But on the original purpose of the law, we must differ. We are in entire agreement with BENTLEY's action in withdrawing his original bill and introducing a bill which would raise the maximum amount a person could earn, while drawing social security, to \$1,800.

The difference in the purchasing power of the dollar, from the date which the social security program was first adopted, to the present, would certainly justify such an advance.

Going back to the original purpose of the social security program, we must consider the conditions under which it was proposed and adopted in the thirties.

At that time unemployment was very high and, as we understand it, one of the chief purposes of social security was to take older men out of regular employment through old age benefits, in order to make room for younger men in the available jobs.

It wasn't merely a matter of setting up an insurance program as such, but was tailored to meet a very serious unemployment problem. That was the reason for limiting the amount a person could earn who had reached the age of social security eligibility. The amount he received for rents, investments, and so forth, had no bearing on his allowable earned income. Whether or not he was holding down a job and was earning more than \$1,200 through this job or a combination of jobs and thus depriving others of gainful employment, was the determining factor.

We believe the same fundamental principles hold true now. In this way a person who has saved during his productive lifetime and made sound investments—in a retirement plan, in a farm, in rentable property, or in industry, is not penalized for his thrift and foresighted planning for his later years. And the present law encourages him to do just that—at least it does not discourage him from attempting to provide for his future. Such a program also enables older people to maintain a better standard of living and a higher rate of spending in their later years and thus remain a boon to the general economy of the Nation, rather than forcing upon them a marginal existence in which they might become public wards in the event of any unforeseen exigency.

On the other hand, we have never been able to justify in our minds the lifting of all restrictions on earned income when a person reaches the age of 72. Actually, there are probably few who would seek full-time employment at that age, and few of those who sought it would find it. But if the principle of encouraging men to drop out of the labor market at 65 is sound, we can see no reason for providing that they can reenter it at 72 and continue to draw social security.

In the light of the original dual purpose of the law, BENTLEY's new proposal to raise the maximum amount of allowable earned income for persons who wish to qualify for social security, takes care of the greatest weakness under present-day conditions. To remove any earned income restrictions would defeat entirely the one, and perhaps the most important objective of social security. It certainly would be a mistake under current unemployment conditions.

To prohibit any earned income would also be a mistake. In allowing a person to earn up to a set amount, less than that required for his entire support, the law recognizes that the social security program is a means of supplementing the income of those who have made some provision for their later years, and permits many to retire from the active labor market who would not be able to otherwise.

Another adjustment that may be warranted in years to come, particularly if the inflation spiral continues, is further increased benefits to retired and qualified workers.

There have already been several adjustments. Funds for such increases have come from larger payrolls and a higher taxable income. This year the taxable income was raised from \$4,200 to \$4,800 and the percentage of tax raised from 2½ to 2 percent for employees and employers. Further adjustments may be necessary in this regard; in fact, are already scheduled.

One other revision has been proposed that should receive thoughtful consideration, depending upon the effect of technological advances on the employment of available labor in the future. This is the matter of reducing the age of eligibility from the present 65.

No matter what the theoretical conclusions, some minimum age limitation seems mandatory from the practical standpoint. And if through automation, there develops what seems to be a permanent and abnormal surplus of labor, then perhaps lowering the eligible age for maximum benefits to 60 should be considered.

The Future of Junior Colleges in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an address before the California Junior College Association, Dr. Roy E. Simpson, superintendent of public instruction in the State of California, presented a strong case for the expansion of public junior community colleges.

I think anyone interested in the future development of American education will find Dr. Simpson's remarks of great value. Consequently, I commend it to my colleagues for their careful consideration.

The address follows:

THE FUTURE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA

(By Dr. Roy E. Simpson)

In the next few minutes I wish to discuss with you something about the importance of public junior colleges for higher education in California, their contributions to vocational education, and the record of success of junior college graduates who continue their schooling at the University of California. Throughout the Nation the public junior colleges of California have long been notable for the size of their student bodies, the range of their offerings in both terminal and preprofessional fields, the competence of their professional staffs, and the facilities for instruction provided by the districts which maintain them. Like all institutions of higher learning, the junior colleges are facing shortages of instructors, overcrowded classes, and difficulties in providing equipment and facilities for their laboratories, libraries, and shops.

The Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education has before it the recommendation for consideration for submission to its parent bodies that priorities for the establishment of any additional campuses of the university or State colleges should be predicated on the assumption that adequate junior college facilities have first been provided. Personally, I am heartily in favor of such a policy. Junior colleges are not en-

gaged in competition with State colleges or branches of the university, but are an indispensable foundation for higher education in California. Already the public junior colleges are caring for three-fifths of all lower division students in California with the remainder distributed among the 4-year institutions as follows: on the campuses of the University of California, one-ninth; among the State colleges, one-eighth; and in all the private colleges and universities, one-sixth. Within the decade we are now considering the total number of high school graduates will double the 100,000 we had in June of this year. Since neither the State colleges nor the university considers expansion of their facilities to accommodate such tremendous increases in lower division students the responsibilities of junior colleges become evident. More State resources must be appropriated for facilities for urgently needed upper division and graduate studies as well as for local districts. The local districts must continue to assume a large proportion of responsibility for providing education in grades 13 and 14.

The need for junior colleges to serve densely populated areas where junior colleges have not been established can easily be demonstrated. Alameda County, for example, has only the junior college in Oakland immediately in the area although junior colleges are available in adjacent Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties together with the University of California at Berkeley and San Francisco State College. Only 42 percent of Alameda's high school graduates were continuing their education last year. Of these, 10 percent enrolled at the university; 8 percent at State colleges; almost 20 percent in junior colleges; and not quite 5 percent at private institutions.

By comparison, Orange County has three junior colleges and although it is more removed from the University of California at Los Angeles and slightly less so from the State colleges at Long Beach and Los Angeles, 54 percent of its high school graduates continued education in 1955-56. The distribution was 3 percent to the university; 4 percent to State colleges; 7 percent to private institutions; and 40 percent to junior colleges. It is clear that the doorways to opportunity for high school graduates to obtain a college education consist in large measure of the available junior colleges in proximity to their homes. Even in Fresno County where the State college is the single higher institution of prominence in the area the percentage of the county's high school graduates attending State college (18 percent), exceeds by only 1 percent enrollments in junior college (17 percent).

If opportunity for education beyond the high school is to become a reality in California, junior colleges must be established in such populous areas as presently lack them. Among these may be listed two centers in Alameda County: Berkeley and the Hayward-San Leandro Districts. Nearby are the Palo Alto and Sequoia areas which San Jose and San Mateo Junior Colleges have no facilities to serve. In Los Angeles County a tier of districts lying between Citrus, Mount San Antonio, Compton, Pasadena, and Los Angeles junior college districts denies junior college opportunities to high-school graduates from Arcadia, Monrovia, Alhambra, El Monte, Montebello, Whittier, and Downey. In San Diego County the Grossmont-Sweetwater area needs a junior college. And the Merced-Madera and Palm Springs-Coachella Valley regions likewise have no junior college readily available to their graduates.

The lack of junior college services in several of these regions is in no sense due to the indifference of the people to the advantages which would accrue from the establishment of junior colleges. The plain fact is that the initial capital outlay required for

junior college facilities frequently is beyond the limited assessed wealth of many populous districts to provide. It will be to the interest of the State to assist in some way, perhaps through matching funds, such districts of restricted resources to acquire the means for offering junior college education. I have urged that such a change in the laws be made. Once a district has developed the facilities originally required, it can enlarge these through its own financial efforts and with the usual State apportionment for average daily attendance units continue to support instruction by the district's ordinary rates of taxation.

In this connection must be noted the service junior colleges provide in the fields of vocational education. Graduates of 2-year curricula who are thus made ready for immediate employment in general settle down in the area and become contributors to its annual earnings and assessed wealth. Training for employment is considered a part of the community services rendered by a junior college—its alumni who find work in the vicinity and make their homes nearby help to upbuild and develop the community served by the junior college. While students who transfer to 4-year institutions for professional education often fail to return to their home communities, the so-called terminal students continue to be assets to the junior college districts.

Special commendation is due the junior colleges for their pioneering efforts in work experience programs to give reality to vocational education. Through work experience students learn what employment demands of them not only in skills but in attitude and ability to concentrate upon continuous output over the entire working day. In April, 1954, members of the Los Angeles Association of Merchants and Manufacturers assessed the value of junior college trainees in their employ as follows:

Better prepared for jobs at which employed, 71 percent.

Better adjusted at outset for beginning jobs, 61 percent.

Positive advantages in securing promotion, 61 percent.

The vocational program of the junior college is more expensive than the straight academic programs. It is my feeling that the real strength of the junior college program lies with an expanded vocational program. If the costs are great, we must in some way provide funds for the expansion of the vocational program. We must not let the dollar control our educational effectiveness.

THE SUCCESS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS TO CAMPUSES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Over the 5-year period, 1951-55, the junior colleges graduated more than 50,000 students of whom almost a quarter (24.51 percent) transferred to the University of California at Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, Riverside, or Santa Barbara. A study of the performance of junior college transfers entering the junior year at Berkeley in the fall of 1951 has been prepared by the office of relations with schools. Comparison was made between the persistence and achievement of junior college transfers and native students likewise entering the junior year in 1951. Junior college transfers who at the time they enrolled in junior college would have been eligible for admission to the University of California completed their fourth or senior year at Berkeley in the same proportion (77.9 percent) as students who had in 1951 entered the university as freshmen. They even had a slightly higher grade-point average overall (1.80 as compared with 1.73 for native students). Clearly the junior colleges as a whole provide satisfactory preparation for upper division studies and do as good a job as the university in the instance of students

whose high school preparation met university requirements for admission.

The study also gives parallel percentages for junior college transfers who originally could not have obtained admission to the university on the basis of their high school subjects and marks. For this group the figures show that the junior colleges also have done a competent job of salvaging and rehabilitating many of them to achieve well at the university. Five-sixths of these students originally ineligible for university admission upon transfer from junior college completed their senior year in the normal time. Their over-all grade-point average was 1.59, well below that of both native students and their fellow-transfers whose high school record had been sufficient to have warranted university admission in the first place. Nevertheless they were able to graduate from the university. Again, the junior colleges demonstrate that they do a capable and significant job of salvaging the late-maturing students. We must continue our efforts to more clearly define this relationship with the university to avoid confusion concerning acceptable transfer courses.

To sum up, the people of California have authorized three kinds of higher institutions to assure the education of their youth. The university and State colleges are charged to provide professional and occupational education, to conduct research and to encourage the pursuit of advanced studies. The numerous junior colleges are primarily and always centers of instruction in which the great teacher finds scope for his genius and recognition of his capabilities in direction of learning.

A junior college is a local institution. It is responsive to community needs. The State assists in its support but imposes no restrictions to the variety of offerings for grades 13 and 14. These are limited in range only by employment opportunities and the aspirations and abilities of its students, and may be as rich as the financial resources of its district can afford. The governing board of the junior college district has original and financial authority to conduct the institution in such fashion as the electorate approve. A junior college operates to advance students in their post high school studies, to guide them into wise choices of vocations, and to build a firm foundation for lifelong learning in their chosen careers. Just as the 4-year institutions seek to attract scholars to explore the frontiers of knowledge, so junior colleges are centers of learning, intimately concerned for the communities which they serve but mindful of the issues confronting the Nation and holding fast to the enduring ideals humankind has found good.

CONCLUSIONS

The policy of the State Department of Education stated in other words recognizes and supports:

1. The uniqueness of the junior college. It is both a vertical and a horizontal relationship as it relates to secondary and college education.
2. That every high school should eventually be in a junior college district. Our laws should be so written to make that possible and effective.
3. That junior colleges should be established in a community before future state colleges or university branches are established.
4. That funds for capital outlay should be provided for qualifying junior college districts.
5. A bureau in the State Department of Education devoting full time to junior college problems.
6. An increase in financial support for apportionment purposes.

Finally, I want to express appreciation to your present officers for the very fine relationship that they have created with our

department. Your State Department is anxious, ready, and willing to serve you. We want to work with you individually and as an association. Your very legal structure gives you the opportunity to continue to do great work for your communities. It is through this community interest that your students develop and your junior colleges improve. These are not idle words. We in the State office believe in you. May that confidence be reflected in all that we say and do together.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles: A Man of Great Character and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Communists do not like John Foster Dulles.

That is the highest accolade that any man of the free world can earn.

For it proves that our Secretary of State is never confused, or intimidated, or taken in by the devious twists and turns of communism.

In the person of John Foster Dulles, communism is opposed by a man who never loses sight of the fact that genuine peace must be built on the twin foundations of freedom and justice.

His profound faith in the dignity of man speaks for the whole western world, and for the unsatisfied longings of the submerged human beings in Russia and China and elsewhere who look forward to the day of their liberation.

Our Secretary of State has given his mind and heart and spirit to this cause with a devotion that has seldom been equaled in history.

We admire Mr. Dulles; we need him; and we pray to God for his complete recovery.

I would like to add the following tribute to the thousands that are coming in. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following article by James H. Powers from the February 15 issue of the Boston Sunday Globe:

HE HAS WORLD'S TOUGHEST JOB—DULLES' ILLNESS THROWS SPOTLIGHT ON HIS TIRELESS LABORS TO CARRY OUT FOREIGN POLICIES AS PROBLEMS OF AMERICA MOUNT IN WORLD AT FLUX

(By James H. Powers)

The indefinite withdrawal of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles from active direction of the Nation's foreign policy has jolted official Washington more severely than any event since President Eisenhower underwent surgery in June 1956. It has also thrown the spotlight again upon what has been called the most difficult job in the world, that of charting course for the United States and her allies through one of the most hazardous periods in the annals of the West.

Mr. Dulles' hope to resume eventually his tasks will find echo among his fellow countrymen, whether critics or friends. Few occupants of his office have labored more tirelessly; none with greater self-dedication. Since the Organic Act of 1789 set up the Department of State, only four of his predecessors in that office have held the post longer: James Madison, John Quincy Adams,

Hamilton Fish, and Cordell Hull, whose 13-year tenure set an alltime record.

TASK ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE

In this position many legendary figures in this history of the Republic either crowned careers or found a steppingstone to higher honors. For John Marshall, it was a way station to the Chief Justiceship of the United States. For Jefferson, Madison, John Quincy Adams, Martin Van Buren, and James Buchanan, it was preparation for the Presidency.

Talleyrand's unforgotten quip that "politics is the art of the possible," needs amendment when applied to the two highly political tasks confronting a Secretary of State at Washington: Direction of foreign policy under the President, and getting along with Congress. That is an assignment to exercise the art of the almost impossible, as Mr. Dulles and many a predecessor in his office have discovered.

Especially is this true when, as today, the powerful influence of the Presidency in shaping foreign policy is attenuated, whether because the incumbent in the White House is unfamiliar with the intricacies of foreign affairs, or because of his philosophy of government. Some Presidents, Grant for instance, frankly abandoned a task temperamentally uncongenial, merely invoking Executive power at appropriate times to sustain decisions made by the Secretary of State.

AUTHORITY PRESIDENT'S

That caused Grant little trouble because he happened to have an exceedingly able foreign policy director in Hamilton Fish. For other Chief Executives, the experiment unleashed many a sea of trouble. Especially in Congress. The storms swirling around Mr. Dulles on Capitol Hill, these past 6 years, are thus not without precedent. His immediate predecessor also faced them—with Mr. Dulles among the critics.

Strong Presidents, from Washington down, have jealously maintained the constitutional prerogatives of their office in relations with their Secretaries of State. Authority and responsibility for the Nation's foreign policy is, of course, actually theirs alone.

Jefferson bypassed his Secretary in deciding upon the Louisiana Purchase. Tyler conducted his own campaign to bring Texas into the Union. McKinley overrode a protesting John Hay to annex Hawaii. Yet the Secretary of State, whether left to do the real homework in foreign policy, reduced to the role of a mere subordinate, like Van Buren, or functioning in close harmony with a like-minded President expert and alert in foreign policy matters (like Madison under Jefferson) remains first among the select in the President's official family.

BURDENS OF OFFICE MOUNT

The burdens of the Secretary have multiplied fabulously since Jefferson inaugurated the long succession at the Department of State with a budget of \$6,500 to pay for its operations. Today a Secretary of State rules over a small empire numbering close to 18,000 persons and reaching to the far corners of the globe, with a budget approximating \$130 million.

He occupies the chair at the President's right hand at every Cabinet meeting, has precedence over all other Cabinet members at official functions, is the most intimate adviser to a Chief Executive, and has almost as much influence in the broad appropriations picture as the Secretary of the Treasury, owing to the range of his policy domain.

FUNCTIONS MULTIPLE

Though many functions originally assigned to the Department of State have long since been shifted to other Federal organs—responsibility for the census, for patents, for copyrights, and pardons—this country's world influence and its leadership role among the

free nations have multiplied new and more onerous duties for State. Inevitably, the change has also multiplied Monday morning quarterbacks, in and out of Congress. That is an essential feature in the democratic process.

Mr. Dulles' strength and weakness lie in this: As troubleshooter extraordinary in foreign policy, his mistakes reverberate; his successes, in the nature of things, can be but temporary in a world at flux.

Sister M. Madeleva of Saint Mary's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADENAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BRADENAS. Mr. Speaker, Sister M. Madeleva, C.S.C., is one of the most remarkable citizens of Indiana. She is a poet and a college president, a Catholic sister and a person of lively wit and humor.

For the last 25 years Sister Madeleva has been president of Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Ind., an outstanding college for Catholic women. Before coming to Congress, I had the great pleasure of serving on the faculty of Saint Mary's College in the department of political science. I came to know Sister Madeleva and to join her band of admirers throughout our country.

This week Sister Madeleva has published her autobiography entitled, "My First 70 Years," in which she describes her remarkable career. I am sure that many persons will be interested in reading the story of this noble and gifted sister. I should therefore like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Walton R. Collins of the South Bend Tribune concerning Sister Madeleva and her new book.

SISTER MADELEVA CITES DREAMS, WORK

(By Walton R. Collins)

"I came to St. Mary's College (as president) at the all-low ebb of the depression, 1934.

"I found myself responsible for a school 90 years old, a great heritage, a magnificent campus, potentials in faculty and students to dream of and work with. The best qualifications I brought to my office were these: my ability to dream, my capacities to work."

So, nearly a quarter century of dreaming and working later, writes Sister M. Madeleva, C.S.C. in a slim, highly readable autobiography published by the MacMillan Co., New York.

Briskly titled "My First 70 Years," the book races through the nun's full and enormously varied life by means of vignettes and rough sketches which add up to a series of distinct impressions. Among them are Sister Madeleva's indefatigable energy, her enormous faith, her generous endowment of common sense and a God-given sense of humor which she is capable of turning upon herself.

The nun followed a curious and often exciting path to the offices she now occupies at the college for women located north of the city limits of South Bend.

STARTS IN WISCONSIN

The path started in the island city of Cumberland, Wis., in 1887, with the birth of Mary Evaline Wolff. It led through a girlhood marked by a joy in nature and the tenta-

tive unfoldings of a restless intellectual curiosity. It led to the mental and spiritual blossoming of college days, first at the University of Wisconsin and then at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame.

It reached a first plateau when Mary Evaline Wolff decided to take the habit of a Sister of the Holy Cross, and entered the order's novitiate on the St. Mary's campus.

Life's tempo picked up speed for Sister Madeleva. There were new degrees (master of arts at Notre Dame, doctor of philosophy at the University of California in Berkeley, and graduate study at Oxford University in England) and new jobs.

The jobs were teaching at Sacred Heart Academy in Ogden, Utah, where the student body was predominantly of the Mormon faith; teaching at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame; the presidency of the College of St. Mary's-of-the-Wasatch in Salt Lake City, and eventually the presidency of the college off U.S. 31 north.

TRIUMPHS, DEFEATS

There were also triumphs, defeats, and friendships, but this book concentrates on the friendships. Sister Madeleva at times sounds like a name-dropper as she recounts her contacts with the great and near-great in this country and abroad. She is not, of course.

Among those whose associations she obviously treasures are Father James Keller, Bernard DeVoto, Joyce Kilmer, Phyllis McGinley, Robert Hugh Benson, Edna St. Vincent Millay, C. S. Lewis, Sigrid Undset, and Evelyn Waugh. There are many more.

In this book, the poet-nun wisely shies away, for the most part, from attempts at detailed introspection into the motives and philosophies that have shaped her life. Such introspections, interesting as they might be, would be out of place in the fast-moving account of people, places, and events in "My First 70 Years."

There are, however, some hints. Typifying the love of nature she alludes to throughout the book is this passage: "I rushed into the Pacific for the first time, breathlessly confident that I could hold the entire ocean and it could hold me, each in the other's arms."

Her self-directed sense of humor (and her faith) comes out in this recollection:

"On the eve and the day of my first holy communion, I surprised my parents with the only signs of asceticism they ever saw in me. Like most good German families we always ended our day with our glass of beer. This evening I walked quietly over to my father and mother to kiss them good night. 'But you haven't taken your nightcap,' said my father in surprise. 'I don't think I care for any,' I said lamely. Mother helped me out. 'Let her alone,' she said, 'if she wants to do this.'"

The same lively humor crops up later when Sister Madeleva describes her first days as president of St. Mary's. She sets the stage by reporting a conversation she once overheard on a Great Lakes boat:

"Wife: Who runs this boat?"

"Husband: The captain."

"Wife: What does he do?"

"Husband: Nothing."

"Wife: Oh, but he must do something."

"Husband: No, he doesn't. He doesn't do a thing."

"Wife: Who does the work?"

"Husband: The crew."

"Wife (still unconvinced): Well, I suppose there has to be someone to take the blame for things."

THIS IS MY STORY

Adds Sister Madeleva, "This is my story for the past 25 years—taking the blame for things."

Along with the blame comes the credit, of course, and the St. Mary's president's outline of her career lists more than is

praiseworthy than blameworthy. She tells of the building of the college's new science hall and of its Moreau Hall fine arts center, a project obviously close to the nun's heart.

She tells of her educational aims and the trailblazing decision to put theology in the center of the educational system at St. Mary's.

She reveals her personal courage in writing poems which she offered first to secular publications, to prove that a Catholic and a sister could write well enough for acceptance by the secular press and also because "I resolved not to permit mediocrity in my writing to be attributed to my religion."

RELIGION IS VITAL

Her religion, nevertheless, is a vital and basic part of Sister Madeleva's existence, and she doesn't have to say so in as many words. It is obvious in almost every paragraph of the book.

South Bend area readers will especially enjoy the autobiography's references to the two educational institutions, St. Mary's and Notre Dame, and that are the city's neighbors. Local people and events pop up regularly in the narrative.

Admirers and former students of Sister Madeleva and her work will enjoy the chatty reminiscences and personal relations of the human being they have known.

Not even the casual reader will be disappointed in "My First 70 Years." Apart from all other considerations, Sister Madeleva's life is excellent material for an autobiography.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, John Foster Dulles has the prayers of all of us. As I oftentimes have said, he has proven to be one of the greatest Secretaries of State this Nation has ever had. His knowledge of foreign affairs is unequaled by anyone, and, with unequalled courage, he has applied that knowledge for the maintenance of peace in the world and the advancement of freedom.

An editorial which appeared in the Minonk News-Dispatch, which is published in my district, expresses my sentiments, and I am sure the majority of the people of my district, with respect to this truly great American.

The editorial follows:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Too often we wait until a man has passed on to extoll his virtues and what he has done for his country and humanity. If there has been a public figure in our country during the past 50 years who has so unselfishly devoted himself to his country, it is John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State.

Here is a man up in his seventies devoting practically every hour of his time trying to get peace established in the world. His salary of \$25,000 is about one-tenth of what he could make in his leisurely private law practice in New York City.

He has no political ambitions, and, to the detriment of his health—he has had two major surgical operations within the past 2 years—has traveled all over the world trying to get things settled. What success he has had remains to be seen, but at least we have been kept out of a shooting war for the

past 6 years. He has cemented closer relations with Britain, France, and West Germany to deter further aggressions by the Soviets.

There are few others who have given so much of their energy, time, and finances to try to help our country. He deserves much praise and commendation from the people of this country for his untiring efforts. He doubtless has made some mistakes in judgment, but they are few compared to what he has accomplished. He deserves the thanks of our Nation.

President Frondizi's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed in the first month of 1959 a friendly and good will conquest of the United States by the scholar-statesman President of Argentina, Dr. Arturo Frondizi. Next month the Chief Executives of Eire and El Salvador visit Washington and other great cities of our Nation. These visits are far more important than mere junkets; they present to America the image of our allies and they present to our allies a proper image of the United States.

There were many special aspects of the visit of President Frondizi; first, he came in the wake of the publicized tour of Soviet Russia's Mikoyan, who tried to sell us on comradeship with the Communists. As the head of International Packers in Chicago, A. Thomas Taylor, said in introducing President Frondizi:

We prefer the spirit of partnership offered by Argentina to the spirit of comradeship offered by Russia.

During his 10 conference-filled days in 10 cities, President Frondizi dispelled any lingering doubts in the minds of American business and industrial interests that we have anything to fear in the partnership he offers our investors in the development of the enormous resources of his country. As DeGaulle has done in France, as Britain's belt-tightening did after the war, so has Frondizi's austerity program impressed all of us with his dedicated determination to solve the economic problems of his country with a courageous disregard for the normal political perils.

Further, a group of 25 Argentine business and industrial leaders have come here to visit their counterparts in America, and they have candidly explained that most of them were opposed to Dr. Frondizi in his elections which made him President, but his courage since inauguration has so impressed them that they now find themselves in full support of his efforts to strengthen the economy of their country. Theirs is eloquent testimony to the Frondizi leadership.

All of this is of the utmost importance to our country, because we know the many shrewd moves of Soviet Russia to

infiltrate not only the culture and government of countries in the Western Hemisphere, but also their economy. For a time, following the angry outbursts against us throughout Latin America at the time of Vice President Nixon's trip to South America, we were shocked and shamed by the obvious weaknesses in our relations with our onetime good neighbors. President Frondizi has reassured us that at least in the southernmost anchorage of the hemisphere, we have strong and good friends who are eager to be partners with us.

Certainly, in this connection, the work of the State Department's Division of Protocol, under Wiley Buchanan and his Deputy Chief, Clem Conger, is to be highly commended. And, also, in passing, I would like to note another role in this fine presentation of a clear image of Argentina to the United States. I refer to the splendid public relations in the handling of the informational task of the Frondizi trip. I understand this was handled through Tex McCrary's public relations firm. He and his associate, Jerry Finkelstein, are to be commended for performing a valuable service to this country when they make available to the U.S. press quickly and concisely, all the necessary background information on the Government they represent.

We all know our failing as a nation to think of other nations in terms of individual images—nearly 400 million people of India are symbolized in Premier Nehru; France was almost anonymous until De Gaulle; England is the Royal Family and Sir Winston Churchill; and unfortunately, a few dictators have cast their shadows across the image of the whole of Latin America: Perón, Batista, Pérez-Jiménez, and still Trujillo. But now there is emerging a new image of Latin America: In El Salvador, José María Lemus; in Chile, Jorge Alessandri; in Mexico, Adolfo López Mateos; in Venezuela, Romulo Betancourt.

And clearest image of all, reminiscent of our own Woodrow Wilson, is Frondizi of Argentina, who has in 10 days almost wiped out the memory of Perón. Of Dr. Frondizi it can be truly said: "He came, we saw, he conquered." This is a healthy victory for international public relations.

A Discouraging Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is important, I think, to know what responsible newspaper editors throughout the country are saying about the visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan. Illustrative of such is an editorial from the Kendallville News-Sun

which I include herewith. It brings to our minds again the caution which must be exercised in dealing with the Russian Communists.

A DISCOURAGING SIGHT

You can't expose a man to television cameras for a solid hour, as we did Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, without learning a good deal about him. And what Americans saw and heard can hardly be a cause for cheering, or even modest hopes.

The real news was not what he said about Berlin, or Germany, or the cold war. It was the disheartening revelation of the Russian Communist pattern of thinking.

Magnified under the glare of TV closeups, this was a genuine shock. Terribly clear now is the fact that we are not just poles apart from the Soviet Union, but are traveling in totally different thinking orbits.

Mikoyan answered almost no question directly in his appearance on NBC's "Meet the Press." But it misses the point simply to say he ducked and dodged.

He offered answers which may seem perfectly valid to Russian Reds. By the Kremlin's accepted standard of double-think—turning facts upside down, giving them any meaning that suits purpose—it made sense to say we are at fault everywhere and Russia nowhere, not even in repressed Hungary.

Watching Mikoyan at work on TV you get the idea, however, that something more than double-think is involved. He seemed to turn almost instinctively from straight dealing on any topic—except thank you and goodbye.

One could not help but be reminded here of documented diplomatic accounts of Russian diplomacy in the 19th century, long before the Communists gained power.

Western diplomats then were in wide agreement that Russian diplomats regarded lying, duplicity, broken promises, and all the other devices of distrust as the vital tools of their trade. The Russians were notorious throughout Europe as being totally untrustworthy.

No one imagines the Communists have any respect for truth. But in their formal practice of deception as the rule of life, they appear only to be compounding a duplicity already firmly fixed in the character of Russian Government.

As a Russian and a Communist, Mikoyan did not let tradition down.

He left us with the big question: How do you negotiate reasonably with men who believe that because they lie to gain their ends, everyone else must surely lie, too?

Three Kentucky Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BURKE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, we have within the past week paid grateful and loving tribute to the memory of one of Kentucky's most heroic sons, Abraham Lincoln. It is altogether fitting and proper that we do this.

I believe, however, that in the frantic world of 1959 we tend to forget that heroes walk the earth, sail the seas and, yes, fly through the sky today.

Just as we approached the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, all Americans were stunned into mute, fist-clenching righteous anger by the disclosure by the

State Department of the villainous assault by Soviet fighter aircraft upon an unarmed American Air Force transport plane last September. I shall not dwell upon the depths of infamy implicit in that base and cowardly crime.

Two of the members of the crew of the ravaged American transport plane were Kentuckians. These two young men are among those whose fate remains unknown. Sgt. Leroy Price was a native of LaRue County, Ky.—of the very same neighborhood where Abraham Lincoln was born. Airman Joe L. Fields was a native of Cynthiana, in the beautiful bluegrass country.

As Lincoln was shot from the back by a mad assassin, so were the 17 crew members of the American transport plane shot from the back by mad assassins who gloated over their base crime.

As we paid tribute to Lincoln let us also honor these heroic airmen whose fate is unknown, but whose heroic devotion to duty is unquestioned.

Mr. Speaker, in the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 16, an article, dated Hodgenville, Ky.—Lincoln's birthplace—depicts with simple eloquence the plight of the family of Sergeant Price. There are 16 other American families similarly injured. I insert that article at this point, and ask all to join with me in fervent prayer that the 11 members of this crew who are missing may soon be returned alive and well to their homes and their loved ones.

LA RUE PARENTS FIGHT GRAY DESPAIR WHILE AWAITING WORD OF SON'S FATE
(By Alan Levy)

HODGENVILLE, KY.—The father works alone in his fields of corn and tobacco.

The mother irons when she wants to forget and tunes into every newscast when she remembers, which is nearly always.

Thus time trudges past for the parents of Air Force Sgt. Leroy Price, who may be alive or dead in Russia or may have been buried recently in Arlington National Cemetery.

Sergeant Price, 29, and another Kentuckian, Airman Joe L. Fields, of Cynthiana, were in an unarmed Air Force transport plane that was downed over Russia last September. The United States claims the craft was shot down by Soviet fighters.

The fate of 11 of the 17 crew members is still uncertain. Six bodies were returned by the Russians, but two of them were unidentifiable. Neither of the Kentuckians was among the four identified.

COLD WAR HAS BECOME A REALITY

"Sometimes I try to have hopes," said Price's thin-lipped, gray-haired mother as she skimmed her iron across a wet blouse. "But when I get to thinking, there really isn't much hope. If we only knew who those two were that they buried."

The missing sergeant's 52-year-old parents, Mr. and Mrs. Horace Price, live on their 194-acre farm in an isolated section of LaRue County, about 7 miles southeast of Hodgenville. They have no telephone, but they do have television.

"We used to watch a quiz show and all the cowboys," said the tall father in blue coveralls. "Now my wife seldom misses a news program."

The mother tried to express her mystification over the cold war. The continuing crisis once seemed remote to the rural couple.

TAPE RECORDING DIMMED HOPES

"Used to be we'd hear the local news, the farm news, or something," she said. "We'd listen to other news programs with half an

ear, in case they mentioned the name of someone we knew.

"Now we listen for Leroy's name. The Air Force keeps us posted, but I listen in anyway just in case someone may have another scrap of information."

The case reappeared in the headlines recently when the State Department played a recording of voices that were identified as those of Soviet pilots sending Sergeant Price's plane into its death plunge.

"That tape made me lose hope," said the father.

"Seems like they're hardhearted people. They must know something. Eleven boys are over there dead or alive one."

The father clenched his hands and sat erect in a suddenly stilled rocking chair.

"You don't know nothing. You can't do nothing," he growled. "I say one minute I'm going to do something and then I say not. I get all sorts of ideas. I start thinking maybe they're not doing enough in Washington and I'll go look for him myself."

He relaxed limply in the chair.

"I wish I had some education so I'd know where to look and how."

The missing son was a 1948 graduate of Hart Memorial High School. He farmed with his father in Hart County for 2 years, then joined the Air Force and became a flight engineer.

WIFE AND TWO SONS LIVE IN TEXAS

Reroy married while in service and has two sons—Mike, 3, and Randy, 4—who reside with his wife, Marian, in Dallas.

"He was due out of the service in 1960," the father said. "He told me he wanted to come back here, rest a while, and then go back to farming. Maybe I'd be able to buy a farm for them."

The new uncertainty of this future dream is an ordeal for both parents. They have another married son. A daughter—Phyllis Jane, 14—died 3 years ago after a long illness.

"We sat by her bedside for 11 months," the father recalled. "When she went, we knew she was going and we knew where she'd went. But this with Leroy . . . it's all uncalled for."

When Leroy's 29th birthday neared recently, his mother did what she always does. She addressed a birthday card to him.

"Then I remembered that this time I didn't have any address for him," she said sadly.

The Constructive Negative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch on February 15, 1959, and was written, I presume, by the distinguished Pulitzer Prize winning editor of that fine newspaper, Mr. Virginius Dabney. In this Congress, when so many Members must in good conscience vote against much of the legislation that comes to the floor of the House, this editorial is both timely and reassuring.

STRAUSS' CONSTRUCTIVE NEGATIVE

Long speeches are not remembered, except for an occasional highlight—a brief phrase that sums up the gist.

In reading over the speech delivered last Wednesday by Secretary of Commerce Lewis

L. Strauss, we came across one such happy phrase.

The speech was about the evils of inflation, and its misguided advocates in Congress. We have read many such speeches and have ourselves published a few thousand words on the subject.

Nevertheless, we keep reading, or at least glancing through, reams of mimeographed copy, hoping to find some nugget of logic, which, repeated in print, might bring home the need of resistance to inflationary deficit spending and price-inflationary wage boosts.

We found one in Secretary Strauss' speech—a two-word phrase which expresses precisely why conservative Congressmen must vote against, and why the President must veto, all nonessential spending. Said Mr. Strauss:

The word "no," used as a restraint on Government, appears in the original seven articles of the Constitution 26 times, and five times in the Bill of Rights. The Founding Fathers quite evidently had respect for the constructive negative.

We need to us it now—as a stoplight on those pressure groups whose fascination for deficit spending, unnecessary programs and government competition with private industry would scuttle prosperity, stunt economic growth and expose us to the disease of inflation.

The key phrase, of course, is "the constructive negative." This is the opposite of saying "no" because of a lack of intelligent concern for defense programs or other essential projects.

We commend Mr. Strauss' phrase to Congress. It expresses conservatism-at-its-best. It tells why we must oppose all deficit spending. Such spending would impose either more burdensome taxes, or a debt which a credit-depleted government would have to finance with inflated, printing-press dollars.

Davis Lee: Negro Editor States Case for Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Negro newspaper editor Davis Lee, who publishes a number of newspapers in New Jersey and other States of the Union, made a speech in an Anderson, S.C., church on the very pressing and serious integration-segregation controversy. This prominent newspaper editor struck out at those members of the Negro race who are causing the critical deterioration of race relations in the South by continuing to push for complete and absolute integration in the school systems in that section of the country. Lee's speech and a followup editorial which he wrote for publication in the Anderson Herald, a weekly newspaper he operates in Anderson, S.C., have received very favorable comments in the press throughout the South.

It is my privilege to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared in one of our weekly newspapers published in Birmingham, Ala. I commend this editorial for the careful reading of all

Members of Congress who really stand for justice for our Negro citizens.

DAVIS LEE: NEGRO EDITOR HITS INTEGRATIONISTS

Davis Lee, Negro newspaper editor, who publishes a number of newspapers in New Jersey and other States, is still trying to pound sense into the heads of members of his race by his forthright editorials against integration. In a speech in an Anderson, S.C., church and in an editorial in a paper he publishes there, he is quoted as saying:

"The liberals who are frothing at the mouth and shedding crocodile tears over the plight of the poor Negro in the South, will gladly offer him integration, but won't give him a job or provide his family with clothing or bread.

"Southerners won't want him to have integration, but they will gladly give him a job, and help him to clothe and feed his family.

"The liberals will open their schools to Negro children, but they won't hire many Negro teachers.

"The South will give the Negro his own school manned by teachers of his race, and all this without cost.

"There are forms of segregation that are degrading and humiliating, but to have one's own school and teachers is not one of them. Giving the Negro his own school and teachers is more in keeping with that concept of freedom, just and equal opportunity that the Founding Fathers had in mind than an integrated system of education."

Other excerpts include:

"In no section of the country does the Negro enjoy the educational, employment, and economic opportunities which he enjoys in the South.

"There are more Negro carpenters, bricklayers, and building contractors in North and South Carolina than there are in the 33 integrated States.

"Negroes cannot eat integration. They need jobs and opportunities to develop their talents, skills, and abilities in fields of their own choosing. The South is the only section in this Nation that offers such opportunities.

"If these liberals and agitators are the Negro's friend and southern whites are his enemies, then someone needs to protect him from his friends."

No doubt Lee speaks for a large number of southern Negroes. Unfortunately not enough of them are speaking out as Lee does against the so-called minority Negro leadership.

Airports and Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith an editorial from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, February 18, with reference to a bill which will come to the floor sometime soon with reference to the philosophy with reference to appropriations for airports. The question will arise this year as to whether we, the Federal Government, are going to be responsible for safety facilities such as control towers, airways guides, weather information and other safety factors—or whether we shall continue to accept the responsibility for building air terminals, baggage and passenger facilities which are

largely local and have nothing to do with safety:

AIRPORTS AND PHILOSOPHY

In the dispute between the Eisenhower administration and a subsidy-minded bloc in Congress over Federal appropriations for local airports, E. R. Quesada, the Federal Aviation Administrator, says the issue is philosophy, a way of government, and not just the money.

Airports and airport buildings, he argues, are community problems, so the communities should pick up the tab. Only the Federal Government can handle the safety facilities—control towers, airways guides, weather information. And it has its hands full with these.

But the philosophy involves money—the taxpayers' money. And when Washington takes the taxpayers' money and does it back for local airport building, a big gob of it gets lost on the way. The cost to the taxpayers goes up.

General Quesada may argue philosophically with the subsidizers in Congress, but if he loses the battle, the taxpayers will pick up the tab, whether they want it or not.

Airports make money and can pay their own way. The U.S. Treasury is having trouble borrowing enough to meet expenses.

We hope General Quesada's arguments, philosophic or otherwise, are effective enough to block this handout. Because it's our money he's philosophizing about.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, again this year, the battle of the budget is about to be joined. Basic in this battle are the contending philosophies of enlarging the Federal role in our daily affairs as opposed to checking the expansion of Federal activities.

One cannot fairly question the sincerity of Members of Congress who express a philosophy of ever greater spending in Washington. However, I believe one must question where this process is leading us. Our Government does not produce or create the wealth of this Nation. It is wholly dependent upon our factories, our farms, and the efforts of those who create products from the abundance of raw materials. Too often, today, the Congress attempts to be all things to all people. This is a demonstration of the good and sometimes of bad aspects of the responsiveness of the Congress to popular pressures. Costly programs enacted without regard to how they will be paid for is an abdication of fiscal responsibility by the Congress. A consistent pursuit of such a policy in the affairs of this Nation, resulting in spending more than our income from already heavy taxes during times of peak prosperity, is, in my opinion, dangerous to the public interest.

This morning, I received a letter from one of my constituents which has impressed me deeply. I want to call the attention of the House to his remarks, since I believe they are an excellent

statement of the responsibility of every member of Congress today. The letter is as follows:

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We, your constituents, apparently expect miracles from you. First, we complain about taxes, taxes, taxes. They're too high. We ask you to see that they're cut.

Then we turn around and ask you for Federal aid for roads, Federal aid for education, Federal aid for this, Federal aid for that.

We don't make sense. We don't realize that when we ask the Federal Government to give us something, we're going to get the bill for it.

Yours is not an enviable position. We put you on a spot.

Since we won't use commonsense, I hope you will. Please help cut our taxes the only way it can be done—by cutting Federal spending.

Don't give us everything we ask for. Let's cut out some of this Federal aid and force us to return a lot of our governmental functions to the local level. Help us wean ourselves away from Washington, for the formula is getting too expensive.

Sincerely,

Preservation of the Tennessee Valley Authority Is Vitrally Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include a resolution adopted by the 81st General Assembly of Tennessee, denouncing the report of the natural resources department of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which proposed the dismemberment of the TVA.

The preservation and continuance of the Tennessee Valley Authority is vitally essential to the seven-State valley area and this attack by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's natural resources department should be condemned.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

Whereas the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has issued a biased and inaccurate report entitled "TVA: What's Next?" which proposed that TVA be dismembered, dispersed, and its power facilities sold; and

Whereas the TVA Board promptly and categorically refuted the above report and denounced it as a misrepresentation of TVA and a disservice to the general public and the members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and

Whereas the action proposed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce report would destroy a great public agency whose retention and growth is vitally essential to the welfare of the seven-State valley area, and moreover, since a vast amount of its generated power is channeled into atomic energy and allied defense industries, its preservation and continuance is absolutely necessary to a strong and vigorous national defense program; and

Whereas it is proper that the 1959 General Assembly of the State of Tennessee take

action on this paramount issue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That the report prepared by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's natural resources department, as titled in the preamble hereof, be forthwith rejected and the action suggested by said report be condemned as unsound, unfair, and impractical in its attack on the Tennessee Valley Authority and indirectly upon the national defenses of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the members of the Tennessee delegation to Congress, and to the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Adopted: January 28, 1959.

JAMES L. BOMAR,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

WM. D. BAIRD,

Speaker of the Senate.

Approved: February 4, 1959.

BURFORD ELLINGTON,

Governor.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania was declared an independent state on February 16, 1918, 41 years ago. Each year Lithuanians in the free world commemorate this occasion remembering their fellow countrymen held captive behind the Iron Curtain, who cannot overtly join in any celebration of this historic event.

The development and growth of Lithuania as an independent republic was brought to a tragic end in 1940 when this proud nation again fell prey to the superior force of the Soviet Union. Lithuania along with the other Baltic States was fraudulently annexed to the Soviet Union under the guise of a free election. A puppet government which does not express the will of the people was established.

The example of Lithuania is typical of Communist aggression. In every case the Communists have come to power by means of subversion and infiltration by Soviet agents and occupation of the territory by the Red army and political elements from the Kremlin. The Communists then enslave the people by threats and such inhuman means, wholesale deportations and forced famines.

What little information is obtained from behind the Iron Curtain clearly shows that the Communists in Lithuania and in other captive nations maintain a completely tyrannical rule over the people. Lithuanians can no longer enjoy freedom of expression or religion or any of the inherent rights of individuals. Free labor has been abolished as have all other aspects of individual enterprise. Under Communists rule, the family is no longer the basic unit of society. The state takes the major share of responsibility for the training of

youth in order to insure their complete allegiance to the Soviet Communist Union.

These things could happen to all the free people of the world if we do not remain vigilant. Communism is a conspiracy which plans to conquer the whole world and bring all peoples under the domination of the Kremlin.

The people of Lithuania have never stopped wanting their national independence or remaining faithful to the ideals of the free world. But these people need our help and continued assurance of our sympathy and interest in their plight. Let us not forget the Lithuanians who have so bravely and steadfastly fought for freedom in the past and who depend on the friendship and solidarity of the free people of the world.

Reuther Dumps Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include the text of an editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Detroit News and concerns Walter Reuther's proposal to impose import duties on foreign automobiles which would be equivalent to the differential between foreign and domestic wages:

LOOK WHO'S IN BED

We hope that Walter Reuther, proposing import duties on automobiles to protect American wages from cheap foreign competition, will have the grace to nod at least to his strange bedfellows.

We refer not only to some sturdy high tariff men in the National Association of Manufacturers but to the dead—the McKinnleys and Aldriches, the Hawleys and Smoots, all the late misguided souls who stood against the march of progress and were buried by it.

Mr. Reuther, of course, is worried. Recovery has come to the automobile industry without reabsorbing many thousands of unemployed UAW members. Imported cars are making serious inroads on the American market. Worst of all American industry, including the automobile manufacturers, is investing even more heavily in factories abroad. This means both less domestic production for export and increased foreign production for sale here—a double squeeze on American jobs.

Mr. Reuther's proposed answer is an international fair labor standard—meaning uniform or roughly uniform wage scales in automobile factories everywhere so that no manufacturer would enjoy a material competitive advantage based on labor costs. To enforce such a standard he suggests import duties equivalent to the differential between foreign and domestic wages.

Despite the direct tie-up proposed between tariff rates and wage scales, Mr. Reuther's idea remains the oldest and most discredited in the book. It assumes that high wages in America cannot be justified by anything more substantial than the desire to have high wages and cannot be maintained except by political power.

The assumptions are demonstrably untrue. America has developed its high wage scales mostly in competition with low-paid foreign industry, by and large without effective tariff protection. High wages have resulted from high labor productivity which in turn has been the product of mechanization and high management skill. We could pay more, in short, because we got more for the wage dollar.

If that is no longer true, then there is the problem that demands solution. No ingenuity in ducking it will serve. In the long run none can profit from artificially maintained high wages and high prices in a closed market. Mr. Reuther knows that. It is sad to see him abandoning his principles in unseemly haste to find any old refuge from his current troubles.

A World Attack on Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article written for United Press International by my friend and colleague in the Senate, Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, which appeared in the February 12, 1959, edition of the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard:

THANKFUL TO BE ALIVE—NEUBERGER ASKS WORLD ATTACK ON CANCER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Last fall, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, 46-year-old Democratic Senator from Oregon, underwent surgery for removal of a cancerous tumor. Wednesday, he was en route back to Washington, grateful for being alive. In this dispatch, Senator NEUBERGER speaks frankly of his experience and, as he prepares to "resume a normal schedule of activity"—his physician's words—offers a message of hope to other cancer sufferers. He also speaks, from the basis of his own trying experience, of what he feels this country must do to bring the possibility of cure to all cancer victims.)

(By Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER)

It has become almost axiomatic to protest about our modern age. Yet if I did not live in a modern age, I would probably be dead now. Three miracles of modern medical science have given me a prospect for recovery from cancer which my doctors regard as excellent.

These miracles are (1) early detection of the tumor; (2) skillful surgery; and (3) the twin agents of cobalt radiation and chemotherapy, with their destructive impact on any of the tumor which might have spread.

Even before cancer was diagnosed in me, I stood on the floor of the U.S. Senate and advocated vastly increased Federal support of medical research. Yet I used glibly the reference that 40 million Americans were destined to have cancer. I never thought I might be among the 40 million. I always felt that this would be somebody else. I suppose countless citizens feel this way—otherwise we would not tolerate spending more on chewing gum than on cancer research, and many times more on such things as permanent waves and cigarettes.

INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL YEAR

Along with my colleagues, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senator HUBERT

HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, I have been proposing an International Medical Year and a pooling of medical discoveries made by all nations. This has a particularly urgent meaning for me today. Cobalt radiation, a vital factor in the successful treatment I have undergone, was developed by such illustrious scientists of Canada as Dr. David A. Keyes and Dr. H. F. Batho. I am fortunate that no unwise import quota kept this marvel of their intellects from coming to the United States.

A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective. First, one becomes profoundly grateful to all those who, through the long history of medical research, have contributed to the advances thus far made in treatment of this grim disease. Secondly, old antagonisms fade away. I no longer can transform political disagreements into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being.

I am keenly aware that some of the most eminent Members of the Senate have died of cancer during recent years—among them Charles L. McNary, of my own State of Oregon; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan; Matthew Neely of West Virginia; and Brian McMahon, of Connecticut. That is why I regard it as so crucially important if I can stand in the Senate and stress to my colleagues that my own life has been spared, because I have had a type of cancer which has responded to a discovery thus far made in the realm of medical research.

Is it not vital that we devote every effort to extending these discoveries, if possible, into other areas of cancer where successful treatment has not yet been achieved? Does it make sense to invest in cancer research only about 1 percent of what we spend on research into armaments and weapons of war? Two out of every three American families are in peril of affliction from cancer.

From the very beginning, I told my doctors to include candidly in their medical bulletins the fact that my illness has been diagnosed as cancer. I realize that has not been done in the case of some public figures. Yet we need to have full understanding of this disease if it is to be conquered.

Medical scientists inform me that some people, knowing they may have cancer, still hesitate to seek treatment because they fear it is inevitably hopeless. Thus, if a person in public life does recover from cancer, it is an event which can give hope and courage for many millions of others.

The American Cancer Society reports that, already, about 30 or 35 percent of cancer victims are being saved. As new findings are attained in the field of chemotherapy, this percentage undoubtedly will be increased—especially if people seek immediate medical care.

MANY COMPETENT DOCTORS

While much remains to be known about cancer, I think it is essential that Americans have faith in the competence of their doctors. Some believe that capable care can be received only at a few nationally known medical centers. I chose to remain for treatment in my native city of Portland, Oreg., because I believe that knowledge and competence in this field are not confined to one or two famous places. I think I have been confirmed in this decision by the fact that, in my travels around our State this past fall and winter, I have met quite a few men and women who have recovered from cancer under the able auspices of their own local physicians.

The National Cancer Institute, which is part of our U.S. Public Health Service, makes grants throughout the Nation to all promising avenues in the area of cancer research.

Your own life or that of a loved one might potentially be saved if you urge your Senator to vote full and adequate appropriations for this vital Government agency, which provides about 72 percent of the funds for research into the causes and possible cures of the series of diseases known as cancer.

An Effective Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert an editorial which appeared in the Observer (N.J.), February 12, 1959, entitled "An Effective Program," which is noteworthy and significant in that it gives emphasis to the need for expanding our people-to-people program in an effort to build a bridge of friendship across the world.

I can think of nothing that has more impact, and nothing more constructive than such a device for bringing about greater understanding among the people of the earth. This is indeed a cross-roads approach toward the way to peace and stability in the world.

The editorial reads as follows:

AN EFFECTIVE PROGRAM

In September 1956 President Eisenhower called a group of some 50 leaders in American life to the White House and presented a plan. First aim, he said, was to build a massive system of communications between Americans and the peoples of other countries. This marked the official launching of the people-to-people program.

The thought behind it was a compelling one. Governments operate on high levels of political, military, economic, and diplomatic affairs. But governments are remote and impersonal. So, the President emphasized, Americans outside of Government must work out thousands of methods by which people can gradually learn a little bit more of each other. People-to-people, in sum, involves a sort of grassroots approach to better knowledge and understanding.

People-to-people has come a long way since that original meeting. Some 40 committees were formed to reach into virtually every phase of American life and activity. These committees have more than 1,100 members, of which 700 represent organizations, associations, clubs, and other groups. Their geographical spread blankets the Nation, and practically all vocations and professions are represented.

Prior to this other groups—such as the Lions International, and the 4-H clubs—had been conducting comparable activities on a person-to-person or group-to-group basis. The formal people-to-people program, however, brought these groups into closer contact with each other, and sharpened the focus on the objective of greater international understanding through a multitude of contacts between Americans and other peoples.

The success of such a program, in which all Americans in every walk of life can participate, is largely measured by the multiplicity of the projects which are undertaken. Judged by such a yardstick, people-to-people has compiled an impressive record. To select a few examples, the public relations committee drafted a pamphlet entitled

"Make a Friend This Trip" for Americans preparing to visit other countries, and a million copies were distributed. To meet a specific request from the Sudan, another committee collected 16,000 books and sent them overseas. More than 70 American communities in this country are now affiliated with communities of comparable size and kindred interests abroad, and a like number are in the planning stage. A sports committee sponsored the American tour of the Pakistan cricket team. A 50-member American rifle team was sent abroad to compete in Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, and the Soviet Union. There are committees of the handicapped, of cartoonists, of people concerned with hobbies and the arts, and so on and on.

In Senator HUMPHREY's words: "People-to-people efforts at building friendship are not bound by the restrictions and handicaps which encumber official government-to-government dealings, and can often be more effective." And the program is and must be a two-way street.

Three Thousand Farm Folks Speak Out on REA Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1959, the Chipewa Valley Electric Cooperative held its 22d annual membership meeting at Cornell, Wis. At this meeting, 4 resolutions were passed which express the wishes of the 3,000 members of that cooperative on current issues confronting the rural electrification program. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include those resolutions in the RECORD:

REA REORGANIZATION

Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate, for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, non-political administration; and

Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interests rates and drive electric and telephone cooperative to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed.

INTEREST RATES

Whereas a member of bills and proposals were presented to the 85th Congress to increase REA interest rates; and

Whereas the Congress, by enacting the Pace Act of 1944, and fixing the interest rate of 2 percent, therein made a covenant with the rural electric cooperatives to proceed with area coverage at reasonable, retail rates; and

Whereas we believe the continuance of the 2-percent-interest rate is necessary to enable rural electric systems to compete the task

of providing full, efficient and reasonably priced electric service on an area coverage basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to vigorously oppose any change or proposed change in the law, the effects of which would increase REA interest rates.

REA LOAN SOURCE

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture last February sent to the Congress a proposed bill which provided that the cooperatives secure their financing in Wall Street for which no legislator would act as sponsor; and

Whereas such bill would double or triple interest rates to the rural electric systems; and

Whereas such bill would virtually kill the program and bankrupt many distribution cooperatives; and

Whereas the Congress has always evidenced its wholehearted support of the REA program by consistently providing sufficient loan funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to oppose any and all proposals which would send the rural electric systems into the private money market for their financing, and we urge Congress to continue its fine support of the rural electric program which means so much to the people of rural America and to the country as a whole.

SELLOUT PROTECTION

Whereas forces opposing the rural electrification program are moving in on cooperatives in various parts of the country, e.g., the New Jersey and Arizona cases, for the expressed purpose of buying them out; and

Whereas it is evident that the power companies instituting sellout are being directed by executives hired and maintained by their holding companies; and

Whereas electric consumers in and outside the program will pay more for electricity if these sellouts become more widespread: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge REA to provide more aggressive assistance to cooperatives needing its help to continue their existence—such as was the case of cooperatives in New Jersey and Arizona; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our State legislatures to provide us with the machinery to function as public agencies or utility districts where such a step is necessary to preserve consumer ownership; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to protect rural electric and all electric consumers by abolishing the electric holding companies; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to investigate and expose the apparent master plan to cripple and destroy the rural electrification program, and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to thoroughly investigate the sellout cases that have now occurred in order that the Rural Electrification Act may be strengthened as a means of protecting the interest of consumers and all Americans who are concerned about the contributions rural electric are making.

Nixon Defines War on Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks,

I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nixon Defines War on Reds," which appeared in the Daily Pentagraph of Bloomington, Ill., on February 13.

It is a commentary on the speech delivered by Vice President Nixon at Fordham College with respect to how best to deal with communism.

As the editorial points out, there is no stronger foe to communism than Mr. Nixon and no one knows better than he how best to deal with this threat to our security and freedom:

NIXON DEFINES WAR ON REDS

When it comes to fighting the Communists inside or outside the United States Vice President Nixon has no peers. Mr. Nixon's views command attention. Among his most pertinent comments on the subject of communism in general and the visit of Deputy Premier Mikoyan to this country in particular are his observations in a Fordham College Alumni Association dinner January 27.

Mr. Nixon does not discount the ability of the Soviet leader. "In several respects," he said, "I would have to rate Mr. Mikoyan as the equal of any leader I have met." He said the Russian Deputy Premier "has a steel-like toughness of character and an almost arrogant faith that his cause was right and that it inevitably would prevail."

This led Mr. Nixon to observe that the United States is not going to "change Communist policy with a handshake. They are hardheaded realists motivated by their own self-interest. They will respect us only if we stand firmly by our principles and our ideals."

The Communists, said Mr. Nixon, have nothing but contempt for those who are dupes and who can be deceived by what the Reds know as obvious untruths; they respect those who oppose them on principle.

"I have been deeply concerned at the naive attitude and lack of understanding of communism displayed by some Americans, both in Government and out."

Among these he might have included the "whipping boys of Communist propaganda, the Wall Street bankers and businessmen," who received Mr. Mikoyan and his promises of greater trade with much less critical judgment than did the leaders of our free trade unions. Mr. Mikoyan admitted that he found these latter the strongest defenders of the American system and the most vigorous critics of communism.

Mr. Nixon urges a better job at the college and university level in teaching the fundamentals of Communist philosophy, strategy and tactics. "The only effective answer to combat a false idea is not ignorance," he said, "but the truth."

Mr. Nixon warned against an assault in the name of economy on our programs for technical assistance, developmental loans, exchange and information. "Anyone with even an elementary knowledge of tactics knows we could make no more disastrous mistake," he declared.

The Vice President said the United States can be the strongest military power in the world and still lose the struggle for the world without a missile being launched "if we don't have the vision to counter the massive Communist offensive in the economic, propaganda, and political areas."

But, said Mr. Nixon, competition on the material level, while essential, is not enough. He holds that material achievements do not meet the deeper needs of mankind.

"Man needs the higher freedoms, freedom to know, to debate freely, to write, and express his views. He needs the freedom that law and justice guarantee to every individual so that neither privilege nor power may make any man subservient before the law. He wants the freedom to travel and to

learn from other peoples and cultures. He wants freedom for worship.

"To us, these are the most precious aspects of our civilization. We would be happy if others were to compete in this sphere and try to surpass our achievements."

Mr. Nixon urges that we speak less of the threat of communism and more of the promise of freedom. He would have us adopt the primary objective, not of the defeat of communism, but the victory of plenty over want, of health over disease, of freedom over tyranny.

The Vice President urged that this country present its programs to underdeveloped countries in terms of their aspirations and their aims rather than our own. This should be easy since the United States seeks no new land; it has no goal of dominating the world.

And in our struggle with the Communists, says Mr. Nixon, we must realize that we are confronting men with iron determination, fanatical dedication, and superb mental discipline.

"The soft, the flabby, the naive, the lazy will not win in a struggle with men like this," he warns. "We must have men who are worthy of those causes we profess."

This is a realistic approach to the challenge we face. We cannot wish the Communist threat away. We must face it with knowledge, courage, dedication, discipline, and with conviction in the ideals we espouse. Mr. Nixon is such a man himself.

Importance of the Boy Scout Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 13 last, it was my privilege to address a meeting of Scouters and their parents at the Windermere M.E. Church in East Cleveland on the "Importance of the Scout Movement." It was particularly significant that Boy Scout Week was being celebrated all over the Nation at the same time that Americans everywhere were commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the text of my speech herewith:

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, WESTERN RESERVE DISTRICT, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, WINDERMERE METHODIST CHURCH, CLEVELAND, OHIO, FEBRUARY 13, 1959

Members of the board of the Western Reserve District (District No. 7) of the Greater Cleveland Council (No. 440) of the Boy Scouts of America, Den Mothers, Cubmasters, Scoutmasters, Explorer advisers, Scouters of every sort and kind, executive staffs and such Scouts as may be here, as well as your many guests: I greet you with a deep sense of the privilege it is to be amongst you here in this great Windermere Methodist Church on this fellowship night.

Yesterday in Washington a joint session of the Congress gathered to do honor to the humble, modest, magnificent Abraham Lincoln, of whom it was said that when he went to a town, a village, or just a gathering, "he brought light with him."

Gathered in the House Chamber at 11 a.m. on Thursday, February 12, were Members of the Senate and House, the Supreme Court, the Cabinet, and a very large representation

of the diplomatic corps. The Army orchestra played in the Speakers Lobby, the choir of the Coast Guard Academy sang in the Chamber, Frederick March recited the Gettysburg Address and Carl Sandburg, who of all others has studied every word Lincoln spoke and wrote, gave an address none present will forget. It was a deeply moving hour, I can assure you.

It seems to me peculiarly fitting that the week set aside as "Boy Scout Week" should contain the date of Lincoln's birth. And this year we celebrate the 150th anniversary. Could one find anywhere a more inspiring example for Scouts and Scout leaders than this great man?

Indeed, I would like to suggest that wherever and whenever Scouts from Cubs on up meet, they would ask that their hours of togetherness might be infiltrated by his simple ways, his deep understanding, and the challenge of his courage and his faith. I am very certain that his spirit rejoices that there are nearly 5 million Scouts and leaders currently in America; 26 million persons who have felt the impact of the Scout oath and are infinitely better for it.

Let us turn now to Scouting.

This is a wonderful organization to whom Congress granted a Federal charter on February 8, 1910. On this last evening of Boy Scout Week in the year of Our Lord 1959, let us glance over the long list of achievements, remembering that more than 4,780,000 active Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Explorers and their leaders have been meeting together in happy, earnest observance.

Since 1911, 331,719 Americans have qualified for Eagle Scout rank; 199 awards for heroism or meritorious service were made in 1957 by the Boy Scouts' National Court of Honor. The Safety merit badge has been earned by 869,756 Boy Scouts and Explorers. This is only part of a wonderful record. And let us rejoice that there are 7,589,183 Boy Scouts and leaders in 67 nations around the world.

A year or more ago I foregathered with many of you in a tent on the Chagrin Reservation. It had been raining heavily and the ground was soggy, the air water-charged. But there were no empty chairs and no one grumbled! It was my first direct contact with Scout leaders and it was a thrilling experience!

And here we are tonight under the delightfully friendly hospitable roof of this Windermere Methodist Church which gives such wonderful service to this community.

What a miraculous thing it is, this togetherness. Never in our history have we so needed strength of body, mind and soul, individually and collectively, as we do at this moment. We are pitted against an adversary who, in denying the very existence of God, signed his own ultimate death warrant, but who is terrible indeed in his present strength. We have found him to be ingenious, in some things brilliant, in others not. We know him to be cruel, ruthless, deceiving and deceitful. We have found him to be without morals and without honor. And we must have realized by now that we are in a long, dark, treacherous battle for the survival not only of the nation that Mr. Lincoln hoped would go "onward and upward," that "will not pass away," but of free men across the world.

And then it is as if someone lighted a little candle and set it upon a rock and darkness gathered her cloak about her and oh, so reluctantly, turned from us and began her long way through the gloom of hatred toward the pity and forgiveness of Him whom she had tried to destroy.

"On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

These lads and those who volunteer as leaders believe that "because God is, I am,"

their strength can be the support of free men and women everywhere. Their faith can uphold the weakest among us, and even as it was with Lincoln they can bring light with them.

An organization such as the Boy Scouts of America does not come forth suddenly from the heart and mind of one man. No, a dream precedes it, a vision brings into being a tiny infant, lusty, perhaps, but not full-grown or fully panoplied as Minerva when she sprang from the head of Zeus. Yet, from the moment of birth this infant has drawn to itself the ever-increasing many whose dreams have been but fleeting, whose vision takes time to clear—the infant has become a powerful force in the Nation, praise Heaven and makes itself felt across the world.

So has it been with this great Nation of ours which was indeed conceived in a dream and born because a few men with vision joined together to build a nation under God. But a nation is not built of bricks and mortar to fall in the first storm, but rather is it built and held together by the hopes and fears, the love and the labor of millions of men and women seeking a way to the infinite. So it is with Scouting. It rests upon the patient collaboration of literally millions of men and women determined that American boys no matter where they live shall have the opportunities that spell faith, hope and love, the greatest of the three.

I have said that the United States came into being because a few great souls saw a vision and determined that a nation dedicated to freedom, to the dignity of the individual and to the Eternal God should be born. It is not yet 200 years that we have lived—nor have we been too successful in giving true freedom of the spirit as well as freedom under law to every American. There is yet so much, so very much to do. And why not—for is not this great adventure we call living, as we come out of unconscious perfection and go toward perfected consciousness, given us that we may strive constantly to strengthen ourselves and those around us to the end that man everywhere may indeed be free?

What group is there better equipped than you of the Scouting world? What does Scouting stand for? Is it not training and discipline each of himself, each helping those with whom he comes in contact? Is it not very basic, very fundamental, not just for the Cub, the Scout, etc., but for the leaders as well, indeed, first of all? When you sit down with yourselves—alone—at the end of a Scout year and take stock, don't you find that you, as an individual, have grown in many directions? Do you not realize more and more each year the truth you came across long since and only half believed, that you cannot teach another (least of all an intuitive youngster) anything very vital about a character quality which you do not possess? Do you not find increasingly that as Walt Whitman so well said, "The gift is to the giver and comes back most to him"?

We need more Scouts, so we must have more trained and dedicated leaders. I have seen your plans toward this end and am glad indeed to add my earnest hope that the very fire of the need for men who will stand up individually and together to strengthen the great army of righteousness, will be a light which will inspire hundreds and thousands and millions to take up their part of the load.

Little by little in these years since Scouting was brought to these shores people are realizing that as President Coolidge said in 1926, Scouting is a movement that has a "unique power for fusing together in a common citizenship in one generation, the different elements that make up the United States, which would otherwise take

two or three generations of schooling and legislation."

Scouting makes visible the elements that have made us a Nation of free men, united in the certainty that in a land such as ours, "one Nation under God" there can be "liberty and justice for all."

Out of this community there can and must come a great tide of desire in the hearts of many to play a simple, quiet but very effective role in giving youngsters a clearer picture of what freedom means—of showing them that character is what makes a man and builds a nation—that honor and loyalty and courage and faith bound together intelligently with understanding will inevitably become a cleansing force not only here in these United States, but also throughout the world.

What must a boy do when he joins up? He must take the Scout oath solemnly, and as we say on Capitol Hill—"without reservations." Listen all over again as I read it to you:

"On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

Strong meat, friends, but potent, for the young respond to these things with every fiber of their threefold being. How much there is in those 40 words, friends. There is a promise in them so rich in possibility that one could sing for joy.

"To keep myself"—not anyone else for him—"physically strong." I watch the many Scout troops that flow in and out of Washington when winter is done with a real thrill. Oh, they often are hot and tired and their uniforms are mussed and tell the story of hikes in dust and rain. But Scouts do not slouch and shuffle along, as all too many school groups do, even at the end of a long, hard, and exciting day. Praise Allah, we have 4¼ million youngsters who can walk.

"To keep myself mentally awake." Just sit down with a group of them—they are like hungry vultures tearing at your brains.

Just the acknowledgment of their recognition of moral values puts the whole country outside the Iron Curtain and all it has grown to mean of atheistic materialism.

So it is not casually said that a Scout is trustworthy for when a Scout repeats the oath—the Scout law—he is really saying that he will be trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent. Rather wonderful, that—especially when one realizes that just the words have little value to the Scout unless they are backed by dedicated, constructive action.

Surely there are—just around the corner at least—the 600 who are needed right away, men and women like yourselves who have dreamed dreams of a strong, healthy, God-fearing land, and who will find such volunteer service more enriching than they would now believe.

I agree wholeheartedly with a statement contained in a recent Boy Scout annual report, which says:

"The development of our youth to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight, to be citizens of character, with high spiritual ideals and motives, is not just a desirable thing, but it is essential if America is to fulfill its mission as the leader of the free world."

Let us remember that: "Scouting is a way of living. It values deeds above words. It builds character through habit and citizenship through service. It develops cooperation through cooperating. It learns through doing. Its outdoor craft enhealthens, deepens, and enriches boy life. Scouting is a process of making real men out of real boys, by a real program—an interest-gripping, growth-producing, character-building pro-

gram of activities. Scout activities are of great worth in themselves as well as in their byproducts of habits and attitudes."

Again my deep appreciation for this privilege of sharing this fellowship night with you. And may the Infinite bless this work, strengthen and keep you, and may His light shine before you on whatever road you travel.

Tony Moyer, Bellflower High School Boy in 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif., Wins California Statewide Democracy Scriptwriting Contest Sponsored by National Association of Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased and very proud indeed to present the text of the California statewide winning script written by my young friend and congressional constituent, Tony Moyer, of the Bellflower High School, Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Calif., in the nationwide State-by-State contest which was sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters.

As I say, Tony Moyer was the top winner throughout the State of California.

I am pleased to say that this distinguished high school lad from my native State of California, together with the top winners of the 48 other States of the United States, is to arrive in Washington, D.C., during the day of Sunday, February 22, and thereafter is to be entertained and looked out for by the National Association of Broadcasters, which association has arranged a thoroughgoing and splendid program of information and inspection for all these distinguished lads who will come from throughout our Nation. Their visitations to famous places and monuments, memorials, and programs and facilities in and about Washington includes a visit to historical Mount Vernon where there will be a special program for them.

On Monday next they will visit our Capitol and attend a session of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives. On Wednesday, February 25, at 12:30 p.m., in the Presidential Ballroom of the Statler-Hilton here at Washington will occur the Voice of Democracy National Awards luncheon and I will have the great pleasure of eating luncheon with that distinguished young guest from my great 23d Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and every other Member of this great legislative body will join with me in complimenting the National Association of Broadcasters upon initiating and carrying forward this Voice of Democracy

scriptwriting contest. I know too that you will join with me in my sense of pride and pleasure in having one of the distinguished lads from my own congressional district be the statewide winner of this significant contest from all the schools of California.

Herewith follows the text of letter to me of January 19, 1959, from Mr. Harold E. Fellows, chairman, Voice of Democracy Policy Committee of the National Association of Broadcasters; and, the text of the winning script of Tony Moyer, the California statewide winner:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF BROADCASTERS,

Washington, D.C., January 19, 1959.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DOYLE: I thought you would like to know that the California State winner in the 1958-59 Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest is Tony Moyer, of 10038 Rose Avenue, Bellflower, a student at Bellflower High School. He is the son of the Reverend Otis H. Moyer, a resident of your congressional district.

Tony competed among high school students throughout your State by writing and delivering orally a 5-minute script on the theme, "I Speak for Democracy." A panel of judges in California determined that this script was the best of all submitted in the statewide contest. It was selected as California's entry in the national contest finals.

Tony and the top winners from the other 48 States will each receive a 4-day, all-expenses-paid trip to Washington, D.C., next month to see their Government in action. Their activities in the Nation's Capital will begin on Sunday, February 22 (George Washington's Birthday), and will be climaxed by a national awards program at the Statler Hilton Hotel on Wednesday, February 25, to which you will shortly receive a formal invitation. The State winners' schedule will include a visit to Capitol Hill.

The Voice of Democracy Contest is designed to stimulate American youth to think about the meaning of our form of government in their own lives and to communicate their ideas to others.

The contest is sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters and the Electronic Industries Association in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It has been endorsed by the U.S. Office of Education and approved by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (a department of the National Education Association).

If Tony is selected as the top national winner, he will receive a \$1,500 scholarship to any college he chooses. If he is one of the four national finalists, he will be offered a \$500 scholarship by the University of Missouri School of Journalism. The finalists and the top national winner will be announced at the awards program on February 25.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. FELLOWS,

Chairman, Voice of Democracy Policy Committee.

ENTRY OF TONY MOYER, 10038 ROSE AVENUE, BELLFLOWER, CALIFORNIA, IN THE 1958-59 VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCRIPTWRITING CONTEST

There are many voices to be heard in our lives, among them the voices of freedom, the voices of knowledge, the voices of religion and the voices of democracy.

I listen to all these voices, knowing that each has for me a message of great signifi-

ficance. I have been born in a democratic nation. I have listened with special attention to the voices of our democracy. Everywhere I look, I see democracy at work and hear its many voices. Yes, the voices of democracy ring out in clarion tones which echo from one end of our Nation to the other, trumpeting the blessings we Americans enjoy. The voices of democracy proclaim the message of freedom; freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of religion, freedom to pursue happiness as I interpret happiness, freedom to choose for myself a life that will bring personal satisfaction and whatever measure of personal security I feel is necessary to my wellbeing, freedom to develop to the maximum of my potentialities.

Democracy makes it crystal clear that the individual is important. Each individual may walk along life's way with dignity, knowing that he or she will never be swallowed up by the oblivion of a collectivized society. Democracy guarantees me the right to live my own life; yet democracy warns me against infringing upon and abusing the rights of others. Democracy demands that I respect other men if I am to be respected by them.

Democracy also has something to say about duty as well as freedom. Democracy affords me the opportunity and imposes upon me the responsibility to vote. My right to vote gives me a say in who shall hold public office and make the laws by which we are to be governed. If people like myself make a mistake and elect the wrong man to public office, we do not need to resort to barbarous force to remove him. Democracy provides a civilized and sensible way—the ballot box. As long as we heed the voice of democracy and assume these duties and discharge our responsibilities, the voices of American freedom will continue to proclaim the blessings which dignify the lives of our people. To listen to only some of the voices of democracy or to disregard the duties that political and economic freedom imposes upon us will soon destroy freedom itself.

Remember, democracy is by and of the people. This means that we decide our way of life and that it is our duty to sustain it. God help us that we as a people never turn over to a few the responsibilities of governing this Nation. If we do, the few will appropriate to themselves these, our corresponding blessings. Therefore, the voice of democracy constantly reminds me that I cannot be selfish and demand the good things of life without doing my part to sustain the system that provides these good things. Too many who do not heed the voice of democracy think that life owes them a living and happiness. It is this very thing that produces dictators and totalitarian systems. Democracy can survive only in a nation where everyone is willing to bear their part of the burden as well as enjoy the rewards.

I wish I could make the voice of democracy heard by all the young people of all lands. If they could but learn of all that democracy offers, I believe that they would in a few years foster democracy in their own lands. We, the teen-agers of our day, could have a mighty impact upon world affairs if we could but reach those of our own ages in other lands. If every school in our land would produce five students each year who could speak fluently a foreign language and would study democracy with a view of speaking to the youth of other lands, I believe it would influence world affairs as much as any other one thing on earth.

We then add our own voice to the voices of freedom wherever they may exist in this world, lest the enemies of democracy crush us into eternal silence.

**Surgeon for Statesmen: Leonard
Dudley Heaton**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the New York Times, dated February 14, entitled "Surgeon for Statesmen: Leonard Dudley Heaton." SURGEON FOR STATESMEN: LEONARD DUDLEY HEATON

WASHINGTON, February 13.—Even among surgeons, Maj. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton is known as a cool hand with a scalpel.

He performed an operation for ileitis on President Eisenhower in 1956, an associate remarked, with the same calm assurance that he showed when he tended the wounded in the first hours of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Today he operated on John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, for a hernia. A little more than 2 years ago, in November 1956, he had successfully operated on the Secretary for a cancer.

General Heaton, now commandant of Walter Reed Hospital, was chief of surgical services at Schofield Barracks, T.H., when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor in 1941.

He was officially commended for the way in which he handled the wounded. He received a Legion of Merit for his work in the weeks that followed.

General Heaton was born in Parkersburg, W.Va., on Nov. 18, 1902. He received his degree of doctor of medicine from the University of Louisville, Ky., in 1926.

COMMISSIONED IN 1927

He was appointed a first lieutenant in the Medical Corps Reserve and assigned to active duty almost immediately upon graduation. He took his regular commission August 3, 1927.

After serving as an intern at Letterman General Hospital at San Francisco, he served at other hospitals. These included Walter Reed, where he attended Army Medical School in 1928.

After his service at Schofield Barracks, he was transferred in November 1942 to Woodrow Wilson General Hospital at Staunton, Va. He was then placed in command of the 160th General Hospital at Atlantic City, N.J., and took that unit to Europe in March 1944.

When hostilities in Europe ended in 1945, he was in command of the 802d Hospital Center at Blandford, England. He returned to Letterman and became chief of surgical service there.

And in June 1948 he assumed the additional duty of director of professional services at Letterman and became commanding general of the hospital in July 1950.

At Walter Reed, where he assumed command April 1, 1953, his associates speak almost reverently of General Heaton as a dedicated teacher as well as practicing surgeon.

He spends 3 days a week in the surgical rooms, occasionally performing operations, frequently assisting the resident surgeons and interns.

Not only the famous men, General Heaton's associates point out, but also private soldiers and others of little public note receive his personal attention.

He is a devout Baptist. His brother, a prominent Baptist minister in Charlotte, N.C., is a consultant with the Department of Labor.

General Heaton reads a great deal, not only almost every professional journal and book

that comes out, but popular fiction and books on public affairs as well.

His second great diversion is golf. He has the reputation of being able to wield a club as well as he does his scalpel. He scores around 80, often breaking that figure.

His wife is the former Sara Hill Richardson, with whom he resides at the commandant's house at the Walter Reed Medical Center.

They have a daughter, Mrs. Sara Heaton Mason, whose husband, a West Point graduate, is studying medicine at Georgetown University in Washington.

Crime Prevention Week Observed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that crime has become big business in the United States. Major crimes last year neared the 3 million mark, an appalling increase of 50 percent since 1952.

Recently, J. Edgar Hoover said:

One of the greatest obstacles which law enforcement faces today is the apathy and disinterest of a large segment of the population. Far too many of our citizens seem to look upon lawlessness as a matter of concern only to the courts, the police, and others in related professional fields.

Last week, the Exchange Club of Fairview Park, Ohio, which lies in the 23d District, took a giant step in dispelling their community's apathy and disinterest in crime prevention.

Mr. Arlin Weardahl was chairman of the Exchange Club's observance of Crime Prevention Week, February 8-14, in Fairview Park. Mr. Weardahl and his committee performed a yeoman service in rallying local churches, parent-teacher organizations, youth clubs, service groups, and law-enforcement agencies in an impressive, week-long series of crime prevention programs.

The Fairview Herald, published by Mr. Emil M. Uschelbec, gave strong support to the week's activities, featuring a four-page spread on crime prevention in its February 5 edition. Commenting in its editorial columns, the newspaper stressed:

Such a program also depends upon the interest of the average resident—your neighbor and mine—who helps the police, the schools and the churches to do the job. Crime is not absent from suburban communities such as ours—but we feel it is being effectively combated by such a program as this one.

Highlights of the week included special church services; talks by Juvenile Court Judge Albert A. Woldman, Detective Robert Lee and Patrolman Fred Standen, and Cuyahoga County Prosecutor John T. Corrigan; a special proclamation by Mayor James A. Dunson; open house at the Fairview Police Department under the charge of Chief Albert Burkhart.

Cooperating with the Exchange Club in sponsoring Crime Prevention Week in

Fairview Park were the city administration, the police department, the Boosters Club, the recreation department, the amateur coaches association, the Fairview Athletic Club, and the board of education.

Mr. Weardahl's committee was composed of the Reverend Fred E. Blue, Jr., and Bill Gillam, of the Exchange Club, and Mayor Dunson, Chief Burkhart, Dr. Frank Barr, of the Fairview Park schools, and Recreation Director Nelson Russ.

**Rural Electric Co-ops Have Remained
Silent Too Long**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for years the public has been bombarded with propaganda advertising directed against the rural electric cooperatives by the private utilities. Meanwhile, the co-ops have quietly gone about their business of electrifying the farms of America—a job that the utilities had refused to undertake. I feel that the rural electric systems should tell their story, and John Van Meter, editor of the New Richmond (Wis.) News, very ably expressed the same conviction in an editorial in the February 12, 1959, issue of his weekly newspaper. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of that editorial in the RECORD:

The hundreds of rural electric cooperatives throughout the Nation are growing up, and waking up, too. They are bringing their message to the attention of the public through newspaper advertisements in the various communities served by each cooperative.

Rural electric co-ops have too long remained silent while the mighty electric power companies have hammered away at them, hindered their progress and generally been a pain in the neck. We believe there is a place for both services—we can't imagine private electric energy companies ever attempting to tap the sparse rural areas with its lines—them boys like to sell electric energy, but in populated areas where the demand is great—one or two customers to the mile is not their meat but they would have the public think they would eventually come to this market.

In the meantime, energetic farmers devised a way to get electric energy to any farmer and more power to them for their success. It appears to have been easier to get set up in business than to stay in—the electric cooperatives are under a bit of pressure from so-called private enterprise for their success. Private enterprise makes some wild claims against the electric co-ops but the main thing is that the co-ops are getting electric energy through to any farmer who wants it, and that's the important thing. It is quite a thrill to have to get up before daylight occasionally to start on a long drive and see the farms along the way safely lighted with electric energy instead of the old-fashioned way of a farmer having to carry a lantern which oftentimes burned down the barn it was supposed to light up.

You wonder what brought all this on at this time? It was the following letter from Manager David Rodil, manager of the St. Croix County Electric Cooperative at Baldwin who recently induced his board of directors to take the advertising columns of the newspapers in the co-op's area to state its side of the case, and they are doing a good job of it:

"During the week of February 9, your newspaper will carry another in the series of advertisements we have scheduled for your publication during the current year. 'Did someone say taxes?' Is the question we ask. The point we try to make is that rural electric cooperatives do pay taxes, substantial taxes. This fact is known to all who seek and use facts as they concern the position of cooperatives in our business economy.

"A fact that is not too well known, or fully appreciated, is that rural electric cooperatives are new business, organized within the past 25 years. Consequent to this fact, the taxes we pay are new taxes, where none were paid before for the reason that the rural electric cooperatives were organized and operate in areas previously regarded as uneconomical for electric service.

"Rural power lines are costly to build and maintain, with few consumers per mile. It was difficult for any electric company to justify the expense of constructing rural lines when expected revenues would hardly cover this expense, much less return any profit. Thus, as late as 1935, only 1 out of 10 of the Nation's farms was electrified. This was justification enough for the U.S. Congress to establish the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) and make funds available for rural line building. Congress decided it was in the public interest, socially and economically, to encourage rural electricity. Private companies, municipal systems, and cooperative groups were invited to participate in the program.

"In our local area, as in a thousand other sections of the Nation, the farmers themselves organized a cooperative to accomplish a job that wasn't being done in any other way. They overcame many obstacles in establishing this new and strange business, and they have succeeded where others would not try. One essential to progress was that rates be kept low enough to encourage a maximum use of electricity. Cooperative service at cost was probably the only way in which this job could ever have been done.

"Members of the rural electric cooperatives are justifiably proud to be providing themselves with modern electric service, to be repaying their REA loans with interest, and to be paying a fair share of taxes, new taxes, where none were paid before."

So far as electric energy users are concerned in New Richmond, did you ever stop to realize we get our electric service somewhat along the lines of hideous co-op methods? We buy the electric energy wholesale, distribute it through a municipal commission, and don't charge ourselves with a full slate of taxes. We should be happy to cooperate with the co-ops—we practice what they preach.

Columbus Day Should Be a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 5 I introduced a bill, H.R. 4188,

to make October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday.

Columbus Day is already a State holiday in 39 out of our 49 States.

In fact the only States which do not pay honor to the discovery of America are Alaska, the District of Columbia, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wyoming.

It is not always called Columbus Day. In Alabama October 12 is designated as Fraternal Day. In Indiana, North Dakota, and Ohio it is called Discovery Day, and in Wisconsin it is known as Landing Day.

Arkansas, Iowa, and Oregon call it Memorial Day.

It seems to me that with so many of the States celebrating October 12 each year as a legal or public holiday, the time has come to make it known as a national holiday for all Americans.

Certainly there is no event deserving more of nationwide acknowledgment and celebration than the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus.

There is no person in history, to whom the American citizenry is more indebted, than Christopher Columbus; no person of greater fortitude and determination; no person who better exemplifies the American impulse to discover new horizons, to press forward, to prove for ourselves the falseness of outmoded theories; and no person has made greater self-sacrifice or taken greater risks in order to serve the future of humanity.

It is only fitting that Columbus Day be declared by Congress as a legal national holiday.

Resolution to Commemorate the 41st Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution which was adopted on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey at St. Georges Hall, Newark, N.J., on February 15, 1959.

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Newark, State of New Jersey, sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey and held on February 15, 1959, at St. Georges Hall, 180 New York Avenue, Newark, N.J., to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas in 1940 the Soviet Union in conspiracy with the Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all treaties and obligations, signed by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and against the will of the people, annexed her to the Communist empire; and

"Whereas since that time the freedom of Lithuanian people is suppressed by cruel means of the Communist dictatorship which strives to dominate all the world; and

"Whereas the fate of Lithuania, as well as of other subjugated eastern European nations, will depend on the success of the foreign policy of the United States: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Newark calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism and do all in its power to liberate the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain; be it further

"Resolved, That this meeting urges the Government of United States to continue its opposition to the United Nation's Code of Offenses which prohibits lending assistance to, and liberation of, captive nations; and be it finally

"Resolved, That the Government of the United States refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to Lithuania and the other enslaved European nations."

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,

WALTER J. DILIS, Chairman.

ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS, Secretary.

NEWARK, N.J., February 15, 1959.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to insert in the RECORD the following article on Thaddeus Kosciuszko which appeared in the February 14, 1959, issue of the Polish-American Journal, commemorating the birth of this great man:

THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO

February 12 marked the anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Poland's great patriot and national leader and America's Revolutionary War general and aid to George Washington.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko was born in 1746 at Siechnowice, Poland. He was the brilliant son of a prominent but impoverished family. After briefly attending a Jesuit college, young Kosciuszko entered the Polish corps of cadets. He completed his military course with the rank of captain. The king of Poland, impressed with his natural ability for engineering, sent him to France to pursue further studies.

After 7 years of studies abroad, he returned to Poland in 1774. He found little employment for his talents because of conditions prevailing in Poland after the First Partition. He left Poland when he heard of the outbreak of hostilities in America. He was determined to go to the aid of America—a Polish knight in the cause of liberty.

In the summer of 1776, Kosciuszko arrived in America at his own initiative and at his own expense. He was commissioned by Act of Congress, October 18, 1776, as an engineer in the Continental service with pay of \$60 a month and the rank of colonel.

In the spring of 1777, he joined the Northern Army, where his ability as an engineer was of valuable use in the campaign against Burgoyne. His fortification at Van Schaick and elsewhere, his able judgment in the

choice of battlegrounds, contributed much to the skillful retreats and the firm stands of the Continental Army before Burgoyne's rash advance. He was ordered by General Gates to erect the fortification in the defense of Saratoga, and his task was accomplished with great brilliancy and speed.

With justified pride Poles regard the role played by their national hero in the victory at Saratoga, a victory which won for America not only a campaign but France's recognition of her independence.

To secure the defense of the Hudson River Kosciuszko was chosen over the French engineer, Radier, to build the fortifications at West Point. Little is now left of the fortification, but the monument erected to his memory at West Point by American youth will remain a grateful tribute forever. That America today can regard West Point with pride is, in large measure, due to Kosciuszko who first suggested for a national military school the spot where it now stands.

General Gates requested Washington to transfer Kosciuszko to the South. Gates, however, ruined himself at Camden before the Polish engineer could join him. While awaiting the arrival of Gen. Nathaniel Greene, who succeeded Gates, Kosciuszko spent some time in Virginia among the planters. There he saw the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with the Negro slavery. It was then that, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, he acquired the profound sympathy for the American Negro which 17 years later was to dictate his parting testament to the New World.

Kosciuszko was present through the whole campaign of the Carolinas. When Charleston fell, he was among the first to enter the city. He fought for 6 years in the American Army. General Greene wrote "Colonel Kosciuszko belonged to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken to nothing his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems, nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance, and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never manifested desires or claims to himself, and never let opportunity pass of calling attention to and recommending the merits of others."

Congress, in 1783 belatedly conferred upon Thaddeus Kosciuszko the rank of Brigadier-General with an acknowledgment of its "high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorious service." He was given the privileges of American citizenship. He was granted lands and money.

In the fall of 1784, Kosciuszko returned to Poland. A further wave of patriotic ardor swept over Poland after the second partition in 1792. General Kosciuszko hastened to Krakow, summoned the people to arms, proclaiming new decrees in favor of the peasants. He attacked the Russians at Racławice. Infuriated, Catherine of Russia sent a large army to fight Kosciuszko and his poorly equipped army at Maciejowice in the south of Poland. The two forces met, three horses were killed under him, and bleeding from many wounds he was taken prisoner. With him fell the independence of Poland. He was cast into a dungeon in Petersburg, and only after Catherine's death her successor Paul I liberated the Polish hero.

In December, 1796, Kosciuszko sailed for Philadelphia, arriving on June 18, 1797. He was warmly received by Thomas Jefferson. He lived briefly in Philadelphia. His grants of American land and American money were very considerable for the time. He turned them over to Jefferson with the stipulation that the gifts be used to found a Negro school and to buy and free Negro slaves. In 1826 the legacy went to found the Colored School at Newark, the first educational institute for Negroes in the United States and which bore Kosciuszko's name.

By the end of June, 1798, Kosciuszko reached Paris. He began negotiating at length with the Government of France for her help in the restoration of Polish independence. Napoleon, in 1806, summoned Kosciuszko to assume leadership of the revolting Poles. But Kosciuszko had little faith in the fortune of the Emperor and none in his promises. He declined to obey the call, and remained in Paris.

Leaving France Kosciuszko settled in Switzerland. And here, on the sad autumn evening of October 15, 1817, far from his motherland, though close in spirit, among strangers, with not a Polish face nor a Polish word to gladden his heart, Kosciuszko died.

Kosciuszko's body now rests in the Wawel Cathedral in Krakow, where lie Poland's kings and her most honored dead. To this day the name of Thaddeus Kosciuszko lives in the hearts of the Polish people, not only as the object of their profound and passionate love, but as the symbol of their dearest national aspirations. His pictures, his relics, are venerated as with the devotion paid to a patron saint. Legend and music have gathered about his name.

The spirit of Kosciuszko, however, will never rest in peace until there is restored to her proper place at the council table of the nations of the world a free and independent and sovereign state—the Republic of Poland.

The spirit of the Polish people is the spirit of Kosciuszko. It is an unconquerable spirit that will never die.

KOSCIUSZKO'S WILL

"I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

"5th day of May 1798."

"T. KOSCIUSZKO."

National Historic Shrine Assured Near Astoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent article by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, regarding the Fort Clatsop National Memorial:

NATIONAL HISTORIC SHRINE ASSURED NEAR ASTORIA

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator for Oregon)

As Oregon commemorates 100 years of eventful history as a State, talented men and women of the U.S. National Park Service are bending over drawing boards at their

regional offices in San Francisco, designing the visitors' center and museum building for the first national historical shrine ever to be located in Oregon.

This is the Fort Clatsop National Memorial, which Congress and the President have recently authorized for construction at a cost of approximately \$350,000 near Astoria.

Fort Clatsop National Memorial will herald an epochal event which occurred more than half a century before statehood—the original crossing of the continent by Americans, when Meriwether Lewis and William Clark ended their overland pilgrimage at the mouth of the Columbia River. They spent the winter of 1804-05 in a primitive stockade of logs which they named "Fort Clatsop." It was the first such habitation by citizens of the United States along the Pacific seaboard.

The site of this occupancy, some 125 acres in expanded dimensions, will be the Fort Clatsop National Memorial.

In November I conferred at San Francisco with the National Park Service officials in charge of preparing plans for the great undertaking. They share my view that the buildings of the memorial should be in keeping with their Pacific Northwest locale, and that perhaps such native materials as field stone and Douglas-fir siding should characterize the edifices. These officials assured me of their enthusiasm for the project, because they believe our system of national historical shrines has too long neglected the Lewis and Clark expedition.

Representative WALTER NORBLAD of the First Oregon District and I jointly sponsored the legislation authorizing Fort Clatsop National Memorial, which passed both Chambers of Congress unanimously and was signed by President Eisenhower. Several months ago I presented to the Clatsop County Historical Society the pen which the President used for this purpose.

Both Representative NORBLAD and I consider it particularly appropriate that the first national historical shrine ever to be built in Oregon should be under way just as Oregon marks its first century of statehood.

In view of the existence of McLoughlin House at Oregon City, even many Oregon historians are perplexed by the claim that Fort Clatsop National Memorial will be our State's first historical shrine of national proportions.

McLoughlin House, which pays tribute to the career of the illustrious Dr. John McLoughlin of the Hudson's Bay Co., is a national historical site, but it is under non-Federal ownership. It is privately owned and privately administered. Federal funds do not contribute to its operation or maintenance.

Fort Clatsop National Memorial, by contrast, will be developed and administered entirely by the U.S. Government. Title to the land will be vested in the Federal Government. Federal funds and personnel will be used in its administration—and, incidentally, the budget for operation will be about \$22,000 annually.

Other similar national memorials of great fame are the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials in Washington, D.C., and the De Soto National Memorial of Florida. There also is the Wright Brothers National Memorial of Kitty Hawk, N.C., where two brothers named Orville and Wilbur Wright flew their handmade flying machine in 1903.

The Fort Clatsop National Memorial, which will be along U.S. 101, represents a longtime goal of the Oregon Historical Society. Through the years the society carefully marked the site of original Fort Clatsop, as the logs crumbled back into the earth from whence they had come. Without this diligence on the part of the historical society, there might have been so much doubt about the location of the winter headquarters of Lewis and Clark that the memorial never could have been authorized.

The Clatsop County Historical Society also has played a key role in the plans for Fort Clatsop. Two of its leaders, Otto Owen and Burnby M. Bell, have been particularly assiduous in marking out the location of the historic winter encampment of the Lewis and Clark party. These local people in Astoria will see the memorial actually under construction during the fiscal year which commences July 1, 1959, because the administration budget includes \$157,250 for the start of work on the undertaking.

Such a sum will be sufficient to finance building of the houses to be occupied by the personnel of the memorial shrine. It also will provide for installation of sewage facilities, parking lots, access roads, wells for a domestic water supply and for rehabilitation and protection of the recreated log fort.

It is highly likely that Congress will go along with the administration's budget recommendations in this field, because the project is not controversial. Our Fort Clatsop legislation passed both the Senate and House unanimously.

The memorial will include the rebuilt log Fort Clatsop, which was a joint project of the Astoria Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Crown-Zellerbach Timber Co. at the time of the Lewis and Clark sesquicentennial in 1955. Buildings added by the National Park Service will be featured by the museum and visitors' center, and also by two staff residences for the superintendent and the historian of the project. Roads, trails and parking areas will complete the undertaking.

Lectures on the dramatic Lewis and Clark trek will take place daily at Fort Clatsop National Memorial for schoolchildren and other visitors. A booklet distributed by the Government will explain the historical significance of the site. Such men as Herbert E. Kahler, chief historian of the National Park Service, tell me that they expect Fort Clatsop National Memorial to become a mecca on the Pacific coast for families interested in American history.

I believe the entire project should be constructed and ready for formal dedication some time late in 1960 or early in 1961. It is hoped that the dedicatory address will be given by the President of the United States, whoever he may be, at that time. After all, Lewis and Clark, whom the memorial honors, were sent westward on their journey of high destiny by our country's eminent third President, Thomas Jefferson.

(Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER was the first Member of Congress to propose Fort Clatsop National Memorial. He and Representative WALTER NORBLAD were the successful sponsors of the legislation which President Eisenhower signed late last summer creating the historical shrine near Astoria.)

Textile Industry Is Alarmed Over Imports From Tokyo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the great American textile industry is alarmed over imports from Tokyo. The textile industry was hoping that Assistant Secretary Henry Kearns

on his present trip to Tokyo would stand up for the American industry and its employees. I was shocked a moment ago to receive the following telegram from Mr. Leon Lowenstein of New York. Mr. Lowenstein is a patriotic American who is desperately trying to furnish employment for Americans. Mr. Lowenstein is working night and day to keep his industry going:

HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Today's news record reports U.S. Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns as saying in Tokyo, "U.S. Government is interested in helping to expand the market for Japanese textile industry and is interested in seeing the Japanese textile market expand in the United States as much as the Japanese are interested." If such quotation is correct I wonder whether Mr. Kearns reflects official U.S. policy. By virtue of what authority does any department of our Government seek to expand markets for Japanese industry in the United States?

LEON LOWENSTEIN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in response to Mr. Lowenstein's telegram, I am sending the following wire to the Honorable Lewis L. Strauss, Acting Secretary of Commerce:

HON. LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Acting Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.:

Fairchild News Service, under date of February 18 from Tokyo, Japan, reported Assistant Secretary Kearns as having said, "the U.S. Government is interested in helping to expand the market for the Japanese textile industry and is interested in seeing the Japanese textile market expand in the United States as much as the Japanese are interested."

I would be interested in knowing the source of the policy on which the Kearns statement is based. The American industry is presently sharing its textile markets with the Japanese to such an extent that it is injurious to our industry and its employees. Please advise why, in view of the present ease of access to our markets, the Assistant Secretary deems it a matter of policy to encourage the Japanese to seek an even larger share. The U.S. economy cannot be expected to absorb the Japanese industrial capacity which has been largely rebuilt with American tax dollars.

WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time for this Congress to know whether or not the State Department and the Department of Commerce are really interested in helping the industry and labor of America or whether or not their first allegiance is to industry and labor in foreign lands.

This Congress has a continuing responsibility to see that our trade laws and agreements are properly administered by executive agencies.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbott, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Anderson, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Bailey, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.-----
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and
Glen Mill Rd.,
Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE,
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.-----
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.-----
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3606 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----

Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.-----
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chiperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt 2122 Mass. Ave.
(Mrs.), Ill.-----
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Bld., Arlington
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah-----1817 N. Quinn St.,
Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.-----
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Felghan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Aime J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Fairfax Hotel
Tenn.-----
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.
N. J.-----
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.-----

Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.-----
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.-----
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeyen, Charles B., Iowa-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.-----
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.-----
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.-----
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

The Role of the Supreme Court as the Interpreter of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have served in the Senate with many able lawyers. However, I do not believe that I have ever served with or known a greater lawyer than the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. He is a jurist of experience and a scholar of many years of labor. He delivered a very noteworthy speech before the trust division of the American Bankers' Association in New York City on February 11 entitled "The Role of the Supreme Court as the Interpreter of the Constitution."

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD so that it will be available to all who are interested in the preservation of the Constitution of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE SUPREME COURT AS THE INTERPRETER OF THE CONSTITUTION

(Address by U.S. Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., Democrat of North Carolina, before a meeting of the trust division of the American Bankers Association, New York City)

The constitution of my native State of North Carolina has always contained a warning which all Americans would do well to heed. It is this: "A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty." Let us pause for a few moments, and recur to some fundamental principles.

The men who composed the Constitutional Convention of 1787 were wise men. They had read the history of the long and bitter struggle of man for freedom, and had found this shocking but everlasting truth inscribed upon each page of that history: No man or set of men can be safely trusted with governmental power of an unlimited nature. As a consequence, they were determined, above all things, to establish a government of laws and not of men.

To prevent the exercise of arbitrary power by the Federal Government, they embodied in the Constitution the doctrine of the separation of governmental powers. In so doing, they utilized this doctrine in a twofold way. They delegated to the Federal Government the powers necessary to enable it to discharge its functions as a central government, and they left to each State the power to regulate its own internal affairs. It was this use of the doctrine of the separation of powers which prompted Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase to make this trenchant observation in *Texas v. White*: "The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible union, composed of indestructible States."

In their other utilization of the doctrine of the separation of governmental powers, the members of the Convention of 1787 vested the power to make laws in the Congress, the power to execute laws in the President, and the power to interpret laws in the Supreme Court and such inferior courts as the Congress might establish. Moreover, they declared, in essence, that the legislative, the executive, and the judicial powers of the Federal Government should forever remain separate and distinct from each other.

This brings me to my subject: "The Role of the Supreme Court as the Interpreter of the Constitution."

In discussing this subject, I must tell you the truth about the Supreme Court.

I know it is not popular in some quarters to tell the truth about this tribunal. Admonitions of this character come to us daily from such quarters: When the Supreme Court speaks, its decisions must be accepted as sacrosanct by the bench, the bar, and the people of America, even though they constitute encroachments on the constitutional domain of the President or the Congress, or tend to reduce the States to meaningless zeros on the Nation's map. Indeed, the bench, the bar, and the people must do more than this. They must speak of the Supreme Court at all times with a reverence akin to that which inspired Job to speak thus of Jehovah: "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him."

To be sure, all Americans should obey the decrees in cases to which they are parties, even though they may honestly and reasonably deem such decrees unwarranted. But it is sheer intellectual rubbish to contend that Americans are required to believe in the infallibility of judges, or to make mental obeisance to judicial aberrations. They have an inalienable right to think and speak their honest thoughts concerning all things under the sun, including the decisions of Supreme Court majorities. It is well this is so because the late Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone spoke an indisputable truth when he said: "Where the courts deal, as ours do, with great public questions, the only protection against unwise decisions, and even judicial usurpation, is careful scrutiny of their action, and fearless comment upon it."

As one whose major efforts have centered in the administration of justice, I have the abiding conviction that tyranny on the bench is as objectionable as tyranny on the throne and that my loyalty to constitutional government compels me to oppose it. In entertaining this conviction, I find myself in the company of such great Americans as Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Abraham Lincoln, who refused to accept in abject silence what they conceived to be judicial usurpations.

I do not find it easy to express my disapproval of the action of the Supreme Court. I was taught in my youth to repose an absolute confidence in that Tribunal by my father, an active practitioner of law in North Carolina for 65 years, who was accustomed to refer to it with almost reverential awe. He used to say that the Supreme Court would administer justice according to law even though the heavens fell.

I regret to say, however, that the course of the Supreme Court in recent years has been such as to cause me to ponder the question whether fidelity to fact ought not to induce its members to remove from the portal of the

building which houses it the majestic words, "Equal Justice Under Law" and to substitute for them the superscription, "Not justice under law, but justice according to the personal notions of the temporary occupants of this building."

Let me confess that I live in the South. Let me also confess that I deem the school desegregation decisions constitutionally indefensible. Nevertheless I assure you that I would be compelled to hold the opinion I have just expressed even if the school desegregation decisions had never been made.

The truth is that on many occasions during recent years the Supreme Court has usurped and exercised the power of the Congress and the States to amend the Constitution while professing to interpret it.

In so doing, the Supreme Court has encroached upon the constitutional powers of Congress as the Nation's legislative body, and struck down State action and State legislation in areas clearly committed to the States by our system of constitutional government. This action has been accompanied by overruling, repudiating, or ignoring many contrary precedents of earlier years.

A study of the decisions invalidating State action and State legislation compels the conclusion that some Supreme Court Justices now deem themselves to be the final and infallible supervisors of the desirability or wisdom of all State action and all State legislation.

This is tragic indeed, because there is nothing truer than the belief attributed to the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis by Judge Learned Hand, that the States are the only breakwater against the ever-pounding surf which threatens to submerge the individual and destroy the only kind of society in which personality can survive.

Time does not permit me to analyze or even enumerate all of the decisions which sustain what I have said. I must content myself with stating in summary form the effect of only a few of them.

Congress is told by the Court that it really did not mean what it said in exceedingly plain English when it enacted statutes to regulate the naturalization of aliens and to punish criminal conspiracies to overthrow the Government by force. Congress is told by the Court that its committees must conduct their investigations according to rules imposed by the Court which make it virtually certain that no information will ever be obtained from an unwilling witness. Political parties are told by the Court that they must admit to their membership persons who oppose the things for which they stand. California is told by the Court that it cannot punish its residents for criminal offenses committed within its borders if such residents are ignorant of the statutes creating such criminal offenses. California and New Mexico are told by the Court that they cannot determine the fitness or qualifications of those who apply to them for licenses to practice law in their courts. New Hampshire and Pennsylvania are told by the Court that they cannot investigate or punish seditious activities within their borders. New York is told by the Court that it cannot prescribe standards of propriety and fitness for its teachers. North Carolina is told by the Court that it cannot determine the status of its own citizens within its own borders. Pennsylvania and the trustees of the will of Stephen Girard, who has slumbered "in the

tongueless silence of the dreamless dust" for 126 years, are told by the Courts that the 14th amendment empowers the Court to write a postmortem codicil to the will which Stephen Girard made while he walked earth's surface and entertained the belief that disposing of private property by will is a matter for its owner rather than judges.

In saying these things, I am not a lone voice crying in a legal wilderness. The concurring opinion of the late Justice Robert H. Jackson in *Brown v. Allen*, and the resolution adopted by 36 State chief justices in Pasadena, Calif., disclose that a substantial portion of the judges and lawyers of America believe the Supreme Court is not confining itself to its allotted constitutional sphere.

I quote these words from Justice Jackson's concurring opinion: "Rightly or wrongly, the belief is widely held by the practicing profession that this Court no longer respects impersonal rules of law but is guided in these matters by personal impressions which from time to time may be shared by a majority of the justices. Whatever has been intended, this Court also has generated an impression in much of the judiciary that regard for precedents and authorities is obsolete, that words no longer mean what they have always meant to the profession, that the law knows no fixed principles." Justice Jackson closed his observations on this score with this sage comment: "I know of no way we can have equal justice under law except we have some law."

Let us consider and weigh the reasoning of those who seek to justify the proposition that it is permissible for the Supreme Court to amend the Constitution under the guise of interpreting it.

They make these assertions: The Constitution must change to meet changing conditions. As its authorized interpreter, the Supreme Court has the rightful power at all times to make the Constitution conform to the views of the majority of its members. Since the doctrine of stare decisis, i.e., the rule that judges stand by and follow the decisions of their own court, might handicap the Supreme Court in making the Constitution conform to the views of a majority of its members on some occasions, the Supreme Court is not bound by its own decisions on constitutional questions.

These arguments rest upon a wholly fallacious premise, namely, that the power to interpret and the power to amend are identical. The distinction between these powers is as wide as the gulf which yawns between Lazarus in Abraham's bosom and Dives in hell. The power to interpret the Constitution is the power to ascertain its meaning, and the power to amend the Constitution is the power to change its meaning.

It seems at first blush that those who advance these arguments overlook the significant fact that article V of the Constitution vests the power to amend the Constitution in the Congress and the States, and not in the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. But not so. They simply nullify article V with these neat assertions:

The method of amendment authorized by article V is too cumbersome and slow. Consequently, the Supreme Court must do the amending. The alternative is to let the Constitution freeze in the pattern which one generation gave it.

To a country lawyer, this is merely a high falutin' way of saying that the oath of a Supreme Court Justice to support the Constitution does not obligate him to pay any attention to article V or any other provision displeasing to him.

When all is said, the thesis that the Supreme Court has the rightful power to amend the Constitution under the guise of interpreting it is repugnant to the end the Founding Fathers had in mind when they gave this country a written Constitution.

Indeed, it is incompatible with the primary object of all law.

"The Federalist," Judge Thomas M. Cooley's monumental treatise on "Constitutional Limitation," and certain great decisions of the Supreme Court antedating the last quarter of a century, reveal with unmistakable clarity the end the Founding Fathers had in mind in giving our country a written Constitution.

The Founding Fathers "were not mere visionaries toying with speculations or theories, but practical men, dealing with the facts of political life as they understood them." (*South Carolina v. United States*.)

They understood the facts of political life exceedingly well. The history of the world had taught them that what was done in the past might be attempted in the future. In consequence, they foresaw that the fundamentals of the Government they desired to establish and the liberties of the citizen they wished to secure would be put in peril in troublous times by both the Government and the people unless they protected such fundamentals of government and such liberties by irrevocable law binding equally upon the Government and the governed at all times and under all circumstances. (Ex parte Milligan.)

The Founding Fathers knew that the surest way to protect the fundamentals of the Government they desired to establish and the liberties of the citizen they wished to secure was to enshrine them in a written Constitution, and thus put them beyond the control of impatient public officials, temporary majorities, and the varying moods of public opinion. To this end, they framed and adopted a written Constitution, thereby putting into form the Government they were creating and prescribing the powers that Government was to take (*South Carolina v. United States*; "Constitutional Limitations.")

The Founding Fathers knew that useful alterations of some provisions of the Constitution would be suggested by experience. Consequently they made provision for amendment as set out in article V. James Madison, whom historians rightly call the father of the Constitution, informs us that the Constitutional Convention preferred this mode for amending the Constitution because "it guards equally against that extreme facility, which would render the Constitution too mutable, and that extreme difficulty, which might perpetuate its discovered faults." ("The Federalist.")

Since the Constitution is a written instrument, its meaning does not alter, unless its wording is changed by amendment in the manner prescribed by article V. "That which it means when adopted it means now. . . . Those things which are within its grants of power, as those grants were understood when made, are still within them, and those things not within them remain still excluded." (*South Carolina v. United States*.)

Chief Justice John Marshall declared in his great opinion in *Gibbons v. Ogden* that "the enlightened patriots who framed our Constitution and the people who adopted it must be understood . . . to have intended what they said."

This being true, it is as clear as the noon-day sun that the role of the Supreme Court as the interpreter of the Constitution is simply to ascertain and give effect to the intent of its framers and the people who adopted it. (*Gibbons v. Ogden*; *Ogden v. Saunders*; *Lake County v. Rollins*.) As Justice Miller said in *ex parte Bain*: "It is never to be forgotten that in the construction of the language of the Constitution here relied on, as indeed in all other instances where construction becomes necessary, we are to place ourselves as nearly as possible in the condition of the men who framed that instrument."

Since the meaning of a written Constitution is fixed when it is adopted and is not different at any subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it, Judge Cooley was justified in declaring in his "Constitutional Limitations" that "a court . . . which should allow a change in public sentiment to influence it in giving a written constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty."

I know that in recurring to fundamental principles I lay myself open to the charge that I am setting the clock back. As one who believes truth to be eternal, I am not troubled by this charge. Moreover, I have observed that the charge is usually made by those who labor under the delusion that there was little, if any, wisdom on earth before they arrived. It was a wise man and not a wag who suggested that these persons object to setting the clock back because it would require them to adjust their clocks and their minds forward.

Let us reflect at this point on the primary object of all law.

Laws are designed to furnish rules of conduct for government and people. As a consequence, a law is destitute of value unless it has sufficient stability to afford reliable rules to govern the conduct of government and people, and unless it can be found with reasonable certainty in established legal precedents. Justice Louis D. Brandeis had this truth in mind when he said: "It is usually more important that a rule of law be settled, than that it be settled right. Even where the error in declaring the rule is a matter of serious concern, it is ordinarily better to seek correction by legislation."

If the thesis that a majority of the members of the Supreme Court have the rightful power to change the meaning of the Constitution under the guise of interpreting it every time a sitting Justice wavers in mind or a newly appointed Justice ascends the Bench should find permanent acceptance, the Constitution would become to all practical intents and purposes an uncertain and unstable document of no beneficial value to the country. Yea, more than this, it would become a constant menace to sound government at all levels, and to the freedom of the millions of Americans who are not at liberty to join Supreme Court Justices in saying that Supreme Court decisions on constitutional questions are not binding on them.

I cannot forbear expressing my opinion that the notion that Supreme Court Justices are not bound by the decisions of the Court on constitutional questions exalts Supreme Court Justices above all other men, and is of the stuff of which judicial oligarchies are made. Be this as it may, what Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo said in "The Nature of the Judicial Process" concerning the contention that the judge is always privileged to substitute his individual sense of justice for rules of law applies with equal force to this notion. "That might result in a benevolent despotism if the judges were benevolent men. It would put an end to the reign of law."

What I have said on this point finds full support in the ringing words of Edward Douglas White, one of the ablest lawyers and wisest judges ever to grace the Supreme Court bench. He said: "In the discharge of its function of interpreting the Constitution, this Court exercises an august power. . . . It seems to me that the accomplishment of its lofty mission can only be secured by the stability of its teachings and the sanctity which surrounds them. . . . The fundamental conception of a judicial body is that of one hedged about by precedents which are binding on the Court without regard to the personality of its members. Break down this belief in judicial continuity, and let it be felt that on great constitutional questions

this Court is to depart from the settled conclusions of its predecessors, and to determine them all according to the mere opinion of those who temporarily fill its bench, and our Constitution will, in my judgment, be bereft of value and become a most dangerous instrument to the rights and liberties of the people."

What has been said does not deny to the Supreme Court the power to overrule a prior decision in any instance where proper judicial restraint justifies such action. A sound criterion for determining when proper judicial restraint justifies a judge in overruling a precedent is to be found in the standard which Judge Learned Hand says his friend and colleague, Judge Thomas Swan, set for his own guidance: "He will not overrule a precedent unless he can be satisfied beyond peradventure that it was untenable when made; and not even then, if it has gathered around it the support of a substantial body of decisions based on it."

In ending this phase of my remarks, I wish to emphasize the precedents set by the Supreme Court on constitutional questions were tenable when made if they conformed to the intention of those who framed and adopted the constitutional provisions involved, no matter how inconsistent they may be with the views of Justices subsequently ascending the bench.

This brings me to the argument that Supreme Court Justices must nullify article V and usurp the power to amend the Constitution while pretending to interpret it to keep the Constitution from freezing in the pattern which one generation gave it.

I assert with all the emphasis at my command that there is really no substantial validity in this argument. I take this position for three reasons:

First, Although the Constitution does not change its meaning in the absence of amendment under article V, the provisions of the Constitution are pliable in the sense that they reach into the future and embrace all new conditions falling within the scope of the powers which they in terms confer. (*Missouri P. R. Co. v. United States; South Carolina v. United States*.) Existing grants of constitutional powers will enable the Federal Government to take action in virtually all new fields in which action on its part will be appropriate.

Second, As the possessor of all the legislative power of the Federal Government, Congress has complete authority at all times to make, amend, or repeal laws relating to all matters committed by the Constitution to the Federal Government.

Third, For these reasons, occasions which really call for amendments to the Constitution are comparatively rare. While it is frequently asserted that the method for amending the Constitution prescribed by article V is too cumbersome and slow for practical purposes, those who make the assertion furnish no satisfactory proof of its truth. To be sure, they cite as evidence the failure of Congress and the States to make constitutional changes they deem desirable. They overlook the fact, however, that the evidence they cite has just as logical a tendency to prove that the wisdom of Congress and the States exceeds theirs. Thomas Riley Marshall said that "it is as easy to amend the Constitution of the United States as it used to be to draw a cork." While this statement is not literally true, it is substantially true in instances where Congress and the States believe a constitutional amendment to be advisable.

In the final analysis, those who contend that Supreme Court Justices are justified in changing the meaning of constitutional provisions while pretending to interpret them confuse right and power.

What Justice Cardozo said of the judge as a legislator, in "The Nature of the Judicial Process," is relevant here.

He said: "I think the difficulty has its origin in the failure to distinguish between right and power, between the command embodied in a judgment and the jural principle to which the obedience of the judge is due. Judges have, of course, the power though not the right to ignore the mandate of a statute, and render judgment in despite of it. They have the power, though not the right, to travel beyond the walls of the interstices, the bounds set to judicial innovation by precedent and custom. Nonetheless, by that abuse of power, they violate the law."

Twenty years ago a great American, William E. Borah, a Senator from Idaho, made this moving statement:

"We do not know what the future has in store for us as a nation, but do know that the system of government which was brought forth on this continent nearly 150 years ago, baptized with the blessings and crowned with the wisdom of great leaders, has brought greater contentment and prosperity and more freedom to the average man and woman than any form of government yet devised. This fact alone should burn into our very souls the determination to preserve it in all its essential principles. It is one thing to adopt and adjust principles to new conditions; it is another thing to permit new conditions to disregard principles; the former is the highest achievement of the statesman and the lawgiver, the latter the work of the timeserver and the adventurer."

In closing, I add this observation to Senator Borah's stirring words: We shall not preserve any of the essential principles of the Government which brought these great blessings to America if we permit the Constitution to be destroyed by judicial usurpation.

Speech Delivered by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, at the Dedication of the National Education Association Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama delivered a remarkable speech at the dedication of the National Education Association headquarters in Washington, D.C., on February 10, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed the Appendix of the Record.

I was present at the dedication of the National Education Association headquarters and heard Senator HILL deliver his speech. The Senate has heard him speak many times on the floor of the Senate, and many of us have heard him in other forums. He always speaks eloquently and well. However, as I heard the distinguished Senator from Alabama speak before the delegates to the National Education Association on the educational problems of our country I thought that it was one of his finest speeches. The subject itself related to defense, the economic growth of the Nation, the necessity of our citizens being prepared to participate fully in democratic government, and to our basic concept of the full development of man.

The speech of the Senator from Alabama was philosophical, practical, and eloquent. It is a call for thought and action by our Government both at the local and Federal levels, and by the people of our Nation. It is a statement of permanent value for the people of our country.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA, AT THE DEDICATION OF NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION HEADQUARTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 10, 1959

Dr. Givens, Mr. Secretary, Commissioner Derthick, Dr. Carr, officers, and friends of the National Education Association and of American education, it is an honor to be with you today to take part in the dedication of this magnificent building, the new headquarters for the National Education Association.

Impressive as is this fine new building, is the record of splendid service that NEA has rendered during the past century to the teachers, to education, and to the people of America.

As NEA begins its second century of service, it is fitting that these handsome new quarters become the home of the efficient and busy nerve center of the largest professional organization in the world.

I know the many services to your 700,000 members, the information and guidance you give to the teachers of the Nation to help them advance their professional competence and improve their economic status. I know your efforts to improve American education.

As your organization has worked to advance the cause of education on all fronts, your greatest fight has been made for educational opportunity for every American child.

Today, as your executive secretary and my friend, Dr. William G. Carr, has so aptly put it: "We have been concerned that every child get into school. Now we must ask what every child gets out of school."

The responsibilities of education have never been better summed up than in the blunt phrase of Thomas Jefferson:

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

America is challenged as never before by a ruthless, ambitious Communist Russia that has deliberately geared its education system to take advantage of the emerging new age of science, with massive and ever-increasing demands for more trained manpower and for new skills and techniques, with a premium upon intellectual excellence, and with its demand for devotion to the hard labor of rigorous thought.

America's traditional values of the dignity, the essential worth, and the inalienable rights of the individual are challenged by the Communist concept of the all-powerful state, where the individual is simply the tool of the state.

Our religious and cultural heritage is challenged by a society of dynamic, atheistic materialism.

Our system of economic opportunity through free enterprise and individual initiative faces driving competition from a regimented economy whose resources are used as political and diplomatic weapons.

Our science and technology are challenged and have been presently surpassed by sputnik, lunik, and other evidence of Russia's amazing scientific progress within a single generation.

And hanging darkly over all is the ominous possibility of nuclear war.

What are the resources of our people—resources of the mind and of the spirit—for

meeting the challenge of a dynamic and ruthless Communist Russia, and the challenge of a swiftly changing world?

At the very roots of our resources and our capabilities lies America's system of education. Education provides not only the knowledge and technical training, but the intellectual discipline and incentives for meeting the challenge. In our democracy, education has a vast responsibility for instilling the patriotism, the sense of duty, the moral commitment to make a choice, to work in the cause of justice and human liberty. For well we know the uncommitted mind leads to the cynicism and decadence of the uncommitted heart.

The successful launching of Russia's sputniks struck a severe blow at the self-confidence of the American people and at our prestige in the world. Rarely have Americans questioned one another so intensively about our military posture, our scientific stature, and our educational system. In the wave of reproach and criticism that has swept America a principal target has been our system of education.

American education, it is charged, is obsessed with the teaching of "social adjustment," with gearing education to the lowest common denominator, with pressing America's children into an educational lockstep that moves them from grade to grade without regard for individual talents and capacities.

Some of these charges are true. For some time, you and I have been concerned over the vastly increased number of non-academic courses in the secondary schools. We have been concerned that English language and literature have been diluted; that physics and chemistry have become general science; that algebra has become general mathematics. We have been concerned that education does not demand the rigorous effort, the mental discipline, the creative thinking, and the respect for learning that American education must have.

But education in America is not determined by the educators and the teachers alone. Education in America reflects the attitudes of a whole people. Our educational programs are determined by:

The businessman, the labor leader, the banker, and the mother who sit on the local school board;

By the industrialist whose factories provide jobs in the community and thereby influence the kind of education provided to fill those jobs;

By parents whose indulgence or whose desire for material success, prestige, and good incomes for their children shape so deeply the child's sense of values and his selection of courses;

By Government—Federal, State, and local—through the administrative agencies and the legislatures, through the funds they provide and the limitations and requirements they impose;

By the foundations and the philanthropists, in the types of grants and endowments they give; and

By the newspapers, radio and television, and the Nation's other mass communications media, as they contribute to public opinion and public attitudes.

It is fitting and proper that all these segments of American democracy play their rightful part in determining the shape and emphasis and function of American education. But when we come to assess the needs and deficiencies of American education, they should stand up and be counted and accept their share of the responsibility. The burden must not be put solely on the educators and the teachers, many of whom are dedicated men and women who give their lives to teaching, who, in their devotion and self-sacrifice, spend and are spent in the cause of educating America's children.

It is important to remember that our aim is to attack the problem, not the schools.

Criticism and difference of opinion help to clear the air, but they are only part of the process of decision. Criticism is a measure of our desire for excellence, but it does not alone achieve excellence.

In the words of John Milton, "Where there is much desire to learn, there of necessity will be much argument, much writing, many opinions; for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making."

We must not permit criticism to destroy our faith in the essential value, the proven success, and the democratic validity of our American school system—the great training ground for democracy. Are we to be made self-doubters by our aspirations and ideals?

What, then, is the American, this new man, who has made the deserts bloom, who has taken the drudgery out of farming and removed the backbreaking toil from factory labor, whose productivity per worker is by far the highest there is, who is surrounded by the world's best systems of communication and transportation, and who enjoys the highest standard of living in the world?

Was this progress made by a people with an inferior educational system?

There are some who look with trepidation on the incoming flood of school and college students that will double the present school population by 1970. There are some who feel this greatly increasing school population endangers the quality of American education. We need not feel besieged by the rising tide of students. Their claims to education are a sign of national health and vitality. Their millions constitute a national asset—a vast reservoir of skills and ambition and intellect. From so broad a base we can discover and develop the most talented young intellects.

In the last session of Congress—with the enactment of the National Defense Education Act—we took a major step for discovering and encouraging the Nation's potential intellectual talent, for creating wider opportunities for advanced training of our gifted young people, for providing better training and equipment for our teachers.

The principal objective of the National Defense Education Act is to help correct the serious imbalance in our educational system that for some years has been unfavorable to the teaching of mathematics, the sciences and foreign languages. Student loans at low interest rates and fellowship grants for advanced study give the able and qualified student an opportunity to complete his education and give the Nation the benefit of his maximum capabilities. Teachers may attend special institutes where they can learn the newest developments in their fields of study. Aptitude tests will reveal talented pupils at an early age. Guidance and counseling services will help students select the paths of study best suited to their individual capacities.

The act provides for research and experimentation into new uses for radio, television, films, and other teaching aids. Language centers are provided to give instruction in the language and culture of foreign peoples.

Expansion of area vocational educational schools will help provide the technicians so vitally needed to support the Nation's scientists and engineers. The latest findings of scientific research throughout the world will be assembled and translated.

As the National Defense Education Act strengthens America's education in mathematics, the sciences and languages, we must move to strengthen our whole educational system. The need for mobilizing our intellectual resources has been dramatized chiefly by the shortage of scientists and engineers. But this deficiency is only part of a general shortage of specialized talent which affects virtually every aspect of our society and the strength of our America. We need more of every kind of talent, not more nuclear physicists and engineers, but more first rate biologists and doctors, teachers and poli-

ticians, economists and ministers, writers, poets, and philosophers—and leaders in all the varied activities that make up our national life. And this calls for total effort from the Nation.

In this effort, we recognize that the primary and basic responsibility for and the control and administration of our educational system, sensitive to the needs and desires of the people, rests with the States, the local communities and their college and universities. In enacting the National Defense Education Act, Congress reaffirmed this principle and the act declares:

"The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education."

In this effort, we recognize that education is a total responsibility of the Nation and that the Federal Government has primarily a twofold duty in American education: To strengthen the intellectual resources of our people to meet the needs of national security; to help relieve the disparities in the wealth of the individual States which impose an undue burden on the less wealthy States in their efforts to maintain adequate education programs. Assistance from the Federal Government should stimulate and encourage and challenge State and local action and never be a substitute for such action.

There are great disparities in the wealth of the States, and consequently in their ability to raise revenue and to support adequate educational programs.

It is axiomatic to say that taxes can be levied only where wealth exists. The disparity in taxable wealth between States is dramatically pointed out in a pamphlet prepared by Prof. R. L. Johns, of the University of Florida, and published last year by the NEA legislative commission. In this pamphlet, entitled "Ability and Effort of the States to Support the Public Schools," Dr. Johns showed that in 1955 the concentration of taxable wealth in five great industrial and commercial States—Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—was so great that over 60 percent of the total U.S. corporation income and profits taxes were raised in these States, although they have less than 30 percent of the school-age children of this country to educate. On the other hand, Dr. Johns points out that 21 non-industrial and noncommercial States, having roughly the same number of children to educate, have taxable wealth which produced only slightly more than 8 percent of the corporation income and profits taxes of the United States. To put it another way, these five great industrial States have many times more the tax collecting possibilities than exist in the 21 nonindustrial and noncommercial States.

In our concern with sputniks, with rising enrollments, with the teaching potential of television and other mass communications media, we must not forget that the teacher is the central figure in the education process.

Inevitably the qualities and influence of the teacher are woven into the character of the Nation. We entrust the minds and characters of our most precious resource—our children—to the teacher for many hours of the day. We look to the teacher to help mold the child for the responsibilities of manhood and womanhood.

Teaching has for a long time been called a profession. It is time to make it a profession in fact.

The hour demands a bill of rights for the teacher, a bill of rights guaranteeing a salary that will enable the teacher to enjoy a good standard of living, permit recreation and travel, continued study and educational growth, and insure security in old age.

The bill of rights must go further. It must recognize the essential worth and dignity of the teacher and assure him of full opportunity to take part in the life of the community, outside the classroom.

But a bill of rights for the teacher is not self-enforcing. To become reality, such a bill of rights requires public understanding and public support. There must be a new consciousness by the public and by State and local officials of their obligations. You, the teachers, must inform the public of your needs and the needs of the schools.

I know that you have organized the citizenship committee of the National Education Association, and it has been an active, aggressive organization. Yet a recent survey by NEA revealed that two-thirds of the teachers in the United States felt a kind of pride in being aloof from politics and public affairs.

You cannot fulfill your obligations as teachers and as citizens by standing apart. Perhaps more than others, you have an opportunity—through your teaching and through your active example—to serve as a constructive and influential force in public affairs.

We stand today at one of the great watersheds of history. It is a commonplace that they are seldom noted until, looking back, we see them rising out of what Tennyson called "the eternal landscape of the past." Our generation can realize, in awe and humility, that we have been permitted the rare experience of crossing an epochal divide into a new valley of civilization.

To meet the challenge of this new epoch, to reap the rich harvest of its promises, we shall need unwavering determination and a burning resolve to reach the new heights demanded of us.

More than any other kind of society, democracy requires talent and leadership, widespread among all the people. The goal of our educational system must be the opportunity and the incentive for the fullest exercise of each individual's ability. America's strength requires that we have a people who hold a deep respect for education and intellectual attainment, who recognize that intellectual discipline is essential to our national purpose, who know the hard labor of intensive study and devoted, rigorous thought.

But for our people to meet the challenge of the Communist world, for them to measure up to the demands of the hour, the answer lies not alone in learning, and in such wisdom as they may acquire.

The foundation of the whole matter lies in the character of our people.

The great task of American education is to build this character, to instill the ideals and the faith to know what is right, and to instill the courage and resolution to choose to work and to fight for it.

Let us build upon the rock of the commandment of Joshua to his troops: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve; as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

The Late Honorable Herman P. Eberharter

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of great sadness that I join here in the House in paying a well-deserved tribute to our departed colleague and friend, the Honorable HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, who at the time of his passing on September 9, 1953, represented the 28th District of Pennsylvania.

When I came to Congress in June 1944 HERMAN EBERHARTER was most kind and helpful to me. During the years we served together we found that we had much in common and worked together in seeking solutions to many legislative problems in which we shared an interest.

HERMAN was an outstanding Member of the House and of the Ways and Means Committee. He made substantial contributions to and sponsored much important legislation beneficial to the welfare of the people he represented in his district, his State, and our country. He was a man possessed of great political wisdom and personal courage. I considered him one of my close friends in this body and one in whom I had great faith and trust. I miss him greatly and I am sure that his colleagues on both sides of the aisle share these sentiments.

His sons, Herman P., Jr., and James Jacob Eberharter, have every reason to be proud of their father's illustrious career and his humanitarian principles. They have my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

His memory is as dear today
As in the hour he passed away.

Foreign Relations, 1793-1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday night it was my privilege to deliver an address before the Sons of the Revolution, at Troy, N.Y. The meeting was a very interesting one. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN RELATIONS, 1793-1959

(Excerpts of text prepared for delivery by Senator WILEY before Sons of the Revolution, at Troy, N.Y., Feb. 21, 1959, at 7 p.m.)

If Washington could revisit the United States today, about the only thing he would recognize would be the institutions of the Government which he helped to found and of which he was the first Chief Executive. In every physical respect, the country has changed and so has its place in the world, since 1796. Indeed, the change which has occurred in these 163 years is greater than the change which had occurred in all the time from 1796 back to Adam's bite out of the apple in the Garden of Eden. This change is continuing, and at an accelerating pace.

The challenge of 1796 was whether a new and relatively weak country, with a government founded on new and revolutionary principles, could survive in a skeptical and largely hostile world. The challenge of 1959 is whether this same country, now grown to be the richest and strongest on earth, can adapt itself with sufficient speed and flexibility to the rapidly changing world environment in which it finds itself.

The fact that Washington would still recognize the institutions of his Government is a tribute to the skill and wisdom with which he and his contemporaries laid the foundations for those institutions. The triangular structure of the Federal Government has proved itself both durable and flexible. It has, of course, grown to meet the new demands with which it has been confronted in each succeeding generation of its existence; but at the same time, it has retained in basic form the beautiful simplicity with which the Founding Fathers endowed it.

Washington became President at a time when Britain and France, the two titans of Europe, were engaged in bitter struggle. They were entering the last quarter of the Second Hundred Years War, and neither was overly respectful of the rights of the insignificant neutral on the western side of the Atlantic. From the long history of European wars and from the circumstances of the time, Washington correctly sensed that a policy of neutrality—or more accurately a policy of noninvolvement—was most likely to promote the national interests of the United States.

It was by no means certain, as Washington assumed the Presidency, that the United States was strong enough to resist involvement in the European war. This question was still in doubt at the end of Washington's second term, and he recognized this fact in his farewell address when he said:

"If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off . . . when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected."

Washington hoped that the period was not far off; he knew it had not yet arrived. And in fact, within less than two decades of the farewell address, the United States was drawn into the final convulsion of the Anglo-French war.

In the same sentence which I have just quoted from his Farewell Address, Washington also predicted the period to be not far off "when we may defy material injury from external annoyance."

"Why," he asked, "forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?"

It was, and is, a good question. The only trouble is that the period which Washington foresaw to be not far off—the period "when we may defy material injury from external annoyance"—has come and gone. Thanks in part to the benign presence on the high seas of the British Navy, we enjoyed such a period for the century which intervened between the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the beginning of World War I.

But increasingly since 1914, the onrush of technology has ended our physical isolation in the world. And it has correspondingly made impossible a policy of political isolation.

Some, who were not convinced of this by World War I, were convinced by Pearl Harbor.

Others, who were not convinced by Pearl Harbor, were convinced by Hiroshima.

Others, who still remained skeptical, were convinced by the ICBM.

And finally, any who even then were not convinced, must certainly have been persuaded by Sputnik.

This snowballing technology, on which no Nation has a monopoly, is at the bottom of the biggest political problem we face today; indeed, it is the heart and core of that problem.

It has given both to us and to the Soviet Union the means literally of destroying the human race.

It has awakened the aspirations of those two-thirds of the human race who for centuries have been somnolent under the pall of a deadening and all-pervading poverty.

It has made a better life possible for the hundreds of millions of Asia and Africa; and, through its improvements in communications, it has made it possible for these millions to glimpse the better life.

It has likewise made possible a better life for us, the American people, and we have been enjoying this better life. Never have so many lived so well.

This greater material well-being may have within it the seeds of its own destruction unless we come to grips with the implications of technological growth. I am frank to say I do not think we have even begun to glimpse those implications.

We are confronted, literally, with a choice between life and death, in a form in which it has never been presented before. If it is death, it will be, as I said, total death. If it is life, it can be—perhaps we can even say it will have to be—a more abundant life than has ever been known.

This has all come about so rapidly that we have not yet adjusted our thinking and our habits of living to it. What complicates the matter is that this change is not a single incident in history; it can not be neatly bounded in time. It is a continuing process, and it is continuing at a rapidly growing rate. Great as has been its progress up till now, I think we are still only on the threshold of this technological revolution. And make no mistake about it: It is by far the greatest, the most portentous revolution of all time.

The possibilities, and the problems, which are opened up to us by this revolution are as boundless as the revolution itself. We can content ourselves with using the instruments it gives us for our own comfort and luxury and can for a period—I fear it will be a brief one—wallow in our private swimming pools, with the color television sets, the station wagons, and the hi-fi apparatus which are spewed out by our technology and our industry.

Or, we can use the new tools which we have acquired to secure our own place in the world and thereby put our rising standard of living on a firmer base. For example, we can—and we must use our new sources of energy to provide ourselves with better missiles and other means of defense. But we should also use these new sources to power the kind of irrigation projects which will make the deserts of the world bloom.

We can use our new found knowledge of electronics to bring Steve Allen into half the living rooms of America. But we should also use this same knowledge to communicate the truth about ourselves to the hundreds of millions of people who are living in intellectual darkness.

What I am trying to say is that technology has now put into the hands of man instruments of the most awful potential for good or for evil. I emphasize that these instruments are in the hands of man; they are not in our hands alone. They can be used, I think—if we are wise enough—not only for strictly technical purposes, but also for broader sociological purposes. Science and technology, in other words, offer one means of building at least some kind of a bridge—fragile though it may be—between us and the Russians. One advantage of this approach is that it is nonpolitical and emphasizes the things that are common to all men. Most people would rather be well-fed than hungry, warm rather than cold, healthy rather than sick. There is no ideology in a slide rule, or hybrid corn, or a vial of penicillin. We should seize every opportunity, however slight, to work together for constructive purposes rather than to work separately for mutual destruction.

On the foreign scene, the technological revolution has complicated our problems, as I have described, primarily because it has transformed communications, transportation, and weapons.

On the domestic scene, it has created what may well be an even bigger problem. At the same time that it has made the physical side of life easier, it has made the intellectual side of life enormously more difficult. The educational effort which must now go into producing a scientist or an engineer is vastly greater than what was required even a generation ago. But even so, it is a great deal easier for an individual to become a qualified atomic scientist than it is for him to become a qualified atomic statesman, and I hope those in charge of our schools will keep this fact in mind.

It has not been very long since leisure was the exclusive property of the upper class. The technological revolution could quite conceivably reverse that. We already have a situation where the factory laborer works 40 hours a week and spends his weekends on the golf course or at the movies or just puttering about the house; while, on the other hand, the factory manager works 6 days a week and spends most of Sunday worrying about next week. The Government clerk works a 40-hour week; his boss is likely to work 60 or 70 hours. What we are seeing, I think, is a reverse twist on the old Marxist doctrine—life is getting easier and easier for more and more people while it is getting harder and harder for fewer and fewer. This has within it political and social implications of the most profound and incalculable nature.

I shall certainly not attempt to deal with all of these implications, but let me comment in passing on only one of them, and this is a rather superficial one. It is frequently said these days, especially since Sputnik went up, that children don't have to work hard enough in school. That may or may not be true, but it is difficult for me to understand how a father can logically expect his child to work harder than the father himself does. If a father sets an example of spending Saturday afternoon in front of a television set, does he really expect his son to spend Saturday afternoon with an algebra book?

I don't know what to do about this, or about the other problems I have mentioned. I do know that the first step in solving a problem is to define it, and I think that we haven't yet even begun to define some of our problems very precisely.

Now let me mention just one more change which has occurred since Washington's time—this on a somewhat different level from those I have been talking about. In 1790 the budget request for the domestic expenses of the Department of State was a little less than \$8,000. This included the salary of the Secretary, which was \$3,500, and eight employees—five clerks, a French interpreter, and two messengers. In addition, it included \$691 to pay for rent, firewood, stationery, and newspapers.

Congress reduced the total from a little less than \$8,000 to a little more than \$6,000. In 1792 the estimated cost of the Foreign Service—as distinguished from the domestic expenses of the State Department—was \$40,000. This included the cost of 5 Ministers and 16 consular officers abroad.

By way of contrast, in the President's budget currently before Congress for the fiscal year 1960 the requests for the State Department, including both its foreign and domestic expenses, total \$243 million. To this should be added requests of \$107 million for the U.S. Information Agency and \$3,498 million for the mutual security program.

Despite these and other changes, however, there has been an enduring quality, not only in our institutions, as I mentioned at the

outset, but also in our basic approach to policy. This can be very clearly traced in the policy pronouncements of our first and our present Secretary of State. Ten days after assuming the Office of Secretary of 1790, Jefferson wrote to his friend, the Marquis de Lafayette:

"I think, with others, that nations are to be governed with regard to their own interests, but I am convinced that it is to their interest, in the long run, to be grateful, faithful to their engagements, even in the worst of circumstances, and honorable and generous always. If I had not known that the head of our Government was in these sentiments, and that his national and private ethics were the same, I would never have been where I am."

The same ideas, of course, recur in the writings of the then head of the Government, that is, General Washington. And I am sure that our Secretary of State would also say that he would not be Secretary unless these ideas were shared likewise by the present head of the Government, General Eisenhower. And compare Jefferson's letter with a speech which Dulles made less than a month before he assumed the office of Secretary:

"I believe that we can still follow the good American tradition of openness, simplicity, and morality in foreign policy. The need today is to rekindle faith in freedom, and make it contagious, by a fresh demonstration of what to do with freedom."

That was good doctrine in 1796; it was good doctrine in 1952; and it remains good doctrine in 1959. It is, as Lincoln said of the Declaration of Independence, a sentiment "which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but, I hope, to the world for all future time."

May I summarize foreign relations, 1796-1959:

In the earlier date there were two great nations, France and England. Now there are two—Russia and the United States.

Then we stood alone against the world—now England and France and the West stand with us against the Kremlin.

Then the world was large, taking months to cross the Atlantic—now we fly around the world in 40 hours.

Then there was no radio, or telegraph, or television, or telephone; no steam, or electric engines; no aircraft; no electronics. Now, as indicated, we are in the heart of a new great revolutionary age.

Then we were the laughing stock of the kingdoms of the world—now we are the envy.

Then we were experimenting with the rights of man while the kings were experimenting with curtailing those rights.

Then we stood alone, apart as the new experiment in government, independent and flexing our muscles. Now we stand, not alone, but interdependent and providing the bedrock for the free nations to rest on.

Then we had but a pittance of a national income and a national market—now we have one-half of the market of the world, and one-half of the income.

Then we talked of noninvolvement in the affairs of Europe—now, because every nation is neighbor to every other nation, we are involved not only in the affairs of Europe, but in the affairs of the whole earth.

Then we were about 15 percent urban and 85 percent agricultural. Now, the reverse is the truth.

Then we stretched along the Atlantic coast, now we encompass the whole distance between the oceans and the gulf.

Then a people of 4 million, now a people of 175 million.

I conclude in the words of Washington: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair."

Making Fresh Water From Salt Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the 85th Congress began consideration of a pressing problem for the United States and particularly for the Southwest—the problem of abundant water.

One of the avenues of research in this long-range program to find a solution for the problem was the establishment of experimental demonstration plants designed to convert sea water to fresh water.

One of the finest locales available for the construction of such a plant would be the Texas gulf coast. This area is just beginning to realize its industrial potential, but one of the factors which is hampering its growth at an even more rapid rate is the lack of fresh water for industrial and other uses.

In addition, the Texas gulf coast is near the lands of the southwestern and midwestern United States, which need more fresh water.

Construction of a conversion plant on the Texas gulf coast would greatly bolster the economy and would benefit the country as a whole. It could provide fresh water for industry, irrigation of farmlands, residential consumption, and many other uses.

We have seen the blossoming of the agricultural and industrial potential of previously arid areas where plentiful water is made available. Such a supply of water could do the same thing for the Southwest.

Building a conversion plant on the Texas gulf coast would be an investment in the future prosperity of our Nation. I strongly urge that Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton and the Members of Congress seriously consider the many brilliant qualifications of the Texas gulf coast as the site for such a plant.

Mr. President, the Honorable J. Charles Whitfield, Jr. of the Texas House of Representatives, has sent to me a resolution introduced by himself and Representatives Miller, Daily, and Bridges and passed by that body recently. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix to the Record, and earnestly commend its content.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 87

"Whereas the great Texas coast is in the center of the fertile crescent of America; and
"Whereas to that area there is a growing migration of heavy industry; and
"Whereas heavy industry cannot survive save with an abundance of fresh water; and
"Whereas the 85th Congress of the United States, by Joint Resolution 135 of September 2, 1958, has addressed itself to the long-range solution of the water problem; and
"Whereas that Congress has appropriated \$10 million for the construction of demonstration plants designed to convert sea water to fresh water; and

"Whereas, one of those plants is to be on the gulf coast; and

"Whereas the Texas gulf coast is the most logical location, considering its industry growth potential, together with its nearness to arid lands of the interior of our great Midwest and Southwest; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, will on or before March 3, 1959, begin this program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the house of representatives, do petition the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, to consider the Texas coast as the first site for this monumental undertaking, and express to him and to our scientists our confidence in their ability ultimately to solve the various problems of cheap and abundant sea water conversion; and, be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of Congress from Texas.

"WAGGONER CARR,

"Speaker of the House."

I hereby certify that House Resolution 87 was adopted by the house on February 12, 1959.

DOROTHY HALLMON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

George Washington and Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we in Brooklyn are not only celebrating the 227th anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country, but also the 335th anniversary of the formal settlement of Brooklyn.

The first actual purchase of land on the present site of Brooklyn was made in 1636 at about what is now Gowanus Bay. Between the following year and 1654 a colony of Walloons built their dwellings on Waal-boght, which we now know as Wallabout Bay.

As early as 1642—only 6 years after the first land purchase—a ferry had been established by one Cornelis Dirksen, operating from Peck Slip, over in Manhattan, to what is now Fulton Street.

Nearby, at the intersection of Fulton and South Streets, the settlement of Breukelen—Broken Land—was established. It was named for a village in Old Holland.

In 1643 Lady Deborah Moody, having been excommunicated by the Puritan Church in Massachusetts because of her disbelief in infant baptism, settled with some English followers at Gravesend.

By 1660—the year of the Restoration in England—New Utrecht, Midwout—Midwood—and Bushwick had been established.

These Dutch-Walloon settlers brought to Manhattan and Long Island a type of culture and community life entirely their own, of which the Dutch Reformed Church was the focal point. Around it all else revolved. Even after the American Revolution, the pattern was still strong enough to impress itself upon the

village and, later, the city. That pattern was, as one writer has described it, one of "order, sobriety, piety."

Oddly enough, the Dutch and Walloons cared nothing, in these early days, for waterfront rights; they were interested in farming the hinterland; it was the enterprising Yankee across the river who established warehouses, slaughterhouses, and tanneries to which the Long Island burghers brought their cattle bred on the salt meadows sloping down to Wallabout and Gowanus.

With the coming of American independence and the consolidation into a closely knit union, Brooklyn, like her neighbor on Manhattan, thrived and prospered. When it was proposed in 1883, that the Long Island town be incorporated into the city of New York as a sensible and practical step, mutually advantageous to both communities, a roar of protest went up from the old-timers. Stout old Gen. Jeremiah Johnson, of Wallabout, speaking for the majority, roundly declared:

Between New York and Brooklyn there is nothing in common, either in object, interest, or feeling—nothing that even apparently tends to their connection, unless it be the waters that flow between them. And even those waters, instead of, in fact, uniting them, form a barrier between them which, however frequently passed, still form and must forever continue to form an unsurmountable obstacle to their union.

The forerunner of the argument that Hawaii is too far from the mainland to be a State.

The following year the intrepid general and his triumphant followers secured from the legislature a city charter for the village. But, as one historian observes:

The general's defiance was fateful. Geographically and hence commercially, Brooklyn was bound to the island of Manhattan; yet it became a city and remained one for 64 years. When incorporation finally took place, in 1898, the insurmountable obstacle to the union had already been spanned by the mighty Brooklyn Bridge. The Williamsburg and the Manhattan bridges followed and the high-sounding words of General Johnson have long since been lost in the roar of three subways under the river.

By daybreak of August 27, 1776, the powerful British Army, landing under the guns of the fleet, threatened the encirclement and complete annihilation of the scanty and divided American forces. Perceiving the peril of the situation—the fate of the American cause hung indeed in the balance during these 2 days—Washington, in a masterly decision, evacuated his entire army from Brooklyn Heights during the night of the 29th in a counterstroke, unsurpassed for swiftness and efficiency in military annals. What is more, he had managed to bring back intact all the cannons, small arms, ammunition, tools, horns, and foodstuffs, so that when the bewildered British, puzzled by the strange silence, finally climbed into the empty works, they found, in the words of a contemporary historian, not "so much as a biscuit or a glass of rum wherewith to console themselves." Though men did not then perceive it, the independence of America was secured.

It is well that we inhabitants of old Breukelen think of those great days as we celebrate the birthday of the Father of our Country and our own civic anniversary.

Who's Who and What Is Going on in Space—A Space Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Abe Silverstein is Director of Space Flight Development at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration headquarters in Washington, D.C. Before the NASA was established, on October 1, 1958, he was associate director of the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio, a research center of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which formed the nucleus of the NASA.

Silverstein directs those NASA programs aimed at the development of space flight. Development programs under his direction includes space probes and manned and unmanned satellite systems. He is also responsible for the development of propulsion systems capable of powering these space vehicles.

Silverstein is a native of Terre Haute, Ind., where he attended local grammar and high schools. He earned a bachelor of science in mechanical engineering degree in 1929, and a mechanical engineering degree in 1929, and a mechanical engineer professional degree in 1934, from Rose Polytechnic Institute. He was awarded an honorary Ph. D. degree by Case Institute of Technology in 1958.

Silverstein joined the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in 1929 and soon after helped design the full-scale wind tunnel at the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory. He later was placed in charge of this facility and directed research which increased the high-speed performance of most of the combat aircraft of World War II. This work was recognized as a major factor in gaining U.S. air superiority during the war.

In 1943 he was transferred to the Lewis Laboratory at Cleveland to select and train a staff which he directed in research at the altitude wind tunnel. These investigations led to significant improvements in both reciprocating and early turbojet aircraft engines. He also pioneered with large-scale ramjet engines, now used on certain missiles.

At the end of World War II, Silverstein was directing the work at several major research facilities at Lewis. He directed the erection of the \$9 million NACA 8- by 6-foot supersonic wind tunnel, first operated in 1949, and the \$33 million NACA 10- by 10-foot supersonic wind tunnel, completed in 1956. These facilities, the largest wind tunnels of their kind in the world, have greatly accelerated the development of supersonic aircraft. In 1952 he was appointed associate director of the Lewis Labora-

tory, a post he held until he was named to the headquarters staff of the NASA.

Silverstein was a member of several NACA committees and subcommittees, including: Committee on Aerodynamics, 1946 to 1947; Subcommittee on Self-Propelled Guided Missiles, 1945 to 1947; Subcommittee on Internal Flow, 1947; Subcommittee on High-Speed Aerodynamics, 1945 to 1957; Committee on Powerplants for Aircraft, 1951 to 1957; and the Special Committee on Space Technology, 1958.

He served as chairman of the Cleveland section of the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, 1946 to 1947. He was a member of the committee on arrangements for the joint meeting of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences and the Royal Aeronautical Society, held in New York City, in 1949. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development appointed him a member of the Technical Advisory Panel on Aeronautics for the year 1955, and as chairman of the ad hoc working group on rockets for 1956. He was a member of the scientific advisory board of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, for 1956 and 1957, and chairman of the OASD technical advisory panel on aeronautics, ad hoc group on propulsion for aircraft and missiles. He was a member of the Assistant Secretary of Defense's steering group of the Advisory Panel on Aeronautics for 1958.

Silverstein was American representative to the joint meeting of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences and the Royal Aeronautical Society, in London, in 1947. He delivered the annual Wright Brothers Lecture before the IAS in 1949.

He is a member of Tau Beta Pi, and a fellow of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences.

Silverstein, his wife Marion, and their three children, Joseph, Judith, and David, live at 7205 Rollingwood Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

Glen Canyon Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today, at Glen Canyon Dam, currently the largest construction job in the United States, a major accomplishment is being celebrated.

The States of Utah and Arizona are now connected by a new bridge over the Colorado River at the damsite, making it possible for a traveling America to visit and explore some of the most colorful and hitherto most inaccessible area of the old West.

Following is a brief statement of facts on this important construction achievement:

The spectacular Glen Canyon Bridge is the final link forged in a new highway joining the States of Arizona and Utah in a colorful corner of the Nation.

Spanning the 1,200-foot-wide, 700-foot-deep gorge of the Colorado River at Glen Canyon damsite, the bridge eliminates the major obstacle in the building of Glen Canyon Dam.

Glen Canyon Bridge was designed by the Bureau of Reclamation; financed jointly by the State of Arizona, U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; and built by Kiewit-Judson Pacific Murphy under a competitively bid contract of \$4,139,277.

Work started at the bridge site in May 1957 with excavation for skewbacks and building the abutments. As work proceeded at the damsite, the steel was fabricated in California. On May 7, 1958, the first steel beam was placed. Erection proceeded rapidly from both sides, and on August 6, 1958, the arch was closed as the last piece was pinned into place.

Now, the Glen Canyon Bridge is completed—the highest of its type in the world. For years to come it will stretch gracefully across the Glen Canyon of the Colorado—an engineering wonder—and a servant to the people of the Nation.

Administered Price Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the course of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee hearings there has been considerable testimony to the effect that a primary cause of the high prices and inflation plaguing the consumer today has been the upward manipulation of prices in the concentrated administered price industries.

I want to place in the RECORD a letter which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald. It is written by Eugene Havas, a prominent financier and economist. It is a vivid statement of how prices are raised in administered price industries, especially in steel, in the face of remarkably high profits. The effect on the cost of living is obvious. It hits every consumer in this country, directly or indirectly, right in his pocketbook.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE ADMINISTERED PRICES

Congratulations on your forceful editorial of February 8 on "Those Administered Prices," and Bernard D. Nossiter's lucid presentation of this new type of inflation.

You have performed a great public service by printing Dr. Gardiner Means' charts comparing the administrative type inflation of 1953-58 with the wartime inflation of 1942-47, so that the average man can understand what is plaguing us and could urge Congress to do something about it.

It is clear from Dr. Means' conclusions that the steel industry passed on to the con-

sumer not only the wage increases granted to its employees, but much more. Indeed in the last 10 years, the leader of the steel industry, the United States Steel Corp., increased its dividend fourfold from 4 or 5 percent to 18 percent on their investment, reinvested more than \$1,250 million from undistributed profits, set up a pension fund of \$1 billion, and wrote off about \$2 billion in normal and accelerated depreciation.

No wonder that the equity of the United States Steel, which was valued about \$550 million by the stock market in 1948 increased to about \$5 billion at current stock exchange prices. Somewhat similar is the story of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., which increased its dividend in the period of 1947 to 1957 from 6 percent to 28 percent.

These two corporations are producing about half of the total of the steel output and dictate the price policy of the industry. Had they refused to increase their prices in August 1958, following the announcement of a \$4.50 per ton increase of the other companies such as Armco Steel, Jones-Laughlin, Republic Steel, there is no doubt that the price increases would have been rescinded by these lesser producers.

Whether some of the less efficient marginal steel companies needed the increase to maintain profitable operation is debatable; what is certain is that some of the big companies such as United States Steel, Bethlehem, Republic, etc., did not need it. Unless, of course, we are willing to acquiesce that United States Steel and Bethlehem Steel needed to earn close to 100 percent on their equity capital (before taxes) or that they needed to continue to pay a dividend of 18 percent or 28 percent, inaugurated in the prosperous years of 1956-57.

The average man does not realize that the so-called regular quarterly dividend of 75 cents for United States Steel, or 60 cents for Bethlehem Steel corresponds to 18 percent or 28 percent because the \$100 per value stock was split in 1949 and in 1955 to the ratio of 1 to 6 in the case of United States Steel and 1 to 12 in the case of Bethlehem Steel. In the first half of 1957, when the steel industry operated at about 90 percent capacity, these two companies earned more than 100 percent on their equities before taxes, and at the present more than 80 percent operating capacity they are approximating that high profit ratio again.

Is it surprising that in face of such high profits steelworkers are restless and want another wage increase in the coming negotiations this spring. They can point to the huge benefits the managers are obtaining from their stock options. The annual report of United States Steel states that options were granted at \$18.50 per share in 1953. These shares are now quoted around \$90, so that in 5 years there is a capital gain of 500 percent, a free ride on the waves of administered price inflation.

This clearly demonstrates that the managers of the big corporations have a vested interest to make good on their stock option and that their pricing practices are not unrelated to their own interest, which is not identical with the public interest.

That such a situation calls for action by Congress is obvious. It is useless to hope that either the policy of the Federal Reserve System or budgetary measures, however sound and necessary they are by themselves, can stop inflation spurred by administrative price increases. The executive officers of the giant corporations cannot be unbiased judges of what is good for the country, when their actions of raising prices could so enhance their private fortunes.

Secretary Anderson, testifying before the joint congressional committee, said that when speculation is safe and saving is a gamble, the country is in a bad way. Nothing can be more true. Let us hope that Secretary Anderson will act in accord with

his wise statement and present Congress with effective measures to stop the free ride on inflation.

He can do that by taxing profits realized on stock options at regular income tax rates, instead of the 25 percent capital gain rates. He can propose taxes for stock splits which are characteristic of an inflationary psychology: that it is safe to speculate and foolish to save or invest in Government bonds.

All the efforts of the administration to achieve price stability, balanced budget and last but not least the easier and less expensive refinancing of the \$80 billion Government debt due in a year, will be in vain if no appropriate measures are taken to end the now prevailing administrative pricing practices in the steel industry. Another steel price increase in July 1959, would further impair the present disequilibrium of our economy and the soundness of the dollar.

EUGENE HAVAS.

WASHINGTON.

Billion Dollar Bundle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one of the most engaging and provocative speeches I have encountered in a long time is that made by Mr. Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of directors of the United States Steel Corp., when he addressed the annual meeting of the Minnesota Editorial Association at Minneapolis. Mr. Blough's speech deals with inflation and the current challenges. I recommend his speech as essential reading for every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BILLION DOLLAR BUNDLE

(An address by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of directors, United States Steel Corp., at the annual meeting of the Minnesota Editorial Association, Minneapolis, Minn., February 20, 1959)

If anyone could be happier these days than a hypochondriac at a medical convention, it is, I suppose, a businessman at a meeting of the press. The reason in both cases is the same. Each feels that at last he can tell his troubles to a group which can really do something about them.

So when you honored me with your welcome invitation to come out here and talk with you today, I accepted it with even more alacrity than usual.

This may have been a mistake. Since receiving your invitation, I have run across a recently published book entitled the Sugar Pill, whose author sets out to prove that you really aren't much interested in news anyhow; and that the vaunted power of the press is a mere delusion. In fact, I believe that claptrap was the word he used in describing it.

Now needless to say, it was quite a shock to me to learn from this, shall I say, authoritative source, that the influence of you members of the biggest and, I think, the most powerful, press in the world is merely

a figment, so to speak, of your own imaginative egos. But if it is any consolation to you, let me offer you the sympathy of one who fully shares your partnership in pain; for over the years, we of United States Steel have suffered a veritable hailstorm of sugar pills that have been aimed in our direction by a number of self-appointed critics who were doubtless equally well meaning.

It is true, of course, that none of these critics, so far as I can recall, ever accused us of being powerless. Conversely, they have sought with great unanimity, to prove that we possessed some vast, mysterious and unhappy power to crush our competitors and thus to work great evil upon society. So I have had frequent occasion to ponder, at length, this question of power, or the lack of it; and it has always puzzled me.

It just happens, you see, that in 1901—the first year of its existence—United States Steel produced about two-thirds of all the steel that was made in America—in other words, twice as much as all of its competitors put together. But last year, our company produced only 28 percent of America's steel; and our competitors turned out more than 2½ times as much as we did.

So you will understand my natural desire to get my hands on this enormous power that we are supposed to have; because if I ever find it, I know exactly what I want to do with it. I want to give it, with my blessing, to Bethlehem, Republic, National, Armco, Jones & Laughlin, and one or two hundred other competitors of ours who have been crushed to such heights of success since United States Steel was born.

Meanwhile I shall continue to take my sugar pills with a grain of salt; and my confidence in the power of the press will remain undiminished. In fact if there is any understandable complaint that can be lodged against the American press today by a tired and harassed reader, it is that you are doing your job so thoroughly.

You recall that onetime colleague of yours, the late, lamented humorist, Will Rogers, once said that if his audience ever walked out on his act, he would bundle up his family and head for the tall grass of Oklahoma. There he planned to get a high-powered rifle, point it down the road, and cut loose at the first man who approached with a newspaper. That way, he said, he could just keep on living in ignorance.

Now living in ignorance, as a solution to all of the problems that confront us daily in the headlines, sometimes sounds mighty appealing; and despite the rising circulation of your newspapers, I suppose that a great many of us would welcome escape from the tidings they so often bring. With pressures and tensions building up on every side of us, we wish perhaps that we might forget the news and seek some quiet wilderness where we could commune, in peace, with nature. But even that word "commune" has lost its restful magic. Today it is usually used as a noun that depicts only terror, oppression, and the degradation of human life—as millions of people in China can attest.

No; today there is no escape—no beckoning Walden.

The news is too demanding. It is filled with questions pressing for answers. And only an informed people can hope to come up with the right answers in a republic such as ours.

So I, for one, am devoutly thankful for the power and the freedom of the press in America—a press which has the energy, initiative, enterprise, and integrity to search every corner of the world for meaningful news, whether it be good or bad, to report that news honestly and fully, to comment upon it intelligently, and thus to maintain in this country of ours an informed and enlightened citizenry.

That, as I see it, is the great, unchallenged power of the free American press. And since

the power to provoke thought is vastly more important than the power to control thought, it stands today, I think, as our first, best hope of survival.

So in talking here with you members of the Minnesota Editorial Association, I first want to say that all of us at United States Steel recognize and commend the well-informed reporting and editorial comment that has generally characterized the Minnesota press in dealing with our mutual problems on the iron range. In company with your distinguished guests, you have discussed the local aspects of these problems at length with many of my colleagues; and you have shown a deep understanding of the difficulties we encounter in our joint search for a solution.

But you also recognize, I know, that the production problems which beset us here are not merely local. They are not unique to Minnesota, nor to the mining industry. Actually, they resolve themselves into one, basic economic problem that confronts every industry in every State of the Nation, and in nations across the world.

And that problem is to keep our production costs competitive with those of other producers both here and abroad.

You know this era that we live in has been called the atomic age, the space age, and by many similarly imaginative titles; but economic historians of the future may call it—more correctly, perhaps—the age of competition; for never before in history, probably, has the ability of man to survive depended so directly upon his ability to compete on a national and international scale.

Today the industrial leadership which America has enjoyed throughout the present century is being challenged by nations all over the world and on both sides of the Iron Curtain. The so-called cold war is centering more and more upon the battlefield of industrial production. But to call it merely a war of production is to miss the point. It is primarily a war of productivity—a struggle on the part of every company, every industry, and every nation to become the low-cost producer of the things which it offers for sale in world markets.

There is no doubt, for example, that if Minnesota's iron mines were the most economical source of supply for all of the steel mills in America, employment on the iron range would increase substantially. And if Minnesota ores could undersell their competitors in foreign markets generally, the iron range would be booming. The same thing is true of steel and almost any other product you can name.

So over the years, American industrial management has striven in every conceivable way to increase its productive efficiency and cut down its operating costs. In its laboratories and its factories, it has devised and developed machines which have multiplied the output of its workers enormously. It has discovered and installed the techniques of mass production. It has streamlined its organization and has hammered away at methods improvement and cost reduction programs until it would seem that there is almost nothing left in this field to hammer—although there is still a plenty.

Yes, it has done everything in the book, and has even rewritten the book. Yet all the economies that it has effected so steadily in the costs that it could control have not balanced out the rising costs that lie beyond its control. And so today we see our production costs mounting on every side; we see prices rising as a result; and we see many of the products of our foreign competitors underselling ours—not only in markets abroad, but often here at home.

In short we see the inevitable harvest of inflation.

Now there is a school of thought, of course, which holds that inflation is a kind of heaven-sent answer to our problems. The ad-

herents of this school believe—sincerely, I am sure—that if Government will just quit worrying about the deficits which are one of the major sources of inflation, and will spend its borrowed money liberally enough, it will touch off such a spree of industrial production and employment that the resulting increase in the tax yield will balance the national budget and bury the specter of inflation forever in its grave.

But if there were any validity in that convenient argument, inflation should have been a dead duck many years ago; for—including World War II and Korea—our Federal Government has operated in the red for 23 out of the last 28 years. Our national debt is at an all-time high, and we are about to raise the debt limit again for the fourth time in 13 years. And our interest payments alone, on that debt, now about to \$7½ billion a year. That is more than the total Federal budget was in 1938; and it amounts to—\$43 apiece for every man, woman, and child in our land.

Nor have our States been backward in the testing of this theory. Seven years ago, 19 of them were spending more than their general revenues could cover. In 1957, that number had increased to 29. So going into the red has become more popular each year; and the net result of this inflationary cure for inflation has been to reduce the value of the American dollar to less than 50 cents in the course of the past 20 years.

Still the quaint belief persists that the way to treat this form of economic intoxication is to administer ever-increasing quantities of the intoxicant to the hapless victim; and while this may make everything look rosy, temporarily, the result is inevitably fatal. From the ancient days of Greece and Rome, inflation has brought collapse not only to nation after nation, but to whole civilizations.

We saw what it did in Germany, Poland, Russia, Hungary, and Austria after World War I; and now, in France—where the cost of living is 37 times greater than it was just 32 years ago—Antoine Pinay, the former Premier who has been put in charge of the treasury by President De Gaulle, has this interesting and expert comment to offer:

"Inflation," says M. Pinay, "corrupts everything, a balanced budget, investments, job security, social legislation, the moral health of all classes, even national prestige abroad."

All our wishful thinking to the contrary, therefore, we know that we cannot spend ourselves into prosperity or inflate ourselves into a position of international security and leadership. We cannot go on forever getting more and more for producing less and less. And we merely delude ourselves when we seek to increase consumer purchasing power by adding more dollars to our pay envelopes, on the one hand, and by ignoring the shrinking value of those dollars on the other. Ultimately, the inflated dollar becomes worthless, and whether we double, triple, or quadruple nothing, the result is still nothing.

Yet this year, unless we can prevent it, the probability is that we shall go orbiting off on another great round of inflation, as unions in a dozen major industries make wage demands that exceed any conceivably possible increase in national productive efficiency. And since one of these industries is steelmaking, I should like to discuss this aspect of inflation with you briefly.

In recent years, our Nation has witnessed a new phenomenon which is known among economists as cost-push inflation and which made its appearance simultaneously with the growth of the powerful industrywide unions that we have today.

Cost-push inflation occurs when wages, and other production costs, are pushed up more rapidly than national productive efficiency increases. This, in turn, forces prices to rise where competition permits, and

diminishes the purchasing power of the dollar accordingly. Where competition prevents the recovery of increased costs through higher prices, the producer ultimately goes out of business. There is no other alternative.

But I do not need to tell you ladies and gentlemen of the press about the dangers of this spiral of wages, costs and prices. People in your industry tell me that rising costs have been largely responsible for the disappearance of some 217 daily newspapers in the United States in the past 10 years.

Now there are many costs, of course, which enter into the production process, but by far the most important of these is the cost of employment. If we take the entire production process from the raw materials right through to the finished product, unemployment costs—direct and indirect—account for 75 to 80 percent of all costs. That means that an unearned rise in employment costs has from three to four times as much inflationary effect as a corresponding rise in all the remaining costs of production put together.

So bearing this all-important fact in mind, let us look for a moment at the wage picture that confronts us. Of the major wage contracts on file with the Department of Labor, 154 will come up for negotiation this year. These contracts cover about 4½ million workers, and among the many unions involved, one of the largest and most powerful is the steelworkers union with about 1¼ million workers. Its present 3-year agreement with the steel-producing companies expires on June 30.

Now presumably most of these unions will come up with demands for a "package" embracing higher wages and benefits; but the steel union union isn't talking in terms of a mere package—it's talking about a billion-dollar bundle.

In the advertisements which it has been running in your newspapers, this union has been telling us how an extra billion dollars, in the pockets of the steelworkers, will increase the sales and the profits of the automobile industry, the moving-picture houses, and the homebuilders of America, and so on, ad infinitum. So it is going to do the whole Nation a great favor by getting that billion-dollar bundle for its members.

And that sounds just dandy; but why be so selfish about it? Why limit it to 1¼ million steelworkers? Why not do the same for all of the 65 million gainfully employed people in America, and thus raise the ante of \$52 billion? In short, why not go on a real inflationary bender while we're at it? It should be lots of fun, while it lasts.

Unhappily for all of us, however, you don't find a billion-dollar bundle in a 5-and-10-cent store—not even in these days of inflation. And when the union, in its advertisements, speaks as it has about a billion dollars in new money, it is describing the situation more accurately and more prophetically, perhaps, than it had really intended. For that is precisely what it would be in the end—new money, fresh off the printing press and worth exactly that.

Now it is not my purpose to argue the steel wage case here today. That would take a great deal more time than any of us can spare on this occasion. But I do want to discuss two points that will be hotly debated in the press, no doubt, as the negotiations in steel and all these other industries develop during the year:

First we will be told that these new wage demands can be met out of increased productivity, and thus will not be inflationary. And second we will be told that the real cause of this cost-push inflation is to be found—not in rising wages—but in exorbitant industrial profits. Let's look at these statements a little.

In the case of productivity, we must remember that it is not, by any means, the

same thing as output per man hour. In any one company or industry, for example, an increase in output per man hour may be completely offset by the increased cost of machines or materials that made the higher output possible. So when we talk in terms of output per man hour we are usually exaggerating greatly any increase in real productivity that may have occurred.

We must also remember that productivity—as an offsetting factor to inflationary wage increases—cannot be measured on a short term basis covering a month, a few months, or even a few years.

For example, if we take the records of the American Iron and Steel Institute, and do a little arithmetic, we find that in 1956—the year in which our present steel wage agreement was signed—the industry turned out considerably more steel per thousand man hours than it did last year. Over that period, in fact, output per man hour declined by more than 7 percent.

That, of course, was due primarily to the sharp drop in steel production during a period of recession; and now that the demand for steel is rising rapidly, it may be expected that output per man hour will do likewise. So if the steel union seeks to justify its wage demands by claiming some spectacular rise in output per man hour during the coming months, it may fool a number of people; but that will not make its demands one whit less inflationary.

The truth is, of course, that from 1940 through 1957, hourly employment costs in the steel industry have gone up an average of 7.6 percent for 17 solid years. And in contrast, the reports of the Department of Labor show that output per man-hour has risen by only 2.6 percent per year. And, as I pointed out before, using "output per man-hour" overstates the real productivity gains. So there you have it: 7.6 percent against 2.6 percent, each year for 17 years. The difference spelled wage inflation.

Now, let's take a look at those profits. The argument here is that rising corporate profits, rather than wages, are responsible for the ever-mounting cost of living. And the trouble with this argument is that corporate profits haven't been rising for years. In fact, only twice during the present decade have the after-tax profits of corporations as a whole been as high as they were in 1950. In all other years they were lower. And Government reports show that last year they were \$5 billion less than they were in 1950.

The same Government reports also show, however, that compensation of employees, throughout the Nation, has risen by \$100 billion during these same 9 years. So I leave it to you; whence cometh this cost-push inflation?

I should add, however, that this decline in corporate profits may have contributed, in one respect, to the inflationary effect of the wage increases; because, you see, there is only one way in which these corporate profits can be spent. They all go to pay for the use and improvement of the tools and other capital facilities necessary to production . . . and had the profits of all corporations risen as they should have, during this period, there is no doubt that many of the cost-reducing improvements that American industry is still waiting to make in its facilities would have already been installed and would now be yielding the fruits of increased efficiency.

So when we hear union leaders say that higher wage costs can, and should, come out of profits, let us remember one little economic maxim: that less profit means fewer tools—or poorer tools—of production; and that this, in turn, means less efficiency, higher production costs, higher prices, shrinking purchasing power, diminishing markets, and fewer jobs. It is just as simple as that.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the outset of this little talk I said I wanted to discuss my prob-

lems with you because you could really do something about them. As you see, however, they are not my problems alone. They are the problems of all of us, of you, of the men in the mines and the mills, and of union members and leaders alike; for no matter what economic group we may belong to, and no matter what the conflicting interests of these groups may seem to be, we are a Nation of 175 million consumers and each one of us has a vital stake in the task of protecting the consumer purchasing power of all of us.

If there is one banner under which we should all unite, I suppose it would read something like this: "Hold that line in 1959."

No single group of us can do it alone. We who represent the steel companies are going to do our full part, but in saying that, let me remind you that at the American bargaining table, in these days of industrywide unions, the power that is concentrated on the labor side normally outweighs by a considerable margin that on the management side. This is especially true when any single company is negotiating with the union and is still likely to be true even when a group of companies have joined together for bargaining purposes.

Unless the representatives of the union are fully satisfied when our present steel contracts expire, they can strike the plants and close down about 90 percent of the steel industry. And they have done so five times in the last 13 years.

The steel companies have taken these costly strikes in an effort to help check the rising tide of wage-cost inflation; but they have never succeeded in doing so; for a strike in steel is not a weapon that is aimed at the companies alone. After it has gone on for a few weeks, many of our customers begin to run out of steel. Thus they face a shutdown of their plants and a layoff of their employees. The flow of steel needed for defense is shut off too; and so the pressure upon the companies to settle finally reaches a point where it is difficult to withstand any longer. It comes from our customers, from the public, and—frequently—from the Government itself.

Settle, they tell us; and settle we must. So the companies alone cannot stop wage inflation. Neither can the Government, I think, under present circumstances. Conceivably it might legislate a more equal distribution of power at the bargaining table, but I cherish little hope that it will do so. Failing that, it could resort to the peacetime imposition of wage and price controls; but those have been tried in nation after nation for more than 2,000 years, and never yet have they stopped inflation. They have only stopped production and progress.

Yet there is, I believe, one great, irresistible force in this country that can stop wage inflation at its source. That is the force of informed public opinion. And the power to create an informed public opinion is the power of the press.

Now I know that the issues in any wage negotiation are many and complex; and that working as you do under the inexorable pressure of the clock, you have little time to delve into them fully. I also know that a wage negotiation, even in a nationwide industry, is pretty small potatoes as news goes, these days, and that there is very little space that you can give it.

It is true, moreover, that you have fully and fairly discharged your reportorial duties when you give both sides of the story. You tell your readers that the union says its wage demands will cost X cents per hour; but the companies claim that it will cost a good many cents more per hour. So the reader, who is often a pretty busy fellow himself, is likely to conclude that both sides are protesting too much, and that it really doesn't matter much because they're only haggling over a few pennies anyway.

But which side is protesting too much? And just how much does it matter?

Well it matters a great deal, because, you see, an increase of 1 little cent per hour in the cost of employment will add some \$15 million a year to the industry's cost of making steel. And in saying that, I am referring only to the direct employment cost. As similar wage boosts occur in other industries and are reflected in our purchased goods, services, taxes, and so on, the increase in our indirect employment costs soon mounts up to an equal sum. So as a kind of rough rule of thumb, we may say that each 1 cent increase in steel wages and benefits means some \$30 million of increased costs to add to the inflation spiral.

But it lies within the power of the press to determine what the exact facts are. You men and women have the opportunity to go to the source of these conflicting statements on both sides, to check the figures for yourselves, and to tell your readers of your findings.

My purpose here today is to invite you most cordially to do so; because unless the public can be fully and truthfully informed, it looks as if we may have another billion-dollar bundle of unwanted inflation on our national doorstep for keeps.

Industrialization of the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Sentinel recently printed a table showing the degree of industrialization of each of the 48 States excluding Alaska, as measured by percentages of personal income derived from manufacturing wages and salaries.

It will surprise many Members of Congress to discover that the State of Wisconsin is now seventh in the country in industrialization by this measure and ranks ahead of such States as Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Illinois, New York, California, and Texas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table and the interesting article accompanying it, written by William A. Norris of the Sentinel be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the table and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE RESIDENTS' INCOME HEAVILY DEPENDENT UPON MANUFACTURING (By William A. Norris)

Here's a good method of measuring the degree of Wisconsin's industrialization, its dependence on manufacturing for its economic life:

Out of every dollar of personal income received by Wisconsin people, 30 cents comes from manufacturers in the form of wages and salaries.

The remaining 70 cents of the State's total personal income are derived from wages and salaries in all nonmanufacturing occupations, and from the professions, interest and dividends, profits on farms and businesses, pensions, annuities and other nonwage sources.

The figures used in this column are based on reports of the Department of Commerce

for 1957 (percentages by courtesy of my slide-rule).

Only six States get a higher percentage of personal income from manufacturing wages and salaries than does Wisconsin.

At the top of the list is Michigan, with 36.8 percent; at the bottom is North Dakota, with only 2.6 percent. The national average is 23.4 percent.

The following table does not show which States have the most manufacturing, but it does show which States have the most manufacturing in relation to all their other sources of personal income.

As a result, some rather surprising things appear. New York, which leads all States in total value of manufacturing, is No. 19 on the list, slightly below the national average. That's because New York has tremendous sources of personal income other than manufacturing—financial institutions, shipping, vast wholesale and retail structures, service industries, utilities, transportation of all sorts. Manufacturing is relatively less important to New York than it is to Wisconsin.

On the other hand, little Delaware, with manufacturing output only about one-sixth of Wisconsin's, is tied with us in the list because its total personal income is only about one-sixth of ours. Relatively, Delaware is as highly industrialized as we are. Some other small States, such as New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, are higher on the list than you might expect.

Some industrial giants, like California and Texas, whose manufacturing volume exceeds Wisconsin's, are far down on the list because their economies include big nonmanufacturing resources. Here's the list:

Percentage of personal income derived from manufacturing wages and salaries

1. Michigan.....	36.8
2. Indiana.....	35.2
3. Connecticut.....	34.5
4. Ohio.....	34.2
5. New Jersey.....	31.4
6. Pennsylvania.....	31.0
7. Wisconsin.....	30.4
8. Delaware.....	30.4
9. New Hampshire.....	28.7
10. Rhode Island.....	27.6
11. Massachusetts.....	26.8
12. South Carolina.....	26.1
13. Illinois.....	25.7
14. North Carolina.....	25.0
15. Maine.....	24.6
16. Tennessee.....	23.4
U.S. average.....	23.4
17. Alabama.....	22.5
18. Vermont.....	22.4
19. New York.....	22.0
20. Missouri.....	21.4
21. Maryland.....	20.8
22. Georgia.....	20.4
23. West Virginia.....	20.2
24. California.....	19.5
25. Washington.....	19.5
26. Kentucky.....	19.2
27. Oregon.....	19.0
28. Minnesota.....	17.5
29. Kansas.....	16.3
30. Texas.....	16.0
31. Iowa.....	15.6
32. Mississippi.....	15.5
33. Virginia.....	15.5
34. Arkansas.....	13.8
35. Louisiana.....	13.5
36. Utah.....	12.4
37. Idaho.....	11.5
38. Oklahoma.....	10.9
39. Colorado.....	10.7
40. Arizona.....	9.9
41. Nebraska.....	9.5
42. Florida.....	8.1
43. Montana.....	7.6
44. Wyoming.....	5.3
45. New Mexico.....	4.9
46. Nevada.....	4.5
47. South Dakota.....	4.5
48. North Dakota.....	2.6

(Apologies to Alaska, for which we have no figures.)

This list, perhaps, will help to impress public officials and private citizens alike with the vital necessity of preserving and expanding our State's manufacturing industries.

The Vanguard Weather Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF DR. ABE SILVERSTEIN, DIRECTOR OF SPACE FLIGHT DEVELOPMENT, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, FEBRUARY 18, 1959

As you know, we launched a 2½-pound Vanguard weather satellite yesterday morning. From all indications, it is transmitting valuable cloud cover data which can be related to the overall meteorology of the earth.

This is a very exciting, historic, experiment. It represents a first step toward obtaining continuous, 24-hour-a-day weather mapping of global scope. At the present time, by means of weather ships, balloons, etc., we are able to map only 10 percent of the world's weather, so it's not hard to see why we are excited about this experiment.

I'd like to review, briefly, the history of Project Vanguard because I feel there has been considerable misunderstanding about this project from the very beginning. And at the outset, I'd like to pay tribute to Dr. John Peter Hagen, chief of NASA's Vanguard division, whose faith in the Vanguard rocket, and the project in general, has never wavered.

On July 29, 1955, the White House announced that the United States planned to launch earth satellites as part of this country's contribution to the International Geophysical Year which ended formally on December 31, 1958. Project Vanguard was the name assigned to that part of the satellite program which was under management of the Chief of Naval Research, Adm. Rawson Bennett. The Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) in Washington, D.C., under the leadership of Capt. P. H. Horn, had responsibility for technical aspects of the program.

Here, I would like to emphasize a fact that is too often forgotten: the Navy set out to produce, essentially from scratch, a satellite launching vehicle in a remarkably short time. The very production of this vehicle was to be, in a sense, one of the most significant contributions of the IGY. The Vanguard vehicle is an advanced rocket, parts of which are in use in other U.S. rockets and missiles.

On October 1, 1958, the President by Executive Order 10783 transferred "all functions (including powers, duties, activities, and parts of functions) of the Department of Defense, or of any officer or organizational entity of the Department of Defense with respect to . . . the U.S. scientific satellite project (Project Vanguard)" to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Under authority of this Executive order, 133 members of the Vanguard group at the Naval Research Laboratory and 25 persons in other divisions of the Naval Research Laboratory devoting substantially full time to the Vanguard project, a total of 158 persons, were transferred to NASA on November 30. Of these, 86 are scientists, 42 technicians, and 30 administrative and support personnel.

Project Vanguard developed not only the Vanguard vehicle but also the IGY radio tracking net (Minitrack) which has been used not only for Vanguard but for observations of every active satellite so far launched, United States and Russian. With the transfer, responsibility for this network passed to NASA.

At the time of transfer to NASA the engineering and manufacture of the vehicles was essentially completed. Seven three-stage vehicles, i.e., test vehicles TV-3, TV-3BU, TV-4, TV-5, and satellite launch vehicles SLV-1, SLV-2, SLV-3, had been launched. Modifications which resulted from study of records from each launching attempt were being incorporated in the remaining vehicles. Additional preflight operations, intended to eliminate the causes of low performance of the second stage in previous flights, had been adopted and were being applied to SLV-4. Four satellite launching vehicles remained to be fired.

When responsibility for the Vanguard program was given to NASA, we reviewed the complete history of the project. The Vanguard vehicle is comparable in complexity and application of advanced techniques to military ballistic missiles. Its early flight experience is substantially the same as that of the other missiles, whose failures and successes were not made a matter of public record. The personnel of the Vanguard group are highly competent, and we are pleased that their services have been made available. They have joined in the overall activity of NASA with highly cooperative spirit and are active in the formulation of the national space program.

As a result of administrative review of Vanguard history, NASA decided to postpone the Vanguard firing scheduled for December 1958 to February 1959 to provide time for an objective technical review of the vehicle to determine whether any additional steps might be taken to increase the probability of success. A working committee composed of experts having no previous connection with Vanguard studied in detail the systems involved in the vehicle and vehicle launching. The committee examined all pertinent data from the Vanguard launchings and from the use of Vanguard components in other vehicles such as the Thor-Able reentry and moon-probe vehicles. Numerous modifications in the system and operational practices were made as a result of the work of the review teams and the Vanguard and industrial teams working together.

Whether any of these modifications definitively helped in achieving success of Vanguard II is difficult to say. Definitely the conservative engineering approach that led to a deliberate look by all the participants at their equipment and operating practices was correct in principle.

Prior to yesterday's successful experiment, one Vanguard satellite had achieved orbit—a three-and-one-quarter-pound test sphere which was launched on March 17, 1958. (Its 50-pound third stage rocket casing also went into orbit.) Vanguard I, as it was christened, is still aloft, with an expected lifetime of hundreds of years. Its solar batteries are still doing their job and the Army Map Service has been making electronic observations of the satellite from Pacific islands to pinpoint their location more exactly. The satellite is also being used for more exact determination of the earth's shape.

The Vanguard II cloud cover satellite is the first in a series of meteorological satellites to be launched by NASA during the next few years. These satellites should gain information about the weather and how it develops. Substantial economic returns—to say nothing of returns in the form of lives saved by accurate forecasting of hurricanes, typhoons, etc.—can be expected as the technology is developed.

Before closing, I would like to note the contributions of the U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory, Fort Monmouth, N.J., which developed the instrumentation in the cloud cover satellite; also, the contributions of the industrial firms which have been associated with Project Vanguard under the Martin Co. as prime contractor. The General Electric Co. provided the first-stage rocket. The Aerojet General Corp. provided the rocket for the second-stage booster, and the Grand Central Rocket Co. made the third-stage rocket. The guidance and control equipment was developed from contributions by the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Designers for Industry, Air Associates, and the Martin Co. The fine contributions of these industrial teams are representative of the high level of the Nation's industrial technology and lead us to a feeling of confidence in the future of our programs.

New Challenges to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was recently my pleasure and privilege to address the Texas breakfast at the National School Administrators convention held in Atlantic City, N.J.

The school administrators of this Nation are a most important group. To them and the teachers under their supervision falls the vital task of training the youth of the United States. The excellent record they have already established stands as a living monument to their skill and dedication to duty, particularly when we consider they have been forced to work with inadequate facilities and are generally underpaid. To remain at their posts and continue to work for the betterment of young people requires a missionary zeal. These people are to be heartily commended.

At the request of friends, I am asking unanimous consent to have my address, given February 17, 1959, printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW CHALLENGES TO EDUCATION

(Address by U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH at the annual Texas breakfast at the National Association of School Administrators convention, Atlantic City, N.J., February 17, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, fellow Texans, fellow Americans, I am very grateful for the privilege of participating in your annual meeting. This is a doubly pleasurable meeting to me, because some of the happiest days of my life have been spent in school—most of them as a student under inspiring teachers.

Although some of my former students in the Piney Woods country of the Neches River Valley may feel differently about those times, my 3 years as a country schoolteacher in Henderson County were to me some of the happiest days of all.

Now, as a member of the Senate Education Subcommittee, I am having an exceptional opportunity to learn something of the many complex problems facing our schools today.

In common with most informed Americans, I am deeply concerned about the lagging progress of public education and I am particularly concerned about it in Texas. This does not mean that I am critical of you and of our teachers. On the contrary, I commend you for doing an excellent job despite limited tools, inadequate pay, and lukewarm public support. It is my job, and the responsibility of every thinking citizen, to do everything possible to see that you have the funds to pay adequate teachers' salaries and to build adequate classrooms.

I firmly believe that teachers' pay in Texas should be raised from 50 percent to 100 percent, but not because I feel that every teacher is worth twice as much as he or she is now receiving. I am convinced that doubling teacher pay would not only solve the teacher shortage, it would create competition for the jobs. Then you as administrators would be in position to demand a high degree of excellence in this vital profession.

To those who say we "can't afford it," my answer is—we cannot afford to do otherwise. Like it or not, we cannot afford either having only half of our Texans educated, or having all Texans half educated. Yet, we are dangerously near that point.

Only one Texan in three over the age of 25 years has completed 4 years of high school. Texans rank 38th among people from all the States in the percentage qualified through the selective service mental test. Likewise, our students rank 38th among the students of other States in the per capita average number of days they attend school each year, under Texas' generally unenforceable compulsory school attendance law.

It is a shocking disgrace for big, rich Texas to rank 32d among the States in public school expenditures for each pupil in average daily attendance. But one must confess that is what might be expected in a State where an inept Government is blind to the needs of education. It taxed students by raising university tuition fees, and refused to tax the interests that are exploiting Texas, her people, and her resources.

A century and a quarter ago, our Texas forefathers revolted because of the failure of the general government to establish a public system of education in Texas.

Texas was ravaged by fire and by sword, her cities besieged, her towns burned, her heroes killed. But her right to a system of public education was won. Are we, the inheritors of those rights, to fail this, and the next generation? Are we too weak, too conformist, too servile and supine, to fight for what we know is right? Is big money to connote big ignorance? I call on every Texan to rally now, and help us build the best system of public education in the United States.

Proud, wealthy Texas is paying its elementary teachers an average of only \$4,296 yearly, considerably below the national average. This is criminal neglect because the student is the casualty in the long run. As your representative in the Senate, I am working for the solution of this problem.

As a member of the Senate Education Subcommittee, I have been present at hearings on Senate bill No. 2, the so-called School Support Act of 1959 introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Montana. Under this provision, Texas would be eligible to receive an allotment of \$25 per school age child in fiscal 1959-60, \$50 the next year, \$75 the next year, and \$100 per student in 1962-63. The estimated allotments for Texas by respective year would total \$63.8 million; \$132.9 million, \$206.4 million, and \$225.3 million.

This money, and I want to emphasize this—without any Federal controls or intervention—would be available to local school districts to use as local boards see fit, either for teacher pay increases or construction of new school rooms, or both.

Regardless of whether this bill passes, you can count on me to fight to see that we do not lose any of the good programs al-

ready underway. I will continue to strenuously oppose moves to abolish or to limit the school-lunch program, and the school-milk program, vocational education programs, and Federal assistance to federally impacted areas. I am working to expand all of these programs. You know, some of these people who are against spending money on public education, no matter why or where the money is needed, have been running around the State saying, "Why you've got to watch out for old RALPH YARBOROUGH. He's for Federal aid to education."

I'd like to clear that point up once and for all. I'm not just for Federal aid to education. I'm for all aid to education. The soundest investment we can make in America is in developing the minds of our young people. The need for more funds in the field of public education is so critical that revenues from local districts, cities, States, and the Federal Government all are required.

With this in mind, I have been shocked and saddened to learn that the board of regents of our Texas State teachers colleges have declined by an official resolution to participate in the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. As you know, this is the act which primarily is designed to start us on the road to higher educational achievement, particularly in the field of science.

One provision of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which, incidentally, I had the honor of coauthoring, provides funds for loans to college students. Most colleges in Texas and throughout the Nation have responded enthusiastically to this loan program as a very worthwhile means of assisting worthy students in securing a college education. But I was astonished to learn that the board of regents of Texas State teachers colleges have denied participation in these loans to students in five colleges.

Despite the fact that college officials had estimated a student loan need totaling \$195,333, the board saw fit to deny this loan program to students at Sam Houston Teachers College, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, Stephen F. Austin, East Texas State, and Sul Ross College.

The board of regents of these colleges has made a decision which I would not want on my conscience. If a single student drops out of a single one of these schools for lack of funds, the regents should be held accountable. Ironically, one of the colleges which the regents prohibited from participating in the loan program has this statement of purpose printed on its letterhead: "Founded to promote the advancement of the profession of teaching. Dedicated to the cause of better schools. Devoted to the welfare of children and youth."

It is my sincere hope that the board of regents of Texas State teachers colleges, for the good of the students, will reconsider its position on this matter: A total of \$21,758 has been reserved for the five colleges involved. If the regents finally deny this aid to their students, I shall make every effort to see that these funds are apportioned to other Texas students in other schools so that they will not be diverted to other States.

In my opinion, the people who make the mistake of opposing the granting of sufficient funds for the Nation's educational program are doing this country, themselves, and particularly our children, one of the greatest injustices of which they are capable.

Basically, the cold war now raging between democracy and communism around the world is a struggle for the minds of men. Enlightenment has always been free men's bulwark against tyranny. Education is the foundation stone of democracy, and it is an ever-increasing factor in the standard of living each man and his family can enjoy. We cannot, we must not, and we will not continue to deny all our students an education of the first class.

It would be simpler if I could say at this point, "Well, we are going to help you get some money, and that will solve the educational problems in America in general, and in Texas in particular."

But it isn't that simple. The educational problem facing us all goes much deeper than money. The thing we need most in education cannot be bought with money; it must grow again in the hearts and minds of the American people. I refer to the once proud dream that this land would be the world's model of universal educational attainment and cultural development. I refer to the spirit which made a backwoods boy named Abraham Lincoln study by firelight because he and other young people of his time recognized that knowledge is an invaluable stepping stone to happiness and to greatness.

What has become of the insatiable and inexorable quest for knowledge which played such a dominant role in pioneering of our Nation? Does it exist no more? Is a penchant for a be-bop ducktail culture a passing fad, or evidence of the long decline?

As a people we have more time free from work and drudgery than any other people in the history of mankind. But are we Americans using this time, even a small portion of this free time, to improve our minds through new educational attainment or even serious thought?

The answer is all too obvious. We have become a Nation with its head stuck in a television set; a people establishing new records annually in the consumption of alcohol and happy pills. We spend our lives vainly searching for happiness from a bottle. We are more concerned with the tearful soap opera TV heroine than with Communist terror in Hungary.

This is a deadly trend. As Adlai Stevenson has said: "We have confused the free with the free and easy." We threaten to become a people whose principal purpose is piling up profits and partaking of fleeting pleasures.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "We cannot escape history. . . . We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or the other of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

There must be an awakening. As a people and a Nation we cannot afford to retire in the prime of our lives. We have reached what might be considered a breathing point in American history. But our indolence and vacuity and indifference cannot continue. This breathing point must not become a permanent campsite. Let us adopt as a national educational aim the motto of an American State "Ad astra per aspera," "To the stars through difficulties."

We must recapture our desire for high educational excellence, and unflinchingly meet the mental disciplines and hard work basic to superior knowledge.

Mass education of all the people, once an American monopoly, is fast coming to the whole world. We can maintain our leadership only by moving faster and working harder for educational progress than other countries now turning their efforts to mass education.

The parent, the teacher, and the politician must all make up their minds that easy courses, little discipline, and stinted funds for education will never add up to high educational standards. Major emphasis on athletic spectacles and academic trivia cannot produce a high percentage of well-educated citizens. It is more likely to produce mediocrity.

We must turn from mediocrity to educational excellence, not only in pursuit of happiness for more Americans, but to achieve educational superiority.

Never before in the history of man have the talents and the specially developed abilities of educated men been in more

urgent demand. Never have the opportunities for educated, thinking, freemen been so great. The next 10, 20, or 30 years will tell whether this Nation produces the large numbers of high caliber citizens it so needs.

The brunt of the burden is on your shoulders. Those of us in public service can assist in the work of making known the need, and by helping to make funds available. But the real job of turning out young men and women who are intellectually prepared to be responsible Americans is up to you.

Upon the success or failure of your mission may well rest the eventual fate of freemen everywhere.

I wish you Godspeed.

REA Co-ops Deserve Protection and Encouragement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the rural electric cooperatives of Wisconsin and of America have been the agencies through which the greatest benefit to farmers has been accomplished in all the history of public action in agricultural policy. Now, unfortunately, these REA co-ops are under attack.

From one of Wisconsin's finest REA co-ops, which held its annual members' meeting early this month, I have received a number of resolutions. The policies advocated by these resolutions are sound and, in my opinion, fully merited. I agree with these co-op members that REA should be taken out of politics; in fact I am a cosponsor of the Senate bill to accomplish this. I agree also that REA should not now withdraw from its traditional role as the banker to the rural electrification program, and that its rate of interest should not be raised above the present 2 percent. This rate of interest has been sufficient to cover the cost of money to the Treasury most of the time since REA was established 23 years ago, and there is no reason why it should not do so at present, if our Government would abandon its high interest policy of forcing interest charges to go up. In any event, these co-ops are undertaking considerable expenses and obligations on behalf of the public, particularly in their complete area coverage policy, which entitle them to an interest charge of no more than 2 percent.

Mr. President, because these matters are of such great and direct concern to all of our rural citizens, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY MEMBERS OF THE CHIPPEWA VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, CORNELL, WIS., AT ANNUAL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 6, 1959

REA REORGANIZATION

Whereas the original REA act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administra-

tion of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed.

INTEREST RATES

Whereas a number of bills and proposals were presented to the 85th Congress to increase REA interest rates; and

Whereas the Congress, by enacting the Pace Act in 1944, and fixing the interest rate of 2 percent, therein made a covenant with the rural electric cooperatives to proceed with area coverage at reasonable, retail rates; and

Whereas we believe the continuance of the 2 percent interest rate is necessary to enable the rural electric systems to complete the task of providing full, efficient, and reasonably priced electric service on an area coverage basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to vigorously oppose any change or proposed change in the law, the effects of which would increase REA interest rates.

REA LOAN SOURCE

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture last February sent to the Congress a proposed bill which provided that the cooperatives secure their financing in Wall Street—for which no legislator would act as sponsor; and

Whereas such bill would double or triple interest rates to the rural electric systems; and

Whereas such bill would virtually kill the program and bankrupt many distribution cooperatives; and

Whereas the Congress has always evidenced its wholehearted support of the REA program by consistently providing sufficient loan funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to oppose any and all proposals which would send the rural electric systems into the private money market for their financing, and we urge Congress to continue its fine support of the rural electric program which means so much to the people of rural America and to the country as a whole.

SELLOUT PROTECTION

Whereas forces opposing the rural electrification program are moving in on cooperatives in various parts of the country, e.g., the New Jersey and Arizona cases, for the expressed purpose of buying them out; and

Whereas it is evident that the power companies instituting sellouts are being directed by executives hired and maintained by their holding companies; and

Whereas electric consumers in and outside the program will pay more for electricity if these sellouts become more widespread: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge REA to provide more aggressive assistance to cooperatives needing its help to continue their existence—such as was the case of cooperatives in New Jersey and Arizona; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our State legislatures to provide use with the machinery to function as public agencies or utility districts where such a step is necessary to preserve consumer ownership; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to protect rural electric and all electric consumers by

abolishing the electric holding companies; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to investigate and expose the apparent master plan to cripple and destroy the rural electrification program; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to thoroughly investigate the sellout cases that have now occurred in order that the Rural Electrification Act may be strengthened as a means of protecting the interest of consumers and all Americans who are concerned about the contributions rural electric are making.

Peach Pioneer of the Piedmont: Ben Gramling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the great farm leaders of South Carolina, Mr. Ben Gramling, of Gramling, Spartanburg County, died on Friday, February 20. Known as the "Peach Pioneer of the Piedmont," Mr. Gramling not only pioneered and engineered Spartanburg County in front of the entire State of Georgia in peach production but also led an inspiring life.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent biographical sketch of Mr. Gramling entitled "Peach Pioneer Ben Gramling," which was published in the April 16, 1958, edition of the South Carolinian, edited and published by Brent Breedin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACH PIONEER BEN GRAMLING

Ben M. Gramling, who will observe both his 83d birthday and his 60th year of blissful marriage this November, is a villain in Georgia, sometimes referred to as "The Peach State."

His crime—pioneering and successfully engineering his county of Spartanburg in front of the entire State of Georgia in peach production.

His defense—there was no premeditation in his "crime" against his Georgia neighbors. When he and three Spartanburg County friends, Andy Harris, P. J. Woodfin, and M. F. Johnson, each planted 5 acres of peach trees in 1921, the intention was simply to go along with one of the new cash-crop schemes of County Agent Ernest Carnes, who had become alarmed by the presence of the boll weevil in cotton-producing Spartanburg acreage. In fact, there was no actual objection from Georgians until 25 years after the first peach trees were put down in Spartanburg soil by Gramling and his associates. It was at this stage that the U.S. Agriculture Department statisticians revealed that Spartanburg County was producing more peaches than all the orchards combined in Georgia and that "The Peach State" tag was no longer appropriate for Georgia.

Georgian Joe Nunn, who worked for inexperienced peach-grower Gramling in the early years, might have returned to his home State to warn friends there about his South Carolina employer and associates, but he didn't. Instead he fell under the magic of the Gramling personality to such an extent that on one occasion he offered Ben the loan

of \$4,000 he had saved in a Georgia bank if it would tide him over following a disastrous peach crop year.

"I really appreciated Joe's sentiments," the reflective Gramling says today, "but I told him that I had been fortunate enough to put up a little money of my own for such an emergency and didn't need any financial help."

Ben has never needed help for lack of foresight. Planning and industry have been the keys to his success in fulfilling the adage, "If you can build a better mousetrap, the world will beat a path to your door." He lived all his life within a mile of his birthplace; yet, Gramling's "Sweet n' Juicy" peaches are in demand throughout the country. In staying home, he has added probably the most colorful and useful chapter to date in the Gramling book of South Carolina history.

His great-great-grandfather Adam Gramling migrated to South Carolina from Germany in 1750 and was given land in the Orangeburg area by the English rulers. It was a practice in pre-Revolutionary War days to welcome non-English settlers to South Carolina, the British using these settlers as a buffer between Charleston and the Indians in the upcountry.

Great-grandfather Martin Luther Gramling (born in 1765) served his neighbors in the Orangeburg sector as a Methodist preacher.

Grandfather Reuben Gramling (born in 1791) started the 19th century by moving into the Spartanburg County area.

And father Henry H. Gramling (born in 1823) amassed one of Spartanburg County's largest estates following the War Between the States, first as a worker on the railroad between Spartanburg and Asheville and later as the biggest producer of ties for the railroad following his purchase of 1,800 acres of virgin timber about 15 miles north of Spartanburg (site of Gramling today) and the setting up of a sawmill. Ben, born on November 1, 1875, can still recall the oxen teams hauling fallen trees from the forest to the mill. It was during this period that the community of Gramling came into existence, getting the name from railroad officials who referred to "Gramling Siding" as the spot at which they could pick up the lumber for their construction.

Ben, literally a chip off the old block, was slated for a full college education after attending a country school at Gramling for 5 years and following graduation from high school in Spartanburg (where he lived with his sister). One year at Wofford, however, and the 18-year-old Gramling was ready to begin work, which he did for merchant W. R. Ballard at a salary of \$10 monthly. A year later he attended business college in Nashville, Tenn., returning home in 1895 following the completion of a bookkeeping course in order to be near a sick father. When Henry Gramling died in July of that year, Ben returned to work for Ballard at \$15 a month. One year later the young businessman borrowed \$200 and went into business for himself at Gramling. And 2 years after that, on November 17, 1898, he married Cora Turpin of nearby Landrum.

Inheriting 150 acres of land from his father, Ben was quick to put his legacy to work in becoming an independent businessman-farmer. Ultimately he purchased the inherited estates to his two brothers and four sisters as well as other lands, putting them all to such excellent usage through the years that he was named one of South Carolina's first "Master Farmers" in 1939. Cotton, wheat, oats, corn, peas, sorghum, alfalfa, and grazing crops for his dairy and beef cattle have all been planted successfully along with his peaches.

Businessman that he always has been, farmer Gramling stepped naturally into matters allied to agriculture—public ginners,

community fertilizer plant, country store, and country bank. When the bank closed in the depression, all obligations were met. The other enterprises are still operating successfully to the advantage of the entire community.

Ben's leadership has not been limited to the fields of business and agriculture but also touches public service and religion. His happy marriage, which he obviously enjoys as much today as he did at the beginning—seven children, seven grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren ago—has been an inspiration to friends and associates. He was a trustee of the Gramling School at age 21 and has served as Spartanburg County's Democratic Party committeeman. At Gramling Methodist Church he has been a steward for years and was Sunday school superintendent for a quarter of a century, "missing attendance only when my children were born at home," he points out.

The management of Gramling Marketing Co., Inc., and the peach orchards have been turned over to the fifth generation of South Carolina Gramlings, while the fourth generation leads an inactive (physically) but nimble (mentally) life in and around his handsome, while unpretentious house. He prefers to discuss current events but can be prodded into reminiscing about his own experiences.

Peaches have been good to the Gramlings and their Spartanburg neighbors. They've meant a new way of life and a higher standard of living, but the success found here has never blinded Ben, or his family, to civic, professional, and religious responsibilities. Three plaques hang on the wall in the Gramlings' front room which testify to this. "Master farmer award, 1939: 'For notable accomplishments in farming, homemaking, and citizenship' (presented by Progressive Farmer and Extension Service).

"Spartanburg County's No. 1 citizen, 1945: (Presented by Spartanburg Kiwanis Club).

"Chairman of building committee, 1952: 'As an expression of our grateful acknowledgment for his untiring and faithful service to our church' (presented by Gramling Methodist congregation)."

Rewriting of Stephen Foster Songs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the able editor of the Johnston (S.C.) Ridge Citizen, J. Luther Aull, expresses concern with the tampering of song lyrics by NAACP-subdued publishers and TV program directors in a February 19 editorial entitled "Foster Rewritten."

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOSTER REWRITTEN

We just paused to look up at the teevee, having heard the announcement that a program of Stephen Foster songs was about to be presented. The program was the Eddie Fisher program. We were interested to see if they would sing it as Foster wrote it, but they didn't.

"Swanee River" was never taught to us as having any such line in it as "Oh, how my

heart is growing weary," but that was the awkward way the line was rendered by the "teevee-ers." Foster wrote it, "Oh Darkies, how my heart grows weary," but that is not pleasing now to the NAACP which has succeeded in having all such references banned on the networks.

That incident serves to point up one of the troubles with the country—too many pressure groups, all too sensitive. Nobody can laugh at anybody any more. All kinds of dialect jokes are taboo, except of course what passes for southern dialect. We even understand that the Plasterers Union is protesting the use of the term "plastered" as a synonym for intoxicated.

Slow Pace of Watershed Protection Program Is Severe Disappointment to Wisconsin's Coulee Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the world's most beautiful regions is located in southwestern Wisconsin. This area is absolutely unique; nowhere else on earth is there a region which has been completely surrounded by glacial ice but never covered. In fact, the Wisconsin coulee country has been surrounded by glaciers several times. Because of this unique geologic history, this region has a distinctive pattern of steep, deep valleys or coulees, separated by high ridges.

Beautiful as it is, and productive also, the distinctive topography of the coulee country makes it unusually vulnerable to the ravages of flood and soil erosion. After the forests were cut off the steep hillsides, erosion has been taking a grimly costly toll of rich topsoil. Frequent flash floods ravage the valley bottoms, ruining farm crops, farm buildings, and property in the small villages and cities located there. Tremendous strides have been made by farmers and their local soil conservation districts, in cooperation with the Federal Soil Conservation Service and other agricultural agencies, to apply contour cropping, terracing, and other practices to help hold the soil and water in place. But these efforts are not adequate. A broader conception is needed. This need gave rise to the watershed protection program established several years ago—which, if applied with energy and determination, could finally do the job.

Many of us are disturbed by the extremely slow progress which is being made under the watershed program. No one is more disturbed, and no one has a better appreciation of the dangers and costs of delay and procrastination in applying this fine program to the Wisconsin coulee country, than Mr. Lewis C. French of the Milwaukee Journal staff.

Mr. French has written a splendid report on this problem for American Forests magazine. It was published in the October 1958, issue. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. French's article be

printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WATERSHED FORESTER (By Lewis C. French)

Richard Sartz, age 39, a watershed forester, goes to work in a new research station on critical land problems in the upper Mississippi River Valley with headquarters in La Crosse, Wis.

In a three-way cooperative agreement between the Federal Government, the Wisconsin Conservation Department, and the Lake States Forest Experiment Station, this new research agency will seek the answers for a more effective means of curbing erosion and curbing upstream floods on some 7,800,000 acres in the fertile Mississippi River Valley.

The plain facts are that conservationists must do something with this whole area—rather than patchwork watershed programs here and there—or more and more land will be gutted by floods and ruined beyond repair.

If this upper Mississippi Valley is worth saving—and it is—then action must soon be taken on a wholesale scale rather than a slowpoke piecemeal basis. Time is running out in the land of the coulees. Under the aforesaid arrangement, Congress authorized \$30,000 a year for the station. The Wisconsin Conservation Department will lease or buy the problem land where the research tests will be run. Under consideration by the State commission is the Russian Coulee not far from La Crosse in the famed Coon Valley watershed, the birthplace of modern soil conservation. It is neglected land, farmed with scant success; a valley wedged in between high ridges with steep slopes, just now a bramble.

As the third partner in the research station, the Lake States Experiment Station will direct the technical program. Currently a memorandum as to definite obligations between the three partners is being prepared. What's the problem?

Starting in northeastern Illinois around Galena and running straight north on the fringe of "Old Man River" past La Crosse and into St. Croix County, of Wisconsin, is land the glaciers missed, the driftless area. There are 100,000 acres in Illinois and 5 million acres in the coulee country of Wisconsin which are flooded periodically, spilling millions of tons of the thin skin of top soil into the Mississippi and on down to the delta.

On the western side of the Mississippi there are about 700,000 acres in the northeastern corner of Iowa and 2 million acres of Minnesota having the same problem.

True, the slopes on the Minnesota side are not as sharp, nor the ridges as high, nor the problem as great as in Wisconsin, but every section of this whole area has erosion and flood problems.

Even in areas given a fairly good treatment of strip cropping, terracing and contour farming, and waterways, periodically the meandering, deep-banked creeks and tributary streams threading through these valleys flood. The dry run creeks, fed by a hundred or a thousand drain pipes, run down those slopes, rolling up a tidal volume of water that, with increased velocity, picks up the top soil, carries off the fences, sweeps the lowland corn out of the field, or silts the alfalfa land, washes out bridges and roads to wreck buildings and hopes in its path.

This happens during the spring thaws and through the summer and fall, right until the area is locked in winter ice. It can be in March, when the snows melt, or in August, when the crops are ready. Let there be a steady downpour and all too often these floods will occur.

Even an untrained newspaper reporter can understand that when the steep, tin-roof

slopes are still frozen with the snow when the rain comes, the water cannot seep into the soil very much and rushes to the bottom land creeks.

But what about those summertime floods when there are grass and crops?

First is the sad mistake of cutting the original timber off those ridges, and especially down those slopes—exposed land.

Then, too, farmers try to stretch their forage supplies by pasturing this land or putting it into crops.

The technicians are now finding out that during the summer those southern slopes, exposed to the sun, denuded of grass and cover, are baked to a hard, tight crust.

Now let a storm hit and the water rushes down these crusted slopes, generally following those blasted cow trails that become gullies, pouring a sheet of water into what was a harmless dry run the day before. And watch out downstream. Run for the hills.

There was an enthusiastic dedication of the 24,000-acre East Willow Creek watershed on the Minnesota side. Twelve solid earthen dams were built, often utilizing a highway grade as the barrier to stop the destruction of 155 farms.

Lovely country, this Minnesota valleyland; the slopes are more gentle and the valleys much wider than in much of the Wisconsin coulee country across the big river.

There had been considerable soil conservation work in this area, here and there—strip corn farms with terraces and contours—but never one solid program for the whole watershed.

Eight years ago, in a spring flood, there were 4 inches of rain within 6 hours. Down poured that flood of water from the slopes, concentrating into the East Willow Creek.

Even in Preston, Editor Ludwig Gartner of the Preston Republican, two blocks from the creek, points to the type cases in his plant and says, "Water clear up to the top."

In a few hours that rip-roaring flood cascading downstream ripped out a gully 15 feet deep and 150 feet wide. The engineers and fieldmen going to work to repair the damage had to climb in and out of that gully with ladders.

There was 100-bushel-an-acre corn on farms where this gully had been. Bulldozers scraped dirt into the gulch. The rills in the farmlands that became deep gullies had been healed. The upstream dams so far stopped a flood threat with the series of reservoirs and ponds. Still, look close and you see slope timberland slashed with gullies.

This Minnesota watershed, like all the rest in the whole upper Mississippi River Valley, needs and deserves a better answer to the cancerlike erosion.

And every place even a novice looks, there is the crying need for trees.

The mass of paper and blueprints for the famed Coon Valley watershed of 93,000 acres on the Wisconsin side finally wallowed through Washington, D.C., redtape to get approval. Normally this Coon Creek is a harmless stream meandering on its way through Coon Valley and Chaseburg and Stoddard to unload in the Mississippi. However, there have been two severe floods in recent years, with every landowner nervous over the dangers.

Having their own blueprint system, and not being tied to a desk, wild beaver moved into Coon Creek to build their own dams . . . but in the wrong places.

The application for a full watershed treatment is now for the Bad Axe section adjoining Coon Valley, around 122,000 acres. Dams are scheduled to be built on a small watershed near the Mississippi. The pilot watershed built by the Government on the Kickapoo River is working.

The East Willow Creek project in Minnesota and the Wisconsin programs, such as historic Coon Valley, are fine. But they are only comparative patches of the 7.8 million

acres of land needing better erosion control. Go down almost any side road in this vast area and you can see land that needs attention now.

"There is alarming need for one overall program for the whole upper Mississippi River Valley," says David Mackie, Madison executive secretary of the Wisconsin Conservation Department during the first conference at La Crosse for this new research station.

"The job ahead is to find what cover does the best job protecting those slopes and valley land," said Sidney Weitzman, St. Paul, watershed supervisor of the Lake States Experiment Station.

The stern fact of the matter is that some of these slopes exposed toward the south have been washed so thin and robbed of fertility so much that many trees will not thrive. The survival rate is too low to be practical.

Red cedar has been used. But there is the problem of this tough tree being the host to a variety of apple rust. Now the genetics divisions of the Lake States station seeks a resistant red cedar strain.

For the start, this new research station is quartered in the La Crosse fish hatchery of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

"It may take time, but we want the right answers," says the committee setting up the program.

It will be Forester Sartz' job to make an analysis of the area problems, then carefully measure the successes and failures of past practices, including cover crops and trees. He will try out practices recommended by the Lake States Experiment Station and others, and in time put the result to work.

Is this upper Mississippi Valley worth saving?

Some early August day when you want a scenic feast, travel to the coulee country, via Coon Valley or the Alma (Wis.) drive back to this quiet haven. Get up on a high ridge.

As far as you can see is a masterpiece of color: the green of the trees and corn and lush alfalfa, then curving bands of gold, the ripe oats and wheat, some as bright as new gold and some burnished bronze of old antiques. Set back is a white church with a tall steeple inviting a prayer of thanks for such beauty and abundance. And farms are nestled into the nooks and valley land; the so-called two story farming, the lowland and the highland.

Here is beauty, the green and gold with bright-colored combines and forage choppers in the distance looking for all the world like huge crawling bugs gobbling up the grain.

Only a statistical dot with a sliderule brain submerged by administrative redtape could see this scene of preharvest glory and still say the costs are too great for the benefits.

Just go to the Mississippi with its series of big dams—26 of them, each costing \$5 million or more to harness the floods of the river and protect the channel—and watch. Look at the finest topsoil of the area. How much better to keep that soil and that extra water upstream on the farms and have fewer dredging costs down the big stem.

We should either do something about repairing this upper Wisconsin valley area or junk much of the soil conservation program. For right in these valleys was intended the basic proof that modern soil conservation would work to preserve the land and abundance.

Either make it work, or in eons of time this area will be the grand canyon of the upper Mississippi.

Graduated from the University of Pennsylvania forestry school, Sartz first went to work for the Forestry Service in the Quaker State. Then he specialized in watershed controls and restoration work near Philadelphia and outside Portland, Ore., on the

Columbia River. More recently he was in the White Mountain forests and watershed of the East, being stationed at Laconia, N.H.

Now he will try for the answers to heal the scars of the upper Mississippi Valley, once so rich with pine and hardwoods.

Representative Charles O. Porter Heralded as Friend of Democracy in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recognition has again been accorded to my good friend, Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon, for his outspoken declarations against Latin American dictatorships. Throughout Central and South America, CHARLIE PORTER is heralded as the champion of freedom and democracy and as a crusader against dictatorial tyranny.

Last week the Washington correspondent for the Oregonian, Mr. A. Robert Smith, journeyed to Venezuela to assess the effect of CHARLIE PORTER's efforts on relations between the United States and Latin American countries. It is not surprising to learn that Mr. Smith heard widespread acclaim for what Mr. PORTER has accomplished in fighting despotism and Communist influence. So that the facts can be known of the effectiveness and vigor of Mr. PORTER's activities for the improvement of our relations with Venezuela and other Latin American countries, I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article, entitled "CHARLES PORTER, Foe of Dictators, Hero to Venezuelan Populace," written by A. Robert Smith, and published in the Oregonian of February 19, 1959.

I wish to emphasize that Mr. Smith is an able, accurate, and responsible journalist. I feel certain that he has reported only the facts in describing the widespread favorable impact which Representative PORTER has had on the populace of Venezuela. For example, Mr. Smith has contrasted Mr. PORTER's forthright defense of democracy with the equivocal and straddling attitude taken by ex-Governor Thomas E. Dewey when he toured Venezuela recently, as the head of the official American delegation to the inauguration of Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt. This comparison is definitely to the advantage and benefit of CHARLIE PORTER.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES PORTER, FOE OF DICTATORS, HERO TO VENEZUELAN POPULACE
(By A. Robert Smith)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—As this leading South American country struggles back upon the road to democratic self-government, often blocked in the past by military coups, many of its political leaders are looking for moral

support from friends throughout the hemisphere.

One of their valued friends, one quickly finds, is Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, who has for 2 years been conducted almost a one-man campaign in Congress against the sort of Latin dictator Venezuela has only so recently been rid of. Gen. Perez Jimenez was ousted a year ago, and last week Venezuela inaugurated its newly elected President, Romulo Betancourt.

Congressman PORTER came down here last week to wish the new government well. Venezuela invited Congress to send the customary delegation to the inauguration. PORTER was the only Congressman who went. To conclude, after many interviews, that PORTER has had a beneficial effect on the attitude of Venezuelans toward the United States since Vice President RICHARD NIXON was stoned here last summer seems undisputed.

SHARP LINE DRAWN

An American newspaperman who has been here 25 years told me that Venezuelans tend to regard U.S. public figures as either good or bad Americans. He said about the only good Americans in their minds today are Porter, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, and Herbert Matthews, veteran New York Times writer to whom a "Good Neighbor" trophy was given here last weekend by President Betancourt.

"That's an improvement," the newsman said, "because not long ago they thought all Americans were bad."

A Venezuelan born here, educated at Columbia University and a long-time resident of New York before returning here, said substantially the same thing.

"There is a great man," he said of PORTER.

PORTER became such a figure in the minds of Venezuelans starting with his crusade against Dominican Republic Gen. Raphael Trujillo, who is despised here; his criticism of the United States giving military aid to Latin dictators, including Perez Jimenez; his coming here after the Nixon incident last summer and again last week to bolster democratic elements and assure Venezuelans that Americans are friendly toward them and are pro-democracy and antidictatorship, whatever State Department policy might indicate to the contrary.

PORTER STANDS ALONE

PORTER, in a word, is the only American official, among numerous other leaders in this hemisphere (such as Jose Figueras of Costa Rica and Gov. Munoz Marin of Puerto Rico) who has lent open support to democratic forces in this rich oil-producing country where military dictatorships have been the rule and not the exception. Betancourt is only the second freely elected president of Venezuela.

Venezuelans have been sore at the United States because of a medal awarded their dictator by President Eisenhower in 1955, along with a laudatory citation. They suspect the State Department of playing footsie with Perez Jimenez, buttering him up with this prestige-making award, in behalf of large U.S. corporations seeking new oil and iron ore concessions from him. Whether there was any connection or not, Venezuelans believe there was. Anti-American feeling ran high, even months after Perez Jimenez fled, one official said. This was exploited by Communists and other agitators in the demonstrations against Nixon.

BUSINESS LIKES DICTATORS

America's image in this country of sharp contrasts between luxurious oil wealth and stark poverty is not improved by the fact that most of the entrenched U.S. business interests here would prefer a dictatorship to a democracy, the American newsman said.

"When PORTER's name is mentioned, they shudder," he observed, recalling his many contacts with the business community here.

U.S. businessmen found Perez Jimenez not difficult to do business with. He abolished a decree of the previous president against granting further concessions to U.S. firms for resource exploitation. Businessmen feel uneasy about a democracy, which may be less profitable to deal with. The new government has already raised income taxes to tap more oil revenue for public improvements such as schools, thus permitting less oil money to flow into hands of foreign investors.

REDS DISLIKE PORTER

PORTER has opposition from still another group, the Communist Party, which now numbers about 50,000 persons in this country of 6 million population. In the December election, the Communist Party elected nine men to Congress, one of whom is Gustavo Machado, their leader.

"PORTER is interfering in the internal affairs of Venezuela," Machado told me resentfully when asked what he thought of PORTER's remarks here a few days before.

The Oregon Congressman criticized local Communists for trying to represent their party as just a nationalistic movement without ties with Russia. The Caracas Daily Journal reported PORTER told a press conference:

"If a man is a Communist, unless he doesn't know better, he must put the Soviet Union first. I don't see how anyone who believes in liberty can believe in communism when he sees how the satellites such as Hungary are treated."

In his inaugural address, President Betancourt, who himself was a Communist briefly as a youth some 30 years ago, said much the same thing as PORTER and reiterated that his new coalition government had no room for Communists. He was roundly applauded by the new Congress, whose members jammed into the senate chamber with other dignitaries to hear him.

This offered a strong rebuttal to those U.S. Congressmen who in recent years have said the United States should back Latin dictators, such as Trujillo and Perez Jimenez, on grounds they were needed as bastions of anticommunism.

PORTER also suggested in public statements here that he thinks the tide is running against dictatorship throughout the hemisphere. He predicted Trujillo will fall before the year is out. He said Dominican rebels are obtaining arms and are organizing within and outside Santo Domingo.

In contrast to PORTER's statements here, Thomas E. Dewey, head of the delegation sent to the inauguration by President Eisenhower, ducked all political questions. In a real way, Dewey personified the administration's oft-expressed Latin American policy of showing no partiality for either democracies or dictatorships.

The latest administration expression of Latin American policy, by Milton Eisenhower after a trip through Central America, reiterated what PORTER, first, and Nixon, second, had said—that we ought to give Latin democracies an embrace and give dictators only a cold, formal handshake, thus leaving no doubt in this hemisphere which form of government our sympathies lie with.

HERO STATUS EXPLAINED

A Venezuelan said his people can see little sign that this new policy is being implemented. He said they think only a change of administration in Washington will do it.

This helps to explain PORTER's hero status in Latin America. He stands almost alone among Washington officials in embracing popular Latin democratic leaders, offering them verbal and moral support, shunning the dictators and consulting with exiled foes of the dictators about ways and means of undermining the despots' political strength.

There are several skilled diplomats on the U.S. Embassy staff here who are well

received by Venezuelans and display their preference for democratic processes. But one stumbles easily across an example of harmful, bumbling staffing, as depicted in the best-seller, "The Ugly American." At a reception at Ambassador Edward Sparks' home on inauguration night, one U.S. military attaché was sounding off loudly that Venezuela would be better off under a dictatorship. Some guests were shocked to find this sort of "military mind" assigned to any diplomatic post, much less in a country where military officers have often needed little encouragement to grab the reins of power.

As long as the State Department doesn't implement Milton Eisenhower's policy proposals more vividly, Congressman PORTER will undoubtedly continue to be regarded as a big man and much-needed friend in this part of the hemisphere where Latins are sensitive to the impression that most North Americans haven't much cared whether their struggle for liberty succeeded or not.

Congress Should "Thumbs Down" Any Increase for Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Columbus Citizen of February 18, 1959, entitled "Thumbs Down."

The Columbus Citizen is one of Ohio's great newspapers, a member of the Scripps-Howard league of newspapers. The editorial indicates that Congress should "thumbs down" any increase for civil defense.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THUMBS DOWN

The Democratic majority in Congress, irked by charges of free spending, promises to cut into the administration's economy budget.

This is a commendable objective, and a good place to start is on civil defense, which has escaped the economy ax and is down for \$87 million next year—actually double what it gets this year.

Civil defense is a handy example of the tendency of Government to expand steadily, regardless of the useful services they perform, if any. As recently as 1955 this office had 787 salaried employees. Now it has 1,634 and wants 1,750.

Leading off the Democratic attack, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, said that half a billion dollars has been appropriated for this purpose in the last 9 years and "most of this money has been wasted."

The money has gone mainly for fanciful and conflicting plans, facilities, and advice pamphlets on what to do in a bomb raid—run for the hills one month and sit tight the next.

In the new budget is more money for sample fallout shelters and matching funds to States to expand their own salaried civil defense personnel, all tending to build up an officious bureaucracy, complete with uniforms and armbands, which would drain defense resources and, more than likely, would just be in the way in event of a real disaster.

No one knows the defense against H-bombs, if there is any. The only reliable protection is retaliatory force so strong it will discourage the firing of bombs, and that's where the money should go.

Congress should thumbs down this increase, and, while at it, should inquire what portions of present expenditures are buying anything worth the money.

Why Are We So Smug About the Dangers of Berlin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in his column in yesterday's Washington Post, Joseph Alsop pointed up a matter which has mystified and troubled me for some weeks—and that is the smug air here in Washington regarding the situation in Berlin.

In the light of the statements made by Mr. Khrushchev, both last fall and recently, Berlin appears to me to be a very dangerous area. The Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. HUMPHREY], after a long interview with Mr. Khrushchev, stated that he was convinced that the Russians intend to be tough about Berlin. Notwithstanding these indications of real trouble, word keeps getting around Washington that everything is going to work out all right.

The danger with this frame of mind is, first, that it may be based upon entirely erroneous assumptions; and, second, if this is so, we may end up in a shooting war—small or large—with the American people wholly unprepared for it either psychologically, militarily, or any other way. Mr. Alsop says the present complacency stems from two words—"Quemoy" and "Bison." I call his explanation on these two words to the particular attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK OF THE BERLIN COMPLACENCY

(By Joseph Alsop)

A question of great importance is underlined by Nikita Khrushchev's angry, warlike answer to the Western allies' note on Berlin. The question is why the American Government is so remarkably complacent about the Berlin crisis.

On the face of the facts, complacency is utterly unjustified. At the very outset, Khrushchev committed himself to use force, if need be, to get his way at Berlin. He has now renewed that commitment in unvarnished terms. For just these reasons, partial military mobilization is actually advocated by many old hands at dealing with the Soviets. These men are Dean G. Acheson, who strongly supports the firm policy of John Foster Dulles, and George F. Kennan, who bitterly criticizes the Dulles policy.

But instead of mobilization, we have continued disarmament. And instead of the earnest concern that is being voiced by men like Acheson, the most intelligent officials

of the State Department went on parroting the story that the Kremlin has got itself into a box on Berlin and wants out. At least, they did this until Khrushchev's last speech.

The American Government has been complacent, in short, because the American Government has been cheerfully convinced that Nikita Khrushchev did not mean a word that he said about fighting to get his way at Berlin. The reason for this conviction can be given, in turn, in four short words: "Quemoy and the Bison."

To begin with the first part of this seemingly magical formula, Quemoy's profound effect on the State Department is really impossible to exaggerate. The decision was taken—by Secretary of State Dulles almost singlehanded—to risk war rather than permit the Communists to seize the offshore islands by naked force. The gamble paid off, too.

Furthermore, there can be very little doubt (and Secretary Dulles feels no doubt at all) that the gamble paid off because of the American deterrent, which lay in wait far from the battlefield. The test of nerves on the islands, with what may not be called false weapons, convinced the Communist high command that there was real danger of the eventual use of real weapons. To avoid this danger, the attack on Quemoy was called off.

From this experience, Secretary Dulles reasoned by analogy that the threat to Berlin will also be withdrawn if the Communist high command is again convinced that there is real danger of the eventual use of real weapons. This was the most constantly repeated Dulles argument, both before Christmas and again on his last courageous trip abroad.

As for the other part of the seemingly magical formula, an overestimate of Soviet production of the Bison bomber has also affected the Defense Department in a way that cannot possibly be exaggerated. In response to this Bison overestimate, former Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson was driven to increase output of our own B-52 bomber. This was just as well, since the B-52's are about the only effective force-in-being we now have. Yet the Defense Department has never recovered from the apparently shattering experience of being driven to increase its own efforts by an overestimate of the Soviet's effort.

"We gave them too much credit in the Bison case," the defense leaders are always in effect saying, "and by God, we're not going to make the same mistake again." Because of the Bison story, in other words, the Defense leaders think that they can safely ignore Khrushchev's claims to great power with long- and medium-range missiles, just as the State Department makes light of Khrushchev's highly specific threats to Berlin, because of the Quemoy story.

The two arguments, from the Bison experience and the Quemoy experience, may both be right. God knows, every American and every other friend of freedom everywhere must pray that these arguments are indeed right, in every minute detail.

But one cannot forget that the Bison overestimate is the only one on record in a long trail of American national estimates which have been much too smugly optimistic about Soviet military capabilities. One cannot forget either that there is no room at Berlin for the kind of safe test of nerves that took place at Quemoy.

Above all, one cannot forget the tone taken by Nikita Khrushchev. For all these reasons, the further question arises: whether Dean Acheson's judgment of the risks is not better than the prevailing official judgment.

Mrs. J. Q. Anderson Sets a High Standard for Us To Meet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Health-O-Gram, the publication issued by the South Dakota Tuberculosis and Health Association, there is an excellent article paying tribute to Mrs. J. Q. Anderson, of Chamberlain, S. Dak., who recently passed away.

In reading this tribute, we can readily agree that Mrs. Anderson is one of the Nation's unsung heroines. Despite physical handicaps and other adversity, this noble woman found time to work in behalf of unfortunate people, especially those afflicted with tuberculosis.

We may often wonder, Mr. President, why community projects or national projects are carried out so effectively. It is almost wholly due to the personal effort and sacrifice of such people as Mrs. Anderson, who serve unselfishly in behalf of worthy causes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article concerning Mrs. Anderson so that her example in life may serve as inspiration to all of us, and that her work may set a high standard for Americans to meet.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEATH CALLS PIONEER SEAL SALE CHAIRMAN

Word has reached the South Dakota Tuberculosis Health Association office of the death of Mrs. J. Q. Anderson, 84, at the Community Bailey Hospital in Chamberlain on February 6.

Mrs. Anderson had been Brule County Christmas seal chairman since 1917. Her long service in the tuberculosis control movement has set a record in South Dakota and her 41 year term as Christmas seal chairman may very well be the longest of anyone in the United States.

Mrs. Anderson became interested in preventing tuberculosis after she had observed the heavy toll the disease was taking in the Fort Thompson community after several employees at the ranch and trading post which she and her husband operated, many of them Indians, had succumbed to the disease.

She helped organize her county for the fight against tuberculosis shortly after the State association was formed in 1913. In 1917, she became Brule County chairman and has served continuously since then, having conducted her 41st seal sale last fall.

Since 1950, when Mrs. Anderson had both limbs amputated because of diabetic ulcers, she has managed the annual seal sale from her wheel chair. Earlier she had both breasts removed because of cancer. For the last 2 or 3 years she has been a resident of the Community Bailey Nursing Home in Chamberlain. At the June 1957 South Dakota Tuberculosis Health Association annual meeting, Mrs. Anderson was recipient of the Agnes M. Holdridge award conferred by the South Dakota Tuberculosis and Health As-

sociation in recognition of her outstanding services and contributions to the work for which the State association was founded.

Mrs. Anderson's husband, J. Q. Anderson who died in 1937, was a pioneer rancher and trader in the Fort Thompson area and well known as a successful rancher, banker, and State legislator. He was influential in promoting the construction of the early pontoon Missouri River crossing at Chamberlain.

In the first quarter of the century the Andersons built up a ranch of some 30,000 acres and operated a successful trading post at Fort Thompson. During the crash of the thirties Mr. Anderson, who was then vice president of the Brule County National Bank, mortgaged their holdings and sold cattle at \$25 a head to pay off \$135,000 of indebtedness and save the bank. After her husband's death, Mrs. Anderson was able to salvage about 1,000 acres from the shambles as she called it, and most of the rest became part of the Geppert ranch.

The Andersons had no children of their own but raised the family of a brother who died in 1930 of pneumonia. One of the children, Myron, the oldest, was blinded in an ammunition explosion in France during World War II. Another nephew, Robert W. Beckwith, has been administrator of the Community Bailey Hospital at Chamberlain for several years and has taken an important part in various State organizations interested in promoting better health.

In an interview for an article written by Ida B. Alseth 2 or 3 years ago, Mrs. Anderson said, "I have had my ups and downs but truly life has been very good to me." In her articles Mrs. Alseth paid tribute to Mrs. Anderson by saying "When one notes her accomplishments, her work in outside activities, her ability to do many things for herself, despite her disabilities that would put many persons so afflicted on the total disability list, one must admit that she is truly a pioneer, with that inbred pioneer spirit that would see her through just such tragedies as she has experienced. Yet, you see her rise above them all with a smile to live a full life dedicated to self-reliance and the service of others. Such is one's reaction to Mrs. Anderson who tops the list of Christmas seal workers in years of service to the cause."

Harry S. Truman Selects Six Great Turning Points of American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the interesting article which follows appeared in the February 22, 1959, issue of *This Week*. I am confident that the historians of the future will recognize Harry S. Truman as one of our country's great Presidents:

HARRY S. TRUMAN SELECTS SIX GREAT TURNING POINTS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Jhan and June Robbins)

INDEPENDENCE, Mo.—More than half a century ago Miss Maggie Phelps, a vigorous country schoolmarm, taught American history to a serious, spectacled youngster named Harry Truman.

"I think Miss Maggie made a special effort to interest me," Mr. Truman recalls, "because she knew I was too shortsighted to play baseball. She sensed that I needed a substitute. She taught me that the events that altered the course of our country's history are some of the most exciting moments the world has ever seen. Right then and there I decided to try to become a history scholar."

Professional historians acknowledge that Mr. Truman has done a pretty good job. He is the only President in recent years who has displayed no interest in whodunits or other escape literature. He rested from his spirited bouts with Congress by reading a relaxing chapter about Yorktown or Chancellorsville.

"Men make history and not the other way 'round," Mr. Truman decided. "In periods where there is no leadership, society stands still. Progress occurs when courageous, skillful leaders seize the opportunity to change things for the better."

TO LOOK FORWARD, HE LOOKS BACK

Today, at 74, Mr. Truman watches with keen interest while modern history unwinds at its dizzy rate. In an exclusive interview granted to *This Week* at the Truman Memorial Library here, he declared, "When I want to understand what is happening today or try to decide what will happen tomorrow I look back. 'A page of history is worth a volume of logic,' Justice Holmes said that."

The former President added feelingly, "I know something about American history. We have had many glorious moments. Many of those which have been of important, lasting benefit to the American people have occurred during the administrations of strong Presidents. This can be no coincidence. We need our system of checks and balances but we must have leaders who can see what needs to be done and who do it. We've been lucky enough to elect a number of such men to the presidency. It is because of their efforts that we have the best government that has ever been organized in the history of the world."

Mr. Truman, who has had quite a bit to do with history himself, believes there are certain key moments in our past which have brought the United States to its present position. Studied together, he believes, they may reveal a predictable pattern for the future. Here, in his own words, he describes six of these key events in American history—and their significance for *This Week* readers.

1. WASHINGTON STOPS THE WHISKY REBELLION

When Congress in 1791 passed an excise-tax law, levying 4 pence per gallon on all distilled spirits, the counties west of the Alleghenies rose in violent protest.

"A government may be organized under the highest ethical ideals. On paper, it may sound efficient. Yet the real test of any government is: How authoritatively can it govern?"

"George Washington, today, is a name that evokes no controversy. From earliest school years our children are taught to love his memory and admire his works. Yet in his own time he was opposed politically, reviled by the press, mocked by professional critics. He was the first leader of a federated nation—a new experiment in modern government. Could the laws that Congress passed be enforced in the 14 member States, even when they were unpopular?"

"Washington met his greatest test as President in 1791 when Congress, with his endorsement, passed a law that levied a tax on liquor. The Monongahela Valley in western Pennsylvania was a good place to grow corn.

"The Allegheny Mountains separated the area from its markets. The cheapest and easiest way to ship its major products over the hills to market was in the form of distilled liquor. The new whisky excise tax hit hard. In 1794, open rebellion broke out in

Pennsylvania. Organized squads of armed infantry began drilling. They declared: 'The whisky tax will never be collected.'

"It must have been a sore dilemma for Washington. Many of those antagonistic mountaineers had been his best soldiers in the Revolution. Yet he did not hesitate. He was President of the United States, sworn to uphold and execute its laws. He called on the Governors of 4 States and ordered 15,000 troops to occupy the area, restore order, and enforce the law. The rebels quickly put down their arms. Only a handful of them were taken into custody. Only two were tried, convicted, and imprisoned and Washington quickly pardoned them. He could afford to be generous. He had proved what all the world of his time wanted to know.

"The new Federal Government could collect the taxes it levied. It could enforce the laws it passed."

2. JEFFERSON PUSHES US ACROSS THE CONTINENT

In 1803 the United States purchased from France for \$15 million over 800,000 square miles of territory, nearly doubling the size of the Republic.

"One of the tests of a great leader is the ability to recognize and seize unexpected opportunity. When President Jefferson sent James Monroe on his historic mission to Napoleon, he was merely concerned with securing freedom for American exporters to ship their goods through the port of New Orleans, then a French possession. Jefferson expected Napoleon to refuse and gave Monroe an 'ace in the hole'—a threat that the United States would make a defensive alliance with Britain, then France's enemy.

"To Monroe's surprise Napoleon was anxious to sell the entire French possession of Louisiana. He felt that Britain would probably capture the area anyway. To push the deal, he threw in what we now know as the Louisiana Territory—the entire west side of the Missouri-Mississippi valley, some 800,000 square miles stretching nearly all the way to the Pacific Ocean. At roughly 3 cents per acre, it was probably history's greatest real estate bargain.

"Imagine President Jefferson's excitement when he heard the news. Here was a chance for his struggling little Atlantic seaboard country to become a mighty continental power. But there was a big 'if.' Jefferson was a strict constitutionalist. He believed that the survival of the new Federal Union and the continued freedom of its citizens depended on hewing to the laws of the Constitution down to the last letter. And nowhere in the Constitution was there any mention of the right to acquire any new territory. What should he do?

"Jefferson decided to take a broad general view of his constitutional powers and go ahead with the purchase. He argued that the power to govern territory obviously implies the prior right to acquire it. He relied on our system of checks and balances to stop him if he were wrong. But the Supreme Court upheld his move. Because of Thomas Jefferson's farsighted courage—which included even the courage to modify his own public position—the United States of America was on its way to our historic destiny as a rich, major power."

3. JACKSON UPHOLDS THE POWER OF CONGRESS

In 1832 the State of South Carolina, under the leadership of U.S. Vice President John C. Calhoun, called a legislative convention and declared that the Federal excise tax law of 1828 was null and void and was therefore no longer enforceable in South Carolina.

"In 1828 Congress had passed a tariff law imposing high import duties on textiles, glass, earthenware and paper. The law pleased the industrial North, infuriated the agricultural South. It brought to a head a question that had been debated for many years. Can a State legally nullify the force

of an act of Congress within its own borders?"

"South Carolina, under the leadership of John Calhoun, called a special convention in 1832 and declared that the Federal tariff law was nullified in that State. Citizens of South Carolina were ordered to stop paying or collecting it. The State militia was ordered to back them up in their intransigent stand.

"Andrew Jackson was President. He was himself a southerner. These were his people, of his own faith, his own kind. What's more, Jackson frankly stated his conviction that the tariff worked injustice to the people of the South. He agreed that it was abominable.

"But he denied that nullification was legal. He said it was not even peaceable—that it was an act of open rebellion, directly inciting to treason and war.

"In a moving speech, he begged the people of South Carolina to honor the Union first and to put States rights second.

Then, to show that he meant business, he ordered Gen. Winfield Scott to command Federal troops in South Carolina, sent two warships to anchor in Charleston harbor. The tax, President Jackson warned, would be collected by force if necessary. The best way to settle disputes over States rights, he firmly believed, was by means of debate and compromise—not by threats of rebellion.

4. LINCOLN HOLDS THE UNION TOGETHER

When Lincoln took the oath of office as President of the United States, on March 4, 1861, the Nation was facing one of its darkest hours; seven States had renounced the Union. Four more would soon join them. Six weeks later our country's bloodiest conflict started. At a cost of 359,528 northern lives and 133,785 southern lives, peace was finally restored and the Union preserved.

"Very few members of my family have shared my admiration for Abraham Lincoln. They were southern in their sympathies. But to me Lincoln is one of our most important Presidents because he closed the door for all time on the right of a State to leave the Union. Ironically, the single act for which he is best remembered—the emancipation proclamation—is not clearly understood even by those who revere him most.

"Lincoln was not an abolitionist. He believed that slavery was morally wrong. He often expressed his personal wish that all men everywhere could be free. But he believed that under the Constitution it was a matter that each State had the right to decide for itself. He knew very well that the men of the North did not answer his call to arms in order to free the slaves. The objective was to preserve the Union. Everything else was secondary to that goal.

"In a letter to Horace Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune, Lincoln stated his point of view. It's astonishing that so few people today are familiar with it. He wrote, 'If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it. If I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it. If I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that.'

"The emancipation was conceived as an act of military necessity. Lincoln acted under his emergency wartime powers. Legally speaking, what he did was to seize and dispose of a large amount of private property—something he could never have got away with in peacetime, no matter how much he longed to do it.

"The proclamation was a master stroke of psychological warfare. It was intended to underscore the withdrawal of Lee's troops after the battle of Antietam, an indecisive contest in which the North claimed victory. Lincoln also hoped that it would draw off some of the slave labor forces that were supporting the armies in the South and help swing opinion in Europe, particularly in England, in favor of the North.

"Today we have still to solve the problems which the emancipation has bequeathed us. If we had had strong, able men in the White House between 1850 and 1860, the issues concerned in the secession could probably have been settled and the slaves freed peacefully and justly. The Civil War would never have occurred and we would not now be living with its bitter racial aftermath that distorts the harmonious democracy we so wish to show the world."

5. CLEVELAND RESTORES THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

An aftermath of the Civil War was the almost complete domination of the national political scene by the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln and of the victorious North. From 1861 to 1885 the administration was in Republican hands for six successive terms.

"Grover Cleveland, a Democrat, was elected to office in 1884, ending 24 years of Republican rule in the White House. It marked the recovery of our healthy two-party system. It also marked the end of a period in which Congress had pushed Chief Executives this way and that and usurped many Presidential powers. Cleveland was not the man to stand for that. During his first term, the Presidential vetoes came down like hailstones.

"When a President doesn't have a fight or two with Congress, you know there is something wrong. A man with thin skin has no business being President. These scraps are not personal. It's part of our scheme of government that the executive and legislative branches jealously guard their rights against infringements. But in 1885, Congress had had things pretty much its own way for a long time.

"Cleveland vetoed 414 bills during his first administration. Many of them were private pension bills—thinly disguised graft. He braved the wrath of the Grand Army of the Republic, the politically powerful veterans' organization, when he knocked out the dependent pension bill which would eventually have put nearly every veteran in the United States on the public payroll. He forced through the repeal of the Tenure of Office Act and regained Presidential control over appointment to and removal from executive office.

"Under Cleveland, our democracy once again began to function as our founders had intended that it should. Our Government was ready to face the massive problems of the 20th century, prompted by a newly alert public and powered by a Chief Executive who had recovered his independence."

6. THE UNITED STATES JOINS THE WORLD COMMUNITY

Under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and later by Harry S. Truman, the United States for the first time committed itself to membership in a world organization of nations. Woodrow Wilson, a generation earlier, was unable to persuade this country to join the League of Nations, but his efforts paved the way for the change in public opinion that eventually resulted in our present leadership in the United Nations. Wilson was right—the irreconcilables were wrong.

"Credit for the sixth, and perhaps the greatest, event in our country's history must be shared by two men—Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt.

"We followed an isolationist policy for the first 150 years of our existence. It took 30 years, 2 dreadful wars, and 2 great leaders who literally struggled to their deaths to lead us to our rightful place in the world.

"Many people think that Woodrow Wilson's second term was a failure because he could not persuade the U.S. Senate to let us join the League of Nations. Yet it's quite possible that if Wilson hadn't tried, Roosevelt couldn't have succeeded. Both of these men understood what we are dangerously close to forgetting today—that it is the President's

duty to lead the Nation in the conduct of its foreign affairs. This is a responsibility that cannot be delegated and must not be avoided.

"Wilson was a great historian and a great leader. Under him, we became international minded. He failed only as a politician. He was unable to enlist the support of the irreconcilables. These Senators abused their power to approve treaties, kept us out of the League of Nations and, in my opinion, played a large role in causing World War II.

"Roosevelt early recognized the need to keep the United Nations project above and beyond politics. When the U.N. opened for business, Arthur Vandenberg, a Republican and former isolationist, was a leading member of our delegation. In this way, we showed the world that our isolationist period had come conclusively to an end.

"When I became President, my first act was to reaffirm the U.S. desire to see a world organization that would preserve peace. Within a few minutes of my taking the oath of office, I announced that we would carry on with the historic assembly that is now known as the San Francisco Conference. In this way, at last a mature Nation, we joined the world community."

We asked the former President what he considered the most important event of his administration. He answered unhesitatingly, "Containment of communism." He ticked off these four major moves:

Preservation of the freedom of Greece and Turkey.

Marshall plan aid that balked Communist political campaigns in Western Europe.

The Berlin airlift that prevented an East German putsch.

Our stand in Korea that met aggression with force and restored the legal status quo.

"It's been proved beyond doubt that the President has the power to meet emergencies when they arise," said Mr. Truman. "Sometimes he has to take the bull by the horns. And he must be strong enough to hold on when he does."

What will history say about Harry Truman?

"A man who has to try to answer that," said the former President, "is in a terrible fix because there is no way anyone can tell today or for the next half century. I do know one thing. People seldom honor the names of men who try to obstruct something that needs to be done. Who can recall the identity of the men who attacked Washington because of the Jay Treaty and vilified Jefferson at time of the Louisiana Purchase?"

"I tried to do the right thing and I suppose eventually the facts will come out. I'll probably be holding a conference with St. Peter when that happens. However when I'm finally carried out feet first I hope it will be said of me, 'He did his damndest.'"

**Ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon,
Analyzes State Administration of Gov.
Robert D. Holmes**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate became familiar with Robert D. Holmes during his service as Governor of Oregon.

Last November, Mr. Holmes, a Democrat, was defeated for reelection by Mark O. Hatfield, a Republican.

On January 12, 1959, a former Republican Governor of Oregon, Charles A. Sprague, published an estimate of the Holmes administration in his daily paper, the Oregon Statesman, of Salem. Mr. Sprague is one of the distinguished editors of the Pacific Northwest, a man of integrity and fairness. He has declared editorially:

And (Robert D.) Holmes is entitled to the respect of all the people for the high character of his administration.

Mr. Sprague also speaks highly of the capable services performed by John Richardson, State director of finance, and Howard Morgan, State commissioner of public utilities under Governor Holmes.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the thoughtful editorial entitled "Changing of the Guard," written by ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING OF THE GUARD

As he retires today from 2 years' service as Governor of Oregon, Robert D. Holmes can take much satisfaction in the accomplishments of his administration. Standards of administrative services have been well maintained. Notable improvements have been made at the many institutions of the State, both educational, charitable, and penal or correctional. His administration has been remarkably free of scandal. He has sought to spur business expansion.

Holmes has upheld the dignity of the office, without show of conceit. He has held firm to convictions even when, as with certain commutations, he has provoked much protest. And Mrs. Holmes has been a most gracious first lady.

Almost any Governor on retiring from office is aware of errors he has made and of tasks left unperformed. Presumably Holmes is normal in this respect and has the added disappointment of failing to win reelection. These regrets, however, should not becloud the pride he is entitled to feel for what has been achieved during his short term. And Holmes is entitled to the respect of all the people for the high character of his administration.

Among the Holmes appointees who leave office today we would like to mention particularly John Richardson, director of finance and business administration, and Howard Morgan, public utility commissioner. Richardson quickly showed his competence in management of the State's fiscal affairs. He was objective, free of partisan bias in administering his responsibilities, and eminently fair in his relations with State officials and the public.

The hostilities which Howard Morgan had incurred in his political battles pursued him in the office of public utilities commissioner. But his administration of this sensitive office appeared to be in strict conformity with the law and with the function of the office, to safeguard the public interest in the regulation of public utilities. His grip was firm, and in this office it must be kept firm, especially in time like the present when inflation is in the air. Morgan has been blamed for extra curricular activity as adviser to Holmes. Of that we have no knowledge and little interest. On the particular job given him, he has done his duty, efficiently and conscientiously.

Survival of Minor League Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Wirt Gammon is the very able sports editor of the Chattanooga Times. In an article appearing in the Times February 16 he analyzes the bill, S. 886, which I have introduced in connection with the application of the antitrust laws to team sports. Mr. Gammon concludes that this bill would be the salvation of minor leagues, and would thereby help the major leagues also. This was certainly my intention.

I invite the attention of my fellow Members of Congress to this article, and I hope it will be read by all those who are interested in the survival and success of team sports. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST BETWEEN US FANS

(By Wirt Gammon)

LIFESAVER FOR THE MINORS

The Kefauver bill would be good for minor league baseball.

We think it would be good for the majors, too, but there is difference of opinion on that. Yet it looks like a gift from heaven for the minors, at a time when there is danger of the smaller leagues going broke.

"I'd say most of the baseball provisions of the bill," Senator KEFAUVER says, "are the result of things the minor league people have told us would help them. I am satisfied that unless a bill similar to this one is enacted into law, very little hope will remain for the continuation of minor league baseball."

KEFAUVER has gained a lot of baseball knowledge since asking Casey Stengel in Senate testimony last summer how many major league teams there are.

Ford Frick, baseball commissioner, testified in the suit for \$250,000 against baseball by a Portsmouth former owner—a case dismissed because no contract was broken—that "the only way I can see that radio and TV can be forbidden in the minor league cities is by legislation. I would like to see such legislation."

Well, it is in the Kefauver bill. Frick has been told by the Justice Department that baseball itself can't make such a law; it would be collusion (against the television-radio businesses).

The minors are hurting, and need the legislation fast.

"We are hurting most because games are televised into our cities on the days we have games," one minor league club official told us by telephone the other day. "The Kefauver bill would help. Anything would be better than the way it is now." We will quote again later from this unnamed official.

KEFAUVER's bill opens the road for agreements among teams to keep TV games out, but leaves it up to the FCC to make them show that such agreements are necessary to survival. The FCC thus is cast in a role of striking a balance, as KEFAUVER puts it, between the two public interests of the minor league ball club's rights and the rights of the television viewer and station owner.

Unless an agreement among the top baseball officials had the sanction of the FCC as

being in the public interest, it would be almost impossible to avoid prosecution under the antitrust laws. But if the FCC has approved the agreement after hearings and a vote by the Commission's seven members, the owners could not be prosecuted for obeying a Federal regulation.

The major leagues and the television business have been running the show and doing very well for themselves. For this no one blames them, for they have broken no rules. But the feeling that the minor league stake in the matter rightfully makes it a three-way proposition has resulted in this bill.

KEFAUVER is the first to make a proposal from the minor league point of view. It recognizes a basic weakness in the baseball structure, pointed out here some months ago, that the minors have no voice in baseball's own law. They are made by the major moguls. KEFAUVER's bill would save the minors by enforcing their rights on the majors and on television.

It's either that or let the minors die, as we see it. Some may not care whether the minors live. They should be against this bill.

MAJORS WOULD BENEFIT, TOO

In another way, the bill also would save the majors from themselves, we believe. That is on giving large bonuses.

Some claim the Kefauver bill would kill the minors because it limits each major club to a total of 80 players, and so the majors would cut down the subsidies to minor league clubs.

On the contrary, the 80 limit would, first of all, cause major clubs to cut down very much on the size of scouting staffs, and on giving out large bonuses to a large number of players.

That would turn the field over to the minor league clubs after each major club gets its 80. The rest of the players could be signed by the minor clubs. They'd be back in business for themselves, instead of being subsidized.

Here's a case in point, as told by the unnamed club official mentioned above: "There was a top prospect near our city last spring. A friend of ours there was watching him and was going to bring him to us after he finished high school ball. But he told us later that he didn't have a chance. The thousands of major league scouts looking behind every bush in the land to line up a lot of players, they found him. The boy just sat still and let them bid. The bidding went up and up, over \$100,000. Way out of reason."

"Now if this bill goes into effect, there won't be these major league scouts everywhere. A kid like that, being near us, will be brought in to us, we'll pay him what we can to sign and we minor league clubs will be able to field our own teams and eventually sell our players to the majors."

Thus, the bill could help the independent club owner to come back.

It could help the major league club with a small farm system, like Washington, too. Washington could still send player help to its main farms, Chattanooga and Charlotte. But the Yankees and Braves would have to cut down on their 250 or so players.

Yet, to say the bill tries to bring the Yankees and Braves down to the level of the rest of the majors is erroneous. The bill tries to keep the minors from disappearing.

WHEN 500 G'S IS PEANUTS

There was a story the other day that the Washington farm system lost \$502,000 in 1958.

This is an imposing figure. But the Senator officials didn't jump on their men in Chattanooga and Charlotte about it. Why? First, farm losses of some of the other major league clubs run over \$1 million. Second, such figures include all phases of the procurement of ball players—the money paid bonus players, salaries of the many scouts,

the cost of spring training, salaries of the head men in the farm system.

In the rat race that major league clubs find themselves now, \$502,000 is not much. Why, Baltimore paid \$125,000 for one player, Dave Nicholson, last year. Incidentally, he was no star at Knoxville.

Surely the Kefauver bill would cut down on this rat race.

The way we see it, the bill would help both the minors and majors.

Education of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the literate and incisive Eric Sevareid, in his broadcast on February 13, spoke of a problem of concern to all of us—educating our youth in spite of the discord of TV, movies, and automobiles. The fact that he made a reference to my State gives me the opportunity to insert his comment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. Here it is, Friday sermon time and we find ourself in the predicament of the old time Negro preacher who said, "I ain't had time to prepare no reglar, theological sermon, so I'm just gwine let the Bible drap open and wheresoever my eyes rest."

Well, we just let the newspapers drap open, and our eyes rested immediately on two stories dealing with the same subject—kids, cars, and high school courses. In one story the subject had been approached by the methods of social science; in the other by the humanistic approach. The humanities, at a rough definition, concern people as persons, as individuals, in their intimate minds, hearts, and spirits, often as reflected in music, literature, and the arts. The social sciences are concerned with persons as people—in the group, where methodistic measurement is used. And it's surprising how often the humanist's pure instinct and intuition lead him to the same conclusions as the social scientist's charts and graphs.

Sam Levenson, the former teacher, is a humanist; he goes by instinct and experience; and what Sam has been saying on TV this week about kids and cars, as retailed for us by critic John Crosby, is just what a group of social scientists have been discovering in their charts and graphs. To wit: Giving a car to a teen-ager is doing him positive, provable injury. The glory of having his own car not only goes to his head but drives out whatever else was in his head.

As a high school official in Los Angeles puts it: the boys are joyriding themselves right out of an education. He cites a study made in Idaho as typical of the country at large. Not one of the straight-A students observed owned a car; only 15 percent of the B students had a car; 41 percent of the C students had one, 71 percent of the D students and nearly all—83 percent—of the flunkers drove cars.

Why parents allow it, says the Los Angeles educator, is almost beyond comprehension.

Sam Levenson, humanist, is concerned not only about what the car does to a kid's education; but what it does to the kid, period.

Kid ownership of cars, he maintains, is just one illustration of the fact that the teenagers are the ruling class in the country. They've overthrown the Government, says Sam. Certainly, they have overthrown their parents; or the parents have abdicated; they haven't the guts to be parents, says Samuel. "You do a kid no good by giving him everything in life," he goes on. "The only thing he gets out of it is the habit of receiving. You've denied him the joy of achieving * * * the car is only a symbol of the unearned increment that a kid should not be given unless it's absolutely necessary."

Even in simple, practical terms, matching a teenager to a car makes no sense, according to the Los Angeles gentleman; what happens, time after time, is that the boy quits school or quits athletics at least, in order to get a job to keep his buggy rolling; almost invariably, he finds that keeping a car costs much more than he had expected.

Levenson is convinced that the motor car is mixed up in the whole problem of truancy and corruption and sex. He's found, he says, that the truant invariably ended up in a car somewhere; the car has become the American boudoir; it's led to sex experience at an early age; the antidote, he thinks, is simply in teaching kids the wonder, the miracle, the reverence for the creation of life itself.

As for rock and roll: it's something, says Sam the humanist and teacher, approaching musical alcoholism.

Thus ended the sermon for today.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Way To Tackle Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star regarding a recent trip to Peoria by our Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which on this occasion was chairmanned by my good friend, the very able and likable gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. FRED MARSHALL. FRED certainly knows the hog business and handled the subcommittee on this factfinding tour in such a manner as to provoke praise from many quarters not the least of which comes from my own hometown newspaper:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Feb. 18, 1959]

WAY TO TACKLE FARM PROBLEM

Peoria and central Illinois this week observed a demonstration of the proper way in which to seek a solution to the farm problem.

A subcommittee of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, visiting here, expressed more interest in efforts to develop a leaner type of hog, which will improve marketing conditions, than in anything else.

Representative FRED MARSHALL, Democrat of Minnesota, speaking for the committee, stressed the fact that development of a leaner type of hog is essential to retention of the national market for pork. This also has an effect on corn and grain products because if the demand for pork falls off and fewer hogs are raised on American farms, the demand for corn and grain also will be affected adversely.

Best solution to the farm surplus problem, of course, is development of additional markets. Development of a leaner hog, with more appeal for the meat purchaser, would go a long way toward cutting down the surpluses not only of pork but of corn and grain.

Artificial support of prices never will provide a lasting solution to the farm problem. Development of additional markets and increases in consumption are the only sound approach. By indicating its interest in the development of a more attractive type of pork the committee has indicated its interest in a sound and lasting solution, rather than a temporary lessening of the surplus problem.

Washington Gave All for His Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there will be many meaningful tributes to George Washington on the anniversary of the birth of the first President of the United States.

Few, if any, will be more inspiring than the column by Walter Winchell. His words of strength about the Father of Our Country are couched in classic prose.

I felt a lift of the spirit as I read Winchell's merited praise of this matchless patriot. He wrote:

During the Nation's darkest hour, he carried the brightest torch. At Valley Forge a winter of suffering made possible the springtime of democracy. Although weapons become obsolete and maps change, the principles of George Washington remain constant.

This complete newspaper column, published nationwide on February 22, 1959, is as follows:

WASHINGTON GAVE ALL FOR HIS COUNTRY (By Walter Winchell)

He was a light in the darkness. The immensity of George Washington's contributions are exceeded only by the knowledge of what he relinquished to make them possible. He was a wealthy man who surrendered material abundance for the burdens of arduous duties. He exchanged personal security for bitter peril. He traded the security of his farm for the torture of battlefields. He sacrificed almost everything for a hope. But he never surrendered his conscience.

His birthday is a time for profound inspiration. It arouses renewed dedication to the Nation's mightiest force: Devotion to liberty. The homage tendered the Founding Father is more than respect for valor. It exceeds the shimmer of personal glory. For it represents a testament of national faith in the concepts his sacrifices gained. The vibrancy of his spirit has always been evoked by the Nation in time of crisis.

For internal obstacles he endured and eventually surmounted offer a finer tribute to his generalship than his final success on the battlefield. The Continental Congress was plagued by corruption. The Nation's credit almost crumbled. There were times when Washington could not send ordinary military dispatches because he was unable to pay the riders. During the second winter at Morristown the Nation was almost numbed by despair. There were wild demands for Gen-

eral Washington's dismissal. When the future seemed dismal, a friend wrote to Washington—urging him to surrender. The general replied: "Death will provide peace."

The shaping of farmer-patriots in the form of an army was one of Washington's more formidable tasks. He was appalled by the lack of essential discipline. Nevertheless, his fixity of purpose, personal dignity and profound faith in the Nation's objectives won the loyalty of his soldiers. He once began an address to his unpaid and discontented troops with the words: "Gentlemen, you will have to permit me to put on my spectacles for I have not only grown gray, but almost blind in the service of my country." Many hardened warriors who heard those words openly wept.

He became Chief Executive amid the earnest acclaim of his countrymen. The singing quality of the high honor (as Washington's successors learned) marks the overture for the solemn beat of harsh realities. The Presidency is a national institution—the President is a man. His problems are not only political, economic, and military. They are also extremely personal. He must be equipped with moral endurance plus philosophical conviction. His physical stamina will be constantly challenged and his spiritual strength severely tested. Glory is transient, the duties are arduous and history is a stern judge.

It is difficult to imagine that the man who achieved an exalted position in history was the target of venomous opposition during his lifetime. The fierce disputes over the Constitution's ratification left burning scars. The controversy incited by the French Revolution and the Jay Treaty rocked the Nation. And there was violent opposition to the whisky tax. Washington was vilified in dailies and denounced at mass meetings. There was an assassination attempt. One paper forged letters in an effort to embarrass him.

The scurrilous press campaigns inspired Washington to write to a friend: "But in what will this abuse terminate? For the result, as it respects itself, I care not; for I have a consolation within that no earthly effort can deprive me of, and that is that neither ambition nor interested motives have influenced my conduct. The arrows of malevolence, therefore, however barbed and well-pointed, never can reach the most vulnerable part of me; though, whilst I am up as a mark, they will continually be aimed."

He urged Congress to repeal the transportation tax on newspapers by reminding the legislators: "No resource is so firm for the Government of the United States as the affection of the people, guided by an enlightened policy; and to this primary good nothing can conduce more than a faithful representation of public proceedings diffused without restraint throughout the United States."

When he embraced the serenity of Mount Vernon, Washington began his historic journey to the viewless heights. During the Nation's darkest hour he carried the brightest torch. At Valley Forge, a winter of suffering made possible the springtime of democracy. Although weapons become obsolete and maps change, the principles of George Washington remain constant. Undoubtedly, he was a man of immense proportions. You can measure the Nation's basic ideals by his character. He was the incomparable magician who transformed sprawling Colonies into a vigorous Nation. He was the Father of our Country.

Even more—he was a brother to every American.

All citizens of the United States would do well to recall the admonition of Washington when he said:

Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections.

This challenge, as necessary today as when Washington gave it on September 19, 1796, was embraced in his Farewell Address on that memorable occasion. He continued by declaring:

The name of American, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discrimination. With slight shades of differences, you have the same religion, matters, habits and political principles. You have in common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels and joint efforts; of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

Washington, as a young surveyor, climbed the hills in what is now West Virginia. He often visited sections which are known as Jefferson and Morgan Counties as well as many other areas of the State.

Diversion of Water of Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Tuesday I appeared before the House Public Works Committee in opposition to the Chicago water bill. I ask unanimous consent that my statement before that committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1959, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

H.R. 1 should be rejected because in the 6 years this kind of measure has been before the Congress there has never been a showing that the study which is the only authorized purpose of this bill is necessary.

The study is unnecessary for these reasons:

1. The Corps of Engineers has already testified (pp. 193, 194, in hearings before Senate Public Works Committee, July 19, 28, 29, and August 7, 1958) that they are fully satisfied that additional diversion will not improve navigation on the Illinois waterway, and will have an adverse effect on navigation on the Great Lakes (p. 18057 in 1958 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD). In 6 years of consideration there has never been a showing that a study would contribute any useful information to a better understanding of navigation consequences. I challenge the author to show that this bill would provide any useful information on navigation although the effect on navigation is the only stated purpose of the bill.

2. The Corps of Engineers has also testified to certain knowledge of the effect of additional diversion on power generation—that it would be favorable at Lockport but far more unfavorable on the St. Lawrence—with a total net loss of power. There is no indication in 6 years of consideration that the study authorized in this bill would contribute even one fact necessary to a better understanding of the consequences of diversion on power. Again I challenge the au-

thor to show that this bill would provide such information.

3. The only remaining purpose the study authorized in this bill could serve is the effect of additional diversion on sanitation. Although similar study bills have been introduced in three successive Congresses, there has never been a finding by the Public Health Service, the Illinois Board of Health, the Chicago Board of Health, any public health group of any kind, or even of a single competent or for that matter incompetent public health authority that increased diversion would be necessary for improved sanitation or public health or even desirable.

On the other hand the most competent public health survey ever made of Chicago (the Chicago and Cook County health survey by the U.S. Public Health Service) called for a series of other recommendations to improve sanitation in Chicago. It specifically considered additional diversion and failed to recommend it.

It is true that this previous study was made nearly 12 years ago. Nevertheless there have been no contrary findings by the Public Health Service since the publication of this book. It would seem to me that since improved sanitation is the only possible beneficial consequence of this bill—that the Public Health Service should be requested to furnish the Congress with a report on the public health justification, if any, for this study.

4. This bill is unnecessary because the Supreme Court has established jurisdiction over diversion by Chicago for some 50 years. Everything provided in this bill could be granted by the Supreme Court. The Court has been willing to grant Chicago temporary increases in diversion in the past. It did so as recently as 1956. It would do so again if the Court deemed such increase merited. Through the appointment of special masters the Court has built up a record of great competence in this matter. Obviously only lack of merit keeps Chicago from going to the Court for the diversion authorized in this bill.

Before the committee votes on this bill I respectfully suggest that it request the Public Health Service to indicate whether a 3-year study is necessary to provide conclusions on the consequences of additional diversion on the sanitary quality of water in the Illinois Waterway.

In the event the committee favorably considers the bill I respectfully suggest the following changes:

1. The bill calls for a recommendation from the Army only. Yet the study authorized by the bill will be entirely concerned with the sanitary quality of water on the Illinois Waterway. This is within the competence of the Public Health Service. Therefore the Public Health Service should be called on to provide its own recommendations.

2. The bill calls for a recommendation but provides no standards for judgment on which such a recommendation should be based. The Public Health Service should be asked to specify the standards that it would be necessary for additional diversion to achieve in order to warrant a favorable recommendation. In the absence of such pre-stated standards for favorable recommendation—the Congress is guaranteeing Chicago a favorable recommendation. The deck is being stacked in advance: The favorable-to-Chicago recommendation is inevitable. What Chicago wants is a stacked deck, a study that will provide a preconceived conclusion—a guarantee of a permanent additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second.

3. The Public Health Service should be asked to indicate whether or not a study of alternative sanitation methods to achieve comparable purification without additional diversion would be necessary to permit rea-

sonable recommendations. A Public Health Service staff report, dated April 8, 1957, and entitled "Estimated Costs of Treatment Measures Equivalent to Increased Diversion of Lake Michigan Water for Sanitation Purposes at Chicago" was submitted at the request of the Bureau of the Budget on April 29, 1957. The report was submitted to Roger W. Jones, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, by Marion B. Folsom, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This staff report indicated that its information was based on limited data. On two of the four alternatives the Public Health Service declared that they were not in a position to estimate the effectiveness. The cost estimates are at variance with firm estimates made by the president of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago. The Chicago estimates are substantially lower. The head of the sanitation district himself states that the cost of one of the alternatives to diversion "would not be beyond the ability of the sanitary district." The Public Health Service concludes its staff study by declaring of another alternative, "Its use for reducing oxygen demand may be economically justified and found effective in meeting the unusual conditions at Chicago either alone or in combination with other approaches." If either of these conclusions should prove to be the case, they would in my judgment demolish any reason for consideration of diversion by Chicago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee, Wis., Common Council has recently adopted a resolution declaring the opposition of our largest city to this water diversion proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION DECLARING CITY OF MILWAUKEE OPPOSITION TO WATER DIVERSION PROPOSALS

Whereas by prior resolutions, this common council has recorded the position of the city of Milwaukee in opposition to proposals for diversion of water from Lake Michigan for the purposes of the Chicago Sanitary District; and

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States bills to authorize additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago; and

Whereas one of these bills is H.R. 1, introduced in the House of Representatives January 7, 1959; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, as follows:

1. That the city of Milwaukee reiterates its position in opposition to increased or unreasonable diversion of water from Lake Michigan for the purposes of the Chicago Sanitary District, or comparable diversions of water elsewhere in the Great Lakes Basin; and

2. That the mayor, the deputy city attorney, and the municipal port director be and they are hereby authorized and directed to appear before congressional committees either in the House of Representatives or in the U.S. Senate holding hearings in Washington or elsewhere, and to express the opposition of the city of Milwaukee to legislation which would in any manner authorize the diversion of additional volumes of water from the Great Lakes Basin; and

3. That the city of Milwaukee hereby specifically declares its opposition to H.R. 1 pending before the Congress of the United States, or bills similar in intent; and

4. That the aforesaid persons enumerated

in paragraph 2 are hereby authorized to confer with representatives of Great Lakes cities of Canada for the purpose of discussing matters pertaining to water diversion, and they are also authorized to meet with other representatives of the principal cities of the Great Lakes area in the United States for the purpose of discussing opposition to water diversion legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to the President of the United States, to the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, and to the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives; to Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin; to the attorneys general of the Great Lakes States opposing water diversion; to the Great Lakes Harbors Association; to the Great Lakes Compact Commission; and to the Lake Carriers Association; and that the city representatives herein enumerated be authorized to collaborate with the legislators and regional groups designated with a view to achieving collaboration and effective opposition to any and all proposals for extraction of water from the Great Lakes Basin; to the injury of the port cities and the maritime interests of the Great Lakes.

Charles A. Plumley, Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD I include a notable address by a former Member of the House, the Honorable Charles A. Plumley, of Vermont, delivered on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Dr. Plumley is the distinguished son of a worthy sire, his father having served as a Member of this body through the 61st, 62d, and 63d Congresses.

Representing his father's district, which included the entire State of Vermont, Dr. Plumley served here from the 73d to the 81st Congresses, inclusive. He came to the House as a nationally known educator and university president, and his scholarly address reflects his long and ardent admiration for the great war President.

The address follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: THE UNCOMMON COMMONER

We honor ourselves today as we appropriately observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, uncommon commoner, great American emancipator, and savior of the Nation; a type that nature wills to plan but once in all a people's years; he was one who owned no common soul:

"Some opulent force of genius, soul, and race, Some deep life current from far centuries Flowed to his mind and lighted his sad eyes, And gave his name, among great names, high place.

"Unschool'd scholar! How did you learn The wisdom a lifetime may not earn? Unsainted martyr! Higher than a saint! You were a man, with a man's constraint, In the world, of the world was your lot; With it and for it the fight you fought And never till time is itself forgot And the heart of man is a pulseless clot. Shall the blood flow slow, when we think the thought Of Lincoln."

It is universally conceded that by his courage, his justice, his even temper, his fertile counsels, his humanity, he stood a heroic figure in the center of an heroic epoch. He is the true history of the American people in his time. Step by step he walked before them; slow with their slowness, guiding his march by theirs, the true representation of this continent; an entirely public man; father of his country; the pulse of 20 millions throbbing in his heart. The thought of their minds articulated by his tongue.

His cautious, but steady advances, militarily, during the war were like those of a Roman Army. He left behind him a firm road on which public confidence followed, as he took America with him wherever he went. What he gained, he occupied. His advanced posts became his colonies.

It is not generally recognized, but it is a fact, that Lincoln stands out as a great war President, probably the greatest in our history, and as a great natural strategist, a better one than any of his generals. He was in actuality, as well as in title, the Commander in Chief, who, by his larger strategy, did more, in the opinion of those qualified and competent to express one, than Grant or any general to win the war for the Union.

As Commander in Chief, he visited General Grant and his army at City Point in the spring of 1865. He wanted to see Grant defeat Lee and end the war. He wanted to witness a victory.

On the 7th of April 1865, Sheridan, smashing victoriously at the Confederates, telegraphed General Grant: "If the thing be pressed, I think Lee will surrender." General Grant sent Sheridan's telegram to President Lincoln, who wired General Grant: "Let the thing be pressed."

That was his last important order as Commander in Chief.

The era in which he lived and moved was but the beginning of things for the United States of America, whose destiny he prophetically saw was foreordained as the savior of the world.

In the grandeur of his soul, he visioned a world unshackled, willed to us the duty and the obligation to carry high the torch of liberty he threw into our hands; to the end that all men everywhere eventually shall be truly free.

"It is for us the living," said he, "to see to it that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

This is the burden and the challenge of our undertaking, today.

His wisdom, they agree, was made up of a knowledge of things as well as of men; his sagacity resulted from a clear perception and honest acknowledgment of difficulties, which enabled him to see that the only durable triumph of political opinion is based not on abstract right, but upon so much of justice, the highest attainable at any given moment in human affairs, as may be had in the balance of mutual concession. Of course, he had an ideal, but it was the ideal of a practical statesman, namely to aim at the best, and to take the next best, if lucky enough to get even that.

His rugged, honest, steadfast perseverance and staunch Americanism still stand as examples, as objectives which the Nation and all of us as individuals may well try to emulate. Unwavering in his loyalty to the fundamentals of American Government, his genuine respect for the Constitution, and his great concern for the destiny of the Republic ended only with his death.

It was Abraham Lincoln who first said: "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep

out of trouble by spending more than you own. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves."

Interesting, also, just now, is his letter with respect to the draft, which letter of date August 15 (?), 1863, he concludes as follows:

"The principle of the draft, which is involuntary or enforced service, is not new. It has been practiced in all ages of the world. It was well known to the framers of our Constitution as one of the modes of raising armies. At the time they placed in that instrument the provision that 'the Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies.' It had been used just before in establishing our independence. It was also used under the Constitution in 1812. Wherein is the peculiar hardship now? Shall we shrink from the necessary means to maintain our free Government, which our grandfathers employed to establish it and our own fathers have already employed (once) to maintain it? Are we degenerate? Has the manhood of our race run out?"

It appears today that without the draft the armed services would fall 700,000 short of the 2.3 million men needed.

Some form of compulsion is necessary to build up the Nation's defense.

"A sad commentary on the willingness of Americans to guard their own country," says the Free Press.

However, we can find comfort in the fact, and it is to our credit, that the fanatical religious zealots—the Jehovah Witness type of citizens—the dedicated conscientious objectors, and the common run of the mill slackers and draft dodgers, Communists, parlor pinks, fellow travelers, and the rest of the lunatic fringe, who by weakening rather than strengthening our defense would give aid and comfort to our enemies, constitute but a very small minority of citizens who do not believe that their country, worth living in, is worth defending, bearing arms if necessary and fighting for.

It is as true today as when Capt. Alden Partridge said 140 years ago that, "In every republic the due cultivation of a proper military spirit among the great mass of the people and a general diffusion of military information are indispensably necessary for the preservation of liberty. The liberties of Rome were safe, while military information was generally diffused and every Roman citizen considered and felt himself a soldier."

History surely repeats itself. "We cannot escape it," says Fitzgerald:

"The moving finger writes; and having writ, Moves on: Nor all your piety nor wit Shall lure it back to cancel half a line Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

We will be remembered "in spite of ourselves," and lighted down "in honor or dishonor, to the latest generations," as Lincoln said.

Abraham Lincoln's standing before posterity will not be exalted by mere praise of his virtues and abilities, nor by any concealment of his limitations and faults. The stature of this great man, one of whose peculiar charms consisted in his being so unlike all other great men, will rather lose than gain by the idealization which so easily runs into the commonplace.

It was distinctly the weird mixture of qualities and forces in him, of the lofty with the common, the ideal with the uncouth, of that which he had not ceased to be, that made him so fascinating a character among his fellow men, gave him his singular power over their minds and hearts, and fitted him to be the greatest leader in the greatest crisis of our national life, the uncommon commoner.

We seldom think of Lincoln as an orator, though the speech at Gettysburg has no parallel in the English language. It was his

happy lot to rise in the realm of oratory by the power of his poetic spirit higher than any American, save probably Emerson, has done in other fields of literature. On the theme of slavery, where his unerring moral sense had free sway, he became our supreme orator, transcending even Webster in grandeur of thought and beauty of its expression. His periods are not as sonorous as our Olympian New England orator's but their accents will reach as far and resound even longer by the carrying and sustaining power of the ideas which they express.

He takes the wind out of Seward's sails by his "Divided House" speech, wins the nomination over Chase, Cameron, Bates, and Seward, and when elected takes up the desperate task of government with his old political enemies for his Cabinet advisers, quietly confident that he is more than a match for them all. Stanton sneers at him as "the imbecile in the White House"; and what is Lincoln's revenge? Only this, that Stanton stood beside his corpse and said: "Here lies the greatest ruler of men the world has ever seen." Born in abject poverty, spending most of his life in squalid or commonplace surroundings, he takes his seat for the ages in a marble temple that Phidias might have fashioned, whose walls on either hand are inscribed with his own words, that will outlast the temple. Could contradiction any further go?

The American people will long remember two of his so-called perorations. Said he: "I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends; we must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

And that closing paragraph of his second inaugural:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

Neither oration has any parallel or equal in the English language.

There was a dream that men could one day speak the thoughts of their own choosing. There was a hope that men could one day stroll through streets at evening unafraid. There was a prayer that each could speak to his own God, in his own church. That dream, that hope, that prayer became America. Great strength, youthful heart, vast enterprise, and hard work made it so. Now, that same America is the dream, the hope, the prayer of the world. Our freedom its dream. Our strength its hope. Our swift race against time its prayer.

Let us undertake to emulate his sturdy virtues, accepting and appreciating the great responsibility of the white man's burden he laid upon our shoulders, welcoming the opportunity to show the world the stuff of which we are made.

"The fiber will hold.

The colors have not faded nor has rot weakened the fabric of our ancient might. Through centuries our forefathers have guarded

Freedom and justice with a jealous pride. We are the heirs of those whose deeds were lauded."

Do we disgrace them? Let the world decide.

"And so he came.

From prairie cabin up to Capitol,
One fair ideal led our chieftain on.
Forevermore he burned to do his deed

With the fine stroke and gesture of a king.
He built the rail pile as he built the State,
Pouring his splendid strength through every blow.

The conscience of him testing every stroke,
To make his deed the measure of a man.
So came the Captain with the mighty heart;
And when the step of earthquake shook the house,

Wrestling the rafters from their ancient hold.

He held the ridge-pole up and spiked again
The rafters of the Home. He held his place!
Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
Held on through blame, and faltered not at praise!

And when he fell, in whirlwind, he went down

As when a kingly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,

And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

"Now he belongs to the ages."

The Death of John Quincy Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the birth of George Washington. Much has been said about the accomplishments and life of this great American. As his Farewell Address is read to us we are all aware of the fact that had we followed his admonitions, the world and this Nation would not be facing the perilous days we see ahead. Nor would there have been the great concern for the economy of this Nation, for had we followed the dictates of that farewell address, our fiscal house would be in order and we could be looking to the horizons of tomorrow with confidence rather than the fear that our irresponsibility may be placing a yoke upon our children and our children's children which they may not be able to throw off.

Mr. Speaker, as one reads the history of our Nation, and particularly of its legislative branch, we find that we are privileged to stand here in the shadow of giants. We should walk with humility as we look back upon those who gave so much which we now take so lightly.

I am reminded on this 23rd day of February that it too is an anniversary, the anniversary of the passing in 1843 of a truly great American, one who served in this House after having served in the Presidency of the United States, in the Senate, in the President's Cabinet, and as a minister abroad, a man truly dedicated to those things in which he believed, who made no compromise with principle and wielded with distinction a trowel which helped to build the foundation and the framework of this great Republic.

I think it is well to look to the past so that we may better appreciate the future. In "Benton's 30 Years View" there is a chapter on the death of John Quincy Adams. I ask unanimous con-

sent to include with these remarks that chapter, which follows:

DEATH OF MR. ADAMS

"Just after the yeas and nays were taken on a question, and the Speaker had risen to put another question to the House, a sudden cry was heard on the left of the chair, 'Mr. Adams is dying!' Turning our eyes to the spot, we beheld the venerable man in the act of falling over the left arm of his chair, while his right arm was extended, grasping his desk for support. He would have dropped upon the floor had he not been caught in the arms of the Members sitting next him. A great sensation was created in the House: Members from all quarters rushing from their seats, and gathering round the fallen statesman, who was immediately lifted into the area in front of the Clerk's table. The Speaker instantly suggested that some gentleman move an adjournment, which being promptly done, the House adjourned."

So wrote the editors of the National Intelligencer, friends and associates of Mr. Adams for 40 years, and now witnesses of the last scene—the sudden sinking in his chair, which was to end in his death. The news flew to the Senate Chamber, the Senate then in session, and engaged in business, which Mr. Benton interrupted, standing up, and saying to the President of the body and the Senators:

"I am called on to make a painful announcement to the Senate. I have just been informed that the House of Representatives has this instant adjourned under the most afflictive circumstances. A calamitous visitation has fallen on one of its oldest and most valuable Members—one who has been President of the United States, and whose character has inspired the highest respect and esteem. Mr. Adams has just sunk down in his chair, and has been carried into an adjoining room, and may be at this moment passing from the earth, under the roof that covers us, and almost in our presence. In these circumstances the whole Senate will feel alike, and feel wholly unable to attend to any business. I, therefore, move the immediate adjournment of the Senate."

The Senate immediately adjourned, and all inquiries were directed to the condition of the stricken statesman. He had been removed to the Speaker's room, where he slightly recovered the use of his speech, and uttered in faltering accents, the intelligible words, "This is the last of earth;" and soon after, "I am composed." These were the last words he ever spoke. He lingered 2 days, and died on the evening of the 23d—struck the day before, and dying the day after the anniversary of Washington's birth—and attended by every circumstance which he could have chosen to give felicity in death. It was on the field of his labors—in the presence of the national representation, presided by a son of Massachusetts (Robert C. Winthrop, Esq.) in the full possession of his faculties, and of their faithful use—at octogenarian age—without a pang—hung over in his last unconscious moments by her who had been for more than 50 years the worthy partner of his bosom. Such a death was the "crowning mercy" of a long life of eminent and patriotic service, filled with every incident that gives dignity and luster to human existence.

I was sitting in my library room in the twilight of a raw and blustering day, the lamp not yet lit, when a note was delivered to me from Mr. Webster—I had saved it 7 years, just 7—when it was destroyed in that conflagration of my house which consumed, in a moment, so much which I had long cherished. The note was to inform me that Mr. Adams had breathed his last; and to say that the Massachusetts delegation had fixed upon me to second the motion, which would be made in the Senate the next day, for the customary funeral honors to his

memory. Seconding the motion on such an occasion always requires a brief discourse on the life and character of the deceased. I was taken by surprise, for I had not expected such an honor; I was oppressed; for a feeling of inability and unworthiness fell upon me. I went immediately to Mr. Winthrop, who was nearest, to inquire if some other Senator had been named to take my place if I should find it impossible to comply with the request. He said there was none—that Mr. Davis, of Massachusetts, would make the motion, and that I was the only one named to second him. My part was then fixed. I went to the other end of the city to see Mr. Davis, and so to arrange with him as to avoid repetitions—which was done, that he should speak of events, and I of characteristics. It was late in the night when I got back to my house, and took pen and paper to note the heads of what I should say. Never did I feel so much the weight of Cicero's admonition—"Choose with discretion out of the plenty that lies before you." The plenty was too much. It was a field crowded with fruits and flowers, of which you could only cull a few—a mine filled with gems, of which you could only snatch a handful. By midnight I had finished the task, and was ready for the ceremony.

Mr. Adams died a Member of the House, and the honors to his memory commenced there, to be finished in the Senate. Mr. Webster was suffering from domestic affliction—the death of a son and a daughter—and could not appear among the speakers. Several Members of the House spoke justly and beautifully; and of these, the pre-eminent beauty and justice of the discourse delivered by Mr. James McDowell, of Virginia (even if he had not been a near connection, the brother of Mrs. Benton), would lead me to give it the preference in selecting some passages from the tributes of the House. With a feeling and melodious delivery, he said:

"It is not for Massachusetts to mourn alone over a solitary and exclusive bereavement. It is not for her to feel alone a solitary and exclusive sorrow. No, sir; No. Her sister Commonwealths gather to her side in this hour of her affliction, and, intertwining their arms with hers, they bend together over the bier of her illustrious son—feeling as she feels, and weeping as she weeps, over a sage, a patriot, and a statesman gone. It was in these great characteristics of individual and of public man that his country revered the son when living, and such, with a painful sense of her common loss, will she deplore him now that he is dead.

"Born in our revolutionary age, and brought up in early and cherished intimacy with the fathers and founders of the republic, he was a living bond of connection between the present and the past—the venerable representative of the memories of another age, and the zealous, watchful, and powerful one of the expectations, interests, and progressive knowledge of his own.

"There he sat, with his intense eye upon everything that passed, a picturesque and rare one man, unapproachable by all others in the unity of his character and in the thousandfold anxieties which centered upon him. No human being ever entered this hall without turning habitually and with heart-felt deference first to him, and few ever left it without pausing, as they went, to pour out their blessings upon that spirit of consecration to the country which brought and which kept him here.

"Standing upon the extreme boundary of human life, and disdaining all the relaxations and exemptions of age, his outer framework only was crumbling away. The glorious engine within still worked on unhurt, uninjured, amid all the dilapidations around it, and worked on with its wonted and its iron power, until the blow was sent from above

which crushed it into fragments before us. And, however, appalling that blow, and however profoundly it smote upon our own feelings as we beheld its extinguishing effect upon his, where else could it have fallen so fitly upon him? Where else could he have been relieved from the yoke of his labors so well as in the field where he bore them? Where else would he himself have been so willing to have yielded up his life, as upon the post of duty, and by the side of that very altar to which he had devoted it? Where but in the Capitol of his country, to which all the throbbings and hopes of his heart had been given, would the dying patriot be so willing that those hopes and throbbings should cease? And where but from this mansion-house of liberty on earth, could this dying Christian more fitly go to his mansion-house of eternal liberty on high?"

Mr. Benton concluded in the Senate the ceremonies which had commenced in the House, pronouncing the brief discourse which was intended to group into one cluster the varied characteristics of the public and private life of this most remarkable man:

"The voice of his native State has been heard, through one of the Senators of Massachusetts, announcing the death of her aged and most distinguished son. The voice of the other Senator from Massachusetts is not heard, nor is his presence seen. A domestic calamity, known to us all and felt by us all, confines him to the chamber of grief while the Senate is occupied with the public manifestations of a respect and sorrow which a national loss inspires. In the absence of that Senator, and as the Member of this body longest here, it is not unfitting or unbecoming in me to second the motion which has been made for extending the last honors of the Senate to him who, 45 years ago, was a Member of this body, who, at the time of his death, was among the oldest Members of the House of Representatives, and who, putting the years of his service together, was the oldest of all the Members of the American Government.

"The eulogium of Mr. Adams is made in the facts of his life, which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Davis] has so strikingly stated, that from early manhood to octogenarian age, he has been constantly and most honorably employed in the public service. For a period of more than 50 years, from the time of his first appointment as Minister abroad under Washington, to his last election to the House of Representatives by the people of his native district, he has been constantly retained in the public service, and that, not by the favor of a sovereign, or by hereditary title, but by the elections and appointments of republican government. This fact makes the eulogy of the illustrious deceased. For what, except a union of all the qualities which command the esteem and confidence of man, could have insured a public service so long, by appointments free and popular, and from sources so various and exalted? Minister many times abroad, Member of this body, Member of the House of Representatives, Cabinet minister, President of the United States—such has been the galaxy of his splendid appointments. And what but moral excellence the most perfect; intellectual ability the most eminent; fidelity the most unwavering; service the most useful; would have commanded such a succession of appointments so exalted, and from sources so various and so eminent? Nothing less could have commanded such a series of appointments; and accordingly we see the union of all these great qualities in him who has received them.

"In this long career of public service, Mr. Adams was distinguished not only by faithful attention to all the great duties of his stations, but to all their less and minor duties. He was not the Salaminian galley,

to be launched only on extraordinary occasions; but he was the ready vessel, always under sail when the duties of his station required it, be the occasion great or small. As President, as Cabinet minister, as Minister abroad, he examined all questions that came before him, and examined all, in all their parts—in all the minutiae of their detail, as well as in all the vastness of their comprehension. As Senator, and as a Member of the House of Representatives, the obscure committee room was as much the witness of his laborious application to the drudgery of legislation, as the Halls of the two Houses were to the ever-ready speech, replete with knowledge, which instructed all hearers, enlightened all subjects, and gave dignity and ornament to all debate.

"In the observance of all the proprieties of life, Mr. Adams was a most noble and impressive example. He cultivated the minor as well as the greater virtues. Wherever his presence could give aid and countenance to what the useful and honorable to man, there he was. In the exercises of the school and of the college—in the meritorious meetings of the agricultural, mechanical, and commercial societies—in attendance upon divine worship—he gave the punctual attendance rarely seen but in those who are free from the weight of public cares.

"Punctual to every duty, death found him at the post of duty; and where else could it have found him, at any stage of his career, for the 50 years of his illustrious public life? From the time of his first appointment by Washington to his last election by the people of his native town, where could death have found him but at the post of duty? At that post, in the fullness of age, in the ripeness of renown, crowned with honors, surrounded by his family, his friends, and admirers, and in the very presence of the national representation, he has been gathered to his fathers, leaving behind him the memory of public services which are the history of his country for half a century, and the example of a life, public and private, which should be the study and the model of the generations of his countrymen."

The whole ceremony was inconceivably impressive. The two Houses of Congress were filled to their utmost capacity, and of all that Washington contained, and neighboring cities could send—the President, his Cabinet, foreign ministers, judges of the Supreme Court, Senators and Representatives, citizens and visitors.

Isthmian Canal Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under a previous order of the House, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] will address this body tomorrow on the most timely and gravely serious subject of the Panama Canal—its control and jurisdiction.

As Members of this body know, he has made extensive studies of Isthmian problems, especially the diplomatic and juridical, and starting on March 26, 1958, made one of the most comprehensive series of addresses on this subject in Isthmian history.

Ever since the 1956 Suez Canal crisis, world attention has become increasingly focused on the Panama Canal. Thus, it is of the highest importance that the

Congress, which is the ultimate authority in the determination of Panama Canal policies, should be fully informed.

I am sure that his address will be highly informative, definitely constructive, and delivered in his usual brilliant form.

Adequate Meat Inspection Appropriation a Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve the protection of adequate meat inspection. Toward that end, those groups that are responsible for providing adequate meat supplies for the American table have joined together in calling upon the Congress to approve the budget request for the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. John A. Killick, executive secretary of the National Independent Meat Packers Association, wrote me on February 19, 1959, and included a joint statement supporting meat inspection appropriations. Believing this statement should receive the serious consideration of the Congress, I include it at this point in the Record, together with the names of the signatory organizations. The statement follows:

JOINT STATEMENT SUPPORTING MEAT INSPECTION APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. Homemaker demands assurance that the meat she buys for her family's dinner table is clean and wholesome. Congress, more than a half century ago, decided that she has the right to this guarantee. It, therefore, established a meat inspection agency.

We, the officers of consumer, public health, farm, livestock, producer, labor and management organizations, agree that Mrs. Homemaker and her family must be fully and effectively protected. We are, therefore, anxious that the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture obtain sufficient funds to employ an adequate staff of inspectors.

For a period, which fortunately ended last year, the Meat Inspection Division was inadequately supported. It could not increase its staff of inspectors to meet the steadily rising demands, which resulted from the meat industry's decentralization and growth. The increase in funds in the appropriation and supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1959 have, we are glad to say, again put the Division on the road to full effectiveness.

The \$21,475,000 budget request for the Meat Inspection Division for fiscal year 1960, although hardly generous, does promise to continue to permit the hiring of new and needed inspectors. We, frankly, would have liked to have seen a somewhat higher request, but we hope this amount will prove adequate.

We, therefore, urge Congress to approve the budget request of \$21,475,000 for the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture. We believe it is the minimum amount necessary to permit the Division to keep an adequate staff of inspectors,

who must provide the consumer protection so necessary to our Nation's health.

Thomas J. Lloyd and Patrick E. Gorman, president and secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO); Radford Hall, executive secretary, American National Cattlemen's Association; Homer R. Davison, president, American Meat Institute; A. Z. Baker, president, American Stock Yards Association; James G. Patton, president, The National Farmers Union; Herschel D. Newsom, master, The National Grange; John A. Killick, executive secretary, National Independent Meat Packers Association; Dr. R. A. Hendershott, secretary, U.S. Livestock Sanitary Association; E. F. Forbes, president and general manager, Western States Meat Packers Association.

Lake Michigan Water Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the attorney general of Wisconsin, Mr. John Reynolds, appeared before the House Committee on Public Works last Tuesday. His persuasive and thoughtful presentation deserves the consideration of the entire Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his statement before the committee be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. REYNOLDS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 17, 1959

Gentlemen, my name is John W. Reynolds and I am the attorney general of the State of Wisconsin. I would like to thank you for the opportunity you have given me to appear before you.

Speaking on behalf of the State of Wisconsin, the city of Milwaukee, and the Milwaukee Port Authority, I urge this committee to take no action on H.R. 1 at this time for the following reasons:

1. The matter of the diversion of Lake Michigan water is presently the subject of litigation. In December 1958, Wisconsin, joining with the other Great Lakes States, which were parties to the original action in the case of *Wisconsin et al. v. Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District*, filed its application with the Supreme Court of the United States to reopen the decree of April 21, 1930. By that decree the U.S. Supreme Court retained jurisdiction over the subject matter of H.R. 1. Wisconsin's present application to the U.S. Supreme Court is for the purpose of requesting the Court to appoint a special master to take evidence to determine whether Chicago should be compelled to follow the practice of all other Great Lakes cities and return its unused domestic pumpage, after it had passed through its waterworks and purification system, to the Great Lakes Basin.

The State of Illinois and the sanitary district filed their brief in opposition to our application in January of this year.

In connection with this litigation, I would like to point out that the Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. J. Lee Rankin, is taking an active interest in this case. He has notified the U.S. Supreme Court that in order to protect the sovereign interests of the United States he will file a brief in March of this year.

In addition, the Solicitor General has called a conference on March 2, 1959, of all the Great Lakes States concerned, including Illinois. I cannot predict what results may be reached at that conference, but I respectfully and specifically request that the records of this committee be kept open to receive a report of that conference.

2. The second reason that we request this committee to take no action on H.R. 1 at this time is that on February 25 and 26 of this year there is going to be held in Detroit a meeting of Senators, Governors, attorneys general, and mayors of Wisconsin, Ohio, New York, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota, and mayors of several Canadian cities, to plan unified opposition to bills and suits on the diversion of water from the Great Lakes. I also request that the records of this committee be kept open to receive a report of that conference.

On behalf of the State of Wisconsin I am here to reiterate our strenuous objection to the never-ending effort of the Chicago Sanitary District to take the waters of Lake Michigan. No other city on the Great Lakes in the United States or Canada has ever sought or asserted the right to deplete the waters of the Great Lakes Basin.

Wisconsin has been fighting for 30 years to preserve and protect the water of Lake Michigan. As a matter of fact, it was my father as attorney general of Wisconsin who got the original decree from the Supreme Court of the United States in 1930, which established the present limit on the amount of water that Chicago may take from Lake Michigan.

Since our time as well as the subject matter at this hearing is strictly limited, I would like permission to incorporate in the record at this point two statements of the attorney general of Wisconsin. The first was made to this subcommittee in March 1956 and recorded in the report of this committee on the hearings of H.R. 2, March 26 and 27, 1956, pages 66-68. The second is reported in the hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate on H.R. 2 and S. 1123, held July 28-29 and August 7, 1958, pages 273-275.

These two statements outline the position of Wisconsin. First, that it is a scientific fact that the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second of Lake Michigan water will have no effect upon pollution in the Chicago drainage canal or the Illinois River Waterway; and second, that an attempt by the U.S. Congress unilaterally to divert this water from an international system of lakes and rivers is violative of international law and would create a dangerous precedent in our dealings and negotiations with Canada over the mutually beneficial use of international waters.

The present bill proposed on behalf of the Chicago Sanitary District, H.R. 1, is considerably watered down from previous bills which have been before the House of Representatives and before your committee. It makes the comparatively modest proposals to increase the diversion of water by the city of Chicago by 1,000 cubic feet per second for 1 year. The alleged purpose of the bill is to permit the U.S. Public Health Service to determine the effect of such increased diversion upon Chicago's woefully mismanaged sewage disposal problem and the problem of pollution in the Chicago drainage canal and the Illinois River Waterway.

Our primary objection to this bill is twofold. First, such a bill would establish a

highly undesirable precedent. Our second objection is that according to the best scientific and professional advice that we can obtain, we know in advance it is not going to do the city of Chicago or the Chicago Sanitary District one iota of good. The available evidence which we have already accumulated indicates that the mismanagement by the city of Chicago of its sewage disposal facilities has now resulted in a pollution problem so great that nothing less than the diversion of 10,000 cubic feet of water per second would do any good.

Surely, gentlemen, if you propose to recommend this bill for passage you should insist that the proponents of this bill present the testimony of at least one competent and qualified sanitary engineer that there is at least a possibility that the proposed diversion will have a beneficial effect upon the pollution caused by the city of Chicago in its drainage canal and the Illinois River Waterway. According to the best advice I can obtain, the proponents cannot obtain such testimony.

This bill would interfere with a difficult and perilous international question. To increase Chicago's take of Lake Michigan water could seriously jeopardize the negotiations which I understand our State Department is now conducting with Canada concerning our mutual rights and obligations in the use of all international waters including, particularly, the Columbia River.

In this connection I would respectfully call your attention to two publications. The first is entitled, "Document on the Use and Control of Waters of Interstate and International Streams," which is a compilation of compacts, treaties, and adjudications affecting the use of interstate and international waters, published by the U.S. Department of the Interior in 1956. The second is the proceedings of the 10th conference of the Inter-American Bar Association held in 1957 at Buenos Aires, Argentina, entitled, "Principles of Law Governing the Uses of International Rivers and Lakes," published in Washington, D.C., in April 1958.

It is my considered opinion that these two publications establish beyond all reasonable doubt the principle that no state or nation can act unilaterally on a matter affecting an international water in a manner which will adversely affect some other state or some other nation.

The distinguished authority on international law, Lauterpacht, who is now a judge of the International Court of Justice, has stated that "the duty of the state not to interfere with the flow of a river to the detriment of other riparian states" is "one of those general principles of law recognized by civilized states which the Permanent Court is bound to apply to virtue of article 38 of its statute." (1 Oppenheim, "International Law," pp. 346-347, 8th ed. Lauterpacht, 1955.)

The so-called Harmon doctrine, under which former U.S. Attorney General Harmon asserted in 1895 that the United States could deal with the waters of the Rio Grande without regard to the rights of the United Mexican States, has never been followed. In fact, by the Rio Grande Convention negotiated in 1906 by the President of the United States of America and the President of the United States of Mexico, the United States agreed to insure delivery to Mexico of 60,000 acre-feet of water annually. And in our relations with Canada we have entered into four separate treaties: the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909; the Lake of the Woods Convention of 1925; the Rainy Lake Convention of 1938; and the Niagara River Water Diversion Treaty of 1950.

If we are to protect and preserve our amicable relations with Canada, I most respectfully suggest to you that no diversions of water whatsoever from the Great Lakes Basin should be authorized or permitted in

the absence of a specific convention or agreement ratified by our own U.S. Government and the Government of Canada.

In conclusion, it is Wisconsin's position that to permit an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second so that the U.S. Public Health Service can make a so-called study of the effect of a diversion is totally unjustified for the following reasons:

1. Such a study would be fruitless and a waste of the time of an important Federal agency as well as the taxpayers' money.

2. Such unilateral additional diversion would violate international law and seriously affect our relations with Canada.

3. Such additional diversion would create a disastrous precedent, and if followed by other Great Lakes cities would have the effect of seriously diminishing the value of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

4. Such additional diversion would interfere with the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I would like to remind the committee of our sincere belief that the riparian rights of the Great Lakes States of the United States are subject to the jurisdiction only of the U.S. Supreme Court under the decree of April 21, 1930, and of any modification that the Court may make thereof upon proper application. As I have stated, there is litigation presently pending affecting those rights, and I most respectfully urge upon the Congress that it should do nothing which would prejudice the outcome of that litigation.

Gentlemen, I would like to again thank you for your consideration.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal discussed the telling points made by Attorney General Reynolds in a recent lead editorial. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial summarizing and emphasizing the case made by the attorney general be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

ATTORNEY GENERAL ABLY PUTS THE DIVERSION BILL IN FOCUS

Wisconsin's Attorney General Reynolds has ably restated, to the House Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors in Washington, the considerations of national public policy that argue against any act of legislation letting Chicago drain off Great Lakes water and not return it.

The amount of Chicago's diversion is not without pertinence in the discussion—some is now sanctioned by rule of the U.S. Supreme Court, and two-thirds more is sought from Congress—but the mere question of how much is not at all the central one that Members ought to weigh in voting on the current bill or any others.

Reynolds instead emphasized three other issues. One is the dangerous precedent. Once Congress started granting water diversion privileges, other sections than Chicago would have the same entitlement and quite likely the same temptation. Cumulative diversions could indeed imperil other users of the same water sources, and be seriously crippling to navigation and water power.

Another point of national import is the indiscretion and even, says Reynolds, illegality of one nation's acting to divert international waters without consulting and agreeing with others affected. Senator Douglas, of Illinois, cannot make stick his claim, heard in Milwaukee the other night, that Lake Michigan is not Canada's concern. For all water purposes it is one body with Lake Huron, and any effect on its levels is felt all the way to tidewater below Montreal.

Canada, though now again going on record against the Chicago diversion, has been

blowing hot and cold on it. Passage of the bill might give her just the needed excuse to do some diverting of her own without our consent, where the great Columbia and Yukon Rivers rise in Canada and flow into the States, for instance. Thus the Chicago bill, far from having only local import, may prove an international trap.

Thirdly, Reynolds reminded that the subject matter is within the purview of the Supreme Court. When it placed the present limit on Chicago diversion 29 years ago, it retained jurisdiction, and is even now being asked by Wisconsin and other aggrieved States to consider whether the diversion should be halted altogether. Thus the bill shifts a judicial question into the political arena.

And that arena is an especially poor place to make this sort of decision because most Members of Congress, from their own regional viewpoints, don't much care. It's the kind of bill they tend to vote for if they don't happen to feel strongly opposed, or by way of scratching the back of some friend who does care. And the Illinoisans are in key position to line up that kind of support, which is not on the merits.

If Reynolds can direct more congressional attention to the national concern for precedent, propriety and foreign relations, he will well serve the antidiversion cause.

The Farm Folly of a \$9 Billion Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, by July of 1959 the U.S. Government will have over \$9 billion of surplus farm commodities in Government inventories and under loan. It will cost the Treasury of the Government of the United States \$1 billion a year—that is \$1,000 million a year, Mr. President—merely to provide storage for the accumulated farm surpluses.

On January 30, 1959, in San Francisco, the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, made a speech on farm problems generally and on the problems of the sugar beet industry in particular. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FARM FOLLY OF A \$9 BILLION SURPLUS

I am pleased to participate in this meeting sponsored by the California Beet Growers Association. I count it an added privilege to find here also so many representatives from other sugar beet areas throughout the country. It is always a joy to visit this historic and beautiful city in the Nation's leading agricultural State.

The development of the beet sugar industry is one of the most fascinating chapters in the history of American agriculture. It is a story of vision, initiative, struggle, of repeated failures and final success. It is a story of the triumph of perseverance by free men in a free economy in a free land. Perhaps it will not be amiss for us to refresh our minds on a point or two of that story.

Early in the history of this Nation, men of vision watched with keen interest the

development of the beet sugar industry in Europe. The United States was then almost completely dependent on foreign countries for sugar. These men saw that if we could produce beet sugar here in the United States, great advantages would result. A new industry would bring new life to the economy. A new and profitable crop would be added to our agriculture.

Back in the 1830's the first recorded attempts were made to establish a beet sugar industry in this country. The Beet Sugar Society of Philadelphia in 1836 obtained 600 pounds of beet seed from Europe. But the seed was planted too late and no sugar resulted. Then about 1839 a factory at Northampton, Mass., succeeded in producing some 1,300 pounds of beet sugar. After operating for about 2 years, this factory closed its doors.

In the next few decades no less than 13 beet sugar factories were established in widely separated localities from Maine to California. One after the other, they all failed.

One of these attempts that is most interesting to me concerns the efforts of the Mormon pioneers to establish a beet sugar industry in Utah. In these early days, more than a century ago, the people of Utah, including some of my progenitors, were buying sugar for \$1 a pound—at a time when a dollar went a great deal further than it does today.

After a study of beet sugar operations in France, Mormon Church officials organized the Deseret Manufacturing Co., intending to establish the industry in Utah. The company bought a complete sugar manufacturing outfit and shipped it from France to New Orleans. It arrived in April 1852. They brought the plant up the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers to Fort Leavenworth. There they loaded it into covered wagons. In November 1852, after many difficulties and hardships, the equipment reached its destination.

I wish I could say that this tremendous effort immediately resulted in the birth of a new industry in Utah and in the Nation. Unfortunately, history records that the promoters lacked sufficient technical knowledge and the factory produced only inedible syrup. Not until over a quarter of a century later was the first beet sugar industry in the United States established on a truly successful basis.

That was in 1879 at Alvarado, Calif. Without taking anything away from California, however, I am happy to say that the people in Utah also persisted and eventually developed a flourishing sugar-beet industry.

In the past 80 years, the sugar-beet industry has had a steady growth. Some 64 factories now produce over 2 million tons of refined sugar annually.

California, the home of the first successful sugar-beet factory, is now also the Nation's largest producer of sugar beets.

Last year, despite a poor planting season and sharply reduced yields, California produced about one-fourth of all the sugar beets grown in the United States.

The sugar-beet industry is in a solid position. Production last year was about 15.3 million tons. This was about 30 percent above the 10-year average and only slightly below the all-time high of 1957. Yields per acre in the past 2 years have been higher than ever before. But you are not burdened with surpluses as producers of some other crops are. The industry has been doing a good job of expanding production and markets simultaneously.

Your operations have been realistic—geared to market conditions.

The Sugar Act is realistic legislation. It has brought benefits to sugar-beet and sugarcane farmers, to consumers of sugar, to the sugar industry as a whole, and to our foreign suppliers.

But the sugar program cannot be used as a model for farm crops in general, particularly those produced in quantities beyond our domestic needs. We import much of the sugar we consume. Therefore surpluses of sugar, when they develop, tend to occur abroad rather than in this country. We have helped alleviate the problem of surplus abroad. The U.S. Government and the domestic sugar industry have participated in the development of an international sugar agreement designed to stabilize the world market. I know it is due in no small part to the cooperation of many of you that no major difficulties have been encountered in adjusting our domestic production so as to prevent the piling up of surpluses here at home.

By keeping prices at reasonable levels the danger of pricing sugar out of the market has been avoided.

The program has permitted and encouraged more efficient production. Here in California from 1924 to 1957 yields per acre rose 127 percent. In our country's beet area the acreage per farm has doubled since the prewar period. This has permitted the use of labor-saving machines which have simplified production and harvesting problems and have reduced costs. During the past decade the man-hours required to produce a ton of beets have declined by at least one-third.

But, I repeat, the sugar program cannot be used as a model for wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco programs, except in this respect, the sugar program has been realistic.

The programs for the six legislatively designated basic crops have not been realistic. The sugar program has been adapted to the particular circumstances surrounding U.S. production of sugar. The same cannot be said of the past programs for the basic crops.

Unrealistic programs have priced the basics out of some of their oldtime markets. Competitors at home and abroad used the artificial price umbrella to expand their production and move in. Surpluses piled up at home, followed by more and more cutbacks in acreage.

Last year we harvested 16 percent more acres of sugar beets than the 10-year average from 1947 to 1956. But last year, compared with the average for the same 10 years, we harvested 10 percent fewer acres of corn, 16 percent fewer acres of wheat, 25 percent fewer acres of peanuts, 26 percent fewer acres of rice, 34 percent fewer acres of tobacco, and 46 percent fewer acres of cotton.

Now I know there will be some who will quickly point out that comparing an import crop with export crops is not very meaningful. I don't want to read too much into this comparison. All I want to do is to show that where we have realistic programs—programs adapted to market conditions—programs that make sense—we can have an expanding agriculture. Where we have programs that are outmoded, unrealistic, not adapted to market conditions, we have a contracting agriculture.

As you know, the Administration has recommended that the Sugar Act be extended. Senator ELLENDER has introduced a bill to make the Sugar Act permanent. This measure is cosponsored by many Senators from Western States, including Senators KUCHEL and ENGLE of this State. These proposals illustrate the importance of this legislation, not only to farmers but to all our people.

It seems paradoxical, but the sugar program's popularity may constitute its greatest weakness. When the pressures to increase production are as great as they are in the case of domestic sugar beets and mainland cane, they demand attention.

The Department of Agriculture is charged with administering the act in a manner that will protect the welfare of consumers as well as the welfare of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry—and that includes the growers.

I trust that all branches of our domestic sugar industry will collaborate with the Department in dealing with the problems that appear to face us in administering the sugar program. The success of the past has been due in large part to the fact that the sugar industry has borne a major share of responsibility for the administration of this program. Let us continue to face facts honestly and courageously. I feel confident that if we join in support of fearless and essential administrative actions, the sugar program will continue to be an effective force, bringing benefits to producers, the domestic sugar industry, and consumers.

Your future progress, like that of all agriculture, depends on how successfully you lower costs, improve quality, and expand markets.

As one who grew up in sugar-beet country, who was thinning beets with a short-handled hoe at the age of 7, I'm delighted to see the advances that are being made.

With your great record of achievement, you can look ahead to still further progress—to improved varieties, better control of disease, and such developments as the monogerm seed to bring greater efficiency and more profits in the future. The productive new varieties you are now growing have done well in holding down our old enemy, curly top. You've learned a lot about using fertilizer to increase yields. The sugar beet has been tailored to fit the machine, and machines have been built to take over most of the tasks in the fields.

But new problems are always arising. The new varieties don't stand up to virus yellows. And we have not yet achieved a quality in machine harvest that is as good as the best when beets are harvested by hand.

The search for the right answers is being carried forward on many fronts. Some of the solutions will come out of production research; others will grow out of research on processing problems. Still other advances will come from the basic research of our new pioneering laboratories.

With all these efforts we are building for the future—for greater efficiency in production and marketing, which means lower costs, for higher quality, and for new markets at home and abroad.

This is the road to a truly prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

Immediately before us, however, is the task of completing a long overdue revision of the farm price support programs as applied to the basic crops.

The President yesterday sent a special agricultural message to Congress. This was his fourth agricultural message. Again he called for changes in a farm program that has become outmoded, costly, discriminatory, and harmful.

We still have only a small part of the program the Administration asked for and that farmers need. We have had to fight every inch of the way to get more flexibility into the pricing mechanism. On some commodities—tobacco for example—nothing has been done. On others we got a little flexibility but not enough. That is why it has been necessary to devise and maintain such emergency programs as the soil bank and Public Law 480.

Our program really has never been put into operation. It has never been given a real try.

That is why the surpluses have built up. That is why a few farm commodities still have serious problems.

Yet our technicians estimate that, even with the little legislation we have been able to get on price supports, we have expanded markets and cut costs to taxpayers by a billion dollars in 1958. And farmers are taxpayers, too.

My fellow citizens, the situation is critical.

The present price support, acreage control program as it applies to wheat is bankrupt. Tobacco and peanuts are also in trouble.

Wheat is our No. 1 problem. Harvested wheat acreage has been cut by over 20 million acres since 1949—yet, under artificial pricing, combined with good weather, we now have by far the greatest wheat surplus in all history.

By July 1960 the carryover of wheat will be about 1½ billion bushels—enough to supply our normal domestic requirements for 2½ years. We will have \$3½ billion tied up in wheat alone. We cannot continue to produce wheat for government by government-provided incentives.

We have spread the Wheat Belt all over America. Wheat acreage has increased in areas of high cost, while acres have been cut back in areas where production is most efficient. This doesn't make sense.

The cost of farm price and income stabilization programs have risen dangerously high.

By next July we will have over \$9 billion of surplus farm commodities in Government inventory and under loan. The cost of storage and interest on these Government stocks will be \$1 billion a year. This is fantastic and indefensible.

The program is unfair and discriminatory.

Farmers produce commercially about 250 farm crops. Only a very few are price supported. And 85 percent of our Federal inventory of farm commodities consists of just three crops—wheat, cotton, and corn.

Less than one-third of our farms account for by far the greater part of our price support outlays.

About one-fourth of the cotton farms have three-fourths of the cotton acreage allotments.

Two-fifths of the farms with wheat allotments have 90 percent of the allotted acres.

Thus, relatively small numbers of farms—usually those with the highest income—account for practically all of the Government price support outlays.

Finally, the old program is harmful not only to producers of wheat, tobacco, and peanuts—but harmful to agriculture as a whole.

It has caused distortions throughout our agricultural economy.

It has caused many people to regard farm programs with suspicion and resentment.

It has depressed farm income.

It has wasted farm resources.

It has placed a ceiling on farm opportunity.

It has enmeshed farmers in a maze of Government controls.

The President again recommended to the Congress further forthright changes in our farm price supports. He urged that price supports no longer be related to a standard 45 years old, but to a percentage of the average market price during the previous 3 years.

If the Congress still prefers to relate price supports to outmoded standards, the President urged that discretion be provided for establishing the level in accordance with guidelines fixed by law. This is now the case for all commodities except the few for which supports are mandatory.

The alternatives before us are clear. Take wheat. Either we must clamp down with more rigorous controls on wheat producers than we have ever had before—more controls that Congress has ever been willing to impose—or we must move toward market expansion and greater freedom to produce and compete.

The controls we have don't control. Wheat allotments have been cut. But wheat yields have nearly doubled in about 20 years. And last year's crop was the biggest ever.

Moreover, the controls provided by earlier Congresses have been watered down by later

Congresses. The allotments used to be based on planted acres—now they are based on harvested acres. The minimum national allotment for wheat is 55 million acres, required by law. But if we applied the formula in the old 1938 law, still in effect, to wheat in 1959—please note this—the national allotment would be zero acres—no wheat production at all.

A far better approach, I believe, would be to provide wheatgrowers with a program that moves toward freedom to produce and compete for markets.

When such a program became fully effective, it would eliminate all acreage allotment and marketing quotas for wheat.

It would relate price supports for wheat to realistic market conditions.

Preferred quality wheat would then sell in the markets at premiums above support.

With such a program, wheat could really compete on its own merits. Better land use would result. High-hazard land would go into pasture and hay.

Other conservation measures would be adopted by farmers.

Farmers could more effectively manage their farms and their crop rotations.

There would be an adjustment of acreage between such competing crops as corn, grain sorghums, and soybeans.

Changes are needed for tobacco and peanuts also. The present laws require price supports at continually rising levels. As prices of U.S. tobacco increase, foreign buyers change their blends and turn to other sources of supply. Legislation is needed to permit adjustments in support levels.

For peanuts, too, the law should be changed so that growers can expand their markets.

The Agricultural Act of 1958 was a step toward more realistic programs for producers of corn, cotton, and rice. Now we need prompt and effective action in behalf of producers of wheat, tobacco, and peanuts.

This is not only the wheat, tobacco, and peanut producers' battle for realistic farm programs. This is your battle—the battle of everyone in every phase of agriculture.

Our present costly farm programs contribute to unbalancing the budget. That is of utmost concern to every citizen. No nation can go on indefinitely living beyond its income.

The President last week submitted a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year—a budget that "will help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes."

As the President said in his Economic Report: "Our objective must be to establish a firm foundation for extending economic growth with stable prices into the months and years ahead. This will not come about automatically An indispensable condition for achieving vigorous and continuing economic growth is firm confidence that the value of the dollar will be reasonably stable in the years ahead."

This is of vital importance to all of us. During periods of economic expansion, the demand for sugar increases. Your prosperity, like that of our agriculture in general, depends on the soundness of the American economy.

We must keep our economy strong. Yes; we must keep America strong—strong economically, strong socially, but, above all, spiritually strong—so that our way of life may endure. This is your challenge and mine—a challenge to every American, no matter who or what he may be. "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are ready to guard and defend it." (Daniel Webster.)

Feeding the World's Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE S. MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring efforts in the world today is the work of religious institutions that are ministering to the needs of starving people in all parts of the globe. Churches and other voluntary groups have been responsible for the distribution of vast quantities of food made available to them for overseas use under title III of the Public Law 480 program. Under this program \$1 given through the church world relief organizations provides approximately \$28 worth of surplus Government-held farm commodities for distribution to hungry men, women, and children in foreign countries. What better method could be devised to convert our farm surplus into foreign policy assets and more important to apply the ancient spiritual injunctions of our faith?

This is the thought behind an article authored by the Reverend Richard Ginder which appeared in the March 1, 1959, issue of Our Sunday Visitor, which follows:

HARDEST FACT OF LIFE

(By Rev. Richard Ginder)

In talking with our missionaries at work in the field, one learns that perhaps the hardest fact in their life is having people of all ages starve to death before their very eyes. They want to help, they spread their resources as thin as they can, and still they can reach only a pitifully small minority of the hungry.

When we read these things at home in the snug security of our armchair, they are only vague abstractions. But to the missionary they are tragically vivid. He is haunted, for instance, by the great sunken eyes of that big-bellied child, to listless now even to extend an open palm. He noticed the child this morning on the way to the post office.

"Should I help that particular boy?" he thought. "But why him, when I passed at least 17 like him in the same short walk?"

Reported in the United States, the situation can only be summarized in statistics, and statistics are impersonal. But, like the missionary doing His work, God has no use for statistics. He sees only individuals. He does not think to Himself: "There are five hungry children in that Chinese family." His thought is, rather—"John and Charles and Peter, Helen and Mary Wu are hungry, and little Mary is likely to die if she doesn't soon get some milk."

To paraphrase Bishop Sheen in one of his recent newspaper columns, "The feeding of one hungry mortal in the name of Jesus Christ is a greater thing than the launching of the sputnik."

The bishops' relief collection will be taken up in your parish next Sunday. Every dollar you give will buy \$28 worth of milk, rice, and other food for the hungry. This is possible through our U.S. surplus-food program. Your dollar just about pays the freight on \$27 worth of supplies given to us by the Government. If you donate \$5, you will be

shipping \$140 worth of food and supplies to Hong Kong, Formosa, Macao, to Korea, Vietnam, India, Africa—wherever, God's children are hungry.

Think of how many children you could have to dinner for \$28. Think of yourself walking along a crowded street, let us say, in Hong Kong and inviting the children to follow you. Soon you are like the Pied Piper. You have 35 or 40 children romping around your knees. By now you are at St. Joseph's Mission.

"Sister," you say, "here is some money. Get us some food and we'll eat"—and you hand her the \$28. In a few minutes you are watching your little guests drinking their milk and enjoying what may well be the first square meal of their lives.

Those children will always be grateful to you—and so will the good God. And on judgment day, maybe things will be going badly for you, when suddenly a chorus of treble voices will ring out in your defense: "We were thirsty and he gave us to drink. We were hungry and he gave us to eat."

Then God will say: "Come, blessed of my Father, and enjoy the kingdom prepared for you. Inasmuch as you have done it to one of these, my least brethren, you have done it unto me."

Want to make that dream come true? Give a dollar, just one dollar—but why stop there? Give as much as you can possibly afford next Sunday to the bishops' relief collection. Remember: whatever you give will be multiplied by 28 here on earth, and by 10,000 up above.

Unbalanced Budgets and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the people of the Nation will not continue to tolerate an unbalanced budget and the ensuing inflation indefinitely. Able editors like Howard Cooper, of the fast-growing Beaufort (S.C.) Gazette are busy informing their readers in simple terms what inflation is doing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record one of the Gazette's February 19 editorials, entitled "Enough Is Enough."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

Have you had enough?

Have you had enough of the high taxes, deficit spending, and galloping inflation that are incinerating your money and threatening your Nation with disaster in a worldwide cold war?

T. Coleman Andrews, former U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue who once had the job of trying to collect your taxes as fast as the Government could spend them, apparently has had enough.

He declared recently in a publication for the Economic Research Associates as follows:

"Inflation must and can be stopped. It cannot be stopped by more inflation. It can be stopped only by removing the causes. There are several causes, but the primary one is wasteful spending. Reprehensible on moral grounds, it is equally bad because it gives the Government too much choice, and leaves the people too little choice, as to how their own income will be spent.

"Tax reduction is urgently needed. But tax reduction without equivalent expenditure reduction would invite resumption of deficit spending and intensify the forces that are driving prices up and thus make the already bad situation worse.

"Any individual who gets into the habit of overspending his income has no choice but to balance his budget or suffer the shame of bankruptcy. It is the same with nations because a nation is but organized people. Its finances come only from its people. It cannot afford anything its people can't, and it cannot violate the rules of thrift and provident living without suffering the consequences that people do for the same offense."

Of course, those are opinions, but here are some of the facts on which those opinions are based:

In 1939, the unmarried recipient of an income of \$2,000 had left after taxes \$1,975. A person with that same income in 1957 had income after taxes worth only \$863, because taxes had increased by \$215 and inflation had taken \$897—the price of a new car in 1939.

In 1957 a single person would have had to have an income of \$4,806 to match a 1939 income of \$2,000. And here's why: The increase would have entailed additional taxes of \$755 and inflation had already taken away \$2,051—the price of a small bungalow in 1939.

The way things are going now (and who's trying to stop it?), in 1975 a single man will have to have an income of \$10,538 to match in buying power a 1939 income of \$2,000. Are you sure you have had enough?

Eyes on the ABA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York News of February 18:

EYES ON THE ABA

The House Committee on Un-American Activities this week released a report entitled "Communist Legal Subversion," detailing activities of a small knot of Red lawyers who act as an "elite corps" to push their cause in U.S. courts.

Eight of these characters operate in New York, including John J. Abt, Nathan Witt, and Harry Sacher.

All Commy lawyers, remarked the committee, should be disbarred. It is foolish and dangerous to let persons dedicated to our Government's violent overthrow act as officers of this country's courts.

HOW ABOUT THAT 1958 DOCUMENT?

Ross L. Malone, new American Bar Association president, welcomed the committee's report with loud cheers. Mr. Malone added that he was sending copies to all State bar associations for appropriate action.

We hope he gets it—though we wouldn't bet on it in the case of New York City, where local bar associations have long been extremely tender about traitors in their ranks.

We also hope Mr. Malone will stand fast against what looks like a conspiracy to force the ABA to disavow the smashing, slashing 1958 report of its special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives.

This document, drawn up under the direction of Peter Campbell Brown, astutely

analyzed Red methods in the United States, and summed up the worst 204 of the Earl Warren Supreme Court's pro-Communist decisions. Through some finagling not yet cleared up, it was partially sidetracked at the ABA's Los Angeles convention last year.

Nevertheless, it got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD via Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire; is now circulated at 10 cents a copy by America's Future, Inc., 542 Main Street, New Rochelle, N.Y.; and continues invaluable to anybody who wants to know how U.S. Reds operate.

The question now is: Will the ABA board of governors and house of delegates, at their Chicago meetings February 20-21 and 23-24, respectively, adopt as an official ABA paper some watered-down version of the 1958 report, making little if any reference to the Warren court, and throw out the 1958 document?

Keep an eye on these ABA meetings, folks. They'll give you an idea as to the courage or otherwise of the ABA's top brass.

Coal Files New Protest With United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an editorial entitled "Coal Files New Protest With United States," which appeared in the February 18, 1959, issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

COAL FILES NEW PROTEST WITH UNITED STATES

The National Coal Association called on the Washington Government last week to impose mandatory restrictions on the import of cheap foreign residual oil being dumped on our shores. The NCA formal protest called such imports a threat to the national security.

The coal association, speaking for producers of two-thirds of the Nation's commercially mined soft coal, filed the statement with the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization, which is conducting an investigation of the oil import situation—a situation which is costing the jobs of several thousand American miners.

The Office is expected to recommend a new program late this month to the Cabinet Committee on Oil Imports, which in turn will make recommendations to President Eisenhower.

The coal industry says President Eisenhower has both the power and the responsibility to clamp import controls on residual oil if they are imposed on crude petroleum. NCA points out that Congress has provided that when imports of any product are limited in the interest of national security, imports of its derivatives must also be limited.

Where is the logic in controlling importation of crude oil to prevent the impairment of national security, and, at the same time, allowing the unrestricted flow into the country of residual fuel oil? It is a fair question, this one which was posed to the mobilization office.

As NCA puts it:

"Uncontrolled imports of residual fuel oil contribute substantially to cutting coal production, capacity and distribution below the level required for national defense.

"The future threats of unlimited residual imports inhibit the growth of the coal industry to meet projected defense requirements."

"The concentrated use of imported residual oil by eastern seaboard industry makes this industry unusually vulnerable to interruption by enemy action."

It should be plain to everybody that electric utilities and industrial plants along our east coast have, through dependency upon cheap foreign oil, mostly from Venezuela, developed a "built-in vulnerability" which could be serious in wartime.

NCA points out that tankers carrying this oil to our east coast could be sunk or blockaded in wartime, depriving the heavily industrialized Atlantic seaboard of much of its energy supply.

This would create a demand for more than 150 million additional tons of soft coal, though foreign oil imports are so weakening the coal industry that there is great doubt that it could expand production to meet sudden new demands.

The number of operating coal mines has declined from 9,429 to 7,855 since 1950. Closed mines cannot be easily reopened—in fact, it would be as easy to open new mines in emergency, which takes 2 to 4 years.

Anybody but bureaucrats, it would seem, could see the folly of tearing down our country's coal mines and building up Poland, Venezuela, and West Germany and other fuel-producing areas which for some years past have been smiled upon by Washington.

It will be interesting to see if the new protests succeed where former protests have produced nothing but vague expressions of interest.

Forty-six Thousand Scholarships by United States Is Ridiculous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Bureau County Republican which emphasizes that private funds are, and will continue to do a good job of providing scholarships for qualified college students without the intervention and encroachment of the Federal Government: [From the Bureau County Republican, Princeton, Ill., Feb. 19, 1959]

OUR OPINION—FORTY-SIX THOUSAND SCHOLARSHIPS BY THE UNITED STATES IS RIDICULOUS

National total of 10,000 high school students, including Lorinne Lane of Princeton High School, have reached the finals of the 1958-59 national merit scholarship program, and 700 of this number will be named merit scholars.

Names of the 10,000 certificate of merit winners will be sent to colleges for consideration for thousands of other privately financed scholarships.

Interest by the National Merit Scholarship Corp. and numerous other private agencies in helping worthy students obtain recognition toward scholarships points up the silliness of the proposal this week by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, that the Federal Government finance 46,000 scholarships.

Over 478,000 students were tested in the national merit scholarship program. Those most worthy of help in obtaining higher education have been located by this testing

program. Private funds are doing a good job without intervention of the Federal Government.

For ordinary citizens to warn Congress against extravagant intrusion into the fields in which people are meeting their needs seems futile with the present composition of Congress, but it nevertheless is the responsibility of every citizen to hammer home at every opportunity the necessity for this Government to restrict its activities to those fields where Government funds are needed.

A Letter to Nikita Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge has been a unique and effective force in inculcating in Americans of all walks of life a real appreciation of the form of government under which our Nation has achieved its enviable position of world leadership, internal strength, record of spiritual and material growth, and solid foundation for the future.

The annual awards to individuals who speak up for freedom are an inspiration to a wide variety of citizens to inspire in their fellow countrymen greater devotion to our concepts of liberty.

Among this year's award winners is a man who wears the uniform of the Armed Forces of the United States, a citizen of California, Lt. Col. T. N. Greene, now on active duty with the Marine Corps at Quantico, Va. For his essay, entitled "A Letter to Nikita Khrushchev," he was cited as author of the most penetrating article on the subject, "My Part in Winning Friends for Freedom." He is winner of the top award of an encased George Washington Honor Medal and the principal prize for members of our Armed Forces.

Because of the inspirational character of Colonel Greene's entry, I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV,
The Kremlin,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV: Don't look now. There's someone behind you.

You say you will bury us. You say the peoples of the world yearn for change. You claim change will pull the rug out from under the world we know. And so, Mr. Khrushchev, your agents swarm like termites gnawing and boring in a thousand dark and rotting beams. You count too much on tearing down, on destruction, despair, and decay.

Revolution truly is loose in the world today. Change does come. Rotten beams are tumbling. But Mr. Khrushchev, this is a revolution begun in 1776 and clearly stamped "Made in U.S.A."

Do you think Americans fear a changing world? Listen, Mr. Khrushchev:

There was taxation without representation. We changed that.

Soldiers quartered in private homes. We changed that.

The cold hand of tyranny choked life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We changed that, too.

And we changed slavery, and child labor, and the 80-hour workweek, and poverty, and ignorance, and sickness.

We changed them by building up, by building a better world. That job's just begun.

Today our money and our skills work around the world, building economies with more jobs, more goods, more prosperity for all to share.

Our technicians share their secrets—how to grow more food on this plot of ground, how to stamp out that plague, how to teach, to learn, to progress.

And our arms, our might, and our sons help our friends patrol the beat, guarding the new world we build from wreckers, vandals, and firebugs.

More than 160 million apostles of freedom are agents of revolution on your terms. We stand for those inalienable rights with which each man is endowed by his Creator. Each American abroad—the serviceman, the technician, the tourist—carries subversion toward the tools of tyranny: the sudden knock on the door, the rifle butt, the concentration camp, the knout, and the enforced work quota. We'll change them. And we'll change the invitations to tyranny on which you count: hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance.

Tremble, Mr. Khrushchev, but you can't turn back the clock. We bring change—light and free air to the dark places on which you and your kind feed. Let your dupes froth and scream, "Yankee, go home." We won't go home.

Not until the world is on the march toward a better life for all.

You shall not herd the peoples of the world, dragging their chains, behind your bloody, red banners.

Even now, nation to nation and man to man we join hands in our living revolution to change the world and build a better tomorrow. We march proudly, heads high as befits freemen. Hear the fife and drum, as they have since 1776, pipe the music that strikes fear to tyrants—the march of freedom.

Yes, Mr. Khrushchev, there's someone behind you, and he's coming closer.

A YANKEE WHO WON'T

GO HOME.

Lt. Col. T. N. GREENE,
U.S. Marine Corps.

QUANTICO, VA.

Fifty Chambers of Commerce Protest Misrepresentations of U.S. Chamber of Commerce on TVA and Causes Change in Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the United States Chamber of Commerce during the past several months has published many misleading statements regarding the operations and programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Many of these were so remarkable in the misrepresentation of facts about the TVA that in view of many it has reflected on the integrity

of the U.S. chamber. More than 50 chambers of commerce in the Tennessee Valley area have protested these misrepresentations, and several southern chambers of commerce have resigned from the U.S. chamber. More recently, the U.S. chamber has modified its position as a result of these protests. This week the policy committee of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce held hearings on this subject. In this connection, Mr. George R. Dempster, former mayor of Knoxville, and Mr. Will C. Mickle, editor of the *Huntsville Times* of Huntsville, Ala., appeared before the above-mentioned policy committee on behalf of the more than 50 chambers of commerce in the Tennessee Valley. Following these hearings, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has announced that it has modified its position on the TVA.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to have reproduced in the Appendix of the *Record* the statement made by Mr. Dempster and Mr. Mickle, and the Associated Press report on the hearings and the chamber's decision to change its policy.

The statement and the AP report follow:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE POLICY COMMITTEE IN WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 17, 1959

(By George R. Dempster and Will C. Mickle for the Associated Tennessee Valley Chambers of Commerce)

We come before you today as members of the chamber of commerce. Specifically, we represent more than 50 chambers of the Tennessee Valley—members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which you represent—which have banded together as the Associated Tennessee Valley Chambers of Commerce to promote the valley region and to protect its interests wherever possible.

Today we ask you, as policymakers for the organization to which we all belong, to reconsider a statement of chamber policy which we believe detrimental to the valley and to the Nation.

We refer to the statement of policy contained in the U.S. Chamber publication, "TVA: What's Next?"

In its place we urge a new policy based on unbiased fact—not on misrepresentations and incomplete facts—a policy aimed at improving the welfare of all the Nation—not on improving the welfare of a select group of citizens or corporations.

It is not our purpose here to argue point by point the many misrepresentations that run through the publication, "TVA: What's Next?" To a sufficient extent that has already been done by TVA itself.

We presume you are familiar with the TVA's comments on the publication. However, in the event you are not, a copy of those comments is submitted with this statement.

We do want to protest the obvious bias, unfairness, and lack of objectivity of the publication. We regard it as an imposition on the public, to which it is presented as representing the well thought out, well grounded conclusions of a responsible business organization.

More specifically, we protest it as a disservice to the members of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. And we mean all members of the chamber, not simply those members located in the Tennessee Valley region which have had experience with TVA and have watched its work for a quarter of a century.

We submit that the publication is even more unfair to those members scattered

throughout the rest of the country who, having no direct experience or observation, have no way of judging its validity and must accept it at face value.

In fact, the character of the report, to our mind, is such that if the research staff of a private corporation were to submit such a report to its officials as a basis for reaching a sound decision, they would be promptly sent back to do the job over again. They would be asked to bring in all the pertinent facts, and not a selected variety; they would be asked to place the report in the proper context of public policy and practice; they would be asked to recommend progressive steps to achieve greater effectiveness, not a policy of retrogression which would sacrifice the gains that have been made in technology and administrative efficiency.

On all these scores, the publication is deficient. It treats TVA as an isolated phenomenon in the field of Federal resource development activities, falsely assuming that it is a special favor to a particular region. The fact is that this project is well within the traditional framework of national policy with respect to the development of natural resources and within the policies on the character of utilities as a public service. Counterparts of TVA's activities are carried on in other regions and river valleys across the Nation.

If there is one aspect which should be carefully weighed by a business association such as the chamber, it should be the effect of TVA activities on business and industry. Yet this publication ignores, if it does not positively exclude, virtually all the evidence that TVA has been a boon and a stimulus to private enterprise, not only in the Tennessee Valley but in other important areas as well.

The efficiency and economy of large, integrated power areas served by central stations with high capacity, economical, and efficient generating units and interconnecting transmission lines has been well established by experience. Such systems take advantage of improved technology. Yet this publication, in effect, proposes breaking up a large and efficient operating system, modern in every respect, into smaller, less economic and less efficient units. This is a proposal which no business man, in his own affairs, would countenance for an instant.

The objective inherent in the publication is the destruction of TVA. Indeed, "TVA: What's Next?" quotes approvingly from the earlier publication of the chamber's natural resources department, "The Continuing Cost of TVA," to this effect:

"The job is not to patch up TVA to make it acceptable, or even less objectionable. No corporate creation of Congress should be continued unless there is a clear, definable public interest to be served that cannot be served in any other way."

What is meant by "any other way"? By ignoring some of the other factors of public interest, electric service could of course be provided in the Tennessee Valley by other means than at present. However, today that power is provided by a system that is an integral part of a broader project producing multiple benefits. After a fashion, power could still be provided if, as apparently advocated by the natural resources department, this integrated system were broken down and the power system itself fragmented into smaller units.

It is difficult to see what public interest would be served by thus returning the Tennessee Valley region to outmoded, uneconomic practices that have been left behind, wherever possible, by the electric utility industry itself.

That this would endanger the national defense in a time of extreme tension—that it would put in question power supplies to the Atomic Energy Commission, Air Force research facilities, and missile and space re-

search installations, not to speak of basic electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries—is apparently of no concern to the authors of "TVA: What's Next?"

One of the most carefully ignored, or carefully suppressed, facts about TVA in this publication is that for the past 4 years more than half of all the TVA power output has been devoted to atomic energy, air research, and space and missile research of vital importance to the whole Nation.

This omission by no means is the end of the effort. The intent to destroy is revealed in the facility with which your natural resources department switches—indeed reverses itself—to suit its purposes.

To wit: For the past several years the Administration has recommended and the people of the Tennessee Valley have urged that the Congress pass enabling legislation to permit the TVA to issue bonds in order to finance generating and transmitting facilities which are desperately needed to assure ample and continuing power supplies for the region now served by TVA power.

This the chamber opposes. It has provided witnesses from the utility industry to testify against the proposals in congressional committees and has opposed it in public statements. "TVA: What's Next?" complains that through this proposal TVA "would be practically assured that it will always be the sole supplier of electricity in an 80,000-square-mile area." This proposition is advanced as unique, although public utilities generally—whether publicly or privately owned—are by customer, law, and regulation the sole suppliers of their service areas.

In 1954, however, the situation was different. No bond proposal was before the Congress. No organizations or people in the valley region were urging it. What was the position of the chamber, or of its Natural Resources Department, then? The view was expressed in the publication "The Continuing Cost of TVA," as follows:

"Most all municipally owned and operated electric plants are now financed in whole or part through the sale of revenue bonds—i.e., bonds backed only by the anticipated revenue of the municipal utility. Surely the TVA, which as far back as 1945 produced more kilowatt hours than any other power system in the United States and which in 1952 alone had a gross power revenue of \$95 million, could market its revenue bonds as easily as municipal plants can. And more positively: TVA power should be financed through the sale of revenue bonds."

We believe the conclusion to be drawn from these contradictory statements is inescapable. In 1954, the Natural Resources Department advocated financing TVA power through revenue bonds because it appeared that this would seriously embarrass, if it did not destroy, the TVA system. Today the TVA and the people of the Tennessee Valley are supporting revenue bonds as a sound and workable proposition which will enable the power system to go on meeting the electricity demands of the region efficiently and at reasonable rates.

Yet today, fearful that the valley region is right and that the proposition the national chamber itself advanced in 1954 is sound and workable, the chamber reverses itself and opposes it.

We believe it is time the chamber, as a responsible organization, put an end to this kind of patent chicanery.

The chamber puts itself in the position of advocating unbusinesslike procedures for TVA by elimination of the sole supplier clause from its contracts. What private utility would build generating capacity, transmission lines, and substations to serve a large wholesale customer and then fail to protect its investment by assuring that the facilities would be used to supply the cus-

tomer over a reasonable period of time? Common business sense dictates the answer. Aside from this, it must be remembered that the contracts are equitable and advantageous to both parties. What municipality, cooperative, or industry would sign a contract with a wholesale supplier of electricity, publicly or privately owned, without concrete assurance that its power supply would be continuously available over a reasonable term of years?

As similarly destructive measure, the natural resources department would turn over operation of the TVA dams to the Army engineers and split up other resource development functions among other Government departments. If this splintering and divisiveness could be shown to contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the resource development activities carried on in the Tennessee Valley as part of the national policy, then by all means it should be done.

But no case can be made for it; certainly the natural resources department has made no such case. On the contrary, the Tennessee is generally conceded to be the best-managed river in the country, yielding a balanced measure of benefits of all kinds—flood control, navigation, generation of power, municipal and industrial water supplies, malaria control, recreation, fish and wildlife development. One of the major reasons for this high degree of achievement is the fact that all these related operations and activities are under a unified administrative control. The proposal to emasculate an efficiently working system can only be regarded as destructive in purpose.

These are only a few of the ways in which the chamber, through the publications of its natural resources department, has placed itself on record with respect to TVA as advocating unsound and unbusinesslike policies and procedures.

We believe that it is time that the national chamber reassess its position on the TVA and, in the interest not only of an important region but of the Nation itself, assert itself on the side of progress.

[From the Huntsville (Ala.) Times]

CHAMBER GROUP BOWS ON TVA—COMMITTEE BACKS DOWN ON POLICY—VOTES TO DROP STAND AGAINST AGENCY IN NATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE STATEMENT—FULL MEMBERSHIP APPROVAL NEEDED

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Chamber of Commerce's policy committee yesterday acceded to a request from local chambers in the Tennessee Valley area and backtracked on its stand against the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The U.S. Chamber has long demanded that the Federal Government get rid of TVA's power facilities.

But the policy committee voted to eliminate any reference to the future of TVA power from the organization's policy statement.

The proposed change will go before the chamber's annual membership meeting in April for acceptance or rejection.

SPOKESMEN APPEAR

The action came one day after spokesmen for 50 valley chamber units appeared before the policy committee and voiced strong disapproval of the U.S. Chamber's stand on TVA.

The group called for a new policy "based on unbiased facts . . . not on misrepresentation and incomplete facts." It was particularly critical of a U.S. chamber publication called "TVA: What's Next?" referring to what it said was the "obvious bias, unfairness and lack of objectivity" of the booklet.

The chamber has been urging since the start of the TVA that the authority's power facilities be turned over to local or State organizations, either public or private, for

operation. This would have been done under a plan agreed upon by Congress and the valley States.

Under the proposed change, the chamber's policy statement no longer would say what it wants done with the TVA power facilities.

STILL OPPOSES CONTRACTS

But the policy committee reaffirmed its long-standing opposition to sole supplier TVA contracts, and issuance of revenue bonds by the authority.

Smith explained that under present contracts, purchasers of power from the TVA now must buy all their electricity from the authority. By eliminating this requirement, he said, power buyers could build their own plants for part of their power needs, or buy some of their requirements from other sources, such as private utilities.

A STEP IN RIGHT DIRECTION, MOST VALLEY OFFICIALS SAY

The national chamber of commerce policy committee's change brought a generally favorable reaction in the valley last night.

Most officials interviewed agreed with former Memphis Chamber of Commerce president J. T. Roach and a leader in the fight there that the decision was "a step in the right direction."

Some, however, felt that the U.S. chamber did not go far enough.

Here are some of the comments:

Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, chairman of the TVA board:

"I am delighted at the policy committee's action."

"The people who went up there to Washington did a fine job and are to be congratulated. I hope this means that from now on the chamber of commerce will take a broader view of the problem of developing an adequate power supply for the Nation."

George Dempster, former mayor of Knoxville and one of two spokesmen for the protesting Associated Tennessee Valley Chambers of Commerce, who appeared before the policy committee:

"It's better than we thought. We had about 45 minutes with them (the committee) and we roughed 'em up to the best of our ability. I asked them how many had ever been in the valley and only about half of them raised their hands."

"I told them: 'Gentlemen, you're not in any position to tell us what to do.'"

Public Policy, Rural Electrification, and the Farm Telephone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable achievements of the past quarter of a century is the extension of electricity and telephone service to the farms of America. No one can fully measure the benefits that have come to rural families in the form of electric lights, washing machines, refrigeration, telephones, and power equipment, all of which have lightened the labors and enriched the lives of farm families.

Both rural electrification and rural telephone service have been made possible largely through low-cost Federal loans to farmers' cooperatives. It is gratifying to know that this grassroots

experiment in rural democracy has actually returned a profit to the Government as cooperatives have honored their loans and paid them back ahead of schedule. Furthermore, the program has brought countless millions of dollars to the mainstreets of America, as farmers have purchased electrical equipment and appliances of all kinds.

Recently, I have been alarmed by Federal practices and proposals that jeopardize the continued growth and reasonable operation of the REA program. The proposal in the President's current budget message that REA interest rates be increased would, if actually applied, stifle rural electrification and telephone service.

The REA's for more than two decades have paid back their loans at the present 2-percent rate to the mutual benefit of both themselves and the American public.

Even if one recognizes that the administration has deliberately raised its own costs of borrowing money above the 2-percent level, it would be a wise public investment for the REA program to be conducted as in the past. Vast Federal outlays were made to build the Nation's railway system and other needed services. Why not a small investment in the blessings of rural electricity? Or better still, why not a rollback of interest rates so that the Government can once again borrow its needed funds at a reasonable level?

In a recent column, Sylvia Porter, the financial analyst, points out that during World War II, military spending sent our national debt to \$280 billion. The interest charge on that debt was \$4.7 billion. "Today, the debt is about the same, \$283 billion," writes Miss Porter. "Yet, the interest payment is much higher, up to \$8 billion. This has been no accidental swelling in interest payments," she writes. "Instead, it has been the result of deliberate policies adopted at the higher policymaking levels in Washington."

I feel sure that many of my colleagues believe as I do that we must fight any disruption of the REA program that would certainly be caused by jumping interest rates on the rural electric association loans.

Recently, I received from Mr. Lawrence Stoley, Highmore, S. Dak., the secretary of the South Dakota Rural Telephone Association, a copy of the resolutions passed by that distinguished association at its annual meeting. I have also been honored recently with an invitation to address the annual meeting of the National Telephone Cooperative Association in Washington.

Believing that they will be of interest to my colleagues, I include a copy of the South Dakota resolutions, together with the text of my remarks to the national association:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE S. McGOVERN TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 7, 1959

I feel honored to appear before the National Telephone Cooperative Association. Since I have lived most of my life in the agricultural heartland of America, your work has long been of keen interest to me.

I have enjoyed my associations with your colleagues in South Dakota and the able staff representing your interests here in Washington. You have made progress in spite of heavy odds. I admire your spirit and determination. You have my support and that of many of my colleagues as you continue your efforts to build a healthy and prosperous rural America.

Never before has American agriculture been faced with so clear a worldwide challenge. We are the possessors of a mighty weapon—agricultural abundance in a hungry world. I use the word "weapon" in referring to the only kind of war the American people want to fight, the war against poverty and hunger and disease. That is why I have sponsored in the Congress a "Food for Peace Resolution," which calls upon our Government to use our farm surplus as a tool for freedom and peace.

More than ever before, our Nation needs men of vision and courage of the type exemplified by the people comprising your organization. As we meet here today, our Nation is caught up in a titanic struggle for military and scientific supremacy. All the world and the space beyond has suddenly been turned into an enormous laboratory, with the launching of globe-circling satellites a commonplace occurrence.

As we concentrate more and more on scientific achievement, I believe a word of caution is in order. Just as we have learned that man cannot live by bread alone, so we should not forget that a nation cannot live by science alone. Our concentration on the secrets of outer space must not replace our concern over the welfare of our fellow human beings. Our world needs more than ever the timeless message of the Good Samaritan.

Given that premise, I see no reason why a nation which has the brainpower to put a half dozen man-made satellites into orbit in outer space, send an atomic-powered submarine beneath the polar icecap, and break the speed of sound, cannot find a way to achieve for its rural people a standard of living equal to that of its city dwellers. Is it too much to ask that farmers receive an income comparable to urbanites and enjoy such blessings as the telephone?

Basically, I believe our farm problem is one of attitude—a misplacement of values. If, for instance, the present administration had as much concern for farmers as it does for the investment bankers, most of your problems would vanish. You would have two telephones in every farm home and an extra one in the barn.

Of course, farmers do not enjoy such favor. I do not want to be partisan today but it is a fact that when this administration took over the reigns of government, it set out to flex farm prices downward and interest rates upward. Since 1932 farmers have lost about \$18 billion in income. On the other hand, the money lenders have increased their incomes many billions of dollars.

Last week the President's budget message denounced the farm price support program and called for virtual abandonment of the parity concept for farm prices. He gave as his reason the excessive cost of the farm program—not taking note of the fact that much of this cost stems from Secretary Benson's mismanagement and mistaken views.

Significantly enough, the interest on the national debt in this fiscal year will cost us \$8 billion—highest in history and the second largest item on the President's budget. Only the defense outlay costs more. Yet the President said nothing about reducing the exorbitant interest rates we are paying the investment bankers holding Government notes. As a matter of fact he implied that higher interest rates were forthcoming. And you and I get socked more and more on all of the money we borrow. The budget message clearly calls for an increase in interest rates on REA loans—an increase which

would throttle rural electrification and rural telephone expansion.

I do want to discuss the rural telephone program now and offer some suggestions. But I felt it important to quickly sketch in a few broad background strokes.

The drive to bring modern communications to rural America began a half century ago. It progressed nicely through the years just following World War I when 38 percent of all farm homes were equipped with telephones.

Then came the 1930's, a steadily deteriorating farm economy, followed by the depression years. The rural telephone program languished for more than 2 decades. In 1945, there were actually fewer telephones on farms than there were in 1920. It was then that farmers, having climbed out the economic basement, began a concerted drive once again for an effective rural telephone program.

With the support of farmers the Nation over, and the help of friends in Congress, you and others like you pushed through a new Telephone Act in 1949. On October 28 of that year President Truman signed it into law.

It was a program of great promise and farmers' hopes were high. But, if I interpret correctly letters I have received from my constituents and official Government reports, the vast potentiality of the act has not been realized.

The information that has come to me leads me to conclude that the rural telephone program is in need of a booster charge.

A decade has gone by since the program was passed. Yet the percentage of farm homes with telephones has only increased from 38 percent to 56 percent.

Henry Ward Beecher once said: "Laws and institutions are constantly tending to gravitate. Like clocks, they must be occasionally cleaned and wound up, and set to true time."

Clearly, the rural telephone program has gravitated away from its original purpose. And just as clearly, it needs to be brought up to date in light of mid-20th century living conditions.

Actually, there doesn't seem to be any single roadblock holding the program back, but a combination of many.

For one thing, telephone co-ops have been plagued by restrictive rulings. Take, for instance, the equity fund requirement for co-operatives. This has been a tremendous hurdle. I know it has been modified somewhat because I was working with your representatives including Dick Dell at the time it was changed. We had been putting pressure on the people administering the program for a long time. But we all know the problem has not been eliminated. Further special considerations for co-operatives are necessary.

The fact that you must borrow your money from the Federal Government complicates matters, when you have an unfriendly administration in power. It is no secret that this administration is cool, if not hostile, toward your program.

Look at the President's budgetary recommendations for next year. Like those of the other years, his request for the rural telephone programs is too small to do the job. Fortunately, Congress has refused to go along with the President's telephone budget in the past and I feel confident that we will increase it this year.

It is bad enough to struggle with insufficient funds, but now the White House wants to increase interest rates on the money you borrow. I promise you that I, for one, will fight this move with all my strength. You need higher interest rates on your loans like a drowning man needs a millstone around his neck. You know it, and I know it.

Furthermore, the administration knows it. Just last year REA Administrator Hamill said in a statement before a Senate committee:

"I have loan applications that have come to me in REA, particularly in the telephone program where an increased interest rate would be difficult to handle. As a matter of fact, Senator, I have had applications in the telephone program that we have been unable to grant with a 2 percent interest rate."

It seems obvious that the administration is deliberately trying to freeze both the rural telephone and the rural electric programs.

Certainly it has given no indication that it intends to tailor its policies in accordance with the intentions of Congress, reiterated last spring by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. In its report, the committee said:

"The committee feels that the Rural Electrification Administration has a responsibility for assisting and promoting rural telephone cooperatives where necessary to secure telephone service to farmers."

The progress report on REA's telephone loans reveals, however, that this admonition has not been carried out. It shows that as of December 1957, REA had approved loans to 205 cooperative-type borrowers and 371 commercial company borrowers. As of December, 1958, aggregate loans approved to cooperatives totaled 209, with loans approved to 429 commercial borrowers. Last year, REA approved loans to 62 new borrowers. Of these, 58 were commercial companies and only 4 were cooperatives. That's a 14 to 1 ratio. Furthermore, the official report shows that 75 percent of the total money loaned went to commercial borrowers. It is quite evident again that the administration has little stomach for promoting telephone co-operatives.

No one would quarrel with this record, if it represented the most effective means of getting service into the remote rural areas. But the truth is that it does not.

As of December 1958, telephone cooperatives were serving approximately 2.5 subscribers per mile of line. In contrast, the commercial companies were serving nearly twice as many—4.6 subscribers per mile of line. It is obvious which type borrowers is serving the sparsely populated areas. It is also clear which type borrowers has the greatest expenditure to make in getting started. When a cooperative gets a loan from REA, it can retain on the average of 32 miles of line in its old system. The commercial companies on the average retain about 77 miles of line.

Thus two points become clear: Cooperatives are the most effective instrument for getting service into the thinly populated areas, and they have greater handicaps to overcome than do their commercial counterparts.

On the face of the record, it is evident that we have a program suffering from malnutrition. To write a proper recovery prescription, we should do what all good doctors do with an ailing patient. Diagnose the trouble and take steps to correct the ailment.

Knowing that the commercial telephone companies do not like the RTA program, you can expect no help from that quarter. The Rural Electrification Administration itself seems preoccupied with the maintenance of an alleged neutrality policy, which says: "Don't do anything to offend anyone." All this seems to place the responsibility for improvement squarely on your shoulders.

For my part, I offer to you whatever assistance that is within the power of my office. I want to discuss legislation with you which you feel necessary to your program, and I would be happy and willing to meet with your representatives anytime to work out feasible proposals. May I suggest some steps we ought to consider immediately.

As a starting point, I would like to suggest the possibility of doing something about getting town and country to join forces in the extension of rural lines. Perhaps the time has come when we should raise or

eliminate altogether the 1,500-population limitation that is now in the act.

We need also to fully explore the problem of cooperatives that are prevented from adding rural subscribers to their membership roles because they are barred from making the central town or small city a part of the same system.

Experience in the rural electric program has taught us that there would have been no program if REA personnel had not gone out into the rural areas and actually organized many cooperatives themselves. Perhaps the same type of assistance and promotion is needed here.

It may be that we should provide legislation transferring the funds and responsibility for co-op promotion from REA to the Farmer Cooperative Service, a branch of the Department of Agriculture exclusively devoted to cooperative problems and their solution. The best co-op talent in the Department could be brought into full play in this way. Since all agencies are now fully assimilated into the Department as a result of the Secretary's reorganization, I do not believe this transfer of assignment would cause any administrative problem. On the contrary, I believe the change would expedite the program.

Finally, Congress should move now to end the 10 percent wartime imposed excise tax on telephone service both for rural and city users. This is a discriminatory tax that was added as a war emergency measure which should be repealed.

I have touched upon a few of the more important points demanding attention in the rural telephone program. Before this fine convention concludes, I am sure you will have discussed many more.

Sometime prior to the time you leave this convention city for your homes, I would suggest that you pay a visit to your Congressmen and Senators up on the Hill. Sit down with them. Inform them of your problems. I can assure you, you will find willing listeners. Many of them look to you for guidance and leadership in this technical field.

When you get back to your homes, talk up the rural telephone cause among your neighbors at every opportunity. Marshall your strength. It is imperative that you revitalize your program. If you chart your course of action properly, and stick to it, I have no doubt that the promise of the Rural Telephone Act of 1949 will be fulfilled, as your part in the building of a more abundant rural America.

ANNUAL MEETING, SOUTH DAKOTA RURAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, MARVIN HUGHITT HOTEL, HURON, S. DAK., DECEMBER 12, 1958

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

1. Increased interest rates

Whereas the President and the Administration appear determined to increase REA interest rates by two or three fold; and

Whereas it is also proposed to increase the cost of financing still further by adding administrative costs on to and in addition to the regular interest; and

Whereas the rural electrification and rural telephone programs have successfully operated over the past years at the normal 2 percent interest rate and have shown a profit to the United States Treasury; and

Whereas the present loans made to rural telephone cooperatives are made to serve rural areas with low density and low operating revenue; and

Whereas approximately 50 percent of the rural population does not have adequate telephone service; and

Whereas good telephone service to all areas of the United States is vital to the defense of our Nation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States vigorously oppose any increase in REA interest rates and that the present interest rate of 2 percent be maintained and preserved.

2. Federal telephone excise tax

Whereas the Federal telephone excise tax was initiated as a wartime measure, and justified in the name of the national defense; and

Whereas the Federal telephone excise tax is still in effect, and continues to work an undue hardship on the rural telephone cooperative program; and

Whereas an excise tax is not in keeping with the concept which prevails under our Federal tax laws in that it is a form of regressive taxation, not in keeping with the concept of ability to pay and burdens those least able to pay; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we here at the annual South Dakota Rural Telephone Cooperative Association meeting condemn this discriminatory tax and petition the Congress this session for its immediate repeal.

3. Encourage development of telephone cooperatives

Whereas the major portion of REA telephone loans are now being made to commercial companies, and

Whereas many areas now needing telephone service are undesirable to commercial companies, and

Whereas formation of cooperatives seems to be the only way in which such service may be made available to such areas; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That REA be requested to encourage organization of cooperatives to provide such service.

4. Participation in NRECA insurance program

Whereas the NRECA has made available its retirement and security program to telephone cooperatives, and

Whereas this provides a plan tailored to the needs of telephone cooperatives; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That all telephone cooperatives in the State be encouraged to participate in this group insurance plan.

5. REA service to telephone cooperatives

Whereas a number of telephone cooperatives find it difficult to set up an accounting system acceptable to REA; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That REA increase the number of field auditors to meet this need.

6. REA Administrator

Whereas the REA Act of 1935 provided for the strict nonpartisan administration of REA, by stipulating the appointment of an Administrator by the President of the United States, with confirmation by the Senate, for a 10-year term, to insure the nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration of REA; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, did in 1957, require that all loans to REA borrowers of \$500,000 or more, and that all loans of any amount requested by new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Rural Telephone Cooperative Association, in annual meeting assembled, apprise the Congress of the United States of its vigorous opposition to any and all impairment of the authority of the Administrator as granted by the REA Act of 1935; and be it further

Resolved, That this association urge the Congress of the United States, as soon as it convenes in 1959 to pass a bill which would clearly and completely restore to the Administrator of REA all authority and functions vested in him by the REA Act of 1935.

John N. Robertson, Director of Highways for the District of Columbia Since 1948, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected and best liked of the public officials of the District of Columbia is John N. Robertson, who has served as Director of Highways for the District since September 1948. Mr. Robertson began work with the District of Columbia Department of Highways in April 1917. He has been concerned with the streets and highways of the District of Columbia in various capacities for almost 42 years.

The Nation's Capital will lose one of its most valuable public servants at the end of this month, when Mr. Robertson retires. He has been a progressive and forward looking leader, a forthright advocate of a highway program for the District that would handle the requirements of modern traffic loads while preserving the traditional and historic values of District streets and avenues. A large part of his effectiveness has been due to his natural friendliness of manner and his willingness to talk frankly and honestly with the proponents of all points of view. He has played a great role in the planning and execution of projects for Washington freeways.

His abilities are nationally recognized. He is a vice president of the American Association of State Highway Officials and a member of the executive committee of that organization. He is a past president of the American Road Builders' Association, and the present treasurer of that organization. I know of no highway official who is held in greater esteem and affection throughout the country.

In my work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, I have come to place a high value on his expert advice, and on his friendship.

The esteem with which John N. Robertson is regarded is well expressed in the following editorial, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on the occasion of the announcement of his retirement:

ROBERTSON'S RETIREMENT

The Commissioners are facing a tremendously tough job in finding a successor for Jack Robertson as city highway director. "J. N." has been synonymous with Washington highways for so long that he seems to most of us to symbolize them.

The reason, of course, is that that's exactly the way Mr. Robertson feels himself. As he recalls, he never has wanted to do anything but build roads here from the time he was "big enough to talk." A third-generation Washingtonian, he knows the city like the back of his hand and loves every bit of it. The District has reason to be proud of Mr. Robertson's accomplishments in the national field of highway legislation and administration. Locally, his contributions during 42 years in the department are too

numerous to single out. Just look out the window of your car the next time you drive; the chances are that Jack Robertson built or rebuilt the road you're on.

More than an exceptional public official, however, Mr. Robertson is a gentleman and a friend to thousands of Washingtonians who treasure the relationship. His mild temperament seldom gave way except in battles with planning and park officials over highway locations. When there were two sides to a question and one of them involved highways, however, Jack never faked any sympathy for the other side. His job was to build highways—and that's what he did.

It's no surprise that "J. N." and Mrs. Robertson intend to remain in Washington. Anything else would be unthinkable. Furthermore, our guess is that retirement isn't going to take him out of the picture. We'll look forward to hearing from him on the state of our highways for some time to come.

Senator Mundt Address at Joint Celebration of Four Patriotic Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the George Washington Memorial Services held in the U.S. Department of the Interior auditorium, February 22, sponsored by four of our patriotic organizations:

SENATOR MUNDT ADDRESS AT JOINT CELEBRATION OF FOUR PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 22, 1959.—This afternoon before a large and responsive audience gathered in the U.S. Department of the Interior auditorium, for the purpose of commemorating the 227th anniversary of the birth of George Washington, the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senator from South Dakota, chose as the subject for his address: "Washington—Then and Now."

Today's observance was the 45th joint celebration of the birth of George Washington that has been sponsored by the District of Columbia Societies of the Children of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Sons of the Revolution, and Daughters of the Revolution.

Conducting of this annual program rotates among the societies. This year the Children of the American Revolution, Mrs. Joseph P. Hall, senior State president, general chairman, and Miss Patience C. Veitch, State president, presiding, conducted the program.

Senator MUNDT briefly reviewed outstanding highlights in the life of George Washington and then stated that the governmental principles upheld by him are still applicable today. As evidence that Washington and others who aided him had great foresight, Senator MUNDT pointed out that the United States is now the only large nation that has continued to operate to date from its founding under the same basic principles. He called attention to the fact that in Washington's time certain people thought that he should be a king, and then others wished that he would accept nomination for a third term as President, but Washington declined and in doing so em-

phatically warned the Nation against the danger of one person having too much power, or continuing in office as President over too long a period.

Senator MUNDT tried to think of some of the things that Washington might have said had he addressed a patriotic meeting today. He felt that he would have again warned of too great power in too few hands, with particular reference toward today's tendency of centralized government.

As examples of the evils of overcentralized government, Italy and its downfall through fascism; Germany and nazism; and Russia and communism, were cited by Senator MUNDT.

In conclusion, Senator MUNDT stated that he was greatly pleased to find that organizations such as those sponsoring this observance were able to bring out a large audience, and he felt sure that with their patriotic zeal much had been done and would continue to be done to prevent disruption of the governmental principles of this country that have proved so trustworthy over the generations from George Washington's days to the present time.

Musical selections were presented by the orchestra of the U.S. Marine Band, M. Sgt. Ralph Bucca, conducting, before and during the program, also for the advancing and retiring of the colors.

Hoosier Guardsmen Defend Lives and Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, the National Guard of the United States introduced a slogan which reads: "Sleep well tonight, your National Guard is awake." This slogan seemed most appropriate to those of us who appreciate the important role the guard plays in our Nation's defense picture, for we realize that without these thousands of citizen soldiers our manpower problem would indeed be critical.

Though this slogan was undoubtedly conceived to dramatize the guard's important position in defending our country, it carries an implication in Indiana that brings it much closer to Hoosier hearts and homes.

For it was National Guardsmen who, day and night, worked and fought to help control the rampaging ice and water of the flooding Wabash River. Called from their own homes and families, from their civilian occupations, these Hoosier Guardsmen built dikes of sandbags, they evacuated stranded families, they literally moved small communities to safety.

When they were called, they moved quickly and without confusion. There was no question about rations, about transportation, about equipment, or anything else. They were ready and they were trained.

Every one of us—and every freedom loving citizen of this country—should thank God for the National Guard. We can sleep well because the National Guard is awake. Just ask the families along the Wabash River Valley.

Friendly Relations Between Sewart Air Force Base and the People of Murfreesboro, Tenn., Point the Pattern for Civilian and Military Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarkable spirit of cooperation existing between the personnel of Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn., and the people of the adjoining city of Murfreesboro, both of which are located in the district which I have the honor to represent in the House.

This most commendable relationship is the subject of a letter from the Murfreesboro and Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce, to Col. Edwin R. Bane, base commander, and another letter from Colonel Bane addressed to me. It is also described in a brief article in the Air Force Times for January 7, 1959.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting these letters and article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The letters and article follow:

HEADQUARTERS,
839TH AIR BASE GROUP,
SEWART AIR FORCE BASE, TENN.,
February 9, 1959.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: You will recall that during your holiday season visit to Sewart Air Force Base, we discussed at length the friendly relationship and remarkable spirit of cooperation existing between Sewart personnel and the townspeople of Murfreesboro. During our conversation I displayed to you a letter from the Murfreesboro-Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce, endorsing our Base Exchange and commissary sales facility, which you felt to constitute such important evidence of our amicable community relationship that it might appropriately be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since the writing of this letter, the directors of the chamber of commerce have further honored Sewart by electing its commander to permanent ex-officio membership on the board. I am enclosing, along with a copy of this letter, a clipping from the Air Force Times of January 7, 1959, which mentions this and several of the many other instances demonstrative of the natural friendliness of middle Tennesseans.

The feeling of belonging to a fine and progressive community, which the citizens of Murfreesboro have instilled in our personnel, has contributed in great measure to our unusually high reenlistment rate of 100 percent for December and 73.3 percent for the first 7 months of the current fiscal year. The hospitality of our civilian neighbors may thus be credited in part with the saving of many thousands of tax dollars which would otherwise have been expended for recruitment, training, and personnel movement.

For this tangible and the countless other less apparent results of their graciousness toward us, we at Sewart feel that the people of middle Tennessee cannot be praised too greatly nor thanked too much. We shall be as proud and grateful as they for any con-

gressional recognition of their contribution toward the defense effort.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN R. BANE,
Colonel, USAF, Base Commander.

MURFREESBORO AND RUTHERFORD
COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
November 25, 1958.

Col. EDWIN R. BANE,
Commander, Sewart Air Force Base,
Tenn.

DEAR COLONEL BANE: In the past the relationship of personnel at Sewart Air Force Base and the townspeople of Murfreesboro has been a credit to both communities. This amiable association is not limited to social contacts between individuals of our two communities but extends as well to business relations.

We feel that this friendly relationship in no way has been affected by the operation of the post exchange and commissary on your installation. We wish to commend the command at Sewart for the excellent manner in which these two facilities are operated. We feel that every effort has been made to carry on these activities in strict accord with the spirit in which they were established, that is, to promote the morale and general welfare of the personnel of our uniformed services without permitting undue competition with local civilian enterprise.

While it is a normal ambition of the civilian merchants to gain the largest possible portion of any available market, we feel that the contributions of base exchanges and commissaries outweigh any loss of trade these facilities might cause to them in civilian counterparts. We recognize, furthermore, that any savings gained by your personnel in trade with these two establishments are not lost to our local businessmen but instead are channeled into our economy through increased purchases of goods not available at these two facilities.

Therefore, we wish you to know that we look with favor upon these facilities at Sewart, maintained within their present limit, as to the type of items sold.

At the James K. Polk Hotel, a meeting of the members of the chamber of commerce unanimously voted to publicly endorse the operation of these facilities at your installation as permanent necessities of our Armed Forces personnel and we, the directors of the Murfreesboro and Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce, concur in their resolution.

Sincerely yours,

W. D. ADKERSON,
President, Chamber of Commerce.

[From the Air Force Times, Jan. 7, 1959]

COMMUNITY RELATIONS FIRST RATE AT SEWART
SEWART AIR FORCE BASE, TENN.—The personnel at this middle Tennessee base claim friendly relations with nearby Murfreesboro have reached the highest possible level.

Backing up this claim is the recent campaign by the city that netted \$4,500 for a base beautification program. The money was raised by selling "Murfreesboro likes Stewart" posters to the city merchants.

The city has gone all out to give Sewart personnel a feeling of friendship. The beautification was just one of the things the city has started.

In an unprecedented move, the base exchange and commissary at Sewart were recently endorsed by a letter from the Murfreesboro-Rutherford County, Tenn., Chamber of Commerce. Drafted by the chamber's board of directors, the letter was received by Base Commander Col. Edwin R. Bane.

The letter said: "The chamber of commerce unanimously voted to publicly endorse the operation of these facilities at your installation as permanent necessities of our Armed Forces personnel, and we, the directors of the Murfreesboro and Rutherford

County Chamber of Commerce, concur in their resolution."

In another portion, the letter cited the state of mutual good relations existing here. "The relationship of personnel at the base is nicer than at any place I have ever been," is a common expression among newcomers.

An atmosphere of this type pays off in better morale among Air Force personnel. In turn, better morale increases efficiency, enabling the base to provide more defense per dollar.

A town of some 26,000 population, Murfreesboro is situated 17 miles south of Sewart. Although in an area which is primarily agricultural, Murfreesboro is a progressive city which is growing rapidly through the attraction of industry.

Many factors make the area attractive to industry, not the least of which is the quality and quantity of labor available. Marvin Beck, manager of a General Electric plant recently established here, has been impressed by the people he has employed.

"Our plant," he says, "reached its expected level of production well ahead of company requirements, and has continued to produce more than its quota. I attribute this to the industry and efficiency of our employees."

Crop Control Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of February 20, 1959:

CROP CONTROL FAILURE

The 17 million bushels of corn stored in bins owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the Peoria area are a monument to the failure of Government crop controls. Other millions of bushels are stored by the Government in private warehouses.

But this corn surplus is only part of the problem. The Government has more than doubled its facilities for storing grain in the last 8 years. It can now store more than 7½ billion bushels. But warehouses are full and the surplus continues to grow. If 1959 is a good crop year, more storage capacity will be needed.

The Government now owns about 1.3 billion bushels of wheat, enough to make all the bread the people of the United States will eat in 3 years.

These growing surpluses worry farmers, for obvious reasons. They worry others, too. The money which subsidized the production of so much grain that cannot be used came from the pockets of all taxpayers. Not only that, but the cost of storing the grain is a continued and growing expense to taxpayers. It is estimated that storage and interest charges on the funds tied up in surpluses will reach a rate of \$1 billion a year this year. Peoria County taxpayers will pay about \$1½ million of this. The average cost to every person in the United States is about \$5.70 a year.

President Eisenhower, in his recent farm message to Congress, said that incentives for excess production should be cut. "The control program doesn't control," he declared, and he has plenty of evidence to prove it.

The President also pointed out that most of the Federal money spent to support farm prices and encourage overproduction has

gone to a relatively few larger producers and has done little to help the farmers in the greatest difficulty.

President Eisenhower's appeal for abandoning mandatory high price supports makes good economic sense, but whether it makes good enough political sense remains to be seen.

Duel Over Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a thoughtful editorial appearing in the Saturday, February 7, 1959, St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I am particularly anxious for my colleagues in the Congress who style themselves as liberals to read this editorial. Naturally, I am pleased with it because it says kind words about the administration's labor bill:

DUEL OVER LABOR LAW

The labor reform issue has produced a face-to-face duel between Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, two men avowedly interested in the 1960 political race. Senator KENNEDY is said by one reporter to have "moved in with the intensity of one who felt that his political future depended on this encounter."

Because of the Senator's over eagerness, we think, Secretary Mitchell made the better appearance. The Labor Secretary avoided attacking the Kennedy bill, and confined himself to defending his administration bill.

In general, the Kennedy and administration bills could be amalgamated with reference to union democracy and financial reports, if some spirit of compromise existed.

The Senator's principal targets, however, are the blackmail picketing and secondary boycott provisions of the administration bill. Neither one supports his charge that the bill is "an open invitation to collusion between corrupt employers and labor racketeers."

The bill would prohibit a union from picketing an employer if his employees showed no interest in joining the union. It would prohibit boycotts of an employer who is not a party to a labor dispute. Both proposals are fair. Neither invites collusion.

When he offered his limited bill, Senator KENNEDY argued that major amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act such as the administration's proposed restraints on boycotts and picketing be left for a separate measure because they were too controversial. Now he no longer disguises the fact he left them out of his bill because he is against them.

That is worth clearing up. It is also worth noting that his attack on the administration bill was mimeographed and given to reporters before Secretary Mitchell had even completed his testimony. Such hasty acts of partisanship can only muddle the labor issue and will not, we imagine, help anybody's presidential ambitions. Senator KENNEDY is a little too obviously trying to appear anti-labor to some people and pro-labor to others. That Secretary Mitchell may be doing the same thing does not justify Senator KENNEDY.

The public interest in this affair is an effective but moderate and nonpunitive labor law which includes reasonable restraints on picketing and secondary boycotts as well as rules for funds reporting and union democracy. The administration bill meets that requirement; the Kennedy bill does not.

Making the Employment Act of 1946 More Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 and 17, 1959, there were introduced in the House and Senate bills—H.R. 2561 and S. 497—to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to do two things:

First. Request the President to include in his Economic Report and annual economic program and recommendations a discussion of monetary and credit policies "to the same extent as all other policies affecting employment, production, and purchasing power."

Second. Assign to the Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President the responsibility for holding public hearings on price or wage increases which appear to threaten economic stability and to issue advisory statements, where advisable, as to whether the proposed increases are justified.

Explanatory statements by the bills' authors, Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and myself, are contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 15, 1959, pages 665 to 666, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, 1959, pages 724 to 725.

The filing by the President of his Economic Report on January 20, 1959, and the weeks of hearings on this report which have been held by the Joint Economic Committee, have reinforced the need for the two amendments included in H.R. 2561 and S. 497. In addition, they have disclosed the need for three additional amendments to the Employment Act of 1946 in order to provide for its more effective administration. Comprehensive new bills, which include the two earlier amendments and the three additional ones, are accordingly being introduced by the same sponsors.

The text of H.R. 4870, introduced by me, follows:

H.R. 4870

A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for its more effective administration and to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1023) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6. It is the sense of Congress that the President, and the Federal Government, in executing this Act, shall give due effect to the following provisions of the Act:

"(a) The provision of section 2 setting forth the goals of maximum employment, production (including the concept of sustained growth), and purchasing power (including the concept of reasonable price stability).

"(b) The provisions of section 3(a) requiring the President to include in each year's economic report, in quantitative terms,

the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power which he deems maximum, and current and foreseeable trends.

"(c) The provision of section 3(b) for the discretionary periodic transmittal of supplementary or revised recommendations.

"(d) The provisions of section 3(a) (3) for a review, and of sections 3(a) (4) and 3(b) for program and recommendations, including therein monetary and credit policies to the same extent as all other policies affecting employment, production, and purchasing power: Provided, That if the Federal agency directly responsible for the execution of such monetary and credit policies disagrees with such program and recommendations, the President shall report such disagreement to the Congress, together with a statement from the disagreeing agency of its reasons."

Sec. 2. Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021 and the following) is amended by adding an additional subsection (c) (6) as follows:

"(6) To hold public hearings concerning (a) price increases, proposed in industries where most of the output is produced by relatively few firms, which increases appear to threaten economic stability, and (b) wage increases where the firm proposing such price increases declares such wage increases to be a cause of the price increases; to issue factual summaries of such hearings; and, where the Council deems it advisable, to issue advisory statements."

The first of the three new amendments explicitly declares that the statutory goal of the Employment Act of "maximum purchasing power"—which is a coordinate goal with maximum employment and maximum production—includes the concept of reasonable price stability. The ordinary meaning of "maximum purchasing power" would certainly seem to include "reasonable price stability." Maximum purchasing power can never be attained without reasonable price stability, since in an inflation, as we all know, incomes and hence purchasing power rise with great inequality. Moreover, the first two chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers—1947-52—Dr. Edwin G. Nourse and Leon H. Keyserling, have both recently testified that the words "maximum purchasing power" of the act constitute an anti-inflationary mandate to bring about reasonable price stability.

The President, however, has cast doubt upon whether the Employment Act, as it is, really does contain the mandate of reasonable price stability. On January 20 the President asked the Congress "to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make reasonable price stability an explicit goal of Federal economic policy, coordinate with the goals of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power now specified in that act." The first amendment, accordingly, explicitly adds the President's words "reasonable price stability" to the definition of the act's goals, without at the same time stigmatizing Dr. Nourse, Mr. Keyserling, and several thousand other reputable economists and public officials as wrong in thinking that reasonable price stability has been a goal of the act ever since 1946.

This amendment also explicitly states that the goal of the Employment Act of "maximum production" includes the concept of sustained growth. Economic growth is plainly comprehended by the term "maximum production," just as

reasonable price stability is implied by "maximum purchasing power." However, the clarification of "maximum purchasing power" requires an equal clarification of what was intended by "maximum production."

The second of the three new amendments requires the President to include in his Economic Report the actual quantitative levels of employment, production, and purchasing power which he thinks are needed to carry out the act's goals—namely, maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. It would also require him to set forth current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power. Actually, the setting forth of these levels is required by the plain language of the 1946 act. The congressional mandate was faithfully adhered to by the executive branch from the first report in 1947 through 1952. In each case, a serious effort was made to project quantitative levels for employment, production, and purchasing power as they were likely to be in the upcoming year, and as they ought to be. But, since 1952, this vital portion of the Economic Report has been omitted. In the January 1959 report, for example, there is no mention whatever of quantitative levels. Obviously, unless the President is willing to project what is likely to be, and then declare what ought to be, his program for altering events so that what actually is becomes as near as possible to what ought to be, will prove inadequate.

The third of the three new amendments has to do with the requirement of section 3(b) of the 1946 act permitting the President to add to his January 20 annual report, where conditions warrant it, by making supplementary or revised recommendations. Again, the custodians in the executive branch of the Employment Act of 1946 during the period 1947-52, found it desirable each year to issue a supplementary report, usually around July. Since then, the Council of Economic Advisers is heard from on January 20, but is then heard from no more. Certainly, if there are major changes in the economic situation at any time during the year, Congress wants to be informed of them. Accordingly, the existence of the power to make supplementary recommendations needs to be made clear.

Hon. Daniel A. Reed

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I express my sympathy to the family of my close colleague, DANIEL A. REED. A chapter is finished and those of us who had a chance to read from this chapter have been enriched. It is a long chapter, a meaningful chapter, and a unique chapter. The sorrow is not for our

friend who wrote it, but for those remaining who now must interpret it. The library of life is composed of many books and we are privileged to read from only one chapter in any book. The chapter preceding and following remain a holy mystery, but I believe we can get glimpses of the past and future through some of the more noble chapters available to us. The chapter written by DANIEL A. REED was among the noblest.

Resistance—Dignified, Determined, Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, to the dismay of the Federal judiciary which had ordered it, and to the chagrin of the ill-informed among the editorialists and news commentators who had chortled that Virginia's will to resist had evaporated in the experiences of Arlington and Norfolk, the Warren County High School at Front Royal, Va., did not integrate its classes on February 18, 1959.

The citizens of Warren County demonstrated again the determination which had impelled them, against heartbreaking odds, to create a new school in which their children might continue their education in accordance with the sincere and firm beliefs of the community, rather than in forced conformity to the arrogant fiat of philosophizing Federal judges.

Under court order, Warren County High School did reopen on February 19. The entire student body in this 30-room building which can accommodate 1,000, consisted of 22 Negroes.

Some who claim qualifications to appraise public affairs in Virginia have suggested that the white students, who have been attending the private high school in Front Royal, did not return merely because their parents did not want them to switch classes again during this term, and not because there were any compunctions about racial integration. These observers, I believe, grossly underestimate the will of the citizens of Warren County to defend their right to control public education as guaranteed them by the Constitution.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include editorial comment which appeared in Virginia newspapers:

[From the Northern Virginia Daily, Strasburg, Va., Feb. 19, 1959]

TURNING POINT IN SCHOOL STRUGGLE

Warren County citizens helped to write a new chapter in history yesterday, when their million dollar high-school building was occupied by 22 Negro students and not one single white student showed up to integrate the school. The 100-odd newsmen, photographers and TV cameramen who milled around trying to get a story may have missed the real significance of the occasion.

It was the first small county in the South which has successfully defended its rights against the overwhelming powers of the Constitution-flaunting Supreme Court. If Front Royal citizens can win their struggle against forced school integration, so can the other smaller communities and counties in the South.

Front Royal was truly valiantly fighting in the front lines of the cold war on race mixing yesterday and certainly Warren County people deserve the highest commendation for their exemplary deportment under heavy fire.

It was a heart warming exhibition of genteel Virginia and Southern conduct, and did not give the horde of alert integrationist critics the slightest legitimate opportunity to defame the good name of Warren County.

There were less than 50 citizens who gathered to view the proceedings, and they were orderly. Despite the klieg-light atmosphere and the realization that the lenses of the world were focused upon them, the vast majority of Front Royal people went about their daily lives in routine fashion.

The officials of the school administration, the county, and the city had laid their plans well. They had anticipated every move in advance. There were no uncertain or awkward moments, and the only chagrined people we saw were the Northern newsmen scurrying in search of a story which did not occur.

The law enforcement officers had the situation under control at all times. Once or twice they found it necessary to declare certain areas off limits, but this was done in a firm, yet friendly manner which commanded respect and obedience.

We could sum up the situation with the comment that Warren County met the supreme test with flying colors. They obeyed the unfair and unconstitutional order of the Federal courts and yet won their point of not mixing the races in their high school. The slurs of the integrationist press and the insults of two Federal judges were shrugged off without attempt at retaliation.

We cannot emphasize the fact too strongly that the fight is not yet over. There will no doubt be immediate effort on the part of the NAACP and their race-mixing friends to induce some white students to enroll in the school. While the odds are against their success in this effort, it could happen. Such a turn of events would certainly nullify the victory won yesterday and mar its brilliant luster.

The issue is not yet finally resolved. That there will be other action within the immediate future is a certainty we must all anticipate. Warren County people have successfully passed the vital tests thus far, and we have confidence they will resolutely face and solve those which are to come.

Freedom-loving people of the South and the Nation should certainly be proud of the citizens of Warren County today. We have already received telegrams and phone calls expressing this spirit. This encouragement should help freedom fighters in their resolve to press on to complete victory.

[From the Daily News-Record, Harrisonburg, Va., Feb. 20, 1959]

WARREN COUNTY'S ANSWER

In court hearings involving the reopening of the Warren County High School at Front Royal, not only segregationists but those who would accept integration to maintain the public schools appealed for moderation and common sense from the Federal bench. In a body, responsible white citizens on both sides of the question of public schools told the district court in Harrisonburg that to transfer to the school now would mean untold confusion to the white students attending private schools and public schools in other counties.

The same plea was voiced before Chief Judge Simon E. Sobeloff of the U.S. 4th Circuit Court of Appeals. He was told, in effect, that few, if any, white students would transfer to the high school upon its reopening for the admission of 22 Negro students. To this plea, Judge Sobeloff is quoted as replying:

"One way to find out is to open the school and register them."

Instead of judicial moderation or understanding of their difficult situation, Warren County white residents received only stern, legalistic answers directed at complying with the Supreme Court's infamous 1954 decision. The desires of 22 Negroes, who already had won from courts sympathetic to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, their fight to attend the school, was placed above 1,000 white students whose parents made it manifest that the schooling of their children shouldn't be interrupted now.

The parents' pleas through their spokesmen went unheeded. At Harrisonburg and at Baltimore, their motives were impugned. Said Judge John Paul in an astounding statement:

"The legislature may devise some futile laws as they did in 1956. My feeling is that you want to wait until next fall in the hopes some way to avoid integration will be found."

That, as it already has been pointed out by other Virginia newspapers, is deciding a case on the basis of speculation about what the legislature may or may not do in the future.

Said Judge Sobeloff:

"I think by any standard that what Warren County has been doing is indefensible."

Yet what Warren County was asking was no more than what Judge Sobeloff already had granted Charlottesville in allowing that school board to delay integration until next September.

Wednesday and again yesterday, it was Warren County's turn to take the stand in the oldest forum known to man—before the people themselves. Its white children stayed away from the school. There are indications that not a single one of them will register for the questionable school term.

Harassed at every turn by the NAACP through courts that prefer to give ear to the theory of Federal domination of community schools, Warren County citizens have elected the honorable way of standing on their rights. They are telling the world that they—and they alone—know what is best for their own children.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times Dispatch, Feb. 19, 1959]

WARREN'S STONEWALL RESISTANCE

The Warren County High School at Front Royal reopened yesterday on a federally prescribed, integrated basis.

Twenty-two well-dressed Negro girls and boys entered the architecturally beautiful, 30-room building, with a capacity of 1,000.

They found themselves alone, with 15 white teachers still under contract to the public school system.

Five blocks away, in makeshift, privately financed schools, nearly 800 white children continued their self-segregated education.

Not a single one had enrolled at the erstwhile alma mater.

Their parents had preferred to accept whatever inconvenience or sacrifices might eventuate, rather than submit to compulsory, nominal integration.

In the gloomy annals of the 5-year constitutional crisis, Warren's stonewall refusal to surrender, will remain a bright spot remembered.

The people of Warren peacefully reopened their high school to the children of colored fellow citizens—as ordered by the court.

But they refused, as Virginians, to send their children to a federally dominated school.

The unanimity of the Warren Court was thus matched, by the unanimity of Warren County.

The county thereby set an example of adherence to a dual code of balanced loyalty inherent in the Constitution of the United States—to the Nation, and to the State.

In doing so the citizens of that county have, despite provocative attrition, maintained an imperturbable dignity of citizenship which, we like to believe, will always be part of the Virginia tradition.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times, Feb. 19, 1959]

INTEGRATION DAY IN FRONT ROYAL

The white-columned school was still there, looking just as it did on the day months ago when its 1,000 pupils departed. People went about their business as if scarcely aware that something unusual was happening in their community.

It was integration day in Front Royal. Twenty-two Negro children presented themselves, as the Federal courts said was their right, to be enrolled in the school where—until it closed on that fateful day last year—only white children were eligible for instruction.

The Negroes had won a great victory, or so it must have seemed to them, in gaining the right to attend the white people's school. Only the victory now appeared to be a hollow one, for not a single white former student showed up at the school. Most of the white children were attending private schools. Some were in public schools outside the community. A few who had little liking for education in the first place were not going to school at all because under the new law they are not compelled to do so.

So the 22 Negro students had the big high school all to themselves except for six white teachers who reported for duty. Tension was there, to be sure, but nothing happened to mar the peace of the town. Police were on hand just in case but they had little to do beyond routine chores. The sensible people of Front Royal showed they want nothing to do with threats and violence, for which they deserve the utmost praise.

Well, nobody knows how things are going to turn out. Will the white children—or at least some of them whose parents do not object to mixed schools—come back? Or will the Negro children be the only students? What kind of integration is it where there is none of the other race to be "integrated"?

One thing can be said, however. It is that Front Royal has given the Nation the most dramatic demonstration of passive resistance it has seen since the drive for compulsory school integration began. Nothing else the community could have done by way of expressing its protest could have approached this in eloquence.

Analysis of H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1959, my distinguished friend and fellow member of the Committee on Ways and Means, A. S. HERLONG, Jr., and I introduced H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001 which provide for a basic reform of Fed-

eral tax rates and methods in five major tax areas. At the time these bills were offered to the Congress for consideration we stated:

The present Federal tax structure stunts economic growth since it both prohibits adequate capital accumulation and destroys capital once accumulated. We can no longer afford a Federal fiscal policy based only on short-term considerations, from fighting inflation in one year to fighting recession in another, while neglecting the root source of fiscal crises.

By removing tax blocks to progress, our bills would contribute more than any other possible Government action to our economic well-being and national security. In enabling the economy to grow much more rapidly and consistently than in recent years, these bills would counter the challenge of Russian communism for world economic leadership; encourage other nations outside the Communist orbit to reorganize their tax systems to permit more rapid development out of their own capital; increase the supply and mobility of venture capital, thus insuring a rebirth of the American genius for the starting and development of businesses; provide new and better job opportunities; insure adequate revenues for military preparedness and all other necessary Federal expenditures; smother inflation with growth.

These bills advocate the principle of tax reduction whereby there would be scheduled annual cuts of individual taxes and corporate taxes over a period of 5 years. After the first reduction, further scheduled reductions would go into effect if budget expenditures were not in excess of \$77 billion or, regardless, if the reductions would not result in budget unbalance. In addition, the bills would establish by statute more realistic depreciation service lives; defer the capital-gains tax on sales of long-term capital assets which are reinvested within the taxable year; and reduce the rates of tax on estates and gifts.

Because of the widespread interest that has already been manifested in this meritorious legislative proposal, my able cosponsor the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] and I have prepared a section by section analysis description of the purposes and provisions of our bills.

Sections 1 and 2 of the bills amend the Internal Revenue Code by adding new tax tables relating to annual reductions from January 1, 1959 through 1963 for individual taxpayers, including the rates applicable to heads of households. Section 3 of the proposals covers the new rate tables for the optional income tax where the taxpayer has adjusted gross income of less than \$5,000.

Thus, beginning with January 1, 1959, there would be five annual coordinated reductions in all the graduated individual tax rates with the first bracket ultimately being reduced from the present 20 to 15 percent. The top graduated rate would be reduced from the present 91 to 47 percent over the 5 years, subject only to the postponement features of the legislation covered in section 5 below.

Section 4 of the bills amends code section 11 relating to the tax imposed on corporate taxpayers. The present law provides for a corporate normal tax of 30 percent on taxable income and a 22-percent surtax on taxable income in excess of \$25,000. The legislation provides five annual rate reductions spread be-

tween the normal and surtax. The first 3 reduction would reduce the normal tax 1 percentage point each year reducing this from 30 to 27 percent. The last 2 corporate tax reductions would reduce the surtax from 22 to 20 percent. Thus, at the end of the reduction period the corporate rate would be 47 percent, the same as the top individual graduated tax rate. The following summary will illustrate the scheduled corporate reductions:

Jan. 1, 1959:	
Normal.....	29
Surtax.....	22
Combined.....	51
Jan. 1, 1960:	
Normal.....	28
Surtax.....	22
Combined.....	50
Jan. 1, 1961:	
Normal.....	27
Surtax.....	22
Combined.....	49
Jan. 1, 1962:	
Normal.....	27
Surtax.....	21
Combined.....	48
Jan. 1, 1963:	
Normal.....	27
Surtax.....	20
Combined.....	47

Section 5 of H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001 would add a new section 22 to the code setting forth the criteria to be considered in postponing any scheduled tax cut. At the time of introduction of the bills, we explained the mechanics of postponement as follows:

Taking the President's 1960 budget estimate as the benchmark, the legislation provides that income tax rate reductions may be postponed after those to be effectuated as of January 1, 1959. Postponement would be made in the event of determination as of November 15 in any year that spending for the fiscal year is running in excess of \$77 billion, and a state of budget unbalance is threatened.

While the postponement procedures may be applied separately as between corporate and individual tax rate reductions, every postponement of an individual tax rate cut must be accompanied by a postponement of a corporate tax cut. The only limitation on this linkage is where the result would be to postpone a corporate reduction for more than 1 year.

The bills further provide that each scheduled reduction in either the individual or corporate tax may be postponed for only 1 year with the schedule of subsequent reductions also being moved ahead 1 year. Thus, if spending should not be kept under control, it would be possible to space out the income tax cuts over a maximum period of 9 years without new enabling legislation.

The legislation places the responsibility for initiating postponement in the hands of the President. Balance has been struck as between the Congress and the Executive in the final exercise of postponement authority.

This balance arises in that adequate opportunity is afforded the Congress, and its tax writing committees, to review the Federal revenue requirements as related to the proposed budget. The bills provide that Congress may take several alternative actions. When the President has postponed a scheduled individual rate reduction from January 1

to July 1, the Congress may, by means of a joint resolution approved before May 15, act to make the reduction become effective as of July 1. In the alternative, a scheduled reduction may be further postponed by the Congress until the next January 1. The same alternative disposition may be made with respect to corporate income taxes. Thus, the Congress may make effective on July 1 a previously postponed corporate reduction or postpone it further until January 1.

Provision is then made under the bills that where the Congress has not so acted by joint resolution the President, by May 15, may further postpone until the next January 1 any corporate or individual cut previously postponed. The criterion for such postponements under the presidential authority "shall be used so as to permit the maximum possible reduction to take effect on July 1 next in the taxes imposed by sections 1, 3, 11, and 3402 without causing an imbalance in the budget of the Federal Government for the following fiscal year."

Subsection 5(d) of the bills provides that a total postponement of any date upon which a scheduled rate reduction shall take effect cannot be for more than 1 year. Subsection 5(e) is a deferral provision wherein if a scheduled reduction is postponed under any of the alternative procedures outlined above, subsequent rate reduction dates not affected by the current postponement "shall be deferred for 1 year." It is by virtue of this postponement authority and the deferral provision of the bills that the rate reductions scheduled for 5 years may be deferred for a maximum of 9 years without revising the statute. Subsection 5(f) of the bills proposes definitions of the terms of reference "imbalance in the budget," "rate reduction date," "current fiscal year" and "following fiscal year."

Section 6 of the bills would amend code section 167 by adding new provisions relating to the tax treatment of depreciable property. The intent of these provisions is that their use be at the election of the taxpayer. This new approach would add six broad statutory classifications of property subject to depreciation and also set forth the maximum useful life to be applied to such classes, as follows:

Classification	Maximum useful life, years
Buildings	30
Standard and general-purpose machinery and equipment, including buildings useful only to house such machinery and equipment	12
Furniture and related equipment	10
Special-purpose machinery and equipment, including buildings useful only to house such machinery and equipment	6
Miscellaneous small equipment chargeable to capital account, including office machines	4
Automotive equipment	3

There are several limitations set forth in applying these provisions. The statutory reduction would be applicable only as to property with a useful life of 3 years

or more and involves new acquisitions of business plant and equipment. The advantages of this reduction in useful life is phased out over a 5-year period so that on property acquired in the first year affected taxpayers may take only one-fifth of the amount of reduction. As to property acquired in the second and each succeeding years, an additional one-fifth of such amount may be taken each year during each of the succeeding 4 years as to property acquired in each of such later years, with this limitation terminating entirely after December 31, 1963.

For example, assume a taxpayer acquired standard and general purpose machinery, which, under present law, would have a useful life of 16 years. Under the bill, the property would then fall into the standard and general purpose machinery category and for that property acquired in 1959, would have a useful life of $15\frac{1}{2}$ years: $16 - 12 = 4 \div 5 = .8$; $16 - .8 = 15\frac{1}{2}$. Property in the same classification acquired in 1960 would have a useful life of $14\frac{1}{2}$ and so on for property acquired in succeeding years until 1964, at which time the property acquired would have a useful life in this category of 12 years.

The bills also provide that except for taxpayers whose accounting is prescribed by a Federal or State regulatory body, the reductions in useful life of depreciable property "shall be applicable only to taxpayers whose books and records are kept in accordance with the determination of useful life there set forth."

As previously stated, we believe:

In practical effect, the new lives available for use in regard to property acquisitions in the fifth and succeeding years would permit an average increase of one-third in the rates of depreciation allowances. These increases would come on top of the liberal allowances in early years under the sum-of-the-years-digits and double declining balance methods, made available to taxpayers through the 1954 revenue code, and the extra first-year allowance granted to small business taxpayers in the legislation of 1958.

Section 6(b) of the legislation amends code section 1231, relating to capital gains and losses on property used in the trade or business, by providing that property subject to the special rule for depreciation shall not be entitled to capital gains treatment "except to that portion of the consideration received on the sale or exchange which exceeds the original cost or other basis of said property in the hands of the taxpayer." Thus, there is a limitation on the extent to which the long-term capital gains privilege may be applied to the adjusted basis of depreciable property.

Section 7 of the bills would add a new code section 1037 providing for the non-recognition of gain on certain sales or exchanges of capital assets.

Our intention in offering this amendment is as follows:

In accordance with the precedent already established on the sale and repurchase of homes, our bills make statutory provision for tax-free transfer of capital by individuals, but not by corporations, from one investment to another when the transactions are completed within the taxable year, and the investments sold have been held by the

taxpayer for at least 6 months. The result would be a deferral of tax on long-term gains until such time as the taxpayer disinvests. We have included this application of the rollover principle in the legislation since the only possible justification for taxing at any time the proceeds from sale of a long-term investment is that the seller is disinvesting with the intention of using capital gains as income for consumption purposes.

This deferral of tax on long-term gains is accomplished by providing that if capital assets are sold by an individual and within the same taxable year other such assets are purchased, any gain shall not be recognized to the extent that the aggregate purchase prices of such assets exceed the adjusted basis of capital assets sold during the year. Capital assets include those as defined in code section 1221 or property used in the trade or business as defined in code section 1231(b)(1). Where the purchase of capital assets results in such nonrecognition of gain there must be an adjustment to the basis of each of the capital assets purchased and held at the end of the taxable year. These adjustments to basis "shall include a reduction by an amount equal to the total amount of gain not so recognized allocated to each capital asset so purchased in the proportion that the purchase price bears to the aggregate of the purchase prices of all such assets" purchased and held at the end of such taxable year.

For example, assume a taxpayer electing to apply this provision at the end of his taxable year to asset A costing \$2,000, asset B costing \$3,000, and asset C costing \$5,000 purchased during such year. For the same taxable year under the bills, assume a gain from sales of other capital assets in the amount of \$4,000 was elected not to be recognized. This nonrecognized gain would be allocated to the assets held in proportion to their purchase price so that asset A would have its \$2,000 basis reduced by \$800, asset B would have its basis reduced by \$1,200, and asset C would have its basis reduced by \$2,000. Therefore, the basis of the assets for the purposes of measuring gains on such assets on future transactions would be as follows: Asset A, \$1,200; asset B, \$1,800; asset C, \$3,000.

In other words, as to assets purchased during any year any tax-free gain must be proportionately allocated to each such asset. The formula for allocation is the ratio of the purchase price of any one asset in relation to the total of purchase prices of similarly acquired assets during the same tax year. The right to invoke this nonrecognition or "rollover" of capital gain may be made at the election of the taxpayer.

Section 8 of the bills would reduce the top rate of estate tax and proportionately reduce the lowest and intervening rates. Section 9 would reduce the gift tax rates. Upon introduction we outlined these reductions as follows:

Instead of establishing a new formula for setting tax rates on estates and gifts, our bills would simply bring the top rate of estate tax down to 47 percent to coincide with the top rates of individual and corporate tax after 5 years, and consistent with the present relationship, reduce the top rate of gift tax to three-fourths of this figure, or 35.25 percent. All lower rates would be re-

duced in proportion. Thus, the estate tax rates would range by taxable brackets from 1.75 to 47 percent, compared with the present 3 to 77 percent, and the gift tax rates from 1.25 to 35.25 percent, compared with the present 2.25 to 57.75 percent.

Section 10 of the bills amends the withholding provisions of the code—section 3402—so as to conform the withholding tables and rates with the forward scheduled individual income tax reductions, provided under the bills. Section 11 would amend the code provisions relating to declaration of estimated tax by individuals—section 6015—and corporations—section 6016—to make it clear that such declarations could be filed on the basis of the tax rates in effect on the last day prescribed for the timely filing of the declaration of estimated tax.

Mr. Speaker, in closing we hope that this analysis will be helpful in furthering the objectives of our bills and understanding of the methods by which we seek to attain these objectives. Federal fiscal policy needs a new look—a long-range look that will provide greater economic growth, greater stability to Government revenues, and greater incentives to taxpayers. We believe our bills would contribute more than any other possible Government action to our economic well-being and national security.

Observation on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of February 18, 1959, and a letter from an Indiana schoolgirl:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 18, 1959]

GFWC PRESIDENT REPORTS ON CUBA

(By Mary L. Vaughan)

Cuba's population is wholeheartedly backing, by almost 100 percent, their new Premier Fidel Castro. That's the opinion of Miss Chloe Gifford, just back from a firsthand check of Cuba's two member clubs of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which she heads.

As president, she is overseer to nearly 11 million women spread around the globe in approximately 13,000 member club organizations.

Miss Gifford toured San Juan, St. Thomas, Jamaica, and Cuba, leaving here on the first day of February and arriving back in Washington last Saturday.

Her mission included visiting with officials of the GFWC member clubs in Havana—the Lyceum and Tennis Lawn Club and the Havana Women's Club.

The latter club, she stressed, took no active part in the revolution.

BACKED CASTRO

Lyceum members, however, backed Castro 100 percent and worked actively for him while transporting supplies and living in caves in Oriente Province for 2 years, Miss Gifford said.

In addition to her GFWC overseeing duties, Miss Gifford visited the revolution-torn areas in Cuba in a double capacity as vice president of CARE.

During her mission she helped distribute 25,000 CARE packages of food, clothing, and medical supplies.

The people in Cuba, she observed, back Premier Castro and buck the U.S. Government.

"They have great bitterness toward the U.S. Government," she stated, "but they differentiate between the citizens and our Government. They think our Government supported and furnished ammunition and guns to Batista."

Miss Gifford, while observing the adulation to Castro paid by the Cuban population, had reservations on that score.

"As a purely personal observation," she commented, "the people of Cuba worried me since I have never seen such dedication, such adulation given to one man as they are giving to Castro. It is dangerous—he is but 32 years of age and may find it difficult to keep his feet on the ground and not become a dictator."

CUBA NEGLECTED

Miss Gifford said she was distressed by the fact a country like Cuba "only 1 hour's flying time from this country" has been neglected in relationships.

In touring the rebel territory, Miss Gifford addressed the Cuban village people.

"I stood on a jeep and smiled and waved since I speak no Spanish," she revealed. "I did not attempt to interfere in their politics but brought greetings from the American people and wished them hope and prayers for unity and good government."

It was Miss Gifford's first visit to Cuba, she said. In Havana, she stayed in the Conrad Hilton Hotel when Premier Castro also was a fellow resident but she caught not even a glimpse of him.

"On the elevators I rode up and down many times with the rebels who wore beads and guns slung over their shoulders," she noted.

"They were most polite, always smiling and helpful," she added.

VISITS OFFICERS

Miss Gifford said she visited with the GFWC member club presidents—Senora Rosario Rexach de Leon of the Lyceum and Mrs. William T. Wright of the Havana Women's Club.

Miss Gifford said her trip will result in more active participation between the parent GFWC and its Cuban club membership.

Miss Gifford, of Lexington, Ky., will be seen by television fans on Friday night when Edward R. Murrow visits her local GFWC living quarters on his "Person to Person" show.

MARY'S CATHOLIC CIVICS CLUB

Decatur, Ind., Feb. 4, 1959.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Today, Sister Joan of Arc read to us from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 27, 1959, pages 1117 to 1118, the speech you made on Cuba. We, the members of Mary's Catholic Civics Club, wish to congratulate you on the fine, just, and honest report you made to the House on Dr. Castro. Sister has been reading to us the true side of the Cuban situation from Catholic periodicals, so we knew, but many, who read only the secular press didn't. We are glad that you suggested to the House Members that United States rally to the Cuban hero instead of denouncing him.

Since my name is Powell too, sister asked that I write to you. I am in the seventh grade of St. Joseph's school, Decatur, Ind.

It is through our Representative E. Ross ADAMS that we get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. With those and other material Mr. ADAMS is sending, we hope to be able to organize debate matter for our mock congressional sessions this month.

We belong to a national club sponsored by the Commission on American Citizenship in Washington, D.C.

Sister and the club join me in saying, "God bless you and more power to you."

Sincerely yours,

PATRICIA POWELL.

Public Housing and the Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget is the most critical goal which must be attained in this session of Congress. It is up to Congress, but here is a picture of just what makes this goal so difficult to reach.

The Constitution provides that no moneys be withdrawn from the Treasury of the United States without an appropriation authorized by law. For the last 20 years, it has been customary for several congressional committees to draft legislation providing for a so-called back-door approach to the Treasury, instead of going to the Congress and asking for an appropriation when said legislation calls for money to be spent for any purpose. This is done with a provision which authorizes the head of an agency, like the Housing Agency, to go to the Secretary of the Treasury, deliver to him a note or notes for whatever amount they might wish to draw, and apply it against the total sum which is made available by the bill. With such a provision, an agency can use the money without restraint, and can do just about as it wishes with it. The agency is not required either annually or at any other time, to go before a committee of Congress, and say what it would do with the money. There is no annual or other review provided for its operations. It is just a freelance in the spending of the money.

Clause 4 of rule XXI of the House rules provided for the solution of these problems and the appropriation of money through the Appropriations Committee. To quote the rule:

No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing an appropriation be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A question of order on an appropriation in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time.

This has been interpreted in several parliamentary rulings in the House of Representatives over the past 15 or 20 years in such a way that congressional committees other than the Appropriations Committee could bring in a bill with a provision for the back-door approach to the Treasury, such as I have described, and as a result of it, we have had a tremendous amount of irresponsible legislation. Over \$5 billion was appro-

priated last year by the Congress through the back-door method. Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, has introduced a resolution, which is now up for consideration before the Rules Committee, which resolution would do away with this practice and force those people who have been avoiding a proper justification for withdrawing money from the Treasury to come before the Appropriations Committee for their money.

Conditions have come to pass where there has been no review of a lot of these Federal expenditures. It is absolutely necessary if we are going to maintain the liberties of the United States that we keep in the Appropriations Committee of the Congress the power to appropriate funds. If we allow legislation to continue to make provisions such as the recent housing bill passed by the Senate; namely, to turn over \$3.7 billion to the Public Housing Administration to spend on public housing without any restrictions whatever and without any control and without any review over the 5½ years that is the period covered by the authority written into the bill, the Congress is simply shirking its responsibilities. Time after time, we find cases where expenditures have been made and will be made that the Congress did not approve and that the very people who are urging this type of legislation did not approve themselves. For instance, there is no control in the housing legislation as to what sort of construction there should be; there is no such thing as an attempt to maintain a good, clean job. The housing bill, as it presently is before the House committee, calls for \$1.5 billion for urban renewal, \$3.7 billion for housing, \$400 million for college housing loans, and for veterans' housing, \$300 million. The Founding Fathers who drew the Constitution, after having gone through a long period of war with Great Britain to obtain their liberties, thought that it was necessary to place a provision in the Constitution prohibiting the spending of money without an appropriation. When there is no appropriation of money, frankly, it appears to me as though the language was not sufficient to comply with the Constitution requirement for the proper appropriation of funds. With that in mind, Congressman SMITH has prepared and has before the Rules Committee House Resolution 161. It would require that these funds should pass through the Appropriations Committee, after being authorized by other committees by bills coming from them. It would require an annual review of what is going to be spent and what it is going to be spent for. We must protect our people from what is going on through a bloc of bureaucrats. Surely, that would save more money than any other action that we could take at this time. This resolution is the only way to restore to Congress the power to appropriate money given it by the Constitution.

These various projects—the public housing construction program where buildings are erected and rented to people who have incomes as high as \$10,000 a year—are probably the most ridiculous of our governmental expenditures. The rents that these people pay are cal-

culated to just above cover the cost of the maintenance of the buildings and the accessories. They do not pay a substantial amount into the Treasury. They pay no taxes upon the buildings and we are taxing the poor people who have been thrifty enough to buy and pay for their own houses, to pay for the cost and maintenance of these public housing projects.

Many of these property owners have less income than the people who are living in these public houses, and if there is any project whatever that we could get along without, this is it.

The urban renewal projects and the college housing projects and the veterans loan project can be taken care of by local and private capital, if the proper efforts are made to provide that sort of thing.

Somewhere, somehow, there must come a sense of responsibility and of meeting our obligations to the Government of the United States; to the necessity for keeping down our Federal budget so that we can prevent any more outbreaks of the inflation which has plagued the United States terrifically since the end of World War II.

The Now Indispensable Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD a very fine editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat Thursday, February 19, 1959, in tribute to John Foster Dulles.

My Democratic friends in the Congress and who write newspaper columns and comment on the news as radio and television news commentators might well read this editorial and explain, for the benefit of their constituents, readers, and listeners, why Secretary Dulles' illness has produced this great change of attitude on their part.

I suggest that the reason for the change lies in the fact that they have been placing American foreign policy into partisan politics in a snide and indirect way, and all the time they have been protesting that foreign policy should not be the subject of partisan attack. Now that they think that building up Secretary Dulles' stature is no longer a threat to this kind of undercover attack because he will not remain on the scene to embarrass them with his prestige, they praise him. I suspect that their real purpose is to try to appear to be nonpartisan and objective so that they can continue their partisan sniping of the Eisenhower administration.

If anyone reading this who does not have the privileges of the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would care to comment on this editorial or my comments, I would be glad to place their remarks in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

THE NOW INDISPENSABLE DULLES

John Foster Dulles, afflicted with a probably incurable cancer, has suddenly become an outstanding patriot, a genius of American statesmanship, the indispensable man in the State Department.

Only a month, a week ago nothing like such prestige attached to his name.

Long, bitter critics of the Secretary of State now view with jittery foreboding his possible departure from the cold war arena, where for six terribly difficult years he has been the West's bulkhead against each Red crisis in the Soviet's campaign for world aggrandisement.

Yet this is the same Mr. Dulles whose resignation has been demanded in some quarters for more than a year. This is the same architect of U.S. policy who has been mercilessly grilled and blasted in the Senate, whose comments have been ridiculed or turned into dirty words.

This is the same Secretary Dulles who has been flayed also in allied capitals.

Today many of the same men in public life, who made him so frequently the butt of lacerating criticism, call him a "great Secretary of State" and express fear at his loss in a time of "desperate need."

Among such are Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas and Senator MANSFIELD, Montana's minor sage of foreign affairs.

This overnight reversal of political opinion is somewhat nauseating. It is understandable, justified. But it makes many sincere observers of our foreign conduct sick at the stomach.

The desperate illness of Mr. Dulles evokes natural feelings of sympathy. But that is not responsible for this shift in critics' attitude. Men with any kind of knowledge about the dangerous power complex look with grave trepidation at possible loss of Foster Dulles.

One reason assigned for the sudden upsurge of Dulles' reputation is that we are in the midst of a delicate crisis over Berlin and Germany. He has laid most of the plans for allied cooperation in this issue, and for the foreign ministers conference.

But Secretary Dulles has confronted a virtually incessant series of crises vis-a-vis Russia and China during this administration. He has drafted and led strategy to balk Soviet and Peiping threats time after time.

He is doing the same job now that he has long done. Where were these latter-day backslappers, where was the approval of political potshotters then?

When the crisis chips were down, the Dulles programs were backed on signally non-partisan basis. But after the heat abated, he was again the target for rasping antagonism that sought to discredit his efforts, to lever him out of office.

Now in London, Paris, and Bonn it is regarded as unthinkable that Mr. Dulles should be replaced. Leaders in each of these capitals, however, have often in the past opposed Mr. Dulles and his policies as inflexible, too moralistic.

Sometimes perhaps, Mr. Dulles gave that impression. He has made mistakes. But it was his courage and indefatigable purpose that has thrust backbone into western diplomacy ever since Mr. Eisenhower became President.

The Secretary has exhibited like an oriflamme America's determination to manifest strength in the teeth of Communist threats. He has refused to back down on principle once, his concessions being ones of procedure and approach.

That has preserved peace without frittering away our position in the Far East, in Europe, in the Middle East where the problem has been the most treacherous of all. No other Secretary of State in our history has possessed so much power. The President has

called him the greatest ever to occupy this post, indispensable to U.S. foreign policy.

While indispensable is a relative term—no one is unqualifiedly indispensable—Mr. Dulles has come close to the role. But this is not a sudden development. His efforts, knowledge, and resource in piloting foreign policy have been the same for years, during those same years his foes—sincere and opportunist drivers—were knifing at his back.

He should remain in office as long as he is able to counsel and direct the Nation's intricate policy abroad. When he is no longer able, he will resign.

Letter From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article written by Richard H. Rovere which appeared in the February 14, 1959, issue of the New Yorker.

The article is as follows:

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON

FEBRUARY 4.

For the fourth or fifth time within a week, the Secretary of Defense has insisted that our missile program is coming along fine, that we are spending on it all the money we need to spend, and that the Russians are not to be believed when they claim to be able to strike any point on earth with their long-range missiles. There is a powerful, almost enveloping tendency here, though, to reject Mr. McElroy's word and to assume that his opposite number, Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky, the Soviet Defense Minister, was speaking the essential truth when he addressed us from Moscow yesterday and said, "Your arms are too short, gentlemen." Of course, the information available to both men is of such a nature as to allow wide differences of interpretation and a broad exercise of sophistry. Mr. McElroy hasn't seen or counted Marshal Malinovsky's missiles, and Marshal Malinovsky hasn't seen or counted Mr. McElroy's. Even the most pessimistic of informed American observers are inclined to believe that the Russians have not yet achieved the striking power they boast of, and it could well be that, as of this moment, the literal truth would confirm the skepticism that Mr. McElroy showed when he said he doubted whether the Russians have intercontinental ballistic missiles ready for combat today. A figure that is accepted by a large number of people is that the Russians are producing about 15 ICBM's a month; at that rate, impressive as it is, it would take a good many months, if not a good many years, production to give them any assurance of being able to destroy us with missiles alone. But to just about everyone but Mr. McElroy, this is a fact of only secondary importance; nobody, after all, is predicting the firing of missiles tomorrow afternoon. The important truth that is known and conceded, even by Mr. McElroy, is that not a single American ICBM is today ready for military use. Mr. McElroy says that the first few Atlases, an Atlas being an Air Force weapon of superior performance, will be emplaced on a site in California by July 1. But this, too, is disputed by people in the Pentagon and in industry whose acquaintance with such

matters is as great as Mr. McElroy's acquaintance with soap; they say they will be surprised to see the first Atlas squadron before the end of next year. As far as it is possible to learn, the United States does not have, right now, today, a ballistic missile that is, in the local patois, operational and that could reach Greenwich, Conn., from Washington, D.C. (The Redstone, an Army missile, can arch its way over 200 surface miles with a quite satisfactory degree of accuracy.)

The administration's logic, as it is found in Mr. McElroy's testimony before congressional committees and in his statements to the press, is that since we don't have any missiles ready for use and since the Russians don't have enough missiles to destroy every one of our military installations here and abroad, a rough parity exists. It could also be argued that since there is no "missile gap" between the United States and Liechtenstein. The administration clings lovingly to the present tense. But its critics—and on this matter it is hard to find anyone who isn't a critic—seem able to destroy its case by accepting the least terrifying of its figures and projecting them no more than 22 months ahead. It is known for a certainty that the Russians have a wide variety of missiles of less than intercontinental range. These have been in production at a rate doubtless greater than 15 a month for a year, at the very least. The stockpile is assumed by some to be in the thousands and by the most cautious intelligence analysts to be in the hundreds. If their ICBM production has been at the rate of 15 a month for 5 to 6 months, and if they maintain this rate throughout this year and next (the chances are certainly that the rate will be stepped up), the Russians will have a number of intercontinental missiles—somewhere between four and five hundred—that simply will not be subject to the kind of cheerful comparisons offered today by the President and Mr. McElroy. Such a quantity of ICBM's, plus a somewhat greater quantity of shorter-range missiles, would, unless our experts are talking through their hats, put Mr. Khrushchev in a position to employ the finite strategy that we ourselves hope someday to be in a position to employ; that is, to proceed from the assumption that the destructive capacity already achieved is adequate to any earthly requirements for destruction. Mr. McElroy has assured troubled Congressmen that well before this point is reached by the Russians, we shall have a squadron of Atlases emplaced on the west coast. One squadron, 10 Atlases. Even if the first squadron is soon joined by another, the relative position of the Russians will be the same. The gap will be for some certain period a chasm of almost immeasurable size.

Attempts to measure it tend, if anything, to make it seem less awesome than in fact it is. Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri, has said that "through 1961 our planning envisages the Russians having over four times as many operational ICBM's as the United States." (Senator SYMINGTON has been aided in most of his calculations by an old associate in the Air Force, Mr. Tom Lanphier, now of Convair, which is making the Atlas. Mr. Lanphier surely knows what his plant is doing, and he thinks the 4-to-1 ratio is the most sanguine possible.) But 4 to 1, 5 to 1, even 10 to 1—no ratio reflects what Senator SYMINGTON says is the simple fact that we will at some point be without effective retaliatory power. At that point, there isn't much practical difference between 10 to 1 and a million to nothing.

It has frequently been recalled in recent weeks that, historically, the most discouraging readings of the Russians' claims for their technology and military strength have been confirmed by the facts when the facts have become known. Some highly discouraging readings have been made in recent weeks, and the effect of them has been to make the

moment of most extreme danger seem closer to the present than it does in a reading that merely extrapolates from the facts that are almost universally conceded. There are people with access to all the intelligence gathered by our several agencies who believe that the Russians right now have not dozens or hundreds but thousands of missiles ready for business. There are some students of test performances who regard Mr. McElroy's statement that it was not "our intent or policy to match [the Russians] missile for missile" as a macabre joke; they maintain that if by some miracle we did have the precise number they have, they would still be twice as powerful, because their missiles are twice as effective as those we are currently planning to build. A distinguished military critic, Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, writing in the Reporter, says that Russian missiles have anywhere from 3 to 5 times the power of ours and that ours are 25 percent behind theirs in accuracy. When these factors are reckoned in, he says, it would take 33 of our most powerful missiles to give us 90 percent assurance of destroying a fortified missile site in the Soviet Union, while 15 of theirs would give them 90 percent assurance of destroying a fortified site on this continent; one of their missiles is worth more than two of ours, and a true matching would require us to have twice the number they have. To be sure, there are estimable men, on and off the Government payroll who dispute this and think that our products are, if anything, somewhat superior. But since we aren't producing our products, the whole matter is academic.

The strategic and diplomatic consequences of the missile gap, and of the possibility of missile warfare even when no gap exists, are absorbing the thoughts of a good many people here; these consequences appear staggering in their dimensions and revolutionary in their nature. One common assumption after another is going by the board. At some stage, it seems plain, the whole notion of mutual deterrence—on which both we and the Russians have placed great reliance—will be of highly questionable validity. To be sure, it is not quite ready for the discard yet. In a general war fought today, manned bombers would still be used by both sides—presupposing, as all but a fairly small number of our strategists do, that the Russians have yet to achieve the capacity for pushbutton extermination. The ability of a handful of manned bombers to get close enough to their targets for retaliatory purposes would seem sufficient to deter any government of sane men—sane enough, that is, to wish to go on living and governing—from taking the initiative. The Strategic Air Command may compare to the Russian forces that could be marshaled for attack as a sheriff's posse compares to a Panzer division, yet even with as little as between 4 and 6 percent of SAC's planes on airborne alert (it used to be said that between 20 and 30 percent were always airborne, well fueled, and carrying bombs, but these figures have lately been challenged without any response from Mr. McElroy's office) we have a capacity for visiting intolerable destruction on the Soviet Union. But the moment the Russians are ready with a truly versatile collection of ballistic and guided missiles, they could—in theory, at least—destroy the better part of our civilization without incurring any danger to themselves except that which might descend upon them when the winds returned to their skies some of the fallout from the warheads rained on us. To achieve a victory so nearly total, they would need a sufficient number of missiles to destroy the missile sites in this country, our SAC bases in other countries, and the few SAC bombers that might come lumbering into Russian air space on instructions from communications centers communicating their

last instructions. The SAC planes might be destroyed by guided air-defense rockets with a hundred-mile range—rockets the Russians claim they will shortly have. Thus, with a well-coordinated war plan, an aggressor could eliminate an adversary without suffering the loss of a single life among his own nationals. Never before in the history of warfare has this been so.

The day is coming, then, when we shall no longer be able to place any degree of trust in the "melancholy paradox," as Churchill put it, of peace being maintained through mutual fear of destruction. As long as piloted aircraft are still useful, terror will be roughly in balance and war will continue to seem inviting only to men with an unconquerable impulse for suicide. But when the Russians are really ready for combat with missiles, then aggression, meaning war, may very well appear a sane idea—even, one can imagine, a prudent idea. The doctrine of "preventive war" may once more make sense—for them, anyway. And this is by no means the worst of it. The balance of terror will still not be restored when—assuming that it ever happens—the missile gap is closed. For the speed of ballistic missiles gives the aggressor an almost absolute advantage over any enemy. The enemy may have the means of retaliation, but he has practically no time in which to decide to retaliate. He may have superb devices for detecting, at the earliest possible moment, that destruction is soaring toward him. His decision, once he has made it, may be communicated at the speed of light, which is still faster than that of any man-made object. But something has to happen between the moment of detection and the moment of response—and that something is quite a lot, and it has to happen in human minds. The procedure by which a decision to retaliate would be made is perhaps the most closely guarded of our military secrets. We know, though, that under the Atomic Energy Act the President is the only person who can authorize the use of nuclear or thermonuclear weapons, so, presumably, the President must be found, given the facts, and given time to make his grave decision. And even before this there has to be some evaluation of the data about the attack. Is the radar working properly? Could it possibly be a flock of geese showing up as missiles? (Geese have been mistaken for weapons on radar.) All ambiguities, presumably, must be filtered out. And then there are the unknown terms of our agreements with our allies. It may be necessary to get in touch with Downing Street or Bonn or the Elysée or Mecca. After evaluation and consultation must come the decision and the communication of it down the chain of command. No doubt the deciding and the communicating can be done in minutes, even seconds. But after all this comes the countdown, which must be gone through as long as all our rockets are fueled with liquid oxygen—a substance that cannot be stored as gasoline is stored in a car. The minimum time for this is about 20 minutes. It is estimated that the maximum elapsed time between the detection of the launching of ICBMs aimed at us and their impact on their targets would be 30 minutes. That leaves 10 minutes for everything else.

There is a possibility of restoring the balance of terror by the development of solid-fuel missiles that could be launched either from concealed and nearly indestructible sites or from mobile ones. Solid, and therefore storable, fuel would eliminate the need for a countdown, and missiles might be launched as soon as a decision has been reached. Indeed, if the means of detection were foolproof and if the necessary legal and political arrangements could be made, an aggressor's launching could simply trigger a retaliatory launching. A mobile site, such as a railroad flatcar or a submarine, or an

impregnable one, such as the ocean floor or the inside of a mountain, would—in the foreseeable future, anyway—eliminate the likelihood of all our missiles being destroyed on the ground while the President was being fetched. We have no solid-fuel or mobile-base missiles operational now, and the only one that is in an advanced state of development—the Navy's Polaris, designed for release from a submerged submarine—has a short range, a low accuracy rating, and not very much of a warhead. (And the problem of communicating a decision to a submerged submarine is formidable, to say the least.) The most promising of our solid-fuel projects (it is an odd world in which "promising" comes to mind as a term for an instrument whose use would make certain the end of life over large areas of the globe) is the Air Force's Minuteman, an ICBM that is being designed for firing from anywhere, anytime. The Minuteman may be ready by 1965.

Our arms may prove useless as a deterrent force. We have, however, the capacity for a surprise attack of our own. It would not be preventive war, for we could not conceivably hope to destroy the present Soviet power of retaliation. And even if we had a good number of working missiles and could, in aggression, hope for as cheap a victory as Khrushchev may soon have in prospect, we would not, in our present frame of mind, strike the first blow. We know this, and we keep saying it, but if Khrushchev does not believe us when we say it, he would have to give the most serious kind of consideration to destroying us. Even if he accepted our good intentions, he might reasonably consider bring about our destruction, simply because it would be prudential insurance against an accidental war—the possibility of which increases every time a missile is mounted on its pad, every time a new radar tracking system is set up.

Fortunately, there are deterrents other than American arms. One must be the self-doubt of the Russians. They cannot ever be sure of their ability to destroy our power of retaliation. Another must lie in whatever remains of the consciences of the rulers of the Kremlin; they are human beings, and none of them could relish the responsibility that would be theirs for a willful act of aggression of such magnitude. Still another is in their view of life and history; they wish to inherit civilizations, and believe that they will. And, too, there is a certain amount of deterrent power in their own arms. An attack on a scale large enough to wipe us out would poison their air as well as ours, the more surely since thermonuclear warheads would have to be deposited on American bases all around the perimeter of their world. Furthermore, the destruction of those bases would mean war with the allies who have permitted us to place the bases on their soil. In many cases, the resources and populations which the Russians covet, would be destroyed. For the present, our need for our allies, our need for placing some part of our strength in their hands, may be greater than any need they have for us. In a full-scale war, our overseas bases would probably be useless from a military point of view; the Russians know where all of them are, and they could knock out every last one with missiles. But the existence of those bases is now immensely precious to us, for it greatly complicates any decisions the Russians must make. Still, there are people here who can foresee a day when the rules of the Kremlin might make a cool, purposeful decision—one meeting most of the requirements of good sense as they understand good sense—to lay waste to the United States and several of its allies.

It is not beyond our means to take many steps that would tend to discourage such a decision—to remove from it the elements of good sense and replace them with elements of folly. Some steps would be in the direc-

tion of more armament, some in the direction of disarmament. In the peculiar dialectic of the cold war, it seems always necessary to sprint in the armaments race and at the same time do our utmost to call the whole thing off; mobilization and demobilization are simultaneous aims. The Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee is receiving expert testimony to the effect that our missiles program could be greatly accelerated—and specifically that we could double our Atlas ICBM production in the period just ahead. It is also being told that our airborne alert could be more alert and more airborne. The outlook for disarmament and for agreements to diminish the dangers of accidental war seems as bleak as ever at the moment, but the very effort to obtain such agreements in good faith has some of the value the agreements themselves would have. It keeps the issues alive and under discussion, it demonstrates concern, it encourages an awareness of the awful responsibilities of those who possess modern armaments. "We arm to parley," Churchill said, and we can parley to disarm—if not with hope of an early reduction of destructive force, at least with the hope of reaching honorable settlements of political questions by political rather than military means.

RICHARD H. ROVERE.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of February 21, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

FEBRUARY 21, 1959.

The Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959 was the year's first tax bill and major legislation from the Ways and Means Committee in which I participated as a committee member. Because this bill affects many people (there are even more insurance policyholders than taxpayers), because insurance is a unique corporate type of business, and its taxation is extremely complicated and technical, I had a real tax baptism. Insurance is already the most heavily taxed thrift institution and the trend is well established away from savings in favor of protection only. At the least, I suggested in debate that the economic impact of State and Federal taxes plus this increase should be more carefully studied. While the bill attempted to improve existing law, and did in several ways, I opposed it finally because of the 90 percent increase in taxes over last year which may well result in increasing insurance premiums and in expanding social security, the Government's competitive provision for everyone's future. (My brief analysis of this insurance bill will be mailed to anyone requesting it.)

Labor leaders' joint pronouncements deserve everyone's attention. AFL-CIO's Reuther announced a march on Washington of the unemployed. AFL-CIO's Meany, in Puerto Rico, announced labor's decision to demand more pay and shorter hours. How's that for logic? You are out of work, so your labor leader demands higher pay and Government intervention. Of course, the whole trouble of these two pronouncements

springs from the fallacious unconstitutional reasoning behind the 1946 Employment Act which implies that the Federal Government is responsible for employment.

In economic fact, this cannot be, regardless of the political and demagogic appeal. Nor do I think Reuther and Meany believe it either. They know, too, that elbow grease, initiative, and work provide employment, not another government-made-work contract which must first drain the tax money from the people. The fact that government does not first get the money in before spending it does not change the simple economic logic that if you spend more than you take in, live beyond your income, you build inflation resulting in weakened currency and ultimate economic crash. The logic of Messrs. Reuther and Meany is consistent only with that of socialists, not with freedom and free enterprise. If, because of government control and big spending economic freedom is lost, then necessarily all personal freedoms will go. This attempted economic security sought by government handout is not security at all, but a cancellation of all our freedoms, even as the prisoner in jail has the security of food, clothing and housing but lacks real freedom—to direct his life minute by minute, day by day, as he sees fit.

Battle of the budget department (U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 13). "Democrats are pushing programs they know the President will reject. Bills are framed to offer huge sums of aid to large groups. The political strategy: Show that the Democrats want to help people, but that a Republican President won't let them." Political attempts of this kind to take credit and place blame by spending our taxpayers' money, along with the labor leaders' demands, is absolutely contrary to the economic philosophy of free enterprise, the American way. Perhaps we should remember the 10 commandments, a modern addition to the Ten Commandments.

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage-payer. You cannot help the poor man by destroying the rich. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred. You cannot establish security on borrowed money. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

It was this philosophy of economic liberty which Abe Lincoln personified and which I endeavored to present in speeches over Lincoln's birthday. Liberals, the big spenders charging our costs of government to the future, as I see it, are doing something absolutely immoral, charging our bills to our children and grandchildren. Taxpayers today can vote. Taxpayers as yet unborn cannot vote. Let's unburden our grandchildren. Further, let's not talk about cutting our debt and taxes without practicing what we preach, namely, by cutting down the wasteful government spending programs and those in the welfare field.

George Washington's counsel in his "Farewell Address" has never been disproved: "As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous

exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasions, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate."

So, it's up to the voter—that's all there is to it. When will the people recognize, praise, and demand fiscal responsibility of the Congress? Now is the time.

A People-to-People Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1959, a group of private physicians and public spirited business leaders, with the enthusiastic endorsement of President Eisenhower and the medical and dental professions of the United States, announced one of the finest citizen efforts yet launched in the field of foreign relations.

Identified as project HOPE—health opportunity for people everywhere—the People to People Health Foundation announced plans to send the converted hospital ship *Consolation* on a continuing good-will mission to southeast Asia. This will be a floating medical center, visiting nations in that area of the world at the invitation of the medical professions of those nations—a truly people-to-people gesture of friendship.

The plan is to stay long enough in each area to give nationals of each country a chance to learn the latest in American medical technology. The ship will carry the latest in equipment, drugs, skilled doctors, dentists, and nurses. In addition, drugs, training aids, and equipment will be left behind for use in each country.

Expansion and improvement of medical teaching by the profession in countries visited will be a primary objective of the mission. The ship will also operate as combination floating hospital center medical schools, training and treatment center, a base for medical, nursing, and sanitation teams, and a logistical center for medical and health and exchange programs.

With the hope that everyone will get behind this splendid effort, I should like to include at this point in my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of February 9, headed "A People-to-People Ship":

A PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE SHIP

The plan to take the Navy hospital ship *Consolation* out of mothballs and send her on a year's visit to Southeast Asia is most imaginative and at the same time relatively simple. The vessel will be a combination hospital and medical school. She will carry a complement of about 200 doctors and an equal number of nurses.

The possibilities of this operation are enormous. It is strictly a "people-to-people" project, appropriately sponsored by the People-to-People Health Foundation. The

necessary funds will be provided from private sources, and the ship will be operated at cost by the American President Lines.

A first objective, of course, is to bring medical care to some remote areas where help is needed. The ship will actually serve as a hospital, a clinic, and a laboratory. Presumably it will stay for a considerable time in some ports where it is especially needed. But the plans go beyond this. The ship will also be used as a training school for persons in the various areas, who can get a sound first-hand look at certain techniques that would not otherwise be within their reach. In turn, those serving on the ship will have an extraordinary opportunity to make observations, to exchange experiences with persons in the field.

We have repeatedly commented on the need to make the exchange of technical skill and information and the actual giving of assistance as simple, human, and "person-to-person" as is possible. A congenial criticism leveled against some of our programs has dealt with the plethora of blueprints, redtape, and the lack of human contacts.

The voyage of the *Consolation* should be subject to no such criticism, since it will attempt to go directly to the heart of the exchange of skills and the giving of aid. The ship itself will be seen. Its doctors and nurses will be there. And persons with whom we are concerned will realize that other persons really care about them and their welfare. There should also be no difficulty in obtaining the funds to pay for this mission. They could not be spent in a better cause.

An Answer to the Wheat Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1959, I introduced H.R. 4749, a bill which would establish a domestic parity plan for wheat.

I am convinced this legislation is a sound approach to our present wheat problems and I am hopeful that it will receive prompt congressional attention.

The February 5 issue of the Oregon Farmer contained an excellent article describing this program. I think Mr. Clancy Jean, executive vice president of the Oregon Wheatgrowers League is to be commended, not only for this fine statement, but also for his consistent and valuable work in support of the wheatgrowers of America:

GROWERS SEEK AN ANSWER TO THE WHEAT PROBLEM—SUGGESTED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEATGROWERS: A MODIFICATION OF THE TWO PRICE PLAN AND BUSHEL ALLOTMENTS

(By Clancy Jean)

Only a person completely sheltered from newspapers, magazines, radio, and television doesn't know that wheat is the No. 1 farm problem in the United States today.

It might be of some interest to take a look at what the wheatgrowers have to say about the problem, since it is they who, in the final analysis, will have to make the necessary adjustments if a path is to be blazed out of the present maze.

When the National Association of Wheatgrowers met for its ninth annual convention in Denver just before Christmas, growers look

a long, hard look at their own situation and at the national picture.

Essentially, they gave cognizance to two basic factors: (1) There's lots of wheat. Further, in any evaluation of the present program, which resulted in the 1958 wheat crop of 1,450 million bushels, it is evident that present production control laws are inadequate. It would appear that, with respect to this point, they would be in agreement with Secretary Benson. So, the growers say a new approach is needed to stabilize production.

(2) From the grower's standpoint, the most pressing problem is that of maintaining sufficient income to purchase the products of industry and labor, which he needs for his operation as well as to retain a satisfactory standard of living in face of reduced acreage and rising costs of production. Thus, a new approach is definitely needed to stabilize income.

In developing their plan the Nation's wheat growers kept four basic concepts in mind:

Wheat growers' net income must be maintained if they are to reduce production below the current level;

The buildup of CCC stocks must be stopped and gradually reduced to a normal level;

Further reduction in acreage of wheat must not be shifted to other crops.

Increased yields per acre must not be reflected in increased Government holdings of wheat.

What is needed, the growers say, is to stop the buildup of Commodity Credit's stocks, and even reduce them, while also reducing production through a program that takes increased yields into consideration and prevents diverted wheat acres from creating problems with other crops—do these things and maintain growers' incomes.

To accomplish this the Nation's wheat producers are proposing a production and income stabilization plan.

First off, they say, do away with acreage allotments and checking of compliance along with current marketing quotas—and substitute for these marketing allotments expressed in bushels.

They want marketing allotments based on the wheat base acreage for the average of the 1952-53 planted acreage. Each farm would receive a bushel allotment. This would be arrived at by multiplying the base acreage by the normal yield per acre, factored to the county allotment. Normal yields, they say should be based on the period that provides the most equitable relationship between counties and States.

For example, it would have worked out this way for 1958:

	Bushels
Estimated amount used for food in the United States	485,000,000
Estimated amount of U.S. exports	430,000,000
Total estimated demand	915,000,000
Less amount of wheat to be moved out of CCC stocks each year	75,000,000
National marketing allotment	840,000,000

The plan also calls for price supports of \$1.60 per bushel for the national marketing allotment. This allotment, as shown above, would be spelled out for each farm in bushels and there would be a price support on this amount of \$1.60 per bushel.

In addition, certificates would be issued on each grower's share of the 485 million bushels used for food in the United States. These certificates would be redeemable in an amount to return to the grower full parity on that portion of his production. Using 1958 as an example, food uses of wheat were equal to about 60 percent of

the national marketing allotment suggested by the plan.

But, in order to be eligible to receive these certificates, the grower would have to put at least 20 percent—but not more than 30 percent—of his wheat base in the conservation reserve. Moreover, wheat growers insist that neither the \$5,000 limitation nor the depletion of the soil bank base requirements should apply under this plan. They recognize, moreover, that a suitable cover must be maintained on the acreage placed in the conservation reserve.

Nor is this all the plan includes. The growers further believe that redemption of the certificates should be provided through the sale of the certificates to processors. This provision is taken from the domestic parity plan, long advocated by wheatgrowers. This would relieve the taxpayer of a major part of the costs of the stabilization plan, it is pointed out.

Wheatgrowers have long held that they are entitled to full parity for at least that portion of their crop that is used for food consumption in the United States.

The proposal, officers of the National Association of Wheat Growers maintain, would save the Federal Government an estimated \$500 million per year, based on current costs. A condensed list of the possible savings shows the program would save the Federal Government \$100 million from reduced export subsidies; \$75 million for the annual storage costs of the proposed defense stockpile and remaining CCC stocks; \$10 million for administrative costs due to elimination of acreage allotments and market quotas; \$310 million, brought about by not only arresting the annual increase in CCC stocks, but also by moving 75 million bushels from CCC stocks each year.

Additionally, the growers' plan calls for no restrictions on the use of wheat on farms where produced or when sold to other farmers or to bonded feed processors.

As outlined, the plan would provide a wheatgrower with income from four sources: (1) He would receive \$1.60 (approximately 65 percent of parity) for his share of the national allotment, which is computed to be 840 million bushels for 1958. (2) About 60 percent of his bushel quota would be eligible to receive certificates, which when redeemed would provide him full parity on this part of his production. (3) He would receive soil bank payments from placing 20 to 30 percent of his wheat base acreage in the conservation reserve, which is a requisition of the plan in order to obtain certificates. And (4) should his production exceed his bushel allotment, this wheat could be marketed only to bonded feed processors, other farmers, or fed on his own farm—at no support level at all.

To implement the program, the growers believe that at least 500 million bushels of the present CCC stocks should be set aside in a defense stockpile. The wheatgrowers point out that stockpiles of food are equal in importance to munitions and strategic materials and this stockpile, like others, should be maintained as part of our national defense program. This is generally recognized as the minimum level of carryover advisable under current world tensions. The growers also note that costs of storage could be greatly reduced if bids for this defense stockpile were asked on a 5-year contract with a schedule of premiums and discounts that would permit turning of stocks by warehousemen.

The National Association of Wheat Growers insist the proposal will work only if adopted in its entirety. The association proposes that the plan be offered to farmers in a national referendum. Eligibility to vote would be based on those eligible to vote in the last wheat marketing quota referendum, and a simple majority of those voting should be sufficient to make it effective.

We Tolerate the Saturday Evening Post Editorials—But Just Barely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 14, 1959, edition of the Saturday Evening Post and an editorial comment on the Post's opinions by my hometown newspaper, the distinguished Eugene Register-Guard:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 14, 1959]

WE TOLERATE DEMOCRACIES OR DICTATORS, AS NATION'S INTEREST DEMANDS

Apparently following Dr. Milton Eisenhower's advice to embrace democrats and brush off dictators, the State Department recognized the regime set up by Fidel Castro in Cuba before Castro had even arrived at the capital. Immediately the Castro regime proceeded to demonstrate its democratic attributes by bumping off some of Batista's followers without trial and announcing the trial of hundreds of "war criminals." Since Nuremberg, the doctrine that a general in a lost cause is ipso facto a war criminal is presumably democratic. Nevertheless, Castro's acts, plus certain items in his history, might suggest the wisdom of letting the dust settle before deciding that Castro was just the democrat to embrace.

There appears to be considerable confusion in the ranks of those who think we should eschew dictators and embrace democrats. Some of those who took a lofty line toward Perón have no compunction about offering aid to Sukarno, who is doing a fair job at dictating in Indonesia. Others want us to recognize Mao Tse-tung's dictatorship over Red China—a dictatorship which even Yugoslavia's dictator Tito has criticized as too tough—but are horror-stricken because we haven't kicked dictator Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, in the teeth.

What it all shakes down to is that an adult country shakes hands with democrats or dictators, whichever is in the national interest of the United States. We are polite to Franco because we need missile bases in Spain. We refuse to deal with Red China because of its threat to our security in the Pacific. We are generous to Tito because we hope to ferment continued discord between his type of communism and the old family brand put out by Moscow. We tolerate Trujillo and tolerated Batista because, with the Communists penetrating Latin America, it is a good idea to deal with men who can keep the Red penetrators under control.

Why we were so promptly cordial to Castro is more difficult to understand. As mentioned above, he has been trying and shooting his erstwhile rivals in true dictator style. He seized British property on the ground that the British Government had sent arms to Batista, as it had a perfect right to do. If the standard of "by their fruits ye shall know them" is still in force, Castro wouldn't rate high as a democrat. Indeed the Soviet press greets his victory as a fatal blow to "American imperialism" in Cuba.

But so squamish has everybody become about dictators—except for Red ones like Mao, Khrushchev, and Tito—that a Latin American who overthrows a dictator is automatically embraced as a democrat. In England, which once would have sent a sharp demand to Castro to give back that prop-

erty or else, the London Daily Telegraph rebuked the Government for giving arms to Batista in the first place. And the United States, whose embargo on arms to the Batista regime is to a considerable extent responsible for Castro's triumph, has appeared indifferent to the precise nature of his regime.

Our advice, for what it is worth, is to forget "images" and judge these regimes according to their impact on the national interest of the United States. Once that simple standard is raised, it will be a lot easier to decide whom to embrace and whom to brush off.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 17, 1959]

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT QUICK RECOGNITION

The Saturday Evening Post, in an editorial, questions the readiness with which this country recognized the new Cuban Government of Fidel Castro. Would it not have been better, the magazine wonders, if we had waited for the dust to settle before giving Castro the benefits of U.S. recognition? The magazine goes on to be critical of some of the strong-arm stuff that went on in Cuba early this year, and asks why so many are so tolerant of Castro, who beat a dictator, yet so prone to advocate recognition of dictators like Mao Tse-tung.

The criterion for recognition, says the Post, should be the national interest of the United States, that and nothing more. We should "shake hands with democrats or dictators, whichever is in the national interest of the United States," says the Post.

We find several holes in the Post's arguments:

1. Recognition does not necessarily mean approval. We recognize Franco's Spain, Khrushchev's Russia, Tito's Yugoslavia, Trujillo's Dominican Republic, and Stroessner's Paraguay. Yet, few Americans approve of these regimes any more than we approve of Red China, which government we don't recognize. There seems to be little correlation between approval and recognition. Recognition, indeed, is not a warm embrace, but rather an official handshake.

2. Who is to determine the national interest of the United States? Is it not possible that our speedy recognition of the Castro government will make it less likely that Castro, a man who needs friends, will turn to Moscow? And is that not very much to the best interest of this country?

3. Today's best interests may turn out to be fodder for tomorrow's recriminations. From 1941 to 1945 the United States embraced the Communist regime in Russia. With American troops being shot at by Germans, it seemed in our best interest to encourage and help those who were shooting Germans. Included, to no small degree, were the Russians. Today, some of those who put the most faith in Saturday Evening Post editorials argue that we should not have been so helpful to the Russians because the Russian regime is, and was, per se evil. They criticize us for not having made a value judgment 15 years ago, but call us foolish if we attempt to make value judgments today.

4. If we were wrong in not waiting for the dust to settle before recognizing Castro, how settled should the dust have been before we made our choice? We waited 15 years before recognizing Russia. It has been 10 years since the Communists kicked out Chiang. Didn't we wait long enough in the Russian case, and have we waited too long in the case of China?

5. As we indicated in objection No. 2, sometimes "best interest" is a long-range gamble. If Spain is a hotbed of intrigue, with a revolution ready to blow up at any moment, as some observers think, should we withdraw recognition from Franco now, so

that we'll appear to have been right when the new regime comes in? Would we have been wise to have withdrawn our representation in Batista's Havana when Castro's strength became apparent?

6. What ever happened to morality? How can one argue that it's right to urge revolution against the de facto government of China and wrong, because of national interest, to urge revolution against Trujillo?

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the second of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia is inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1959] FORTY-SEVEN THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVEN GARNISHEES UNDER ANTIQUE LAW

(By Morton Mintz)

The District's bad debt law will be 53 years old March 3. No birthday parties are planned.

The garnishment law may some day, perhaps this year, undergo radical surgery in Congress. Meanwhile its get-up-and-go is positively youthful.

Last year, for example, it kept a couple of platoons of deputy U.S. marshals hopping around the city with 47,877 writs of attachment to be served on employers.

Because March 3 happens to fall on a Tuesday, a municipal court judge will find himself marking the law's birthday by spending hours hearing, granting, and denying requests for exemption.

Joining in this observance, a solemn one, will be numerous victims of garnishment, busy executives who have left their jobs to bring in payroll records, and many lawyers. It's really just another day—nothing special.

Let it be said that the law does have a band of devoted friends, the easy-credit operators. The reason for their devotion, of course, is that their friend the law lets them use the court as their collector.

The clerical staffs of the municipal court's small claims (up to \$50) and "M" (\$50 to \$3,000) divisions compiled the following figures at the request of the Washington Post. They are for the year 1957, the last for which complete information is available:

Suits asking judgment against debtors filed by—	In small claims	In M division	Total
Hollywood Credit Clothing Co., 703 7th St. NW	1,471	2,311	3,882
Martins Credit, Inc., 734 7th St. NW, and the same firm trading as Elsenman's, 7th at F St. NW	429	1,976	2,405
Crown Co., Inc., 827 7th St. NW	660	760	1,420
Bernard and Bertha Goldberg, copartners trading as Long's Clothiers, 731 7th St. NW	481	839	1,320
Leon A. Tashof, trading as New York Jewelry Co., 719 7th St. NW	342	927	1,269
Union Clothiers, Inc., 415 7th St. NW	632	526	1,158
Royal Credit Co., clothing, 741 7th St. NW	405	819	1,024

USERS OF SYSTEM

These seven firms lead the list. No one else sought so many judgments against debtors.

There is one exception, but it only emphasizes the point: The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. But the phone company, unlike the other firms, a spokesman said, has almost never used a judgment as a springboard for garnishment; almost invariably it has negotiated settlements.

The phone company, as a public utility, must give service to all applicants, except where a customer's credit has not been established (in that case, it requires a deposit).

A total of 58,225 cases were filed in the two court branches. The seven easy-credit firms filed 12,507 of these, or roughly 1 out of 5. Hollywood alone filed about 1 in 15. Each suit can lead to one or more wage attachments.

The combined business volume of the seven firms is known to be well into the millions. Hollywood's president, Herbert Kapiloff, in an appearance in municipal court on July 18, 1949, was told by Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr.:

"You are the owner of the business; you set the policy."

Kapiloff replied:

"Yes, sir; I am the owner, but we have 45,000 accounts, and I cannot watch each of them."

In a letter to the editor published in the Washington Post on July 23 of that year, Kapiloff said, "We file suit only as a last resort, after there has been a clear default in payment and the debtor by his conduct indicates no intention to pay."

LAW IN OPERATION

Yesterday's article illustrated some faults in the garnishment law; today's will take a closer look.

Who gets the bill? Persons who had nothing to do with an easy-credit purchase frequently find their wages attached to pay for it. Usually the unknowing guarantor is the husband or wife of the customer, but sometimes the name entered on the account is that of a relative. And there are cases in which an unrelated person's name has been used, for example, a landlady-customer's roomer.

If the supposed guarantor establishes that he is not liable for the debt he is in the clear. But if he should have the misfortune not to get the summons (it can be served on another adult on the premises, even on the purchaser who may wish to keep him in ignorance); if a default judgment is declared against him, and if the creditor sits tight for 90 days before attaching his wages—then the judgment is almost invulnerable to attack, and the guarantor must pay.

LOSS OF TWO CASES

Hollywood Credit recently lost two cases in this area:

A relative bought \$100 worth of household goods under the name of Mrs. Blanche Wright, 2651 Nichols Avenue SE. The firm discovered the misrepresentation and sued the relative and then Mrs. Wright. Her first knowledge of the entire matter came when her wages were attached (the attachment was later set aside). She filed suit charging Hollywood with malicious abuse of the legal process. The store's lawyers said the attachment was made "in the regular course of collecting" and without malice. A \$1,000 verdict in her favor was returned by a municipal court jury last December 9.

Harston Hall bought \$91.25 worth of clothing in 1953. His wife Eula, 1327 U Street SE., said she had nothing to do with the purchase. The Halls later separated. The store sued her for the sum in 1957 and obtained a judgment. The municipal court

vacated the judgment and stopped the attachment. Despite this, she contended, the store went ahead and attached her wages, and the court upheld its action. But she appealed, and last Monday the municipal court of appeals upheld her. Judge Thomas D. Quinn said the store had abused its garnishment powers. Further, he added, "the existence of an ulterior motive may be inferred from this action which appellee is alleged to have done with full knowledge of the situation."

NO PROTECTION

Nonresidents of the District: However weak the exemption provisions are for District residents, they offer no protection at all for residents of Maryland, Virginia and other areas outside the District. The key point under the law is not where the purchase was made, but whether the customer's employer has an office in the District. If the employer does, the debtor's wages can be attached even if he made the purchase in Timbuktu, lives and works in Timbuktu and never set foot outside of Timbuktu.

Exemptions: The law says that 2-months' earnings, "not to exceed \$200 each month," shall be exempt from attachment if the debtor is head of a household. (Sixty dollars if he is single.) However reasonable this might sound, it is so vague and weak that it breeds these troubles:

If the head of a household has earned less than \$400 in the 2 months immediately preceding issuance of the attachment and wants an exemption, he must ask the court for a hearing to certify that he is head of a household. His employer must bring in pay records to prove the debtor's earnings.

Pending the court determination, his wages are frozen for a week to 10 days.

If he does not apply for an exemption he cannot get it; his wages will be attached. At least three out of five debtors do not apply.

Successive attachments may be obtained on a debt until it is satisfied. An exemption does not carry over from one attachment to another. Therefore, the debtor, if he wants an exemption, must go through the court process each time his wages are garnished.

A man may get one exemption. But, by an accident of the calendar, there comes a month in which he has five instead of four paydays, putting him over the \$400 mark for 2 months.

CONFUSION CAUSED

This is one of the instances in which the vagueness of the law causes major confusion. For some judges interpret it to mean that only the sum in excess of \$400 can be attached, while others say the entire sum can be attached and there is no exemption. It depends on which judge is on the bench. No case testing the interpretation of the judges in either group has ever been taken to the municipal court of appeals.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK (Democrat, Pennsylvania), put the case against the law's exemption provision this way:

It "is unworkable and economically unsound in that the majority of defendants never take advantage of it and it promotes a coercive influence on defendants due to the holdup of the defendant's salary until the litigation is determined."

Disrespect for judicial process: Chief Judge Leonard P. Walsh of the municipal court, says the garnishment law breeds this disrespect because the court is "used as a collection agency . . . rightly or wrongly, the employer and employee receive mandatory demands on them in the name of the court . . . the court appears to be in cahoots with the seller."

CREDIT FOR BANKRUPT

As the law now operates, even a bankrupt can get credit.

There is one case in which a mentally-ill woman made some purchases at three easy credit stores. Her husband did not know

he was being made responsible for the debt. The upshot was that his pay was attached so many times that he lost his job and he was declared a bankrupt. Despite all this and the additional fact that he himself was a financial incompetent, two of these same stores again sold to him on credit.

A member of a District Bar Association group that studied the laws of 48 States says there are "probably more garnishments per capita here than anywhere else."

There were almost 48,000 of them here last year. And each of them, Municipal Court Judge Kronheim told a Senate District Subcommittee "is a tragedy—not a tragedy in a theater, but a tragedy for people consisting of flesh and blood."

Some intimates of the garnishment law believe the legislators who fathered and amended it through the years would be horrified by the true nature of their child. They might agree with Judge Kronheim that it is a monster.

In Memory of the Twelve Hundred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there is a nationwide appeal for funds to construct a worthy shrine on the USS *Arizona*. This great ship, sunk by Japanese bombs on December 7, 1941, rests on the bottom of Pearl Harbor. Its metal sides are rapidly eroding, and the appearance it presents hardly does honor to the memory of the men who are entombed there.

One of our fine veteran educators of Arizona, Mr. Harold W. Smith, superintendent of the elementary schools of Glendale, Ariz., feels very strongly concerning the need to do something, not only to make the *Arizona* a fitting last resting place for those who gave up their lives, but to remind the Nation of the debt we owe to them and the many other brave men and women who perished on December 7, 1941. Mr. Smith's thoughts have been expressed in the following poem:

IN MEMORY OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED

(Who died about the battleship *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941)

They lie beneath the sea in watery graves of steel.

In their dark tombs they cannot see or feel
The sunshine and the light;

Theirs is the dark, the black eternal night.
Entombed in sacrifice that freedom might

survive,
They now are dead while we are still alive.

Confined within the walls of dank and Stygian grave,
Those honored dead, they speak in pleading

voice
On every wave that washes overhead and

seals them in the night,
Reminding us that through the life they

gave,
We still may walk in sunshine and in light.

Give us the grace, humility, and power
To build within our hearts an altar

Where burns the flame of freedom.
May we not falter till liberty and justice

Walk hand in hand wherever men abide,
Then shall those honored dead be free to

walk with us
And see the reason why they died.

—Harold W. Smith.

Kentucky Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, it is a good time today and at this moment to emphasize and reemphasize again the economic conditions as they now exist in southeastern Kentucky and in other places at the present time. It is much better, I believe, for us to work up some jobs of ordinary livelihood for our own people than to continue to build airfields for Afghanistan or multimillion-dollar highways for Siam, as we have continually been doing under our foreign aid programs of the past few years.

My own bill, H.R. 3696, would, if adopted, serve to correct conditions and to invite industry into our depressed areas all over America through giving those industries income-tax exemptions that are willing to move into depressed areas and furnish jobs to the unemployed people. And the beauty about this entire proposal is that it neither requires any appropriation nor adds any employees to the Federal payroll.

In order to indicate the conditions now existing in one southeastern Kentucky county, I would like to call your attention to an article in the February 23, 1959, issue of Time magazine. These conditions cry out for correction. The need is jobs. The article follows:

KENTUCKY

NEVER A TIME SO BAD

"This mining town I live in is a sad and lonely place

Where pity and starvation are pictured on every face."

—Harlan County Ballad.

The pine-backed Cumberland Mountains walling off Kentucky's Harlan County from the rest of the world breed into the Harlan-born a primitive defiance. In years past, Harlan moonshiners disdained to dodge revenue men; safe on impenetrable hilltops, they patted rifles and taunted Federal agents with doggerel. Harlan justice was rudimentary; seldom was a killer hanged, but often one murder was avenged with another. And when the United Mine Workers set out 30 years ago to organize Harlan's prosperous coal mines, pitched battles between bloody Harlan's miners and company police brought out the National Guard so often that guardsmen were on first-name terms with miners they tossed into jail by the scores.

But bloody Harlan's defiance has long since given in to chilling despair. As the United States puts recession behind it, most cities and towns are speeding up production lines or hunting up new industry. Harlan County's one industry—mining—is dying; because of geography the county is unlikely to find others. Hundreds of unemployed coal miners are in privation's clutch, haunted by the specter of expired unemployment compensation and dwindling food supplies. Kentucky's Governor A. B. (Happy) Chandler has declared Harlan an emergency area. President Eisenhower was informed of the distress last week by Kentucky's two Senators, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and THURSTON B. MORTON. Private agencies make the rounds regularly with minimum food and clothes.

Prosperity's victims

Harlan's crisis has a combination of sources. For one, demand for its rich bituminous coal will never again match the good old day of the twenties, when production zoomed to 14.5 million tons a year. For another, Harlan's miners, members of the U.M.W. for the past 18 years, are in a sense victims of other miners' prosperity. Rising labor costs (Harlan operators have so far refused to sign a new U.M.W. contract under which miners would get \$14.25 a day to enter a mine, 76 cents more per ton to load coal) have spurred mine owners to mechanize. But Harlan's shallow (32 in. to 48 in.) seams make mechanization impractical. A third reason: rail costs from the heart of the Appalachian soft coal field have soared.

Ten years ago, 32 big mines were operating; today there are 9. The number of working miners has dipped from 12,500 in 1950 to 5,000. Few other jobs are available. Harlan is all hill and hollow, and the hollows are too narrow for farming or factories.

Rusty red dog

Despite the billion tons of rich bituminous coal still underground, conveyors and tipplers are being sold for scrap metal; white-frame company towns such as Red Bud, Golden Ash, and Kenvir are boarded up and rotting; in Clossplint and Punkin Center, streets rust-colored from a half century of "red dog"—slate and clinker dust—are quiet and deserted. Miners who could afford to have gone off to Paducah, Louisville, Cincinnati, or even Chicago. Others, who could not, are in worse trouble than in the depression thirties. In Kenvir (population 800), where the Peabody Coal Co. closed its mine a year ago and left 450 jobless, miner Orville Gibson, 44, stays behind because he cannot afford to move his 10 children. Hoping to find work in one of the smaller mines still operating, Gibson meanwhile feeds his family U.S. surplus rice, flour, and cornmeal, gets clothes and shoes from the Baptist Church.

Says Levi McGeorge, pastor of the Clossplint Church of God: "I've been preachin' the gospel for 25 years, and I've never seen a time so bad." Adds 63-year-old Ben Middleton, a third-generation Harlan resident and a power in county Republican politics: "I watched this county build up, and now I'm awatchin' it go down. I don't see no hope."

Representative Daniel A. Reed

SPEECH
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a fine man and a great American, Representative DANIEL REED.

I have been in Congress only a few weeks and had looked forward to his kindly assistance and wise counsel. I envy those who have had the privilege to receive his advice and guidance.

Mr. REED may not always have been in agreement with others, but he respected their thinking. Any time he participated in debate, he gave factual and concrete analysis of his thinking. Mr. REED was rugged in work but mild in heart, and was one of the great humanitarians of our time.

The good Lord has called him to his reward. Not only the State of New York but the entire country has sustained a great loss. We will find it most difficult to replace a man of his stature.

I would like to extend my sincerest sympathy to Mr. REED's wife, his son, and family.

Crime Prevention Is Concern of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include herewith an editorial entitled "Crime Prevention Is Concern of All," which appeared in the February 13, 1959, issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

CRIME PREVENTION IS CONCERN OF ALL

This is National Crime Prevention Week. And if people are to judge by the reports which come at stated periods from J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, such a special week is badly needed.

During this week, civic clubs and other groups all over America are making special efforts to enlist the citizen in a greater program of crime prevention. Such a program, if properly planned and carried out, could prove to be one of the most worthwhile efforts of our crime-ridden age.

It is a sad fact, but true, that crime and rackets and easy money and big gangsters and the little gangsters who bear the unprintable name conspire to make crime pay in a big way—financially, that is. Some there are who think the total take of crime and rackets in the United States today rivals the gross national product—which means the total of goods and services produced and rendered by the law-abiding citizens of the United States of America.

People once thought that setting up strong walls and doors, posting guards and patrols, and other like measures would be effective crime preventatives. History shows these are but deterrents. The criminal too often has found means to penetrate these defenses.

True crime prevention must be a long-range matter, one in which all persons are enlisted from their youth.

Children need to be taught the need for self-control, the basic requirements of discipline, the fact that law and order are essential to modern society.

The children who learn these and related facts tend to grow into what we call law-abiding citizens.

Their elders have some lessons which they, too, can learn for the good of all.

The example of parents, the lives parents live, the manner in which parents obey the law instead of working to evade it, these things make a greater impression on their children than do words by the hour.

Nor should we minimize the effect of crime prosecution and the manner of its punishment.

A "slap on the wrist" for murder may satisfy the "bleeding heart" element, but it may so influence children and others that they, too, come to place a small price on human life.

Efforts to fix a parking ticket may seem unimportant to an adult, but they can fix in his child's mind the fact that anything is all

right if you can get by with it through influence or other means.

So long as this age lasts, crime will be with us because there are those who disregard all but their own desires. But we can reduce the amount of crime by controlling our own actions and teaching our children to be law-abiding citizens.

We can also speak up for law and order, and back it with our votes at the polls.

Are Goods Being Priced Out of Market?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, for some time now there has been a cloud on the horizon no bigger than the palm of a man's hand. This cloud, though small, is very black and is made up of inflation and of the fact that we are being priced out of the world's market.

The following article by Harold B. Dorsey appeared today, February 23, in the Washington Post and Times Herald. The article gives the facts that we do not want to face, and tells a story we do not want to hear.

Mr. Speaker, when the storm breaks, it will be too late to face the facts or to listen to the story:

ARE GOODS BEING PRICED OUT OF MARKET?

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

The recent weakness in the price of crude oil both here and abroad, points up a condition that permits some generalizations on the subject of commodity prices, a matter of very practical interest at this particular juncture when there is so much talk about inflation.

The explanation for the price weakness in oil is quite simple. There's just too much oil in relation to current and intermediate-term demand. But this fact seems to be true of a great many other commodities.

Stimulated by Government price supports which have cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars, we now have a condition of overwhelming surpluses for practically the entire agricultural group. Very recently there was a cut in the domestic price of lead, in spite of the fact that we are experiencing an industrial recovery and have placed a partial embargo on lead imports. Our industrial recovery has increased the demand for copper and this has permitted some increases in the price. However, the industry's leaders are loath to see the price of the red metal climb much further because they fear that their customers will be driven to purchasing aluminum, of which there is an abundance.

There seems to be growing realization that the price of steel is already high enough to encourage imports of certain types of steel for the seaboard markets and that the price of steel included in fabricated products is already so high that it is helping to price such products out of world markets.

A friend recently returned from Europe tells us that he asked the head of one of the large foreign automobile producers if he was alarmed by the prospect that the large American auto manufacturers were going to put a small car on the market. The foreign manufacturer was entirely complacent about

his prospect, feeling positive that he would be able to serve the American market with a better value because his costs were lower.

There recently have been two published examples of English bids to supply electric power generating equipment to the United States at prices substantially below the lowest bid of the domestic manufacturers. In these instances, everybody's bid had to conform with the same specifications; so the lower foreign bid was probably a fairly accurate measurement of contrasting United States with foreign costs.

But how about textiles, where prices have been firming recently? In the first place, the prices are rising from a level that was practically profitless. Fortunately, the industry's inventories were low enough and demand was recovering enough to permit some price increases to offset the currently rising wage costs. Here again, it is quite clear that foreign production costs are lower than those of the United States industry, which happens to be a leader in the employment of American labor.

All of these facts pertaining to conditions that are operating in a negative way on commodity prices suggest that our price structure may already be too high as a result of (1) artificial price supports stimulating production and discouraging consumption, or (2) the wage-price spiral which is pricing some goods out of either domestic or foreign markets, or both, or (3) the complete restoration during the postwar period of foreign production facilities, and (4) the tremendous strides on the part of foreign producers in the direction of improved efficiency.

At least in retrospect, it is clear that the inflationary wage-price spiral could operate as long as the demand for goods both here and abroad was abnormally high as a result of (1) the restoration of producers' equipment abroad, (2) the sharp expansion of producers' and distributors' equipment in the United States, and (3) when there was an expansion of private debt at a rate that could not possibly continue without trouble. More recently, signs have developed that productive capacities both here and abroad may have been temporarily overexpanded. At any rate, that seems to be the story that is currently being told by an analysis of the supply-demand price conditions of important industries.

No doubt it will be contended that the foregoing condition does not represent excessive capacity or overproduction, but that the problem is associated with underconsumption. That is the argument presented to support recommendations that demand should be stimulated by Government deficit spending and by liberal credit that would stimulate another wave of excessive expansion of non-Government debt. The weakness in the argument centers around the simple fact that debt has to be repaid. The interest charges and repayment on debt must necessarily be a subtraction from the purchasing power of future earnings.

As pointed out in this space last week, interest charges on the Federal Government debt for the next fiscal year are budgeted at \$185 per average family of four. And the servicing of private debt subtracts still further from the purchasing power of current earnings. And whenever there is a sharp deviation from that principle, we head for trouble. There is an old economic adage which says: "There ain't no such thing as a free lunch."

The evidence is not all in yet, but the clues that are coming to hand are beginning to suggest very strongly that our price structure may already have been inflated to the point where workers and their output are being priced out of their respective markets.

Fair Trade Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced a bill—H.R. 1253—to establish a national fair trade law. This legislation would make it lawful for a manufacturer to establish and control, by notice to his distributors, stipulated or minimum resale prices for his trademarked or brand-named merchandise, if such merchandise is in interstate commerce, or is held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce, and is in free and open competition with merchandise of the same general class produced by others.

The bill would make it unlawful for a distributor, with notice of applicable stipulated or minimum resale price on such merchandise, to sell, offer to sell, or advertise such merchandise in interstate commerce at a different, or lower price, as the case may be. Any person suffering, or reasonably anticipating, damage by reason of violation of this legislation may sue in any State or Federal court of competent jurisdiction for damages and injunctive relief and be entitled to recover the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

This bill is for the purpose of aiding small business from the onslaught of unrestrained, cutthroat competition of large chainstores, department stores, and discount houses which have been flourishing as a result of a breakdown of effective State fair trade laws. It is substantially identical to the bill recommended by the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the last session of the 85th Congress.

My attention has been brought to an excellent statement on this subject by Mr. Ed Wimmer, which appeared in the January 12, 1959, issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer. Mr. Wimmer is vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business which has a membership of approximately 120,000 members made up exclusively of independent business and professional men.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include Mr. Wimmer's statement:

CONSUMPTION CUT BY CHEAP PRICES—UNFAIR TRADE CREATES MONOPOLY, DESTROYS JOBS, REDUCES TAX REVENUE

(By Ed Wimmer)

The growing realization that unfair competition is not only destroying thousands of businesses, but is lessening production and decreasing employment in the distribution field, promises passage of a strong fair trade law during this session of Congress. As summed up by John W. Hubbell, vice president of the Simmons (mattress) Co.: "In the wake of price cutting, there is a shortened markup and profitless selling by the retailer. This creates a chain reaction, which results in the unwillingness of most stores to sell this merchandise at an inadequate markup.

In fact, the salespeople in the stores are compelled to discourage purchase of profitless items, leading to misrepresentation and a diminished volume of total goods sold."

Let me ask you: shouldn't a manufacturer who spends millions to develop and market a quality product, and who spends more millions to establish acceptance, have the right to protect that product from a type of competition that ruins its reputation and sales?

The discounter claims that once he obtains ownership of a product by purchasing it from the maker or a distributor, that it is his to do with as he pleases—no matter what the consequences. He loudly claims that any attempt to protect the maker or reputable distributors from his depredations, is harmful to the consumer.

Fair traders, like ourselves, have never believed that predatory competition is good for anyone but the most predatory, and it is good for them only so long as their unscrupulous practices are unexposed. When an item is offered as a lure—and is sold at or below cost—its sale provides no profits to the seller, so he must make up for the loss in one way or another. His competitors may meet his tactics for awhile, but soon they quit handling the bootlegged product, which caused layoffs at the factory, in the stores, and in all other channels affected by an unsteady flow of goods.

There is a false impression in this country that cheap prices result in more buying, but in every area of the economy where cutthroat competition has been at its worst, volume goes down, tax revenues are reduced, jobs disappear, stores are emptied, salesmen and clerks are laid off, expansion and modernization plans are dropped, advertising revenue falls, and public confidence wanes. Isn't this what we had in 1932—with hamburger 6 cents a pound?

Even in the case of cheap milk sales no increased consumption showed up in the worst hit areas; except in home deliveries where consumers bought their regular needs at regular prices. When they quit home delivery for the low price offers consumption dropped off.

This is a profit country and if legitimate profits are not widely spread throughout the economy there is no real expansion, no new venture, no real progress in any direction. When consumers deprive a service station operator of his profits by demanding trading stamps or buy gas in a price war, they help themselves only for the moment, for by depriving others of their just returns for their services, goods, or labor, the prosperity level of the community is hurt that much, setting in motion the chain reaction mentioned by Mr. Hubbell.

Companies like Sunbeam, Bissell, Fisher Pen, Parker Pen, Champion Spark Plug, E. I. Lilly, Colgate, and others, who have fought for fair trade laws, are not inefficient people looking for an umbrella, as the discounters claim. They are reputable firms who know that fair wages and fair profits must come out of fair prices and that unfair competition destroys all three.

The Late Honorable Daniel Alden Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in

the Appendix of the RECORD the following telegram from the St. Bonaventure Alumni Association, of which our late colleague, Daniel Alden Reed, was a member:

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 19, 1959.
Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We have suffered great loss in the passing of our distinguished honorary alumnus Daniel A. Reed and join with all his friends and admirers in their expression of sympathy on this sad occasion.

WASHINGTON D.C. CHAPTER ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.

WILLIAM J. ANGER, President.

"And All Her People One"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered last Friday night, February 13, before some 300 Oregon Democrats gathered for a fund raising dinner in Salem, Oreg.:

EARTH MIGHT BE FAIR

On January 4, the Sunday just before the convening of the 86th Congress, I attended a church service in Washington, D.C., invoking the blessings of God on the work of this Congress. One of the hymns, "Turn Back O Man," was familiar but it took on a particular meaning for me in connection with the jobs we Democrats have to do in Salem and in Washington, D.C. You may remember the exhortation, "Turn back O man, forswear thy foolish ways."

Here is the second verse:

"Earth might be fair and all men glad and and wise."

Age after age their tragic empires rise,
Built while they dream, and in that dream-
ing weep.

Would man but wake from out his haunted
sleep,

Earth might be fair and all men glad and
wise."

Earth might be fair. We have the resources, human and physical. This evening I will talk about some foolish ways we might well forswear and about four places on this earth: Latin America, Washington, D.C., Oregon, and China.

Yesterday morning I was in Venezuela as a guest of the President who was formally inaugurated today. A few weeks ago I went to Cuba and spoke with Fidel Castro. Next weekend I shall confer with him again and make a speech in Santiago near San Juan Hill where Americans and Cubans mingled their blood on the battlefields in their common cause against the Spanish oppressors.

THE POLICY WAS TO KOWTOW

In my first term in Congress I accepted invitations twice to Puerto Rico and once each in Costa Rica, Colombia, Venezuela, and Honduras. As you may remember, my interest in this area arose from my investigation into the disappearance of Gerry Murphy of Eugene. The Dominican official explanation of his death was officially rejected

by the United States, but only after a period of reluctance during which I learned, to my surprise and dismay, that our usual policy was to kowtow to non-Communist dictators.

Certainly this is a foolish way we must forswear, and we are in the process of doing just that, if earth is to be fair. We cannot attempt to lead the free world and appear to be faithless to our own revolutionary origins and deepest traditions of freedom.

It is a surprise for me, and at times a little embarrassing, to see how famous I am in Latin America and how newspapers up here refer to me as a Latin American "expert" or "specialist." All I have done is reaffirm that we norteamericanos remember our own Revolution against a tyrant. We like governments of and by the people based on law. We hate tyrants. Nothing very new or radical about that position, except that somehow our State Department had given the impression in Latin America that democracy was only for us and that we preferred to deal with "strong man" governments. This was wonderful for the Communists but not for us. The United States was identified with the tyrants and the Communists with the democratic elements opposed to tyrants.

A CHANGE FOR THE BETTER

It is gratifying to be able to say that our official policies are changing for the better in this respect, thanks to the Vice President's exciting trip, Milton Eisenhower's report, and perhaps some of the protests made by me, the New York Times, the AFL-CIO, and many others.

In all these matters I am conscious of my ignorance and I try to keep in touch with experts, including those in the State Department. Generally, my activities for democracy and against dictators have been warmly approved by career men in the Department of State. Recently I received an enthusiastic letter from the top man in our Embassy in Havana with respect to my visit in Cuba.

NOT FOR THE GOP ALONE

Yesterday was the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, a man I refuse to give to the Republicans, a man much respected and loved in Latin America. One hundred and one years ago Lincoln said: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere."

Let us now leave Latin America and turn to Washington, D.C., that city of alcohol, protocol, and Geritol. We do have a feverish pace. Last week my very able right-hand man, Jack Billings of Eugene, collapsed to the floor by his desk and had to be carried out on a stretcher. The doctors finally decided he had had a coronary without damage. He spent 4 days in the hospital and is now back at his desk.

As in Salem we in Washington, D.C., face great and urgent legislative challenges. We Democrats with our majorities have the opportunity and the responsibility. In Washington Senator JOHNSON has outlined a fine legislative program, a positive program, which I will be discussing as I travel around the Fourth Congressional District in the next few days.

"JUST A POLITICIAN"

The other day my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, PAUL BROWN, told me about the politician who found a farmer in the backyard milking a cow. The farmer's wife called from the house to ask who he was and the farmer answered, "Just a politician." "You come right in the house," she yelled back, "and bring that cow with you."

Politicians are, as the libel lawyers put it, objects of fair comment which, you may have noticed, often includes a lot of unfair comment. "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen," Harry Truman advises.

Alben Barkley and several brother Senators were once on a junket in a Middle Western State. Their bus stopped at a crossroads store. Alben and another Senator got out to stretch their legs. Alben spotted a native leaning against the store and proceeded to impress on him what a superduper Congressman this man had working for him in Washington. As they got back on the bus, the other Senator asked Alben, "By the way, what is the name of the Congressman from this district?" "Darned if I know," shrugged Barkley, "just some guy like you and me, trying to get along."

IN THE PUBLIC EYE

We politicians are, after all, only human beings, human beings often under tremendous strains. Of course, this is true in other lines of work except that the results do not receive so much public attention.

Let us consider the case of our two Senators. We talk about this privately. I think it is time to say something publicly. DICK and WAYNE were not getting along as we would wish. WAYNE's reception of DICK yesterday in the Senate and DICK's remarks are most encouraging. Both these men drive themselves hard. They are conscientious, intelligent, and courageous. They are human beings.

In partisan politics there is a tendency to choose up sides, a sort of polarization along adversary lines. This hasn't happened but it could happen. The Knight-Knowland rift didn't help the Republicans in California, nor would a MORSE-NEUBERGER split be an advantage to us in 1960.

I know that a few of you here tonight and some who are not here have already decided you are for one Senator and, hence, against the other. I tell you this is wrong. You don't and you can't know enough of all the circumstances to make any such judgment.

NO SIDES TO CHOOSE

I tell you this is unnecessary. The differences between them have not kept them from working effectively together on almost every issue. Naturally some of the newspapers try to blow the matter up. Last year I saw them quietly conferring in the Senate at a time when, if you believed some of the newspapers in Oregon, they were practically at each other's throats. Of course the Republicans want to encourage them to fight each other. How foolish of any Democrat to help in any way.

The test to apply to our Senators is not how amicably they get along but rather what they accomplish for the peace, prosperity, and freedom of the Nation. By this test they rank high on any list of leading Senators. They deserve our support and our friendship and I believe they have both. We are proud of them and their deeds which have earned them outstanding national reputations for political courage and intelligence. We grieve when they do not get along. We hope and pray that, for their own peace of mind, their differences will end. We will do all we can to speed that day.

NOT SAINTS, NOT LOST SINNERS

A politician, like anyone else, makes mistakes. Excessive adulation and excessive vilification are heaped on him. Sceldom is he seen as just a guy trying to get along, to do this important, complex, and trying job as best he can.

Earth will be fair indeed when more citizens will evaluate their public officials as human beings, not as irreproachable saints or as unredeemable sinners.

Turning now to Oregon where the earth is fair in so many ways, but where too many persons are unemployed and where our per capita income is distressingly low. Our State is 100 years old tomorrow and naturally we look forward as well as into the past.

Certainly this celebration should call for a political truce. I congratulate Bob Holmes

and the Democrats for their nonpartisan spirit in this matter. I reproach the few Republicans who delayed the issuance of the invitations to Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, the Trumans, and Mr. Hoover. The centennial has no room for petty politics. The next hundred years will give us ample time for both petty and grand politics.

WHAT IS ESSENTIAL?

I read the Governor's inaugural address with great interest. Much had merit, just like the messages the President sends to Congress. What we now look for is deeds to match words. The spirit, however, seemed to me to be defeatist as indicated by his slogan, "Is this essential or merely desirable?" To the extent it has any meaning it denotes conservatism, caution, fear, when what we need, if earth is to be fair, is courage and confidence in the future of our great State. Hope, not desperation, is what we need now.

Oregon should stride into its second century, erect and unafraid. Is it essential that our children be able to go to college or just desirable? Only 18 out of every 100 of Oregon's eligible young men and women enter a 4-year college now. Is it essential that we have a full-time parole board or just desirable? Is it essential that Oregon families eat three meals a day or merely desirable?

Governor Hatfield's historic slogan belongs in history. It cannot help him or you or me answer our problems of progress in the present and future. All it really shows is a Republican attitude of despair and defeat.

OUR PROBLEMS ARE CHALLENGES

Our present economic position is bad. The latest figures from the Department of Labor show that 10.4 percent of the insured Oregon workers are drawing unemployment benefits. This is the highest in the Nation. We were also atop this dubious pinnacle in January of 1957. Last year, in January 1958, we were one-tenth of a percent from the top with only Montana edging us out for this tragic booby prize.

We have areas of chronic unemployment. The Labor Department's list of major labor surplus areas includes Portland, Albany, Coos Bay, Eugene, Pendleton and Roseburg. Our per capita income figure for 1957 was \$1,914. California's was \$2,504, Washington's \$2,128, and the national average was \$2,027.

Between 1940 and 1953 the average Oregonian made 1.2 percent to 11.9 percent more money than the average American. Since then, that is since the coming of the Republican Eisenhower administration, Oregon's personal income has risen but not as fast as the national average, with the gap growing even wider. We Oregonians make our living mainly from our timber resources, then, much less, from agriculture and tourists. Each area is capable of tremendous expansion. Our potentialities give us no reason for despair. We can hope to provide our citizens with many desirable services. Our problems are challenges, not chains.

TRADE WITH MAINLAND CHINA

I want to conclude by recommending a change of national policy that could help Oregon become a prosperous State, in fact, a truly maritime State. Oregon fronts on the Pacific Ocean, a great highway for trade. We can only improve the benefits to cost ratios for harbors like Reedsport and many others if we open up trade with mainland China and vicinity. We now enforce a total embargo on our trade with China, a policy that began in 1950. The position of the administration remains as stated to me in a letter from the State Department April 17, 1957, "This country definitely intends to continue the embargo."

We who want this trade resumed only ask that we be permitted trade with China on the same basis we now trade with the Soviet

Union. This of course means trade in only nonstrategic items.

China's trade is estimated at about \$500 million per year.

In 1931 Oregon and Washington sent 314 million board-feet of lumber to China, whereas in 1956 these States only sent 299 million board-feet to all other nations. In terms of 1954 dollars the 1931 China trade in lumber alone would have meant \$16,221,004 for operators, woodworkers and longshoremen in these two States. A similar situation exists for wheat and flour.

POTENTIAL IS STAGGERING

Ivan Bloch, a leading industrial consultant in Portland, says "potentials of this trade stagger the imagination." He predicts "a great possibility of numerous new jobs and industry in the Pacific Northwest if trade with China is reopened."

Restrictions on trade only serve to postpone, but cannot prevent, the development of the military power of Red China. Effects of embargoes are now evaded by purchase or barter from other countries of the items which we refuse to ship to Red China. To say that certain items cannot be shipped to Red China and then permit them to be shipped to Russia, from where they are forwarded to Red China, serves no purpose so far as hampering the Red China regime is concerned. What is accomplished is to strengthen the ties between the Communist countries. On the other hand, increased trade between the United States and Red China would be a means of weaning her away from the Soviet bloc.

Removal of barriers to trade with China would greatly benefit Japan, whose primary market has historically been the Asiatic mainland, mostly China. Resumption of trade with China would reduce the need for the export of many Japanese goods to the United States. Opening of the Chinese markets to Japan would remove from competition in the domestic markets of the United States many goods which are now a primary target for domestic protectionists.

TRADE FOR TRADE'S SAKE

Questions of trade and of diplomatic recognition of the Peiping regime can be considered separately. Trade should be considered on the basis of "trade for trade's sake" and trade questions not mixed with international politics. Efforts of "Yankee traders" were prime factors in the greatness achieved by the United States. That trade should not be unduly hampered now, trade itself being the greatest weapon in the hands of a diplomat and, if skillfully used, can be a great instrument of government policy.

Some former "China traders" are of the opinion that United States machinery, trucks, automobiles, metals, specialized equipment of all kinds, petroleum, and certain agricultural products could now find a good market in China. The Peiping regime has indicated interest in the purchase of capital goods and petroleum. Trade is now conducted by the Peiping regime, which tend to bypass traders and warehouses to deal directly with governments, or, if that is impossible, directly with producers in the country from which they purchase goods.

Advocates of increased trade see a market for large quantities of capital goods continuing over many years. They are dissatisfied with restrictions which keep them out of the trade and permit Great Britain and other European country traders to lay the foundations for possible future trade. United States trade with mainland China would contribute to an improved standard of living for the Chinese people, creating a market for many of our consumer goods. Chinese people would be able to see how much better goods are produced in the United States.

A SOURCE OF IRRITATION

The United States must create friendships with other peoples. Increased trade with

China would remove a source of irritation. The smoothing of trade relations would pave the way toward long-range adjustment of Asian problems. Hostility is determined by many factors other than economic strength; a strong industrialized Red China would not necessarily be an increased threat to the United States. Rather, Red China, through economic strength, will be in a position to assert independence of the Soviet Union and to oppose further Soviet penetration of the Chinese economy. Since trade with the West would not be a temporary, but a continuing benefit to China, it would be difficult to see why she would endanger that benefit by action which would threaten the United States, since China would have so much more to lose by any such action.

American policy should be based on considerations of the benefits to the West from trade in nonstrategic goods as well as consideration of that portion of trade which benefits the Communist world. Certain goods, when sold, are strategic to the selling nation's economy. Where trade yields a net advantage to the West, it should be allowed and should be used, if possible, as an instrument for extending Western influence inside the Communist borders.

The blockade is ineffective. The Red China regime has not been undermined, but only forced to rely almost exclusively on the Soviet Union. The time for a change in our policy is here.

Last Year the Oregon grange strongly endorsed this point of view.

Senator Knowland has been removed from politics. In January last year the California Democratic Council urged resumption of trade with China.

SENATOR MORSE ON DULLES POLICY

On July 4, 1957, Senator Morse said, "One of the results of the shortsighted Dulles policy is to turn over to our allies the economic advantages of trade in nonstrategic goods. Pacific coast States are suffering great losses as a result of the boycott."

Henry Ford II, in January of 1957, pleaded for realism with respect to trade with satellites. He asked: "Shouldn't we give the people of Red China some alternatives to their present ties with the Kremlin?"

Even President Eisenhower in June of 1957 said, "I am personally of the school that believes that trade, in the long run, cannot be stopped . . . I don't see as much advantage in maintaining the differential as some people do, although I have never advocated its complete elimination." The "differential" to which he refers is the additional embargoed list for China over the list for the Soviet Union. It is, of course, too much to hope that the President's views would be reflected in action.

THE TIME IS NOW

My chief legislative project in the 86th Congress is the removal of this embargo. Nothing could mean more to Oregon's economy. I am having the necessary legislation drafted. I am encouraging the organization of the many persons who believe strongly in the political and economic benefits of trade with China. We are, I am sure, more powerful than the miscalled China lobby and the committee of one million. I am talking with Pacific coast Congressmen like JACK SHELLEY, of San Francisco. I am gathering evidence from Government departments, shipping companies, and elsewhere. I hope that the Committee for Trade with China, now being formed, will soon send a delegation to Washington to confer with congressional proponents, with the Secretary of State and the President. If it is not possible to arrange immediately for a congressional sponsorship of a trade mission to China, then the Committee for Trade with China should sponsor such a mission. I would gladly be a member of such a mission

and I know other Congressmen and other Oregonians who want to be included.

The time for Oregon to become a maritime State is now.

FOOLISH WAYS, FOOLISH WAYS

Oregon's unemployment must go down and her per capita income must go up. Foolish ways, such as no new construction starts for public works, tight money policies that depress the lumber market, trade policies that cut us off from natural markets—all these and more foolish ways must be forsaken if our earth will be fair and all men glad and wise.

It is up to us Democrats to provide the leadership. We will meet the challenge both in Salem and in Washington, D.C. We will go forward into another hundred years of achievement for the families who make Oregon their home. We Democrats believe that we can improve our society if we are determined and if we use the abilities God gave us—and if we are not afraid to make mistakes from time to time and start again.

We Democrats are fully in accord with the closing verse of "Turn Back O Man":

"Earth shall be fair, and all her people one,
Nor till that hour shall God's whole will be done.

Now, even now, once more from earth to sky

Peals forth in joy man's old undaunted cry,
'Earth shall be fair, and all her folks be one'."

Thank you very much.

UMWA Vice President Kennedy Says Russians Would Cut Your Throat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, appearing in the United Mine Workers Journal of February 15, 1959, in which he advises Soviet friends in the United States that Russians would cut your throat.

KENNEDY RAPE SOVIET FRIENDS IN UNITED STATES—SAYS RUSSIANS WOULD CUT YOUR THROAT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—UMWA Vice President Thomas Kennedy is a longtime foe of communism. His hatred of that philosophy is based on personal observation of "Commies" at work here in the United States and on what he has seen during his extensive travels in foreign lands. Recent Soviet attempts to lure the United States down the primrose path of peace and coexistence reminded Kennedy of similar attempts in the past. In a recent speech, he warned that this was only another approach toward Russia's real goal, world domination and control. He formalized the thoughts he voiced in that speech into a formal statement for the press. The full text is printed below.)

Is history being repeated? In the late 1920's a distinguished public relations firm in the United States started to build up a case in the public's mind for recognition of the Soviet Union of Russia by the Government of the United States. This public relations outfit represented some of the largest

industrial and financial interests in this Nation.

At that time the United Mine Workers of America opposed recognition of Russia and pointed out the dangers involved if our Government accorded such recognition. Briefly, we pointed out that it would result in all of the consular agencies of Russia in the United States being the means of infiltration, propaganda, espionage and everything else, which subsequently proved to be correct.

The basic policy of Soviet communism is for world domination and control. In fact, one of the founders of this ideology is quoted as saying that "Russia could live and coexist with other governments and with other countries to the point where it was necessary to accomplish world aims."

At the present time in the United States, it seems to me that vigorous attempts are being made to build up cases for the American people to coexist and get along with Russia. The recent visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan to many sections of the United States was probably the principal propaganda effort thus far in support of the coexistence program.

It is surprising to me in my travels to talk to people throughout this country who mostly voice the same opinion on this subject. I might emphasize, however, that this attitude comes not from among the ranks of labor or among the officers of labor unions, notwithstanding that officers of a subordinate labor union, under guise of freedom of speech, held meetings with Mr. Mikoyan during his American visit. This maneuver on the part of these individuals will be exploited in Russia and I venture the statement that there is very little, if any, freedom of speech in Russia.

From our experience with the Soviets, the first attempt to make inroads in the United States was to attempt to destroy the United Mine Workers of America. In their efforts to accomplish that purpose, a union was formed in Moscow called the National Miners' Union. Fortunately, however, the mineworkers of the United States resisted the infiltrating tactics of the Soviet regime. As an illustration of the attitude and action of the United Mine Workers of America, the leaders of the Communist movement were driven out of the State of Illinois with pick handles. Furthermore the Commies held a convention in Pittsburgh, Pa., which was the first and last they held anywhere in the United States.

If the American people adopt the program that is being built up for them, we can look for repetition of what happened in the past. Personally I have no desire to work with, or coexist with, people who would cut your throat at the opportune time. Russia, at this moment, through bartering arrangements brought about as a result of subsidies and loans, is helping to destroy the American coal and other markets in Europe, insofar as American exports are concerned. They are also bartering with the Scandinavian and Latin American countries. They have made barter arrangements with France and Belgium. In fact, just recently the West Germans purchased a million tons of brown coal in Eastern Germany. Furthermore, France has been importing Russian anthracite to displace American anthracite at a much higher cost to the consumer than American anthracite.

As further proof of why we should mistrust Russia on all fronts, I would point that a recent State Department release of information concerning the shooting down of an unarmed American plane should be enough to open up anybody's eyes. This is just another instance of Russian policy over the years and, in my judgment, it will continue to be their policy. However, despite the fact that Russia has been putting the knife into our backs in all of these economic and military situations, they still have the gall to ask

us for cooperation and coexistence, which to my mind is utterly ridiculous.

As one who is a little familiar with the situation in Europe, I am putting these few words together as a matter of information and hope they will be of some value and interest to the American people and our Government.

A Tribute to the Late Daniel A. Reed

SPEECH

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when our colleague, DAN REED, passed away, a towering oak fell making a great gap in the forest of men that time and time alone can fill. This House of Representatives will not be the same without DAN REED.

Several years ago I spoke for Congressman REED in his congressional district. On that occasion I said that his people must have selected him to represent them in Congress as the Israelites of old selected King Saul, their first king. They looked around for a man who stood head and shoulders above the common crowd. As the Good Book expresses it:

He was higher than any of the people from his shoulders and upward . . . there is none like him among all the people.

DAN REED towered above the rank and file of men. Physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually he stood head and shoulders above the average member of society. He was a man among men, a leader, an inspiration to others, a man of strong convictions, steadfast and true.

Congressman REED will be missed—by his friends, by his people, but most of all by those who were near and dear to him.

To his loved ones and to his friends I offer the following comforting words from an unknown poet. They are words of faith and hope in the midst of sorrow and loss:

THERE IS NO DEATH

There is no death! The stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death! The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death! Although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms.

Although with bowed and breaking heart,
With sable garb and silent tread,
We bear their senseless dust to earth,
And say that they are dead.

They are not dead! They have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Tho' disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here and love us yet:
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

Appendix

The Conspiracy Is Unfolding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence in everything but medical science. But if we wait long enough, we may discover that the cocoon—plot—comes first, and then after the chrysalis—scheming—stage, we may get a butterfly—conspiracy.

And so it is with Krebiozen, as the persevering and innocent Dr. Andrew Ivy battles his way through the barriers set up by the opposition—more and more the conspiracy unfolds.

I notice that on the board of directors of the American Cancer Society are familiar names; one, a powerful, important, and influential person who has been a star performer in the Krebiozen question from the very beginning. No wonder the American Cancer Society first, sidesteps the issue, then procrastinates about the technicalities involved in the tests, and finally after nearly a year, issues a flat refusal.

A distinguished attorney and counselor, the Honorable Thomas N. Clifford, of Baltimore, became very interested in the Krebiozen issue because of his tremendous interest in the cancer problem and the scientific efforts to arrest or control its ravages upon the human family. These letters speak for themselves. No wonder Mr. Clifford is disgusted. So are many other civic-spirited citizens.

The great tragedy of this generation is the iron handed grip of control that the American Medical Association, in its unbending and unyielding arbitrary will, exerts over the fearsome attitude of its unsuspecting membership: We set the policy—right or wrong.

The letters follow:

NOVEMBER 26, 1958.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I would appreciate it very much if you would send me some information with respect to the new drug Krebiozen.

I would like to know if you have tested the same and if so, what was the result of your tests.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
New York, N.Y., December 9, 1958.

MR. THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. CLIFFORD: I have your letter of November 26 relative to Krebiozen.

The American Cancer Society is doing everything possible to find a preventive or

effective treatment for cancer. However, it has a responsibility also to protect the public against being misled in regard to unproved methods of treatment, no matter how earnest or how loud spoken their supporters may be.

As you probably know, case records of patients treated with this preparation were investigated several years ago, not only by the American Medical Association but also by other groups of physicians and scientists experienced in cancer research. The conclusions of all these groups was that they could find no evidence that Krebiozen had any value in the treatment of patients with cancer. Up to the present time, no information has been made available to us which would justify the belief that these conclusions were no longer valid.

Recently, the American Cancer Society has had some correspondence with the Krebiozen Research Foundation relative to a possible further evaluation of this preparation on the basis of what is claimed to be additional evidence not previously considered. This proposal was considered by several groups of distinguished scientists, expert and experienced in cancer research. After full consideration of this proposal, these groups of scientists advised the American Cancer Society that the proposal does not provide a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation, inasmuch as the plan proposed has many defects when compared with the well-established scientific methods now existing for the test of products proposed for human use.

These were three points that were particularly unsatisfactory:

1. The plan did not provide for the trial to be conducted by an independent group of clinical investigators recognized as being objective and competent by the scientific community at large.

2. It did not permit an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results, since it provided for the administration of the drug by the proponent only.

3. It provided no clear-cut standards for measuring either the results desired or defining or measuring the results to be obtained.

The American Cancer Society reiterates its willingness to support the testing of any substance proposed for the prevention, treatment, or cure of cancer provided the substance is available for testing under the well-established scientific methods known and accepted for all products proposed for human use, and further, provided that satisfactory preliminary evidence exists that the substance has shown promise of being useful in the treatment of cancer.

I hope that the above explanation will be helpful to you in understanding the American Cancer Society's position in regard to Krebiozen and to the support of cancer research in general.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. PRESS, M.D.

Associate Director, Professional Education.

DECEMBER 16, 1958.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: I have your letter of December 9, 1958, and I am enclosing a copy of Senator DOUGLAS' letter to me and a copy of his statement on this matter. I am further

sending a copy of your letter to me and my answer to your letter along to Senator DOUGLAS in order that he may have the same available to him for his use before the appropriate committees of Congress.

As to the second paragraph in your letter, you state that case records of patients treated with Krebiozen were investigated several years ago not only by the American Medical Association but also by other groups of physicians and scientists. You do not mention who these other groups of physicians or scientists are. As to the American Medical Association, you do not state that this medical association conducted any test, you only state that case records of patients treated with this preparation were investigated. You do not say how many patients were used in the course of your test nor the exact nature of the tests which you ran. In short, just from your letter, I must conclude that the tests or investigations were on the skimpy side.

Senator DOUGLAS states in his proposal of August 22, 1958, that errors were made by the developers of Krebiozen but that errors have also been made by the opponents of Krebiozen. He then went on to say, "Vari-ous statements of fact have apparently been made about numerous cases alleged to have been treated with Krebiozen in an effort to discredit the use of that preparation." He then goes on to state that Dr. Ivy is not only a world-famous physiologist and scientist but that on the basis of a long acquaintance with him, he, Senator DOUGLAS, trusts Dr. Ivy's personal integrity. If a man of the stature and integrity of Senator DOUGLAS feels that way about Dr. Ivy, I feel that the least that should happen should be a thorough examination of Dr. Ivy's product and contention.

Further in your letter of December 9, you refer to a proposal by the Krebiozen Research Foundation with respect to new evidence. You then turn down the idea of testing the product even with the new evidence mainly on the basis that the proposal did not provide for a test along certain traditional scientific lines.

I cannot believe your point 1 that the trial cannot be conducted by an independent group of clinical investigators. With Senator DOUGLAS' services available, I see no reason why a group from the American Cancer Society, a group from the American Medical Association and a group suitable to Dr. Ivy cannot jointly evaluate the test, if necessary, publishing majority and minority reports.

Your refusal to accept or even suggest on your own any mutually acceptable independent group of clinical investigators is exactly the same as if two litigants in a legal matter could not get to court because the defendant kept claiming no suitable judge or group of judges could be found in the United States and, therefore, the defendant could not be sued.

As to point two that the test would not provide an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results since it provided for the administration of the drug by the proponent only, I am utterly astounded. If the new product has any value, who is going to be able to demonstrate the value of it, the men who created it and are familiar with it or someone who is not familiar with it. Furthermore, the purpose of the test at this time is not to determine whether physicians generally can

obtain the same results as the proponents but to determine if the product has any value. If it is proven that the product has any value, I have no doubt whatsoever that the practicing physicians can easily master the procedure used by the proponents of the method.

As to point 3 that no clear-cut standards for measuring the results desired or defining or measuring the results to be obtained, this is equally confusing. The results desired are immediately clear to any and every layman. They are purely and simply either a cure of the disease or any degree of improvement. The simple idea being that even if there is some degree of improvement the treatment may have some value which can be further developed.

As for obtaining a precise measurement of the results of the treatment, I think you are quibbling over trivial technicalities. The person who is sick and dying of cancer is quite competent of judging any favorable result in his condition. I admit that this is not a scientific test and must be accepted with limitation and only gradually applied to larger numbers of people but it is certainly one of the many ways of measuring results. Furthermore, any doctor can easily measure marked improvement merely by observing the patient before and after treatment and questioning the patient before and after treatment. In addition, the patient can be photographed both before and after treatment so that a larger group of doctors can then make their own evaluation of results with a case record of photographs, tests and observations of the physicians' treating the patient. Last but by no means least, the patients themselves would be available to other doctors for further questioning.

As to your next-to-the-last paragraph in which you state that you are willing to support the testing of any product providing the substance is available for testing under the well-established scientific methods known and accepted for all products proposed for human use and provided further that satisfactory preliminary evidence exists that the substance has shown promise. I am amazed at your scientific rigidity in approaching a problem that has defied analysis by all ordinary approaches.

What you are saying in plain English is two things; first, that unless a substance or method of treatment is available for testing under certain traditional time-honored, ancient methods, you will not consider testing.

The second point that you make is that you are, in effect, saying that the product has to be practically proven to be a cure before you are willing to test it. If you are going to sit back and wait until a product is proven beyond any doubt to have value before you test it, what is your organization doing with its contributions?

Furthermore, how can you determine whether or not a substance shows promise of being useful unless and until you first test it? That is the purpose of testing to see if a product shows promise.

From the standpoint of the general public, it is totally immaterial whether a cancer cure is discovered by Drs. Ivy and Durovic or by another group of doctors, or by chemists or druggists or other groups. The essential thing is that a cure be discovered, and the only truly scientific procedure is to run down each and every possible clue.

In conclusion, if you are going to insist upon elaborate screening techniques and procedures before even testing any products, I, in turn, have no choice but to apply a similar set of elaborate qualifications and screening techniques before responding with a financial contribution upon the approach of any of your solicitors.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD.

JANUARY 6, 1959.

Mr. THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. CLIFFORD: In response to your letter of December 18, 1958, I would like to develop for you the circumstances which led up to a consideration by the American Cancer Society of the proposal made by Dr. Ivy last February.

In the summer of 1957 in response to the query of a science writer we stated publicly, and to Dr. Ivy directly, that any proposal for an objective test of Krebiozen would receive careful consideration by our advisory committees and by our board. In their collective responsible opinion this plan did not provide for a valid and objective test of Krebiozen. We have made known to the Krebiozen Research Foundation the reasons for this decision.

In the first place the society rejected Dr. Ivy's proposal because it called for a joint committee of the Krebiozen Research Foundation and of the American Cancer Society to arrange for and conduct a so-called "double blind controlled test." Under this plan it was further stipulated that the substance was to be administered to the patients solely by Dr. Ivy who is the principal spokesman for the drug. It was obvious to our advisory committees and to the Board, that a test under which the arrangements are to be made by a committee on which the promoters of the drug are represented equally with the group presumable responsible for the objectivity of the test, and in which the principal spokesman for the drug is the person to administer it to patients, was not objective within the scientific meaning of this word.

Our Board considers that unless the test is carried out wholly independently of the Krebiozen Research Foundation the results would have no real significance and would not be generally accepted by the doctors who treat cancer. The Board felt that to assent to and participate in a test of the sort proposed by Dr. Ivy would in effect be aiding and abetting a procedure which could serve no useful purpose.

In the second place, the proposed test gave no basis for determining whether the substance, when administered by physicians generally would produce the same results because no independent appraisal by others was to be permitted. To have validity, one of the primary criteria of any scientific experiment is the ability to duplicate it with similar or comparable results by other investigators.

In the third place, the proposal provided no definite standards for measuring either the results anticipated or the results obtained. The final step in the test as proposed was to record Dr. Ivy's opinion as to which patients had been given Krebiozen and which had been given mineral oil. On a pure guesswork basis he would have a 50-50 chance of being right. On the basis of his selection of patients who had received Krebiozen and those who had received mineral oil the cancer society would have been placed in the position of seeming to certify as to the efficacy of this drug. Our board felt that this would have only further confounded an already thoroughly confused situation and misled thousands of patients suffering from the disease.

Moreover, the proposal from the Krebiozen Research Foundation required that plans for a so-called double blind controlled study be agreed upon by the society prior to a study of the case histories of patients who have received the drug, which are stated to be on file with the foundation. Obviously, one would be working in a partial vacuum in attempting to define the conditions of any

evaluation without knowledge of results already achieved.

There were other objections to the test but these were the essential reasons for our board taking the action it did.

The American Cancer Society is responsible not only for exploring all possible avenues in its search for an answer to cancer but equally for protecting the public from the unhappy results which would follow if unjustified confidence were placed in any particular substance which would delay cancer victims from receiving the only treatments presently known to produce a cure—surgery or radiation.

However, there are now, and there always have been, channels open to Krebiozen which, if followed, will produce conclusive results.

The society does not operate clinics or research laboratories of its own and therefore cannot conduct tests itself. For many years, however, it has supported the experimental investigation of drugs and substances which may be useful in the management of cancer. Its purpose in this program is to provide support to qualified investigators in the expectation that from this program a cancer cure will be developed.

As we repeatedly pointed out the American Cancer Society would welcome any arrangement which Dr. Ivy makes with a responsible laboratory receiving financial support from the American Cancer Society for them to test Krebiozen as they are currently testing thousands of other drugs. The results of these tests would then be published by the scientists or clinicians who carried them out and Krebiozen would have to stand or fall, as does any other drug, on the collective results.

This research procedure has been responsible for the discovery and testing of the many compounds now being used in cancer therapy. To mention some which are being used by physicians in the treatment of this disease we list Triethylene thiophosphoramide, Triethylene melamine, and other nitrogen mustard derivatives, 6-mercaptopurine, 5-fluoro-premidine derivatives, Methotrexate, and other antimetabolites, isotopes, hormones, and so on. If Krebiozen has a useful place in this armamentarium, it can be established beyond argument in the same way that the efficacy of these other drugs has been established.

The above facts make it clear that the society did not refuse to test Krebiozen but that it refused to participate in a procedure which, in its responsible opinion, would serve no useful scientific purpose and which might well have further misled the public.

To repeat, avenues of scientific appraisal are open for Krebiozen. What is closed is any proposal under which the Cancer Society would lend its name to a test which is not carried out on a scientifically acceptable basis. Any test in which the society is involved must be conducted and documented in accordance with the impeccable principles of the medical profession and the scientific community at large.

The onus of delay and of obstruction rests clearly with those promoting Krebiozen and not with us nor with the medical profession. If there was any reliable evidence that Krebiozen is useful in the treatment of cancer, we believe its proponents have a moral responsibility to submit this substance properly to the scientific community for an assessment of its worth.

This is the position of the society whose affairs are directed by openminded, public spirited citizens serving the interest of their fellow citizens without pay and without hope of personal gain.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. PRESS, M.D.,
Associate Director, Professional
Education.

JANUARY 15, 1959.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I received your letter of January 6, 1959, and have read it very carefully and thank you for your time and effort in answering my letter.

One of the main reasons that led me to write you was that from time to time in the course of drawing wills, I, and for that matter many other lawyers, are called upon, especially for elderly people, to recommend certain worthy charities as recipients for donations. Thus I, as well as many other lawyers, are frequently called upon to answer all sorts of questions such as "Is it a worthy charity?" "Why don't they do this?" "Why don't they do that?" "Which one do you prefer?" Not to mention the obvious questions, as "Would the donation be eligible for a tax deduction?"

You can naturally understand my legal predicament, besides whatever personal feelings I may have on the matter, when I discovered Senator Douglas' resolution to force the testing of Krebiozen.

I must frankly and honestly state that your refusal to test the drug under any procedure other than your own constitutes, in my mind, behavior that is either out of date in this modern, changing, and fast-moving world or else is evidence of stiffness on your part that having once taken a certain position you will under no circumstances change and submit to a test that might prove you wrong.

Upon reviewing your correspondence, it seems to me that your basic position is simply that unless the test is done 100 percent the way you want it done, that is by the time honored, traditional methods, which, incidentally, have not led to any results in this particular disease, you will not consider any method of testing Krebiozen.

Basically, it seems that your objection to the Krebiozen plan as per paragraph 3, page 1, of your letter of January 6, 1959, was that Dr. Ivy, who is the spokesman for the drug, would administer it and that there would be equal representation by the Krebiozen Research Foundation and the American Cancer Society.

Apparently, you seem to feel that there is something unfair about equal representation. Neither I nor any of my clients ever felt that this is the American viewpoint.

As to your objection to Dr. Ivy administering the drug, it is inconceivable to me that you would even want or allow someone else to administer it since on the first trial, at least, obviously the best results could only be obtained by the person most familiar with the drug who would know just how to vary dosage with individual need.

Furthermore, I consider it totally unfair to Dr. Ivy not to allow him to conduct the test. Since this refusal to test Krebiozen has blown up into such a national issue that it is now before Senators in Washington, Dr. Ivy is in the position of being either a hero or a quack. If he is a hero, he should be honored; if he is a quack, he should be exposed. However, assuming that Krebiozen has merit, it would be unfair to Dr. Ivy to let some person unfamiliar with it test the drug, have a failure not due to the drug but due to improper administration of the drug and thereby have his medical reputation ruined—not to mention the loss to the public of a valuable treatment.

And what incentive to research does anyone have if he looks at the case of Dr. Ivy and reads your letters in which the American Cancer Society refuses a test based on equal representation.

On page 2, paragraph 5, of your letter of January 6, 1959, you state that the American Cancer Society is responsible not only for exploring all possible avenues in its search for an answer to cancer but also for protecting the public from unhappy results

that would follow if unjustified confidence were placed in any particular substance which would prevent cancer victims from receiving treatment presently believed to be more beneficial.

I am very much afraid that your society is not doing its duty under your own definition per paragraph 5, page 2, of your letter of January 6, 1959, since first of all, I think the general public feel and is under the impression that you are diligently searching the length and the breadth of the land for every treatment or rumored treatment and taking steps to have it tested. To find that this money is not being so used would be quite disturbing to them.

Furthermore, under your definition of your responsibility, I would also feel that you have a duty to expose quacks and fakes. The only way to do this is to test their products and, I think, any developer of a drug is entitled to equal representation in the test under the most elementary rules of fair play.

With reference to your next to the last paragraph in which you state that the onus of delay rests with those promoting Krebiozen and not with those of the medical profession, I agree with you as to the fact that it is not the fault of the medical profession. A doctor engaged in practice does not have the time to do research. Furthermore, he does not have funds pouring into him with which to subsidize tests. No blame can possibly be laid at the feet of the practicing physicians.

However, to have one group of doctors led by Dr. Ivy claim they found helpful treatment and then to find an organization such as yours which has received public funds and is a trustee of the public's money do nothing except form committees to decide whether or not to test the material is unfair to the public.

It borders on the absurd that a group of doctors led by Dr. Ivy should have to appeal to a U.S. Senator to try to get the American Cancer Society, who have been collecting research funds from the public, to test a possible cure under conditions of equal representation.

In addition to everything else, I personally, have some doubts as to the legality of your position. You have received public funds, you are administering these funds as a trustee with a duty to search out and make tests for cancer cures and a responsibility as per page 2, paragraph 5 of your letter of January 6, 1959, to protect the public from unhappy results such as being preyed upon by charities and even well-meaning but misguided people. If your funds are not applied diligently toward these ends, then I doubt that a court would let you retain these deposits of public money placed with you under public trust.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD.

JANUARY 30, 1959.

Mr. THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. CLIFFORD: Your letter of January 15 has been referred to me for reply. This letter, which I have read with care, raises a number of questions, in part general and in part legalistic, as to the decision of the American Cancer Society not to sponsor a test of Krebiozen under the terms proposed by Dr. Ivy and the Krebiozen Foundation. You question also the procedures which led to this decision.

As Mr. Runyon's letter to Mr. Davis explained, the American Cancer Society does not have research laboratories under its control or cancer patients under its care but supports cancer research in the universities, medical centers and hospitals of the country. Grants for the support of research projects are made upon the recommendation of advisory committees which consist of scientists

from all parts of the United States, experienced and distinguished in various aspects of cancer research. The only way, therefore, that the American Cancer Society could proceed to get any further test of Krebiozen made would be to go to certain cancer hospitals and request them to undertake such a test. The fact however that our advisory committees consider Dr. Ivy's proposal scientifically unsound and unacceptable make it clearly impossible for us to proceed further with this proposal.

The Cancer Society has never received a request from a responsible group of investigators for the support of a proposal for the test of Krebiozen. If the Society did receive such a request, it would receive careful consideration and very probably would be granted.

Your letter also questions the legality of the position of the ACS in this matter. Relative to this I can only say that on our board of directors and on the various committees which passed upon this request, we have a number of able lawyers—individuals, I might add, who are just as anxious as anyone could possibly be to find an effective preventive or cure for cancer.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD S. DIEHL, M.D.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1959, I introduced H.R. 3983 to repeal excise taxes on jewelry, furs, cosmetics, luggage, motor vehicles, appliances, telephone calls, and admissions to cabarets, theaters motion-picture houses, concerts, and operas.

These World War II taxes have long been a deterrent to business growth and they are still in effect even though World War II ended nearly 14 years ago.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., which appeared on February 5, 1959:

OLD TAXES TOO DESERVE HONORABLE
RETIREMENT

Representative OSMERS, Republican, Ninth District, has just commented on a classic shortcoming of Government, one which all public officials understand but few care to discuss: it's a tough job to repeal a tax. Once a tax is imposed, even though it be at a specific time for a specific purpose, there it stays long after the time has expired and long after the purpose, if any, has been served.

Mr. OSMERS pointed out that only one of the special excise taxes enacted during World War II has been repealed. It was on the transportation of property. All the rest are still being collected, and the war ended 14 years ago.

The Ninth District Representative makes this argument:

Wartime excise taxes were placed against commodities like jewelry, luggage, or photographic equipment not so much to raise revenue as to discourage purchase. In an expanding economy what we want to do is encourage buying, but there the excise taxes stay. If they are repealed the stimulated interest in buying at resulting lower prices

will raise more revenue for the Government through business income taxes than is being raised through the excise taxes.

Mr. OSMERS must have looked into the arithmetic of this argument. But, whether new tax income of one kind will offset taxes of another kind lost by repealing the excises, they ought to go. Mr. OSMERS has introduced a bill to accomplish just that, and it would be a refreshing change and an economic shot in the arm to see a tax repealed.

**Congress Should Have More, Not Less,
Control Over TVA—H.R. 3460 and
Similar Bills Should Not Pass**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a reading of the record of TVA from its inception in 1933 discloses that TVA has engaged in a progressive assumption and usurpation of powers that Congress never intended it should have. In fact, TVA officials and its proponents have from time to time denied the authority and the intention to do the very things that were later assumed or claimed. Such an agency should have greater congressional control, not less.

It would take volumes on volumes to set forth all the various statements and claims that TVA and its proponents have made relative to the future programs or actions of TVA, and the record of failure to perform in accordance with such claims or contentions. A few of the more obvious failures of TVA to act in accordance with the expressions of its officials and proponents are here noted.

In regard to the cost of TVA, the author of the TVA bill in the House stated that the entire proposed TVA program could be completed for less than \$150 million. An opponent who prophesied at the time that it would be a billion-dollar program was only half right. It now has cost \$2 billion in money appropriated out of the U.S. Treasury, in addition to the loss of freedom and initiative of the people in the TVA region itself due to the autocratic power placed in the hands of a three-man board.

Surely an agency that has had almost unlimited and dictatorial control of the spending of over \$3,760,000,000 from its inception to June 30, 1958, and whose annual gross income now approaches one quarter billion dollars, should have more congressional control, not less.

TVA's 14,600 employees are under the almost unlimited control of the three men who run TVA. It would seem more proper to provide that these 14,600 TVA employees come under the United States Civil Service Commission laws and regulations as do most Federal employees, rather than to continue or expand the almost unlimited control that three men now have over these TVA employees.

**TVA DENIED IT PLANNED TO CONSTRUCT STEAM
PLANTS**

TVA told the U.S. Court of Appeals with reference to the Sheffield steam plant near Wilson Dam that was turned over to TVA:

Said steam electric generating plant has not been and is not being operated and there is no plan or intention to operate said plant now or in the future, or to construct or operate any other steam electric generating plants.

This contention to a high U.S. court was made in order to obtain a favorable ruling on the question of the legality of TVA's operations and program. The record of failure on this point is highlighted by the later operation of the steam plant in question and the construction of many other steam electric plants by TVA, one of which is now boastfully claimed by TVA to be the largest steam electric plant in the world.

Such action clearly indicates that the people's representatives in Congress should have more, not less, control over the operations and expansions of the TVA power empire.

TVA told the U.S. Court of Appeals that TVA "has disposed of and will dispose of only such electric energy as is generated from waterpower inevitably created by the operations of the said dams for navigation and flood control and which is not needed for governmental purposes and which would otherwise be wasted."

Today more than 72 percent of the electric power TVA disposes of comes from steam electric plants. This is another indication of why TVA cannot be trusted and should have more congressional control, not less.

TVA officials have gradually usurped or assumed a utility responsibility for the area in which they operate, and after such assumption try to claim that Congress by its action in providing the bond issue to purchase the Tennessee Electric Power Co. properties gave TVA such a utility responsibility.

This of course is not in keeping with the TVA position before the congressional investigation of TVA in 1938. At that time a high TVA official who was in charge of the negotiations for acquisition of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. system said in reply to a question as to whether TVA intended to purchase the Tennessee Electric Power Co. steam plants:

In the case of the acquisition the plan has been that TVA would acquire the hydro plants in the Tennessee River system and the local public agencies would acquire the major steam plants.

And in regard to operation of these steam plants the same official also said:

My point on it is this, that these steam plants are located near these large cities. TVA at the present time is not set up to operate these large steam plants where the local public agencies would have a substantial organization and crew, and very probably the operation of the steam plant would fit in better with the organization setup of those agencies than it would with ours.

Take the Memphis situation, for example, there is a large steam plant at Memphis, which the city will probably purchase in case

of an acquisition. Now, that plant would very probably be operated by the city to support our service to Memphis. In recognition of the support to our service to Memphis we would make an adjustment in our power bill. But the city would operate the plant, and I think that arrangement would be better than TVA operating the plant because we would have to maintain a steam plant personnel over in Memphis for that purpose alone. And the same thing would apply at Nashville.

Of course the record is clear on the failure of TVA to follow this claimed program for acquisition and operation of the utility company steam plants.

As a matter of fact, the contracts TVA executed with these local public agencies were "captive" contracts that prevented the very type of operation TVA told the Congress it intended to accomplish under the proposed bond issue amendment to the TVA Act. There can be no question that the distributors of TVA power such as Memphis, Nashville, Chattanooga, Knoxville, and others could have constructed steam electric plants to provide for the load growth of their respective areas that was in excess of the hydroelectric capabilities of the TVA system. Such operation could have been integrated with the TVA system for maximum benefit and economy.

TVA officials also told the Congress that the TVA power contracts with the industrial customers "provided for cancellation and utilization of such power for the preference customers of TVA."

I can find no record of any cancellation of such contracts in accord with these TVA statements. In fact TVA has, over the years, steadily promoted and increased the sale of power to industry.

This is but another example of why TVA cannot be trusted with more corporate power but should have greater congressional control.

TVA officials have from time to time attempted to claim that they have not encouraged industry to locate or move to the TVA territory. Yet a TVA Director early in TVA existence made it quite clear that TVA did have a policy or intention to promote such industrial expansion in the TVA area. He said in a speech:

I am very definitely of the opinion that it is the Authority's duty to encourage and stimulate the growth of large-scale industry in the Tennessee Valley area. We are making provision for one of the largest hydroelectric developments in the world, with a potential 3 million horsepower available. We are expending and expect to expend, millions upon millions of dollars in construction activities, all looking toward the development of more and more power. Although we are bending every effort to greatly increase the use of electricity in the home and on the farm, it is obvious that only a large-scale industrial expansion will absorb the great pool of power which is thus being created. As we lay our plans for developing this cheap power in great quantities, it seems to me to be mandatory that we also lay plans for utilizing it in an industrial expansion program.

And a few years later at a congressional hearing this same TVA Director said:

But industries don't set themselves up in a region automatically. There must be some organizing force, with technical and research

facilities. We believe it is appropriate that some of this technical and research work should be undertaken by the Tennessee Valley Authority as an agency of all the people.

One could spend a full year in going over the thousands and thousands of pages of TVA record of its claims and contentions in public speeches, releases, and congressional testimony and the record of later failure to act in compliance with one after another of the earlier claimed actions, programs, and policies. This record gives abundant reason why TVA cannot be trusted with more corporate power but should have greater and more strict congressional control than it has had in the past.

The three TVA directors now have more power than three good men should want or more than three bad men should ever have. The present congressional control of TVA as now interpreted by TVA and as acquiesced in by some committees of Congress gives them almost unlimited control over the spending of nearly one-quarter billion dollars a year. To relieve them of even the present limited control should be unthinkable to any representative of the American people who has sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States and its American form of government. Steps should be taken to reestablish the congressional controls that are inherent under the Constitution.

The Constitution of the United States provided for three separate branches of government. This was to act as a system of balances and checks. The people's representatives in Congress were given a most important task of writing the laws for the executive department to administer. The Constitution also provided for the House of Representatives to initiate the revenue measures needed to provide the funds necessary for the operations of the Government. This authority to provide revenues and the authorization and appropriation of the funds needed to carry out the various acts of Congress was the check on the operations of the executive department through control of the purse strings. To relinquish this inherent control as provided for by the Constitution would be a betrayal of the oath of office to uphold the Constitution. It is quite clear that under H.R. 3460 and similar bills the legislative branch would be relinquishing its responsibility to maintain the check provided for by the framers of the Constitution. TVA needs more control by the people's representatives in Congress, not less.

Last year in the discussion of H.R. 8002, Congressman after Congressman stood on the floor of the House to say that there was a great need for more control by the Congress on the funds being expended by the executive department. Certainly this need for greater congressional control applies to TVA as much, if not more so, than to any other executive department of the Government.

If TVA had operated in the manner in which its officials initially told the Congress it was going to operate, then there would be less need to insist on greater control. But after 20-odd years

of progressive failure to so operate and the gradual but continuing usurpation and assumption of powers not intended by the Congress, it is time to call a halt. TVA needs more congressional control, not less.

Under unanimous consent, I include along with my own remarks, an editorial from the *Argus*, of Rock Island, Ill., dated December 1, 1958:

TVA, 25-YEAR FRAUD

One of the largest and most amazing projects of the 20th century, the Tennessee Valley Authority, is starting on its second quarter-century.

Built at the taxpayers' expense, at a total cost of \$1.5 billion, it is the Nation's largest power generating enterprise.

It buys more coal than any enterprise in America. It generates more power annually than all of France. It is now studying the possibilities of utilizing atomic power.

Yet when the TVA act was established, power wasn't even mentioned in the purpose preamble. The whole project was put over, and was approved by the U.S. Supreme Court, as a flood-control scheme.

It is concerned also with navigation, develops fertilizer and reforests eroded areas.

Originally intended to utilize hydroelectric power, it gets 75 percent of its electricity from steamplants—an aim originally disavowed.

It has the backing of hot-eyed southern conservatives who receive its cheap power at the expense of the rest of the Nation, of wild-eyed radicals in the North and of plain and fancy crackpots everywhere.

Norman Thomas, the Socialist leader, called it the only genuine socialistic measure of the New Deal.

Intended to serve electricity only to valley homes and farms, it distributes 51 percent of its power to U.S. defense agencies.

And it isn't satisfied with that. It seeks the authority—which was denied in the last session of Congress—to issue bonds for the construction of more plants.

It disavows any intentions to expand, but Philip Sporn, head of the American Electric Power Co., says a careful study of its proposal shows it would be able to take in 25,000 more square miles—a 30 percent increase—where private utilities now operate, and that it might go even farther.

That would be fully in accord with TVA's history.

It can move with confidence because it has a tremendous tax advantage over the private utilities. The latter pay 23.4 percent of their revenue from electric operations to State and Federal governments. TVA pays 5 percent to local and State governments and nothing to Washington, though it has returned \$250 million on its original investment, at the rate of 4 percent.

TVA paid only \$4,148,000 in taxes in 1956, last year for which figures are available. But it did better than some Government power schemes at that. The Hoover Dam project pays \$600,000 a year to Nevada and Arizona, but all other Federal power projects pay no taxes. If they were taxed at the rate of private utilities, they would pay a total of \$82,523,610 into all governments.

What they fail to pay has to be made up by taxpayers in all parts of the country. As one utility executive put it, TVA's waters flow through three States and drain the other 45.

And TVA uses its 4-to-1 tax advantage to club the private companies out of existence.

This will continue as long as the American people, through their Congress, allow TVA to get away with it.

The private companies are asking that TVA be sold off to private and municipal interests. But TVA is still fighting to expand and

will renew its bonding request in the next session of Congress.

There is a big principle involved in this unfair advantage which TVA is allowed to use against private companies. Congress ought to stop it.

Even if there were no such principle, the Nation as a whole should be tired of subsidizing the relatively small area which uses cheap TVA power. If private companies were operating throughout this area, Federal tax money would be swelled and the load on the rest of the Nation would be reduced accordingly.

TVA is a fraud against free enterprise and a fraud against the Nation's taxpayers.

The New Jersey Labor Herald Calls for a National Labor-Management Assembly, and Declares a True Labor-Management Accord Could Usher in a New Era of Enlightened Capitalism Which Would Excite the Admiration of the Entire World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New Jersey Labor Herald, a fine labor paper officially endorsed by the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, affiliate of the AFL-CIO, recently called for a national labor-management assembly to be held in Washington, D.C. It said that a labor-management accord could usher in a new era of enlightened capitalism that would excite the admiration of the entire world. In fact, it is the sole hope for the survival of free enterprise in America, as organized labor is the greatest bulwark against the Communist menace.

In a recent speech at the University of California, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor Millard Cass said:

Labor and management can, however, do more for themselves and for the country by trying to get along together than by trying to harm each other.

It is apparent that New Jersey Labor Herald proposal is bearing fruit. At the New Jersey congressional dinner in Washington on February 5, 1959, Mr. Lansing Shield, president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce urged that a labor-management accord be reached through a conference.

A labor-management conference was proposed by the New Jersey Labor Herald editorially in December 1958 in the following language:

We respectfully submit the suggestion for convening of a semiannual labor-management assembly, preferably in Washington sponsored, but not dominated, by government, composed of 10 representatives each, from labor and management. We are confident that AFL-CIO President George Meany would welcome such an opportunity.

I include here the text of the editorial for the information of my colleagues because of its importance:

THE WITHERED OLIVE BRANCH

In the spirit of the Prince of Peace * * * whose birth is celebrated at this season, we once again extend a sincere invitation of labor to the masters of American industry, to cease sharpening their spears * * * and agree to confer with leaders of organized labor, in the hope that our tremendous joint powers might, at long last, be devoted to the future welfare of our country.

Surely, the millions of dollars wasted by the National Association of Manufacturers and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in financing late-labor campaigns, could more profitably be utilized in helping such fields as higher education * * * or, even the sincere enhancement of sound labor-management relations. To fair, hard-headed business executives this certainly must appeal as "good business."

The only losers when and if labor-management peace is finally achieved, would be the hired mercenaries of NAM who would lose their soft jobs. These parasites thrive solely during times of travail—generated mostly by themselves.

In a recent speech at the University of California, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, Millard Cass, pointed out that "Labor and management, can and should, do more for themselves and for our country by trying to get along together, than by trying to harm each other." This desirable cooperation should not be too difficult of achievement, he said, when one considers the fact that over the past decade the total working time lost by strikes, has been only one-third of 1 percent.

This is a remarkable record when more than 80,000 collective bargaining contracts are negotiated annually—95 percent without a strike or lockout.

Labor-management accord could usher in a new era of enlightened capitalism that would excite the admiration of the entire world. In fact, it is the sole hope for the survival of free enterprise in America, as organized labor is the greatest bulwark against Communist menace.

An excellent beginning has already been made in several important industries of national magnitude, including the sprawling electrical field. It is interesting to note the success of periodic conferences, on the national and regional levels, by the National Electrical Contractors Association and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which deal with every phase of the industry through a council on industrial relations. There are a number of other industries in which joint energies are being channeled into plans for the common good.

They are successful because they spell good business, higher production, and better profits and wages without benefit of Government meddling.

We respectfully submit the suggestion for convening of a semiannual Labor-Management Assembly, preferably in Washington sponsored, but not dominated, by Government, composed of 10 representatives each, from labor and management. We are confident that AFL-CIO President George Meany would welcome such an opportunity.

Here is a major objective for the newly elected president of the NAM, Mr. Stanley C. Hope who, because of his long and distinguished business career, must realize the potentialities of such an accord and the benefits that could flow from it, for the workers, management, and what is of utmost importance—this last real bastion of freedom in a world torn asunder by power-maddened tyrants parading under the blood-soaked banner of communism.

North Dakota Legislature Urges Reinstatement of Local Grain Testing by Agriculture Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, hardship has been suffered by North Dakota farmers as a result of the Department of Agriculture's ruling that local testing programs for grains subject to an application for a Federal loan must be abandoned in favor of testing at one central station. Where farmers could previously take their grain to local elevators for moisture content and grading purposes, they have found that the new central testing program occasions delays of from 3 to 6 weeks on the approval of loans.

Mr. Speaker, the North Dakota Legislature is justifiably concerned about the effects of this so-called testing system, and has forwarded me the following Concurrent Resolution F:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION F

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture to reestablish a local testing program for grains that are subject to an application for a Federal loan

Whereas it has long been the practice of the Agricultural Stabilization Committee to permit local elevator operators to test grain for moisture content and grading purposes prior to the approval of a loan thereon by the Agricultural Stabilization Committee; and

Whereas such policies have now been changed to require that such testing and grading be carried on at one central station; and

Whereas such central testing practices result in a delay of from 3 to 6 weeks in the approval of loans with a resultant inconvenience and often hardship to the owners of the grain who are seeking a loan thereon from the Agricultural Stabilization Committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby urged to discontinue the central testing system now in existence, and that the Agricultural Stabilization Committee accept the results of tests carried on by local elevator operators for the purpose of approving processing and approving applications for grain loans from the Agricultural Stabilization Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Secretary of Agriculture and each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,

Speaker of the House.

GERALD L. STARR,

Chief Clerk of the House.

C. P. DAHL,

President of the Senate.

VIC GILBREATH,

Secretary of the Senate.

I am today contacting the Secretary of Agriculture on this problem, and it is hoped that the Department will reinstitute its former policy of local testing.

Leslie L. Biffle Signally Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently my constituent, the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle, was recognized signally by a vast number of well-wishing friends on completing 50 years of public service in the Nation's Capital.

I include a newsletter distributed under date of January 23, 1959, regarding this tribute to Mr. Biffle:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE SIGNALLY HONORED

Thoroughness, attentiveness to duty, loyalty to friends, and hard work brought fame and distinction to Leslie L. Biffle, of Piggott, Ark. He was honored at a magnificent testimonial dinner after 50 years of outstanding public service in the Nation's Capitol. More than 1,200 friends swelled the grand ballroom to overflowing in the swank Mayflower Hotel. The requests for tickets had to be shut off a few days before the banquet was held for lack of space in the five ballrooms which were thrown together for the event. The \$15-a-plate dinner featured music and songs by recognized artists, addresses by leaders from both major political parties, and presentation of gifts.

Here are some of the tributes paid to Les Biffle by speakers on the program:

"He's affable, courteous, and deserving of our admiration and esteem."

"His personality endeared him to the hearts of all of us."

"Distinguished public servant, who knew what the word 'loyalty' meant."

"Only man who could whisper to Senators without moving his lips."

"The Senator at Large from the United States."

"His counsel was sought. He was adviser to those in the highest places of responsibility."

"He never forgets a friend and never fails to reward one."

"Confidant of Presidents."

"A pinnacle few men attained."

"Walking encyclopedia."

"He makes no demands; all he asks is to do something for his friends."

"Never puts off until tomorrow * * * did his job to perfection."

Former President Truman said at a news conference while in office, "They don't come any better than Les Biffle."

"The Arkansas Pollster of 1948." (This label given him was due to his activities during the presidential campaign of that year in which he dressed as a chicken peddler and drove through several States in a dilapidated pickup to get the tenor of the voters in rural America. He reported that the trend was to Truman.)

The words of praise came with genuine fervor and earnestness. It was evident that each of those who made remarks admired

and respected the soft-spoken Arkansan who had served as Secretary of the U.S. Senate and in many other capacities over the past 50 years.

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, the toastmaster, introduced celebrities from Government and business. He read the laudatory joint resolution which was passed unanimously by the Arkansas General Assembly commending Mr. Biffle's outstanding public service. Mr. and Mrs. Biffle were presented wristwatches and a large color television set.

The lavish function featured a musical spectacular and other numbers which were concluded at a late hour.

THE MENU

Fresh fruit cocktail, terrapin soup, hearts of pascal celery, mixed olives, grilled heart of filet mignon sur canope with mushrooms, sauce perjournine, asparagus tips polonaise, potatoes au gratin, salade verte (mixed green) de saison, Lorenzo dressing, coupe aux marrons, ice cream with whipped cream, cakes, coffee.

Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, last week the membership of the House of Representatives approved legislation known as the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959.

Since 1921 this area of taxation has posed a most difficult and perplexing problem. It is therefore appropriate for me to compliment my committee chairman and each fellow member of the committee who have labored so diligently and with such efficiency to prepare this legislation for consideration.

The insurance company of today is not the simple protective agency of yesterday, but rather today it serves its policyholders as bank and protection agency. The result has been that the savings operation has become so intertwined with the pure insurance function that it is difficult to determine who is the beneficiary of the investment income. The problem of taxing the company's income and not the income necessary to meet long-range contingencies and commitments is difficult of solution.

It is my belief that this legislation takes the most practical and effective approach to the problem. No longer will this industry be taxed by means of a fictitious formula that taxes investment income of a company even though that company sustained a net loss on its year's operation.

This bill, H.R. 4245, departs from the present inequitable system by including the various types of income in the tax base. The underwriting gains which were previously untaxed are now included in the tax base along with the free investment income and with capital gains.

Although I concur generally with the approach this legislation takes to the solution of the problem, it was with some hesitancy that I voted affirmatively. I

question whether there has been sufficient consideration given to what the economic impact will be under circumstances of retroactively imposing such a substantial tax increase on this industry. We must be certain that this legislation will not result in such a burden as to discourage saving through the purchase of life insurance. It is essential to the future economic well-being of this country that our people are encouraged to provide for their own future security.

It must also be noted that the insurance industry is heavily taxed at the State level and the cumulative burden of all taxes must be weighed in considering the appropriateness of a particular tax.

It was for these reasons that I felt compelled to express my views on the possible ramifications of this bill. I am confident that during the legislation's further study in the Congress careful consideration will be given to these economic factors.

Military Draft Versus Sound U.S. Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a small minority of us sought a 2-year extension of the draft in order that a thorough and comprehensive review might be made of our military manpower procurement problem. Our efforts failed, and the majority of my distinguished colleagues voted to continue the draft for another 4 years. I opposed this arbitrary extension in order to point out to the people the urgency of the need for a reevaluation of our manpower problem in the military service. To this end, my "nay" vote proved most successful. My mail has been overwhelmingly in support of the position I took. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch and the Waukesha (Wis.) Daily Freeman, which are in support of my position:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

THE DRAFT IS OUTMODED

If the Armed Forces are to have the newest and best weapons that science and industry can provide, they should have men who are fully qualified to use them. Therein lies a manpower problem. A vastly improved National Defense Establishment could be had if a way were found to solve this manpower problem, the crux of which is the draft. The draft simply is not supplying the type of recruits that are needed, nor is it fair to the youth of the land.

As matters stand right now, military conscription is necessary until some better substitute can be devised. The draft inspires many to volunteer so that they can pick their own branch of service as well as the time they want to begin serving. If there were no draft, there would be insufficient volunteers. This is proved by the fact that during 1948-49 the armed services tried to maintain a com-

bined force of less than 2 million men without draft quotas—and failed miserably.

There is little chance to devise a substitute for the draft between now and June 30, when the law will expire unless extended. It seems certain to be extended. The House voted last Thursday, 381 to 20, to extend it for 4 years.

Why would it not be wise to extend the bill just for 2 years, and during that time have a joint congressional committee, or a civilian-military committee, study the manpower problem seriously in an effort to reach a solution?

A good long look at the draft and how it has been functioning is badly needed. The Army is the only service using the draft. In recent months it has called about 8,000 men per month; less than 7,000 are inducted for the 2-year period of duty. About 90,000 sign up annually for a 6-month period of service followed by 5 years in the Reserve or the National Guard. Thousands of others volunteer for duty in the Air Force, Navy, Marines and Coast Guard, which do not depend on draftees.

Some 1,200,000 youths come of military age every year. According to the Pentagon, some 660,000 persons enter the services, only 180,000 being inductees. Thus the chances are excellent the vast majority of the class that attains military age every year will not see service. That is not fair to those who are drafted or who volunteer.

Reference is sometimes made to the military pay increase bill which was passed last year by Congress after it had somewhat watered down the Cordier report which stressed the need for better pay to keep the best men in the service. The matter of higher pay begs the question for those who enter in the lowest ranks. And even the higher pay now permitted is not sufficient to retain many of the very best and most badly needed men.

Surely a group of men such as those who turned in the Rockefeller and Johnson committee reports should be able to find a better solution to the manpower problem. The draft, as it stands now, is badly outmoded in this era of atomic-powered submarines, radar, ballistic missiles, and space satellites. A thoughtful study to devise a space-age substitute is needed.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Daily Freeman]

MILITARY DRAFT VERSUS SOUND U.S. DEFENSE

Second District Congressman ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER was among 20 Members of the House of Representatives who last week voted against extension of the military draft for 4 more years. His position is sound and the people of this district should give full approval to it. We are particularly impressed with the reasons for his vote when he said:

"I am convinced that our future military position requires an immediate and comprehensive study of how we can best maintain a well trained and highly skilled military force to operate the equipment developed in this age of nuclear weapons and space travel.

"Therefore, I supported unequivocally the 2-year draft extension coupled with a thorough national review of the entire manpower problem. The 2-year extension failed. I could not in good conscience support the arbitrary 4-year extension, which to my way of thinking is merely sweeping our military manpower problem under the rug for another 4 years. It is my belief that our future military security depends on how quickly we reevaluate our needs in the light of recent technological advances."

The Freeman has been a consistent foe of the universal military training system under which the armed services are operating. The day Congress adopted this legislation it was installing an outdated form of military service which has become more grotesque in its application with each passing year.

The longer the United States extends the Military Draft Act the more unprepared it will be to meet tomorrow's national defense requirements. This act is guilty of fastening onto the Nation a wasteful and unnecessary program of nonpreparedness. It is forcing young men into military service who have no business there, who through no fault of their own are contributing nothing to the national defense and because of this are wasting their own time and the time of those attempting to instruct them. Considerably more important, the Nation is spending billions of dollars unnecessarily going through the motions of giving these men a smattering of useless military training simply to satisfy the advocates of universal military training, who claim that every red-blooded American boy should know how to shoulder a gun and dress in a fatigue uniform.

The study Representative KASTENMEIER is requesting would, if it is done honestly and impartially, reveal that an immediate return to voluntary enlistment is the Nation's best course. It would give our military services an opportunity to appeal directly to those who by personality, mentality, and interest would make the type of military personnel we require. The effective defense of this country is no longer dependent on how many young men who are able to carry a gun can be mustered. If we continue to rely upon the safety which was once found in numbers, the United States will fall victim to its own monumental error. We must put an end to thinking of military service as a necessary physical exercise which every youth must taste to qualify him for manhood. As KASTENMEIER says, unless we re-evaluate our needs in the light of recent technological advances we will fall as far behind the times in an effective national defense program as we have in the conquest of outer space.

The Neighbors Are Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., February 16, 1959:

THE NEIGHBORS ARE IMPORTANT

In trying to build friends, the United States often overlooks its near neighbors.

For that reason, President Eisenhower's meeting this week with Mexico's new President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, is important.

Mexico is an important link with Central and South America, where U.S. stock does not rate as high as we'd like.

Eisenhower and Lopez Mateos are to meet in Acapulco, Mexico. What they'll talk about may never be announced—just as no announcement was made 3 years ago when Eisenhower met with Mexico's President Adolfo Ruiz Cortines in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.

But the need to build better understanding must be in the front of both men's minds.

Mexico's lower level of education and lower standard of living throw up roadblocks. The language barrier slows the spread of better understanding. Anti-American feeling has been something of a political tradition in Mexico—although this feeling is not nearly as strong as it used to be. Mexico is 98 per-

cent Catholic, whereas the United States is predominantly Protestant.

Still, there are forces pulling the two countries together.

The United States is Mexico's main customer. And Mexico, in turn, buys more of its supplies from the United States than from any other country.

The United States has given Mexico about \$109 million in net aid since World War II—far less than it has given many other countries, but still a big help.

Half a million Mexicans come into the United States each year to work as migrant farmworkers. They pick up some knowledge of U.S. customs, which they take home with them—though it must be added that some of these workers are abused and take home bad impressions.

Relations between the United States and its near neighbors become more important every day. Long neglected fields close to home could stand a lot more cultivation. One of those fields is Mexico.

Hate Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1934 which curbs hate mailers by prohibiting the transmission through the mails of matter calculated to arouse racial hostility.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a January 25, 1959, editorial and a February 2, 1959, article, both of which were published in the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1959]

HATE LITERATURE

It is now reported that the distribution of racist and hate literature in this country reached a new postwar high last year. The chairman of the national executive board of the American Jewish Committee, in making this report, made some suggestions about constructive community action to meet this menace. He urges against unilateral retaliation, giving undue publicity, and the entering into logical disputes. He hopes for better support for interfaith community programs.

This is good as far as it goes. No one can criticize generosity and moderation. But the menace must be met on a sterner ground. The hate literature is not merely a matter of interfaith misunderstanding. It is directed, not just against Jews, but against Negroes, Roman Catholics, liberal Protestants, and indeed against any and all men of good will who wish to solve the problems of community living on the basis of reasonable understanding.

When this literature can be tied up to overt action such as bombing of public buildings or organized lynchings it becomes a problem in the preservation of public order, of life and of property and thus touches the law itself.

Manifestly, some of our legislative processes need to be tightened up in this field. Most of our statutes concerning the distribution of printed matter are concerned with only two things, obscenity or fraud. And it is possible for the hatemongers to do incalculable damage without being even faintly obscene (although some of them are) and without the provable intent to defraud.

We are jealous of the right to print and publish and distribute expressions of free opinion. But, as an eminent Justice of our Supreme Court once pointed out, the right of free speech does not permit a person to raise a false cry of "fire" in a crowded theater. The legal ground upon which the hatemongers can be met is complicated and occasionally tricky. For this reason, there must be more, and more careful, study of how to meet what is an obvious danger to our freedom, our social dignity and our community self-respect.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1959]

HEAD OF HADASSAH ASKS U.S. LAW TO BAN HATE LITERATURE SPREAD

(By Irving Spiegel)

The head of Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America, called on Congress last night to enact legislation to ban the distribution of hate literature.

Dr. Miriam K. Freund, president of Hadassah, declared that "the activities of the hatemongers and bigots in the United States give aid and comfort to those forces which seek our destruction."

"Soviet leaders," she added, "seeking to undermine American prestige abroad, have chided us about the existence of hatemongering in the United States."

She spoke at the opening session of a four-day midwinter conference at Hadassah's headquarters, 65 East 52d Street. Hadassah has 318,000 members.

Dr. Freund told the delegates, representing every section of the country and Puerto Rico, that an increasing distribution of hate literature "betrays an apathy of Americans toward this crucial problem."

She declared that President Eisenhower should take the lead in a campaign against bigotry, hate and discrimination.

"The activities of the hatemongers and bigots," she said, "provide a vehicle for foreign governments to strike at certain religious, racial and ethnic groups in efforts to divide the American people."

"Soviet publications are only too eager to play up incidents that present America in a derogatory light."

Dr. Freund disputed First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan on his assertion that the Jews within the Soviet Union had the right to develop their cultural facilities.

"But he says the Jews want to become a part of Russian culture," she said. "It is inconceivable that three million Jews would decide overnight to scuttle their Jewish cultural heritage."

Discussing President Eisenhower's proposed budget for foreign aid, Dr. Freund declared that the requested \$3,930 million must be increased by Congress to provide larger funds for vital economic assistance programs.

Mrs. Alexander M. Dushkin, chairman of the Hadassah Council in Israel, said that Hadassah facilities there were being prepared to aid in receiving the expected heavy influx of immigrants.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1933 which will severely punish "hate bombers" by prohibiting certain acts involving the importation, transportation, pos-

session, or use of explosives, and H.R. 1934 which curbs "hate mailers" by prohibiting the transmission through the mails of matter calculated to arouse racial hostility.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the Record a poem, which is extremely timely and fitting in these material days. It was written by the author of such famous songs as "Honeysuckle Rose," "In the Mood," "Memories of You" and "S'posin'." Andy Razaf, the author of these songs and this poem, was a resident of Englewood, N.J., in my congressional district, for many years. He is now residing in Los Angeles, Calif.:

A MIXED-UP WORLD

There's plenty to do in this mixed-up world
For all of us each day,
Sweeping the dirt beneath the rug
Is not the honest way.

Let's clean up the human misery,
Hypocrisy, greed and hate,
And practice the noble things we preach
Before it is too late.

Too long have we worshiped material things,
With our eyes on worthless goals,
Improving our gadgets and machines
But not improving our souls.

Too long have we turned away from God
And disobeyed His commands;
Too many speak of serving Him
With unwilling hearts and hands.

The angels must weep as they look at man,
Now striving to conquer space
Before he has learned to conquer himself
And make earth a decent place.

What can we hope to do on the moon
Or on some planet afar?
When so much good is left undone
Down here, right where we are!

North Dakota Legislature Asks Early Action on Bills To Start Construction of Garrison Diversion Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, at the time the Garrison Dam was started, there was a clear understanding and a tacit promise that the irrigation development in North Dakota should go forward with all possible speed. This golden promise of irrigation benefits was to help compensate us for the loss of our lush river bottom lands, above Garrison, which were flooded out when the dam was completed, and to help stabilize agriculture in a large area of the State. 460,000 acres were taken for Garrison Reservoir and 88,000 acres of North Dakota lands were taken for the Oahe project. Till now, despite the promise, not one single irrigated acre has been developed.

The North Dakota Legislature, now in session, is understandably concerned that no action has yet been taken on the diversion unit, and I am pleased to call

to the attention of my colleagues the following concurrent resolution, which has the unanimous support of North Dakota's delegation in Congress:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION H

A concurrent resolution endorsing and approving the Bureau of Reclamation project plan report on the Garrison diversion unit and supporting and urging early enactment of desirable and needed modifying and confirming legislation authorizing the construction thereof

Whereas the Garrison diversion unit, Garrison division, Missouri River Basin project, located in North Dakota (and a small segment in South Dakota) was in general authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, and when developed will:

1. Enhance the future economic welfare and prosperity of the people of the State, particularly those within the project area;

2. Provide for the eventual irrigation of over 1 million acres of land periodically subjected to drought which will result in a more diversified and stabilized agriculture in a large region of North Dakota;

3. Replenish and restore the depleted waters of several lakes, rivers, and streams and augment the levels and flows therein; and

4. Make available within affected areas water diverted from the Missouri River for irrigation, domestic, municipal, and industrial needs, production of hydroelectric power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other public beneficial uses; and

Whereas the construction of the Garrison diversion unit will result in a greatly expanded and more dependable agricultural and business economy in North Dakota, which will result in an accelerated population growth and increased prosperity in the area; and

Whereas the investigations and studies by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that the project is economically feasible and the Bureau advises that it is in a position to initiate construction thereof as soon as appropriate modifying legislation now pending in Congress has been enacted and funds made available; and

Whereas the farmers in the project areas and all North Dakotans have shown a definite interest in and demand for the early construction and development of the Garrison diversion unit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the senate concurring therein, That the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota favors and approves the Garrison diversion unit, and respectfully urges the appropriate committees of Congress to schedule hearings at the earliest date possible on S. 147, H.R. 1891, and H.R. 1963 to make certain provisions in connection with the authorization and construction of said unit, to the end that construction thereof may be undertaken as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed by the secretary of state to Hon. James E. Murray, chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Senators William Langer and Milton R. Young; Representatives Quentin N. Burdick and Don L. Short; Hon. Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; Hon. Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and Hon. W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.

HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.
C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
VIC GILBREATH,
Secretary of the Senate.

Is It Evil To Own a Large Farm?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, propagandists are busy in an effort to build up resentment against a farmer because he owns or operates a sizable acreage. These people would lead one to believe that a large operation is wicked and evil since such farmers allegedly receive the major part of Government benefits.

If that argument were valid it could just as well be argued that the farm programs are just a dole or handout to farmers irrespective of the size of this participation by them.

A few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Lloyd Godley, of Osceola, Ark., on this subject. The writer of the letter is a farmer, general manager of the Mississippi County (Ark.) Production Credit Association, and one of the Nation's foremost agricultural leaders. His letter is recommended reading.

I am attaching also my reply to Mr. Godley's letter:

OSCEOLA, ARK., February 11, 1959.

HON. E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "TOOK": Why is there such a persistent drive to sway public opinion on our farm problems by condemning larger than family-size farming operations?

It is distressing that some of our staunchest friends seem to have succumbed to the idea that bigness in agriculture is evil. They say that big farmers get most of the price support money, but ignore the fact that 20 percent of the farmers grow 80 percent of the crops.

Farmers, large or small, do not generally approve of discrimination because of the size of a farming operation. They feel that we should have a sound farm economic program, not a farm relief program.

Most people are aware of the fact that our Nation has been made great because of every man's privilege of becoming as big as his energy, inclination, and ingenuity will permit. They do not believe that the farmer should be singled out by his Government as being one entitled to less consideration than those of other economic groups.

A few days ago I was talking with a typical so-called family-type farmer and here is what he said. "My son likes farming and I would like to send him to an agricultural college for a degree in agriculture. He and I have talked it over and we have just about decided that it may be wiser for him or any other ambitious farm boy to prepare for some other field. Here is my son's thinking and I agree with him, the Government will in the years to come limit the benefit of farm programs to small operators. In that case the ambitious farmer who wishes to fully apply his managerial ability will be materially handicapped by Government restrictions relative to the size of his farming operation."

I could not disagree with the thinking of this father and son.

Most certainly I do not wish to criticize those very fine and able Congressmen and Senators who are devoted to the cause of agriculture, but I do think it is a disservice to the cause of agriculture when farmers are divided as to the size of their operation and

when one group is set apart as deserving of less consideration because of his apparent success.

This farmer's son could prepare to enter big business, big industry, or big labor without fear of economic restrictions or reprisals and with the knowledge that he would be permitted full exercise of his managerial and executive ability. But, not so in agriculture if limitations become law. It would be easy to understand if this were the enemies of agriculture advocating this policy, not the farmers.

Our farm leaders who have joined themselves together for the purpose of formulating programs to present to the Congress are constantly haunted by the fear that program benefits will be limited to a certain size farming operation.

If we may console ourselves by the fact that no compulsory program has ever had limitations due to size of operation then we may be led to believe that none ever will.

On the other hand, if all big farmers were exempt from allotment compliance we would indeed be buried by surplus.

To be sure we farmers have much unfair competition but it doesn't come from the legitimate farmer. It comes from those who make their money in some other business and enter farming as a fascinating hobby.

If there can be any legal way, this type of farming should be eliminated but not at the expense of honest-to-goodness farmers who have through their own efforts built up a large farming operation.

No industrial corporation has ever had tariff benefits limited because of the size of the business, nor has any fast tax write-off or any other subsidy been limited to industry or business because of size—then why discriminate against agriculture.

What we need is farm legislation that will permit agriculture a fair share of the national income. It should not be tied in with social legislation.

When farm people have a stable expanding income consistent with the progress of the other segments of our economy, farmers will set and maintain their own social pattern which will not be inconsistent with the well-being and traditions of this Nation.

It is a fact that small farmers have made a mighty contribution to the social and economic structure of this Nation, but they have never been deprived by law from expanding to the full extent of their ability.

They should never be so handicapped. Many farmers believe that the issue of "limitations" is the greatest stumbling block in the road to sound and permanent farm legislation.

I am writing this with the hope that a farmer's viewpoint may be of value to you in your deliberation on this vital issue.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LLOYD GODLEY.

FEBRUARY 19, 1959.

Mr. LLOYD GODLEY,
Osceola, Ark.

DEAR LLOYD: Your letter is greatly appreciated and so clearly depicts the valid and sound arguments in opposition to payment limitation movements which have grown up in recent years. I have in my file an earlier letter from you on this subject which I prize most highly. This story needs to be told and reiterated.

It is true that larger farm operators receive the greater return from benefits provided by the Government. The message is being related and emphasized as if such a person is a culprit, scoundrel, or grand rascal. His participation in these programs is greater since his contributions in volume output are larger. It is an effort to poison and prejudice the minds of the American people that the large farmer should be made smaller. That theory—if carried to its ultimate end

conclusion—would mean that if a person had saved his money and lived frugally and acquired new holdings from time to time he would find himself confronted with a movement to split up his operations among his less fortunate brother farmers. That type of philosophy is not in keeping with the principles of equality of opportunity to the citizen. The incentive of the individual should be encouraged under our system.

You are right when you say that no effort is being made to penalize large industry. Subsidies for railroads are not being made on the basis of the length of the line or the amount of equipment and other properties that the railroads possess; subsidies to the airlines and steamship people have no such limitations. Fast tax writeoffs have benefited all size operators. Your letter is most convincing, plausible, and informative upon this subject; and I am grateful to you for writing me.

With personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

E. C. GATHINGS.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me especially appropriate on the occasion yesterday of the birthday of a distinguished American statesman, G. Mennen Williams, six times Governor of Michigan, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extremely informative and capsule biography of this brilliant and effective leader of our time.

Governor Williams is easily one of the foremost Americans of this generation and has contributed enormously to the wise administration and progressive leadership of one of the most powerful States of the Union.

This biography is particularly pertinent because it reached the people on the occasion of the election of the Governor for the sixth time to the highest office within the gift of the people of his Commonwealth.

G. Mennen Williams, the first man in the Nation's history to win six consecutive terms as Governor of a State, was born in Detroit, February 23, 1911, the son of Henry P. Williams and Elma Mennen Williams. He attended the Detroit University School, Salisbury School, Salisbury, Conn., and was graduated from Princeton University in 1933 with an A.B. degree, and from the University of Michigan law school in 1936 with a J.D. degree. His scholastic attainments are indicated by his membership in Phi Beta Kappa at Princeton and the Order of Coif at the University of Michigan.

He began his career of public service in 1936 as an attorney for the Social Security Board in Washington. From that time, through the days of World War II naval service in the Pacific, on to his unmatched record of governmental and political leadership, Governor Williams has devoted his life to public service.

In 1938, he became assistant attorney general of Michigan. In 1939-40, he was executive assistant to Frank Murphy, then U.S. Attorney General; and in 1940-41, he was

special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, Criminal Division.

After service on the Carriers *Essex*, *Bunker Hill*, *Hornet*, and *Yorktown*, he was separated with the rank of lieutenant commander in March 1946. During his war service, he received 10 battle stars, the Legion of Merit with Combat V, and three Presidential citations.

On his return from war, he became Deputy Director of the O.P.A. for Michigan, and later was named Democratic member of the Michigan Liquor Control Commission. He resigned the latter post in 1948 to run for Governor of Michigan, and in that successful effort began a new chapter of his remarkable career.

Six times the people of Michigan have elected him to the highest governmental position within their power to bestow. This repeated endorsement of his executive leadership did not come about by chance. It reflects the fact that his administrations have given the people of Michigan—businessmen, farmers, workers, nationalities, minorities, schoolteachers, the aged, housewives, all the people—the kind of governmental and political leadership they want in these times.

Governor Williams is nationally known for his firm adherence to programs for the common good, for his executive and political leadership, and for his deep personal faith in the spiritual values which underlie our Nation and its democratic processes. He is a devoted family man, a scholar, a traveler whose journeys have taken him across Europe, into Russia, Africa, South America, areas of the Far East, into Israel and the Middle East, and across the Nation from its borders to its shores.

In 1937, he married Nancy Lee Quirk of Ypsilanti, Mich. They have one son, Gery, a student at Princeton, and two daughters, Nancy and Wendy, in school in Lansing.

James W. Riddleberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, there has been favorable, and bipartisan, reaction to President Eisenhower's nomination of Mr. James W. Riddleberger to head the International Cooperation Administration, which is responsible for the management of the foreign aid program.

Mr. Riddleberger is from Woodstock, in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, and is a member of a widely respected Shenandoah Valley family. His many friends share the pleasure of this new recognition which has come to a distinguished career officer of the Foreign Service of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Roanoke (Va.) Times of February 21, 1959:

RIDDLEBERGER: MAN WITH SKILL

A dispute between the State Department and Republican National Chairman Alcorn over who shall head the International Cooperation Administration apparently has been settled by President Eisenhower. As a successor to James H. Smith, who resigned last month, the State Department favored

Henry R. Labouisse, a highly regarded career officer presently directing United Nations relief work among Palestinian refugees.

Chairman Alcorn is reported to have objected strongly to appointment of Mr. Labouisse because the latter once registered as a Democrat in Connecticut. Mr. Alcorn is said to have insisted that the job of running the Agency which administers the foreign aid program be given to a deserving Republican.

Mr. Eisenhower's new choice for the post is James W. Riddleberger, member of a well-known Virginia family, whose home is at Woodstock. Mr. Riddleberger is now Ambassador to Greece and has no known political affiliation. He is a graduate of Randolph-Macon College and a veteran of the diplomatic service. He was chief of the State Department's Division of Central European Affairs immediately after World War II and later Ambassador to Yugoslavia where he served for nearly 5 years. In the latter post he had a leading role in the Trieste settlement between Yugoslavia and Italy.

Mr. Riddleberger's qualifications have been tested in numerous difficult and sensitive situations abroad. He stands high in the esteem of congressional leaders, Democrats and Republicans. If confirmed by the Senate—and that appears to be a virtual certainty—he will bring to his new task a broad background of knowledge of foreign affairs and demonstrated skill in diplomacy.

They Never Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal-American, in an editorial on January 27, 1959, entitled "They Never Quit," calls attention to the unremitting attack over the years against J. Edgar Hoover, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The members of the Committee on Un-American Activities are grateful for the support of this fine newspaper. With such backing by the press I am certain that the American people are not going to be misled by the current vicious campaign to discredit the committee, the FBI and its great Director. The editorial follows:

THEY NEVER QUIT

It has become clear that the pseudo-liberals, anti-anti-Communists and leftists have singled out two targets for 1959. One is to discredit J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. The other is to wreck the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The attack on Mr. Hoover and the great organization he heads has taken the form of articles insidiously slanted to undermine confidence in the fairness and meticulous care to protect both witnesses and accused by which the FBI operates.

The attack on the House Un-American Activities Committee is more open. Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, California Democrat, has introduced a resolution to junk it and shift its jurisdiction to the Judiciary Committee.

He continued to press the attack yesterday and based his objections to the committee on the fact that "it has subpoenaed people who were former Communists after

having learned their names from the testimony of friendly witnesses."

What would he have the committee do—subpena members of sewing circles?

The committee has been vilified for years by pseudoliberals, anti-anti-Communists and leftists because it has been one of the most effective forces we have for exposing the Communist conspiracy.

Fortunately, there is every reason to believe it will keep on being so. A far greater Democrat than JIMMY ROOSEVELT, by name of SAM RAYBURN, is adamantly opposed to the ROOSEVELT resolution and promises it will be overwhelmingly defeated if it ever reaches the floor.

But this effort together with the smear campaigns against Mr. Hoover and the FBI are a challenge to vigilance. The counterfeited liberals and the others never give up.

The United States, Thought of Abroad as Materialistic and Without Interest in Cultural Affairs, Subsidizes Music and Art at State, County, and City Levels of Government—George Antheil, Famous New Jersey Composer, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Trenton Symphony Orchestra Association, Joseph D'Annunzio, recently advised the city commission of Trenton, N.J., the Mercer County, N.J., Board of Chosen Freeholders, and Mercer County Counsel Joseph S. Bash that the Trenton Symphony Orchestra has been operating 37 years as a nonprofit organization. In all that time, he said, it has depended for its support on its patrons, donors and subscribers. He added that unless they were able to get some additional aid this year the Trenton Symphony Orchestra could not carry on.

Mr. D'Annunzio, one of the leading businessmen of Trenton, N.J., pointed to the substantial subsidies provided their orchestras by other cities in the United States. Philadelphia, he said, gives the Philadelphia orchestra \$100,000 each year and \$50,000 for operas; Detroit gives the Detroit symphony \$50,000 yearly; San Francisco gives its orchestra \$45,000 plus free use of two auditoriums. Baltimore, Atlanta, and Denver each give their orchestras \$60,000; St. Louis provides \$75,000; Milwaukee and Indianapolis each gives their orchestra \$50,000.

In Indiana, according to Mr. D'Annunzio, a State law was passed in 1941 making it mandatory for the educational fund to contribute to the orchestra. Many U.S. cities furnish auditoriums free of cost for orchestral concerts, in return for which the orchestras agree to make a limited number of student tickets available at reduced prices.

Showing sympathy for the financial woes of the Trenton Symphony Orchestra, the City Commission of Tren-

ton, N.J., has agreed to do what it could to help out. One of the steps under the study by the city commission is the purchase of \$5,000 worth of concert tickets every year for distribution through the city schools. The Mercer County Board of Chosen Freeholders is considering a similar step.

A NEW JERSEY STATE ART COMMISSION PROPOSED AS A LIVING MEMORIAL TO GEORGE ANTHEIL, WORLD-FAMOUS COMPOSER, WHO WAS BORN AND EDUCATED IN TRENTON, N.J.

Actually, of course, the arts at home and the arts as a vital part of our foreign policy overseas are but two sides of the same coin. The New York Times on January 12, 1959, reported that two New York State legislators, Senator MacNeill Mitchell, Republican, and Assemblyman Bentley Cassal, Democrat, are sponsoring a bill to create a 15-member New York State Arts Council. This plan has the support of many cultural leaders in our country. If this plan is good for New York State, with all of its myriad art groups, it should be equally good for New Jersey's cultural groups, like the Trenton Symphony Orchestra, to establish a similar arts council in New Jersey. Such an arts council would be most appropriate as a living memorial in honor of George Antheil, one of New Jersey's world-famous sons, who died recently, it has been suggested by William H. Falcey, county clerk of Mercer County, Trenton, N.J., a leading backer of the Trenton Symphony Orchestra and a member of the board of governors of the orchestra.

A number of States, among them Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin have established State agencies of various kinds to assist the arts through such means as advice, grants-in-aid, and so forth. The States thereby have aided theaters and orchestras, managed museums and libraries—the New Jersey State Museum and the New Jersey State Library are outstanding examples of this—arranged for exhibits and supervised the artistic improvement of State buildings and whole sections of cities.

A New Jersey State art commission would be able to make an important contribution to our own fine cultural organizations, such as the Trenton Symphony Orchestra.

There is deep concern with the finer things of life on the part of our people away from the great cities, and surely if there is a native American culture it is expressed at least as much by the Trenton Symphony Orchestra as by the Metropolitan Opera Co. After all, there are more than 700 such orchestras spread across our country from coast to coast and from Canada to Mexico. In the world of today the race is for political, economic, scientific, and cultural supremacy. In this situation in which we find ourselves, cultural organizations, such as the Trenton Symphony Orchestra have a major role to perform in raising the standards of our people and acquainting them with our noble cultural heritage. We must understand our own culture and assist our own artists in order to better understand and

appreciate the culture of other peoples—this is basic to our country's continued leadership of the peoples of the free world and to the hope we give to many of the people in the totalitarian states that they, too, will one day be free.

I include here several items relating to the Trenton Symphony Orchestra and George Anthell from the *Trentonian*, the *Trenton Evening Times*, and *La Nuova Capitale*:

[From the *Trentonian*, Jan. 23, 1959]

TRENTON'S SYMPHONY IN TROUBLE

The news that Trenton's 37-year-old symphony orchestra may expire because of financial ills is distressing indeed, even though it has been apparent for some time that the Symphony Association was encountering heavy going.

As Joseph D'Annunzio, Sr., the association's president, makes clear, the group has been caught in a squeeze from which it cannot escape unless aid is forthcoming. Because of its limited budget, the association cannot book the type of artists who would draw well. Consequently, receipts are insufficient to maintain the operation. Two types of aid are suggested—subsidization by the city and county and increased public support.

The value of the symphony to the Trenton area cannot be overstressed, and the lack of public support is not readily understandable. Perhaps the difficulty which now besets the musical enterprise will serve to engender the support it needs to complete this season and to plan for the next one.

[From the *Trenton Evening Times*, Jan. 22, 1959]

THE ORCHESTRA'S PLIGHT

The Trenton Symphony Orchestra has been one of the city's major cultural assets for 37 years. It had its origin with a small group of enthusiastic and talented local musicians whose number grew with the passing years and whose artistic merits gained substantial recognition. Although cultural enterprises are seldom attended by impressive financial success, the Trenton Symphony has managed to attract adequate patronage and support and to survive even the economic stringencies of the long depression.

Ironically, it is in a period of at least relative affluence that the orchestra is experiencing its most acute financial difficulties. Announcement has been made that unless the city and county provide "substantial aid this year" the orchestra will find it necessary to close its career.

This is bad news for music lovers of Trenton and it is a far from creditable reflection upon the city's cultural standards. The Trenton Symphony Orchestra has come to be recognized as a musical organization of fine quality and one whose programs over the years have been of a high order. It has earned public support.

[From the *Trenton (N.J.) La Nuova Capitale*, Feb. 6, 1959]

NEED FINANCIAL AID OR SYMPHONY MUST QUIT

The president of the Trenton Symphony Association told the Mercer County Freeholders yesterday that unless the orchestra receives substantial financial help it will not be able to prevent a concert series next year.

Joseph D'Annunzio also indicated at a closed conference with the county board that the symphony may even have to cancel two of its three remaining concerts this season unless it obtains additional funds.

D'Annunzio said the association would try its hardest to finish the season, but that its

financial picture was so dark it might be physically impossible to do so.

The symphony president declined today to reveal how much financial aid he sought from the freeholders.

He said he would meet tomorrow with the city commission to present a similar appeal. The freeholders turned D'Annunzio's request over to its budget study. County Counsel Joseph S. Bash said he wasn't sure whether the county could legally give financial aid to the symphony.

D'Annunzio said the symphony's board of governors would meet on Friday to decide the orchestra's future. He said a decision would have to be made soon because detailed plans for next season's concerts must be made far ahead of time if it is found feasible to continue.

In a letter to the freeholders, D'Annunzio pointed out that the Trenton Symphony has been operating for 37 years as a nonprofit organization and is so recognized by the Internal Revenue Bureau. In all that time, he said, it has depended for its support on three sources—ticket sales, patrons, and honors, and the generosity of a few civic-minded individuals on whom the association could depend at the end of each season.

"Our position is somewhat changed insofar as being able to expect financial aid from the latter source now," he said, "and unless we are able to get some substantial aid this year it will be quite impossible to carry on."

D'Annunzio pointed to the substantial subsidies provided for orchestras in other cities. Philadelphia, he said, gives the Philadelphia Orchestra \$100,000 each year and \$50,000 for operas; Detroit gives the Detroit Symphony \$50,000 yearly, San Francisco gives its orchestra \$45,000 plus free use of two auditoriums. Baltimore, Atlanta, and Denver each give their orchestras \$60,000. St. Louis provides \$75,000, Milwaukee and Indianapolis \$50,000.

In Indiana, he said, a State law was passed in 1914 making it mandatory for the educational fund to contribute to the orchestra.

"All of these cities furnish an auditorium free of cost for the concerts and the orchestras agree to have a limited number of student tickets available at reduced prices," he said.

"In Trenton nothing has ever been done for our orchestra."

D'Annunzio told the freeholders that the Trenton symphony has only one paid employee. All others are volunteers. More than 60 percent of its budget is for musicians' payroll, 6 percent is for soloists, 4 percent for war-memorial building rental, and 30 percent for other expenses such as printing of tickets, brochures, music rental, postage, telephone, advertising programs, etc.

He pointed out that through the generosity of the Mifflin Piano Co. the orchestra never has had to pay for the use of pianos or organs for its concerts.

"Our board of governors feels that this civic project is Trenton's outstanding cultural asset," he continued, "and that we are all richer for having had it these many years."

"Men in public life are realizing more than ever their responsibilities for the welfare of the people and that bread alone does not satisfy the soul."

[From the *Trenton Evening Times*, Feb. 20, 1959]

PLEA FOR SYMPHONY

Sir: Upon returning from a 3-week trip out of State, I was aghast to find newspapers, local and Philadelphia, reporting that the Trenton Symphony was in dire straits, financially, and that if the city would not come to its rescue, disbanding of the orchestra was imminent.

For shame, Trenton. How can such a situation exist in a city which for generations has been proud of its culture?

Saving the symphony should be the work of every man, woman, and child in and around Trenton—from the mayor, through the chamber of commerce, to the lowest grade in the schools.

What about the people behind the scenes of the symphony, who have given so much for so little? Are you not willing to stand behind them?

Every successful symphony has its city 100 percent behind it.

In practically every major orchestra in this country you will find men, who, because of their great artistic ability, have been recruited from the ranks of the Trenton Symphony, nearly every one a first-chair man. The roster reads like a "Who's Who in Music."

Good music, like good bread, is a real staff of life, for, like bread, which from time immemorial has been the symbol of bodily nourishment, so music is the symbol of cultural advancement. Guard your musical knowledge and appreciation as you would a priceless jewel. Without it, you sink into the abyss of cultural degeneration and one of the greatest gifts ever offered man is denied you.

LEONA RUTH STODDARD.

[From the *Trentonian*, Feb. 14, 1959]

GEORGE ANTHELL DIES AT 58; NOTED MODERN COMPOSER

Former *Trentonian* George Anthell, 58, noted author and composer Thursday night died of a heart attack in his New York home, of 610 West End Avenue.

Born in Trenton, Anthell was graduated from Trenton High School in 1918. He made frequent visits to Trenton with his family and at one time wrote "McKonkey's Ferry," a musical based on Washington's crossing the Delaware, using Trenton as the background.

He conducted some of his own compositions with the Trenton Symphony Orchestra during one of his longer visits here.

Anthell toured Europe as a concert pianist, and then in the late 1920's became the first American ever to hold the position of assistant music director of the Berlin State Theater.

Returning to the United States in 1933, he became musical director for Eastern Paramount Studios, and composer for Hollywood Paramount and Columbia Studios. With his young bride, Mrs. Boske Markus Anthell, he moved back to Trenton. It was here a few years later that his wife became a United States citizen.

As an author, he contributed many articles to *Esquire* magazine on endocrinology, wrote, "Every Man His Own Detective," and "Death in the Dark."

His book "Bad Boy of Music," was based on his own experiences as a modern composer, and told at length of his boyhood in Trenton.

His most recent efforts have been scores for the "Twentieth Century" series on CBS and music for "Happy Journey" which is to appear next season.

Funeral arrangements have not been completed. He is survived by his sister, Mrs. Justine McTighe of Delaware Avenue, New York, and his son, Peter, 22, who attends a west coast school.

[From the *Trenton Evening Times*, Feb. 13, 1959]

HEART ATTACK FATAL FOR GEORGE ANTHELL—TRENTON PIANIST AND COMPOSER WON WIDE ACCLAIM

George Anthell, the gifted Trenton composer and pianist, died last night at his home, 610 West End Avenue, New York City, at the age of 58. Death was attributed to a heart attack.

His sister, Mrs. Justine McTighe and her husband, Arthur D. McTighe of 40 Delaware

Avenue, were summoned to the composer's home shortly after 9 o'clock last night. Word was also sent to the composer's son, Peter, 22, who is a student at a west coast college. He flew into New York today.

Funeral arrangements have not yet been completed.

Anthell, one of the world's great composers of what has been termed "modern music," always regarded Trenton as his real home, although many of his years were spent abroad or in California where he composed his highly original scores and also music for the motion picture industry.

BORN IN TRENTON

He was born here, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Anthell, Sr., attended the old Hamilton School, and graduated from Trenton High School in 1918. From time to time he returned to Trenton for visits with his family and on one of these trips composed his unique opera "Helen Retires" which was based on the life of Helen of Troy. This superb work was created at the home of his parents on North Broad Street, near Academy Street.

Although Anthell had numerous first-rate compositions to his credit, including some symphonies which have been played by the leading orchestras of the United States and Europe, he was especially well-known for a single composition he had written in his early days. This was the "Ballet Mecanique," scored for xylophones, electric bells, a player piano, and airplane propellers.

CREATED SMALL RIOT

At its premiere in New York City reaction from both critics and the audience was so violent that a small riot broke out among those attending the performance. Years later, when the same composition was played again, there was only applause for the man who had helped to create a new style for the modern age.

Anthell began to study the piano at the age of 6. At 10 he began composition lessons with Constantin von Sternberg in Philadelphia, and later with Ernest Bloch.

An opportunity to tour Europe arose when a Philadelphia concert manager sought a soloist of the "fiery, ultra-modern variety." Anthell practiced the piano for 36 hours straight, got the job, and proceeded on a concert tour of the continent that resulted in his being dubbed the "Bad Boy of Music." In later years he recalled his experiences in an autobiography, "Bad Boy of Music," in which he wrote at length of his boyhood in Trenton.

His First Symphony was given its premiere by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra in 1922, and it was said to be the first symphonic piece in which jazz was recognized.

MORE TIME TO WRITING MUSIC

It was around this time that Anthell gave up personal appearances to devote himself almost entirely to writing music. He went to Paris and among his friends and acquaintances were counted Gertrude Stein, Pavel Tchelitchev, Ezra Pound, and Ernest Hemingway. It was there, also, that he met a young woman, member of a prominent Viennese family.

He married her and for a number of years later on they resided in Trenton. It was in Trenton that Mrs. Boske Markus Anthell became an American citizen.

Anthell wrote such stage works as "Transatlantic," an opera, and a ballet, "Fighting the Waves." Several years after his return to the United States, the composer began to do film scores for Charles MacArthur and Ben Hecht. These included "The Scoundrel" and "Once in a Blue Moon." In 1936, he became a composer for both Paramount and Columbia studios.

After writing the scores for many other films, including the original production of "The Buccaneer" and "Make Way for To-

morrow," Anthell wrote an article for The American Scholar in which he propounded the idea that serious music could be written for the films.

A prolific writer, he contributed many articles on endocrinology to Esquire magazine, and his interest in police activities (he was an honorary member of the Paris detective force) led to his writing of "Every Man His Own Detective."

The composer's recent creations included "The Capital of the World," a ballet based on a short story by Hemingway. It was performed by the Ballet Theater in 1953. He also did the film score for "The Pride and the Passion" and his third opera, "Volpone," was presented in New York in 1953.

He also composed scores for various television shows, including the "Twentieth Century" series which is presented over the Columbia Broadcasting System. He wrote the music for "Happy Journey" in which Alfred Drake is to appear next season.

His association with Trenton resulted in several compositions which had a local background, the outstanding one being "McKonkey's Ferry" which gave a musical version of the crossing of the Delaware by Washington.

And on one of his longer visits here he conducted the Trenton Symphony Orchestra in some of his own compositions.

No matter where he went, whether it was on the Riviera, in Paris, Berlin, or north Africa, he made news. Once he was reported lost and stories were flashed across the Atlantic to that effect. It turned out that he was not lost. He had just failed to keep up contacts.

Federal Aid to Depressed Areas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, or yesterday, I introduced H.R. 4878, a bill to aid depressed areas.

It might be said that what we need right now is not new bills to aid depressed areas but an act signed by the President which would bring Federal assistance to the scores of communities in the United States which have for years been plagued with chronic unemployment. I fully agree with this view.

My record in favor of depressed area legislation is crystal clear.

For years I have cooperated with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle interested in this type of legislation and my disappointment was as great as theirs when the President vetoed the Douglas-Spence bill last fall.

Mr. Speaker, on the subject of Federal aid to depressed areas there are some excellent bills pending before this session of Congress. In this connection, it would not be difficult for me to support the bill introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], and its companion bill in the Senate introduced by Senator Douglas, of Illinois.

At this point, however, it is pertinent to ask—and I do so in all sincerity—why solicit a repetition of last year's veto by having the Douglas-Flood bill given similar treatment since it resem-

bles to a marked degree the Douglas-Spence bill in the 85th Congress.

Frankly, the possibility of another veto is cause for great concern.

While there is no one in the Senate or the House who would stoop to playing politics with the misery of unemployment, we cannot ignore the fact that unless a bill is enacted the suffering of the people in the depressed areas is not going to be alleviated.

Mr. Speaker, among the sponsors of depressed area legislation there exist two conflicting points of view.

To begin with, in principle the administration has endorsed aid to depressed areas.

In addition, the two great major political parties also endorsed the principle in their 1956 platforms.

Therefore, the question that Congress must resolve is the extent of aid to the depressed areas of the Nation.

In an effort to reach this common objective, it is imperative that reasonable people should be willing to compromise.

In this connection, it is my belief that the President will find it possible to accept a reasonable compromise between the administration bill and the Douglas-Flood version of the legislation.

In my plea for a reasonable compromise, it must be thoroughly understood that I am not presuming to speak for the administration nor have I had any consultations with administration leaders on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, let us be practical and face the facts concerning depressed area legislation.

In the event of a Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill, I have been unable to find anyone willing to flatly predict that the veto will be overridden by the House of Representatives.

The fear of being unable to override a veto is based on the fact that it requires two-thirds of the votes cast to accomplish that purpose.

Therefore—looking the facts right in the face—when you review the position of those Members of the House today in relation to their last year's vote on the Douglas-Spence bill, one finds that the margin of victory would be insufficient to override a possible Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill.

Mr. Speaker, to improve our chances of enacting depressed area legislation, I introduced H.R. 4878 a bill which represents a compromise between the administration's approach and the Douglas-Flood proposal.

With a few exceptions, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, offers the same types of aid contained in the Douglas-Spence bill vetoed last year.

For example, instead of making every depressed area eligible for the same types of assistance, my bill provides different degrees of Federal assistance based upon the level of chronic unemployment and the need in such areas.

In this connection, it is my belief that areas which have suffered greater levels of unemployment should be entitled to a greater degree of aid than those communities whose problems of unemployment are of a lesser degree.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 4878, provides for the following programs:

First. Technical assistance: Depressed areas would be eligible for technical assistance to help the communities to appraise their physical and human resources, which would prepare them to plan constructive programs to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses in these areas.

Second. Community loans: Depressed communities would be eligible to receive loans from a revolving fund of \$100 million.

We know that the conventional lending facilities in depressed areas are not as venturesome as those in growing and expanding communities.

The fund would put the depressed areas on a more equal footing with other communities in attracting new jobs.

Third. Public facilities: some communities need improvement in public facilities before they would become sufficiently attractive to new businesses which might desire to locate in these areas.

My bill provides for an establishment of a \$25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

While the figure may appear modest, attention is called to the fact that legislation is pending before the House which would establish special funds for community facilities.

Meanwhile, under my bill, H.R. 4878, a smaller fund would be allocated and earmarked to aid depressed areas.

In addition, the most depressed communities which do not have the sufficient resources to borrow funds would be eligible to receive grants up to a maximum of \$25 million.

At this point, let me stress that this is not an annual appropriation but is intended to be a \$25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

The administrator of the program would be expected to limit the grants only to communities with the greatest need for aid and which do not have sufficient resources to repay the loans in the foreseeable future.

It should be stressed that this is no giveaway program; under the provisions of my bill grants would be made only for projects which would provide lasting improvements and thus broaden the economic base of the communities.

Fourth. Vocational training and subsistence: One of the big problems of the people in depressed areas is the fact that many of their industries have declined or disappeared and, consequently, the demand for the skills acquired by the people in these areas has also diminished or vanished.

In order to enable these people whose skills have become obsolete to gain new employment, we must provide facilities to retrain them.

But many have been unemployed for a long period of time, and it would be unreasonable to expect that they could undergo an effective period of vocational training without any means of support.

Consequently, while the unemployed are undergoing training and if they are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation, they would be receiving subsistence payments equal to the average unemployment insurance in their States during the period while they are undergoing training, but not for a period exceeding 13 weeks.

Only the unemployed residing in the communities with the highest level of unemployment would be eligible for this type of aid and the total amount that would be appropriated for this program would be limited to \$5 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, in brief, these are the provisions of my compromise bill, H.R. 4878.

They are modest, but at the same time will provide a sound program of Federal assistance to depressed areas.

All of us are deeply concerned by the latest reports about the rise of unemployment.

Experience has shown that the people in depressed areas are the ones that are mostly hit by any rise in unemployment and are the last to recover from the onslaught of recession.

Therefore, it is urged that we enact the program contained in my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, as a realistic means of providing an effective program to aid the chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Since the cost of depressed area legislation has proved a stumbling block in the past and impeded our efforts, let me point out that the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill is \$389.5 million as compared to the cost of the administration bill which is \$53 million.

By way of contrast, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, will cost \$158 million or just about midway between the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill and the administration bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I should like to include the following comparative analysis of the provisions and costs of the Douglas-Flood, administration, and Van Zandt bills:

Main provisions of the Douglas-Flood, administration, and Van Zandt bills

Douglas-Flood bill	Administration bill	Van Zandt bill
Title: Area Redevelopment Act	Area Assistance Act of 1952	Same as administration bill.
Purpose: To establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.	To assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes.	Do.
Organization: Establishes the Area Redevelopment Administration as an independent agency.	President appoints an Area Assistance Administrator who reports to the Secretary of Commerce.	Do.
Criteria for area eligibility:		
a. Industrial areas with unemployment of 12 percent for 12 months; or 9 percent for 15 out of 18 months; or 6 percent for 18 out of 24 months, or 15 percent for 6 months if causes are not temporary.	a. Labor market areas where the nontemporary unemployment rate (1) is currently 6 percent and (2) has averaged at least 6 percent— (a) for 4 out of preceding 5 years and has been 50 percent above national average, (b) for 3 out of preceding 4 years and has been 75 percent above the national average, or (c) for 2 out of preceding 3 years and has been 100 percent above the national average. (3) Also, nonagricultural employment has declined, or has increased less than in the country as a whole, during preceding 5 years. (Loans and technical assistance grants.)	a. Same as administration bill. a(2)a. Designated category I. a(2)b. Designated category II. a(2)c. Designated category III.
b. Rural areas with the largest number and percentage of low-income families and having a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. (NOTE.—The term "redevelopment area" may include 1 or more counties, or 1 or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.)	b. "1 industry" towns, small towns in rural areas and rural low-income areas (technical assistance grants only.)	
Loans:		
a. \$100 for industrial redevelopment areas	a. \$50,000,000 for eligible labor market areas	a. Same as Douglas-Flood bill.
b. \$100 for rural redevelopment areas	(NOTE.—Area assistance fund to be financed by congressional appropriation.)	b. \$25,000,000 for public facilities (categories II and III only).
c. \$100 for public facilities.		
(NOTE.—Area redevelopment fund to be financed by public debt transactions.)		
Terms for industrial loans:		
a. Up to 65 percent of project cost for 30 years with interest at Treasury cost plus 0.5 percent minimum of 10 percent State and local and 5 percent private funds.	a. Up to 35 percent of project cost for 25 years at rate of interest to be determined; at least 15 percent funds from State or local sources.	a. Up to 33 1/4 percent of the project cost for category I, 50 percent, category II, and 75 percent category III; at least 15 percent from State or local sources.
b. Loans for land, construction and machinery	b. Loans for land and buildings only	b. Same as Douglas-Flood bill.
c. Loans must be approved by the official State or local development agency. If none exists, the Administrator appoints a local redevelopment committee.	c. Loans must be approved by State development agency	c. Same as administration bill.
d. Project must be consistent with an overall economic development program.	d. Project must be consistent with an overall economic development program	d. Same as administration and Douglas-Flood bills.

radius of about 3½ blocks, near downtown Front Royal. Five different buildings with about 30 classrooms are being used—three of them Sunday school buildings for Methodist, Baptist, and Episcopal churches; one a museum for the United Daughters of the Confederacy; one a rather ramshackle former private home of frame construction that served as a youth center before the private classes moved in.

Each building generally serves one grade, from the 8th to the 12th. There are 95 12th graders—seniors who will receive the first diplomas from the foundation next spring. About 200 are enrolled in the largest grade, the 10th, and nearly that many in the 8th.

Three times each week, chemistry students have 2-hour laboratory classes at Randolph-Macon Academy, a prep school in the town.

Pond says the only classes offered at Warren County High not available at the foundation's school are agriculture, home economics, and shop, and that agriculture and home economics could be offered if there were sufficient demand.

The principal can visit on foot all the various buildings serving the private school in the space of 30 minutes, and does so daily. He, himself, teaches one class, general science.

BLACKBOARDS, NO DESKS

At the Methodist Church, a block from Pond's office near the county courthouse, 10th graders are taught on the third floor in Sunday school classrooms. There are blackboards, but no desks. The students seem serious, are quietly attentive.

"If you stayed, you would like what you see," says J. M. Brownlee, an English teacher, who leaves his class for a moment to greet visitors.

A block distant is the old youth center, where senior classes are in progress on the first and second floors. A sign on the wall announces a dance for the seniors, who plan a trip to Washington to see Congress in action.

"We have social events quite often," says Pond. "About the only thing we don't have is student clubs, and I'm not so sure that's bad."

The school paper and annual are missing this year. But seniors have arranged for the taking of individual photographs to be exchanged.

Juniors are planning for the annual junior-senior prom. And the basketball team, playing under the foundation name, has had a winning season.

Another block and you come to the UDC building. Exhibits have been stored away to make room for the youngsters, but still adorning the walls are pictures of Lee, Jackson, Davis, Mosby. There is unusual noise from one downstairs classroom and it turns out to be a typing class for 10th and 11th graders. There are classrooms upstairs, too.

Next door is the public library where, Pond says, "You see a lot more students these days than you used to."

UP-TO-DATE LIBRARY

About 15 are there. It is quiet, as libraries are, and up to date.

A half-block away is the Baptist Church Sunday school annex. Ninth graders are here in six classrooms fashioned from what used to be a private home.

Around the corner is the Episcopal Church. A room in the stone parish house serves as a study hall for eighth graders. Across the street in the cinderblock Sunday school building there are seven classrooms, only six of them used.

Three classrooms are in the basement, three on the ground floor. A teacher steps into the hall and rings an old-fashioned hand bell. It is 11:25 a.m.—time for classes to change.

On your tour, you pass the Front Royal elementary school. It is a large, handsome school with 1,250 students, all white. Four Negroes have applied for admission, and may have to be enrolled next September.

Who knows, Pond observes, this too may be empty in the fall.

From the Shreveport (La.) Journal of February 19, 1959:

ALL PRAISE TO FRONT ROYAL

All praise to the people of Front Royal, Va. When the Warren County High School at Front Royal was finally reopened on an integrated basis Wednesday in compliance with the Supreme Court's idiotic race-mixing decree, not a single white pupil showed up. Again today, the white pupils stayed away.

The 22 Negro pupils who gained admission to the previously all-white school found themselves still segregated. With ten teachers and a principal on hand in obedience to court orders, the situation which resulted represented a new high in absurdities created by the Supreme Court: One white instructor for every two Negroes—and no acceptable public school facilities at all for the white children.

The majority of the 1,000 displaced white pupils calmly continued their studies in emergency private, segregated classes.

Front Royal now takes its place with Little Rock in showing the parents of America how to save their children from the socialist existence to which judicial crackpots would doom them. Every time the courts force racial integration upon a white school, simply keep the white pupils away and send them to private schools instead. With no white students available to attend the public schools, State legislatures certainly will have no obligation to continue operating the institutions for Negroes alone.

The really glorious aspect of the situation in Front Royal is that the Supreme Court is powerless to impose its senseless will further upon the white parents and their children. Against the unity of determined citizens who are willing to build a new school system rather than submit to its tyranny, the Supreme Court is as impotent as the reasoning on which its race-mixing decision is based.

Front Royal's display of strength could not have come at a better time. Just a few days ago an Associated Press reported trumpeted to the world that the proud old State of Virginia had calmly thrust aside the color barrier. He theorized, apparently, that if two Virginia communities would yield to token integration, the whole State would capitulate.

Thank God for the people of Front Royal.

From the Staunton (Va.) News-Leader of February 22, 1959:

FEDERAL DESPOTISM STUMPED

Someone has asked a good question: Will Federal Judge John Paul, of the western district of Virginia, jail the 1,000 or so white students who have prevented integration of the Warren County High School? They have done this by simply staying away, most of them attending private schools, or public schools in other communities. Isn't this outrageous defiance of the court order to integrate, and of the overriding power of the Federal Government?

The logic of the various Federal court rulings in integration cases clearly dictates condign action against the students, their parents and the teachers conducting the private school serving white students in Front Royal. They have conspired to thwart the court order. Lacking enough cells in which to confine them, the logic of Federal actions since the illegal 1954 Supreme Court decision against segregation in the public schools could move on to herding them in

a concentration camp. Federal despotism toward southern Americans hasn't gone quite that far, although it did in the case of Japanese-Americans after Pearl Harbor.

Warren County has given the Nation an example of gallant passive resistance to Federal despotism. Its people, under orders as to how to run affairs which constitutionally were always theirs to run until the Supreme Court presumed to make law in 1954, have reacted with dignity, determination and orderliness. Let Judge Paul try to punish them if he dares. To do so, he would have to overlook again the fact that the Supreme Court did not order integration—it ruled that there must be no exclusion from public school's on account of race. Judge Paul, who has joined the judicial despots in his old age, could be impeached for trying to exceed the arrogance of his nine old superiors in Washington.

Toward a Budget Based on National Goals Rather Than Political Expediency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE S. MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most intelligent discussions of the Federal budget that has come to my attention was offered by Mr. Nate White in a recent column of the Christian Science Monitor, which follows:

WHY NOT TRY A PROGRAM BUDGET?

(By Nate White)

Washington's budget debate would be more effective if less emphasis were put on the words "spend" and "save" and budget "balance" and more on what is known as "program budgeting."

Current news from Washington tends to separate the sheep from the goats. Everyone who is against the Eisenhower budget is labeled a "spender," and those who are for it are called "savers." This name calling does not produce much economic light.

The United States is a great and powerful nation, and it is not on the brink of economic collapse, as some overseas sources—particularly those with interest in gold stocks would like to argue. Inflation in the United States has been serious and every possible effort to stop it should be encouraged. But this inflation is considerably less than the rate of inflation in other nations. It is not an inflation which is going to push the country into sudden crisis.

The budget debate, therefore, is not a crisis debate—that is, having to do with a threat of sudden collapse if the budget is not balanced—and it should not be discussed in these terms.

Program budgeting is budgeting in which the administration and the Congress determine what the United States must do to progress, grow, and gain superiority in the missile race, and at the same time take care of its urgent needs for better schools, handle the unemployment problem better, and give greater consideration to the needs of the young people who every year enter the productive force.

The Nation, having determined what it needs to do, should then tailor the program budget to accomplish this end. If this means higher taxes—and the programs are desirable and economically achievable—then a budget with higher taxes is required.

Program budgeting, however, cannot be done as a once-a-year, all-out thing in which hairs are split every year over dollars spent.

Program budgeting is long range. It is achieved in the councils of government, preferably where the Executive and the Congress work together. It cannot be contained within 1 year for a nation as large and strong as the United States. A program necessarily requires consideration for its long-range effect, and it can be achieved step by step economically over a period of years. Some years will take more money than others as a matter of practical necessity.

Over a period of say 5 years the overall picture should show a budget surplus rather than a deficit if the program budgeting is carefully done and tax revenue progressively planned to take care of it in each stage of the program.

In program budgeting it is necessary for the Executive to work closely with the Congress in the planning stage. The system today calls for extensive examination by the Congress after a budget is submitted.

In the present usage the yearly budget is an economic anachronism. It is useful as an educational tool for both the Congress and the public. As a budgetmaking process for a great nation it is an outmoded system.

The budget can never be made the supreme objective in government or business. If it is, the cart has been put before the horse, and the government and the business which does this will not make progress. They will stagnate and fossilize. On this point business leaders and careful students of the Federal budget agree.

In a business, the stewards of the business decide what they wish to accomplish in a given period of time. An automobile company, for instance, determines when it wishes to launch a new automobile, when it wishes to expand its research, and so on, and it budgets for this purpose. It spends money on a new product in order to gain future profit.

A Federal, State, or local government can bring order into its financial affairs if it sets its objectives and budgets for them.

The threat in the current debate is that the Nation's overall objectives will be lost sight of on the issue of spend versus save. This is not keeping the eye on the ball.

Economic growth is the ball. How to budget best for this progress—so that progress is assured—is the real issue. Program budgeting holds the answer.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the people know more about a balanced budget and deficit financing than we give them credit for. They know that from personal experience. For example, they know that when they live within their means, they are operating on a balanced budget. They know that when they spend more than they make, they are going into debt, which is exactly the same thing as deficit financing. There are a few of them who do not care one way or another, but most of them do. They know that their habits should not be more costly than their own purse can

buy. And make no mistake about it, they expect the President and the Congress to find a way not to spend more money than the Government takes in. We will be hearing more and more about this subject, and so far as I am concerned, I am willing to stand up and be counted right now.

But first let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe in name calling. I want to express my personal views without regard to conservative, liberal, Democratic, Republican, or any other kind of partisan politics.

In my opinion, the most serious threat to our economy is inflation. Deficit spending breeds inflation and inflation in turn reduces the value of the dollar. In his "History of the French Revolution," Carlyle once said, "You cannot quench fire with oil. You must choke a deficit or else it will swallow you." In short, I believe in and have made it a practice in my own way to vote against deficit spending and for a balanced budget. In fact, I believe we should try to go one step farther. We should strive to spend less than we take in and apply the difference against the public debt, because I, frankly, do not see how we can hope to have a general tax reduction until that is done. If we cannot do it now, how can we expect to do it in case of a more serious national emergency.

Now, in Government as in business, a budget is composed of two parts, the income and the outgo. When the one is equal to the other, then the budget is in balance. But when the proposed expenditures exceed the anticipated revenues, then the budget is out of balance. We cannot have our cake and eat it too, and in this situation, in order to bring it back into balance, we must either reduce the expenditures or increase the taxes. That is exactly the position the President found himself in when he received the estimate of income and expenses from the Budget Bureau. In other words, the Budget Bureau estimated the outgo to be more than the income under all existing taxes, and they had to either trim down the expenses some more or propose new taxes. They chose to recommend new taxes. That is the hitch.

Let us take a look at the President's budget itself. We call it the budget for the fiscal year 1960, but it actually covers the period from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960. It is a very complex document, containing over 1,000 pages and weighing over 10 pounds. It provides for the operation and services of every branch of the Government in every congressional district and in every section of the country. We refer to it as the President's budget because in the final analysis, the occupant of the White House, whoever he may be, directs the policy of his administration and has the right on a broad scale to reduce or increase the expenditures of this or that department or function of our Government. We all know, however, that the President himself does not and cannot possibly be expected to prepare his budget. The job is done by the Bureau of the Budget, which is the right arm of the President. It is a big job, indeed, and a year round

checking and bookkeeping operation. Every single item of proposed expenditure, and each and all demands made upon our Government must be weighed and considered, approved, increased, shaved down or disapproved. They cannot possibly please everyone. In the end, some people feel that the proposed expenditures are too low, while others, with equal sincerity, believe that they are too high; some people, or some sections in the country, are glad, some are half-pleased, some are displeased, and still others are downright mad. As I said, a few people just do not care, but most of them are dead serious in wanting to know at least one thing: does it balance? It is to these people that I address myself.

Well then, does this one balance? The answer is "Yes," provided the Budget Bureau has correctly estimated the expenses at \$77 billion; and provided they have correctly estimated the revenues, under all existing taxes, at \$76 billion, and provided further that Congress adopts their recommendations and imposes \$1 billion of new taxes to make up the difference. In order to make my points clearer, I speak in round figures throughout.

I want to be more specific. After screening the demands of all the Federal departments and agencies, including requirements for public improvements, flood control, navigation, highways, public housing, veterans, welfare and social security, agriculture, postal services, the administration of justice, and the manifold other functions of our Government; the interest on the public debt and the staggering cost of our national defense, the Bureau of the Budget estimated that the expenditures for the next fiscal year, which actually covers the period from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960, will amount to about \$77 billion. So much for the outgo.

Now let us consider the estimated income for the same period, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960.

For the information of Members of Congress and others, the Bureau of the Budget issued a pamphlet entitled "The Federal Budget in Brief." According to this pamphlet, the income of our Government from all sources and under all existing taxes for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959 was as follows:

Fiscal year:	Income (in billions)
1957 (July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957) --	\$71
1958 (July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958) --	69
1959 (July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959) --	68

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly obvious that if the business trend in the last 3 fiscal years should continue, the estimated expenditures for the next fiscal year, amounting to \$77 billion, would far exceed the income. And if that should happen, the proposed budget of the President would be way out of balance. But in the pamphlet I refer to, the Bureau of the Budget states that "with continued vigorous economic recovery" the revenues during next fiscal year will amount to about \$76 billion. Now the Bureau of the Budget has been operating as an agency of the executive department of the Government for a very long time.

And I respect their expert opinion. They certainly are in a much better position than I am to make an educated guess about anticipated revenues. I am sure that they would not deliberately mislead Congress. In fact, it has been their practice to stay on the conservative side over the years. I know they are sincere, and I hope they are right. Nevertheless, their estimate of income is certainly based on an optimistic business outlook, and that is why I said that the budget, as presented, is in balance, "provided they have correctly estimated the revenues."

But let us assume that the estimates are correct and that the income from all sources and under all existing taxes will turn out to be \$76 billion against their estimated expenditures of about \$77 billion. At this point the budget is still out of balance, and as I previously indicated, in order to bring it into balance, the President and his advisers had to either recommend trimming down the estimated expenses or increasing the revenues somehow to the tune of about \$1 billion. Do you realize what \$1 billion is? Let me illustrate. If you placed 1,000 dollar bills one on top of the other, the stack would be as high or higher than the Washington Monument. Or put it this way. Using round figures again, only about 1 billion minutes have gone by since the birth of our Lord, Jesus Christ. Take up your pencil and figure it for yourself.

In any event, in order to make up the difference between the income and the outgo, whatever that exact figure might be, the President wants Congress to make sixteen new tax adjustments.

But, Mr. Speaker, a rose by any other name would still smell the same. In plain language, they want Congress to impose a brandnew tax on jet fuel, raise the general gasoline tax, raise the postal rates, raise the income tax of life insurance companies, raise the taxes on cooperatives, and reduce or juggle the 27½-percent depletion allowance, which is another name for raising the taxes on income derived from oil and gas. They also suggest an adjustment of other fees and charges so that persons receiving special services will more nearly pay the cost of those services. I do not know exactly what is meant by this particular item. I might be able to go along with the general idea, but I will want more information about it. In fact, all the proposals have been made in such very general terms that we will not know what each one means in dollars and cents until the administration bills are actually introduced.

I recognize that certain tax injustices have developed over the years and I believe that this should properly be the subject of a broad study by the Committee on Ways and Means, but I doubt that this can be done overnight, so to speak. I have great respect for the Committee on Ways and Means and if and as they make recommendations, I will most certainly consider them.

And I want to say that I, for one, applaud the President's determination to balance the budget. I am for it because I firmly believe in fiscal integrity. In

short, I agree with the President on the necessity for a balanced budget but I disagree with him on his way of achieving it. He recommends that we do it by first increasing taxes, while I think we should first try to do it by reducing certain expenditures.

My policy will be this. I will study each item of expenditure and each item of appropriation as they are presented on the floor for debate. I realize full well that different people in my congressional district, or in any other given area for that matter, have different ideas about where to cut and we have to try to reflect the views of the majority. Even that becomes a difficult task at times, but we have to do the best we can under the circumstances existing when we cast our votes.

But when all my votes for expenditures are laid side by side with those for appropriations, they will spell out a balanced budget. In other words, I will not personally vote to spend more than we take in. And I think that, at least, is the general feeling of the people I represent. Just to give one example, I am quite sure that the people of my district would prefer for me to vote to cut down on foreign aid rather than to vote for an increase in the gasoline tax. As a matter of fact, I have always voted against all foreign aid. The President's budget calls for almost \$4 billion for foreign aid. If we should eliminate this one item in toto, as I will vote to do, or if we even cut it in half, the budget would not only be in balance, without new taxes, but there would be enough left to boot to apply a sizable sum against the national debt.

The Nation's Capital Is Not a Cultural Backwater—A Report on the National Cultural Center and Culture in the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the able drama critic of the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, Richard L. Coe, reminds us that—

When the White House announced the names of trustees for the National Cultural Center, it also announced that the advisory committee would be appointed next week. That was 4 weeks ago.

Mr. Coe might well have gone on to say that the legislation establishing the National Cultural Center passed the Congress on August 22, 1958, and was signed into law by the President on September 2, 1958. He might have pointed out that the President at that time asked a number of national organizations in the fine arts field, including the National Music Council and the American National Theater and Academy, to submit names for the advisory committee. These

names were submitted but, as Mr. Coe has pointed out, the appointments have not been made.

Mr. Coe made the point last week—February 21, 1959—that—

"Next month," said HEW Secretary Fleming, when asked about when the first meeting of the auditorium trustees would be held. "Next month" was the answer to the same question last month.

In its February 23, 1959, issue Time magazine referred to the Nation's Capital as a city that has long been known as a cultural backwater. In the same report Time praised the Washington Opera Society, its promising ballet company, and the fine National Symphony, whose reputation has grown steadily, until it today is not far from the top echelon of U.S. orchestras.

The New York Times hailed Washington's opera for a recent production which was attended by Walter Lippmann, the Secretaries of Commerce and the Air Force, and a sprinkling of ambassadors. It said "there will be an opera troupe to move in" the National Cultural Center when and if it is realized.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia recently established a National Arts Committee which represents all of the many cultural groups and great institutions in the Nation's Capital. This committee will have a national and international importance, and will contribute to the new image of America abroad which is developing.

The District of Columbia Recreation Department, created by the Congress in 1942, is carrying out its mandate to establish activities in the arts. One of the most progressive and forward-looking cultural programs of any American city has been established. The department sponsors a summer music festival, as well as the outstanding Washington Civic Opera Co. The latter company is directed by Frederick Fall, a distinguished European opera and symphony conductor. A resident company, it gives hundreds of people in the Washington, D.C.-Baltimore, Md., area an opportunity to participate in cultural activities which would otherwise be denied them.

The groundwork is clearly being laid in the National Capital for resident companies in the performing arts which one day will be of great national importance and which will encourage the development of similar companies in many other American cities. When this transpires the United States, once thought of as materialistic, will be able to assert its cultural leadership throughout the world.

I include articles from the New York Times, Time magazine, the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, and the Washington (D.C.) Star which attest to the fact that the Nation's Capital is definitely not "a cultural backwater":

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1959]
CAPITAL REVIVAL—AN OPERA TROUPE GROWS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Howard Taubman)

Though sound is in abundant supply in the Nation's Capital, one must have sharp ears to hear any euphony in it. But underneath the tocsins of the public servants, the murmurs of the diplomats and the clamor of the politicians, one may discover, if one

listens carefully, shy noises that are music. For Washington is making a determined effort to build up its musical institutions.

The city on the Potomac was once regarded as a horrible example of a world capital that was provincial in its neglect of the cultural amenities. Compared with London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, and Moscow, it looked like an esthetic desert. Foreigners who liked to scoff at the United States would point to the paucity of artistic activity in Washington as another demonstration of American materialism.

The comparison was never quite fair, for Washington has always been an artificial city, a Government center whose population fluctuates substantially with shifts in party power. Nevertheless, there seemed to be a basis for the charge that the community cared for little but the political and social game. The symphony orchestra was in the doldrums; there was no opera, and apart from Zelda Fichandler's Arena Stage, no continuous theater.

BURIED IN COMMITTEE

Some citizens complained that Washington was missing an opportunity. No longer a village on Foggy Bottom, they insisted, it ought to behave with the pride of a great capital. It ought to be a showplace in the humanities and arts. Conscientious Congressmen introduced legislation to promote this aim, and generally it was interred in committee.

Last year, however, a law was enacted to make possible a cultural center in Washington. It avoided committing the Government's money, but arranged for official approval of an apparatus to raise \$25 million and build a center. When this project will become a reality is open to speculation. In any event, no one need be puffed up with optimism.

Fortunately, some Washingtonians have not waited for cultural amelioration wafted on wings of Government action. In recent years the National Symphony Orchestra has had an infusion of energy. Its conductor, Howard Mitchell, has brought a modern point of view to program making. By means of good ideas and personal drive, he has strengthened and orchestra, lengthened its season, and magnified its prestige.

For several years an opera company has been taking shape. The organization, backed by local people, was formed in September 1956. It began its active career with "The Abduction From the Seraglio" on January 31, 1957. It used professional elements on the stage and in the pit. Economies were urgent, of course, and properties were borrowed, including some from the Turkish Embassy.

OPERA COMPANY

In April the Opera Society of Washington followed with a Menotti program: "The Old Maid and the Thief" and "The Unicorn, the Gorgon, and the Manticore." Like the Mozart production, the Menotti twin bill had two performances. One could not say that the company was swollen with ambition.

In its second season, the Opera Society ventured on three productions: "Fidelio," "Ariadne auf Naxos," and "Così fan Tutte." Each had three performances.

In the current season, the third, four works are on the agenda: "The Marriage of Figaro," Monteverdi's "Orfeo," and "The Rake's Progress" have been presented, and "Falstaff" will wind up the schedule.

This repertory is enough to make clear that this is no ordinary company. It has no interest in pursuing success down the easiest road. "Bohème," "Traviata," and "Carmen," admirable works all, would be obvious selections if one wanted sure-fire attractions. But the Opera Society, much as it enjoys sellouts, prefers pieces likely to be less familiar to its clientele. To the company's great delight, productions like "Ariadne" and "Figaro" have played to full houses.

NATIONAL SYMPHONY

The general manager of the enterprise is Day Thorpe, music critic of the Washington Star. Mr. Thorpe is a brave man, and his paper is generous to let him risk his reputation on the firing line. Critics everywhere are indebted to him, for he proves what a protean lot we are. Who but a critic could do his job and manage an opera company with his left hand, as it were? Mr. Thorpe, of course, does not review his own productions. That would be too much of a good thing, wouldn't it? The Star uses guest critics for Opera Society openings.

The company operates on thoughtfully conceived principles. Its standards are professional, but it does not depend on big names. Its objective is ensemble spirit. It pays its Figaro and Don Curzio the same fee, and it expects both to be equally prepared. The singers, though young, are generally experienced; quite a few come from the New York City Opera.

GENERAL MANAGER

The orchestra is the National Symphony. For each of its productions the Opera Society takes over the orchestra for an entire week, and it is thus available without interruption for rehearsals and performances. The chorus, made up of singers with professional training, is local. So is the conductor, Paul Callaway. Stage directors and designers may be brought in from New York and other cities.

"The Rake's Progress," the most recent production, cannot be used as a gauge of the Opera Society's accomplishments. But, in spite of misfortunes, it was a performance of which the company and the city need not have been ashamed.

Less than 24 hours before curtain time, a 23-year-old tenor, Sgt. Mallory Walker, took over the role of Tom Rackwell and carried on with amazing aplomb, though he had not had a rehearsal. In the main soprano part there was Phyllis Frankel, who had replaced another singer and had learned the role from scratch in less than 10 days.

In a way, this miserable luck turned out to be good luck. It showed that the company was resourceful enough to survive the buffeting of fate. "The Rake's Progress," by the way, gave evidence of its durability, for its music was appealing in the face of a handicapped performance.

The Opera Society's budget this year is about \$100,000, with half coming in at the box office and the remainder from contributions. If the company could raise more money, it would undertake more productions. At the moment, it has no choice but to play in the Lisner Auditorium, where part of the orchestra must be stationed in front of the limited pit. But, much as a proper opera house would be welcome, the company is the important thing. If the Washington Cultural Center ever materializes, there will be an opera troupe to move in.

[From Time magazine, Feb. 23, 1959]

CAPITAL CULTURE

It was the kind of disaster-and-triumph series that makes opera legends. Rehearsing the part of Anne Trulove in Washington's Opera Society production of Stravinsky's "The Rake's Progress," the soprano was felled by a virus; she left the role to Baltimore's Phyllis Frankel, a singer who studied for an operatic career with famed Soprano Rosa Ponselle, has appeared with New York City Opera. Then the title-role tenor came down with laryngitis during dress rehearsal, was replaced by Mallory Walker, a 23-year-old soldier from Fort Myer, Va., where he is singing in the U.S. Army Chorus. Walker had never sung the Rake role before but had learned it as understudy, hopes to become a professional singer after he gets out of the Army. Finally, Tenor Hugues Cuenod lost his voice, responded enough to

frantic, last-minute medication to carry off his role.

Despite the crises, audience and critics last week applauded. Said the Washington Daily News' Milton Berliner: "A topnotch performance."

CULTURAL BACKWATER

Much of the credit for Rake's success goes to its director, tiny (5 feet 2 inches) Paul Callaway, 49, organist and choirmaster at Washington Cathedral (Protestant Episcopal), who organized the Opera Society in 1956. In a city that has long been known as a cultural backwater, the company was financed by contributions averaging \$100, plus some sizable gifts from Washington society's cave dwellers, including Mrs. Herbert May (formerly Mrs. Merriweather Post), Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss.

Deciding from the start to limit the repertory to rarely heard operas performed in their original language, Director Callaway set such a high standard with last year's staging of Richard Strauss' "Ariadne auf Naxos" that one critic feared listeners would expect a triumph every time. In fact there have been many triumphs, including stand-out productions of Mozart's "Così fan Tutte" and Monteverdi's "Orfeo." Audience response matched the performances: paid season subscriptions rose from 322 in 1957 to nearly 2,000 this season.

PROMISING BOOM

Last week's production of the 8-year-old "Rake's Progress" brought out as rare an operagoer as Walter Lippmann, also the Secretaries of Commerce and the Air Force, a sprinkling of ambassadors—all of whom seemed to glow at Washington's cultural boom. The opera company is not alone. Washington also has a promising ballet company and the fine National Symphony, whose reputation has grown steadily, today is not far from the top echelon of U.S. orchestras. This season the orchestra hopes to repeat last year's feat of landing in the black. Propelled by Conductor Howard Mitchell, the symphony this summer goes on a 10-week Latin American tour, also gives some 30 concerts a year for visiting teenage tourists.

Last week the National Park Service prepared to add a final touch to Capital culture. By 1965, it hopes to restore Ford's Theater, which failed after Lincoln's assassination, was long used as a museum. Needed for the project: \$1,750,000.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 23, 1959]

D.C. CULTURE IS DEFENDED BY HAYES

Concert manager Patrick Hayes gave the back of his hand to Time magazine yesterday. Hayes spoke over Radio Station WGMS and said he was sorrowed at a short phrase in this week's issue of the news magazine.

The phrase is: "In a city (Washington) that has long been known as a cultural backwater." A Time writer used it in a story describing the success of the Washington Opera Society's production of Stravinsky's "The Rake's Progress."

Washington makes out pretty well in the magazine story, which sees recent art and theater activity here as indicative of a cultural boom, but Hayes wasn't placated.

"Today, the back of my hand goes to Time magazine," he said.

He commented on the Time writer's statement that a final touch to the cultural boom would be the restoration of the old Ford Theater, where Lincoln was assassinated. Hayes doesn't think that's the final touch and he doesn't think the city in such bad shape right now.

Hayes said, "Between now and 1965, while we wait for restoration of the Ford Theater, we will have to suffer along with our backwater."

"All we have to look forward to are the daily showings at the National Gallery of Art, the Corcoran, Freer and the Phillips and half dozen or so smaller galleries. Scholars will have to get along as best they can at the Library of Congress and the Folger Shakespeare Library. Music lovers will have to be content with about 1,000 programs of merit each season * * * Our six universities in the area * * * will lumber along culturally. The National Theater will continue to book shows and now and then an Old Vic Company will visit us."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 30, 1959]

CZECH BASS IMPRESSIVE IN OPERATIC EXCERPTS (By Paul Hume)

The Washington Civic Opera Association presented an evening of operatic excerpts last night in Roosevelt Auditorium. Frederick Fall conducted, and the difficult assignment of simulating the operatic orchestra was handled in yeomanly manner by pianists Paul Higinbotham and Richard Wellenmann.

The stage was simply set with four large candelabra, against which the chorus was arrayed, some 60 strong.

The evening was especially fortunate in the presence of the Czech bass, Jan Rubes, of the New York City Center Opera. Rubes, who has been heard here in past productions of both the Civic Opera and the Opera Society, contributed the evening's noblest moment in his impressive delivery of Sarastro's "O Isis and Osiris," from Mozart's "Magic Flute." With the men of the chorus, this was an elevated scene.

It was Rubes also, later in the evening, who gave us the touch of real theater that removed us from the school auditorium and the well-meaning level of things with his remarkably well handled Coronation Scene and Death of Boris, from Moussorgsky's "Boris Godounoff."

It was interesting to note how warm his voice became in the second scene, which he sang in Russian, precisely as it had in the Mozart, in German. His first "Boris" scene, and his opening scene, from Smetana's "Bartered Bride," were in English, and neither of them came off as well as the succeeding episodes. Frankly, there are moments in the role of Boris that lie too high for Rubes to negotiate at all. But his voice in its middle and lower registers has a voluninous sound that he used with great effect.

Working in front of a plain curtain in the middle of a spotlight, he yet captured the drama and tenderness, the fear and hope of the final scene with telling impact. The chorus, properly behind the scenes, sang the closing lines, and learned the minimal Russian needed. Their work in the Coronation Scene, which is a great wall of choral sound, was alert, though they could not provide that real mass of tone needed. How much easier they would have found it to sing "Slava" on those high lines rather than the awkward "Glory." But we must pretend to like our opera in English. If a chorus can learn a little Russian, surely it can learn a little more.

The evening's other soloists included Lida Brodenova, soprano, who sang in scenes from "Bartered Bride"; Carolyn Friday, soprano, and Jacob Barkin, tenor. Miss Friday, also imported from New York, joined Barkin in the last act duet from "Traviata," and later sang Marguerite's spinning song and Jewel Song, from "Faust," before winding up the evening with Barkin and Rubes in the closing scene from that opera.

Miss Friday was not in happy estate. Her Violetta was routine, her "Roi de Thule" dull and flat, and her Jewel Song shrill, accompanied by an unceasing waving of the arms in a kind of night-clubby way. There are sopranos in Washington and Baltimore who sing better than Miss Friday. The Washing-

ton Civic Opera, which usually makes a point of giving the home team the nod, will probably not make this mistake again.

Barkin was in excellent voice in arias from "Rigoletto" and "Faust," as well as in his ensemble roles. It was nevertheless disturbing to see him singing of the most romantic love, with the attractive Miss Friday right next to him, while he kept his eyes glued to his little black book. In programs such as this, one is expected to have the thing in mind.

Frederick Fall displayed his customary sound knowledge of the subtleties and nuances of every scene.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 29, 1959]

JAN RUBES STANDS OUT IN OPERATIC EXCERPTS (By Day Thorpe)

The Washington Civic Opera Association last night put on an evening of music from various well-loved operas, using the local talent of its chorus, Jacob Barkin, tenor, and Lida Brodenova, soprano, together with two able pianists, Paul Higinbotham and Richard Wellenmann, and importing two stars, Jan Rubes and Carolyn Friday. It was a relaxed unassuming and often quite enjoyable evening.

Miss Brodenova is a one-time opera singer who now, after her retirement, is teaching at Mount Vernon School. That her voice is past its prime is of much less moment than that the musical style and eloquence with which she imbues her singing could be an object lesson to many a younger artist. Her aria, sung in Czech, from "The Bartered Bride" was natural and appealing.

Miss Friday, a talented young soprano with a pleasant voice, was suffering from bronchitis. Cantor Jacob Barkin is one of Washington's best tenors. His strong and romantic voice is heard in synagogue, opera, and oratorio.

It is surprising that a good singer whose musical life is so close to operatic music makes not the slightest effort to act or live his role. It is not that Cantor Barkin is a poor actor—he simply does not act at all, but sings his notes without any histrionic emotion, usually from a score. Of course, last night's show had neither staging nor sets, but the other singers created their situations by effective pantomime.

Dr. Fall's mixed chorus of about 50 voices sings for the love of it. More rehearsal would help it, for it is a bit ragged. Mr. Higinbotham, to whose lot fell most of the accompanying, was excellent throughout a long evening of many styles of music.

That leaves us with Mr. Rubes, bass of the Toronto Opera. It was he who gave the concert its real character and kept the customers happy. He is a singer of tremendous vitality, a rich and smooth voice and exceptional acting ability. His two solo scenes from "Boris Godounov," one sung in English, the other in Russian, coming as they did intermingled with a variety of quasi-amateur operatic numbers, gave the evening its charge of electric excitement which it needed to make it memorable.

Mr. Rubes' aria of Sarastro from "The Magic Flute" was marred by the glee club sound and the false entrances of the men's chorus, while his fine comic aria from "The Bartered Bride" was vulgarized beyond all excuse by the paltry clichés of the English translation.

In considering this evening of opera, put on by the D.C. Recreation Department, one must remember that it is created with virtually no budget. The interest of Congress in opera in Washington will, of course, blossom with the advent of an opera house—until that time it is concerned only that other world capitals outshine us. The recreation department does quite well with what it has to do with, but I wonder if it could not put

together an operatic evening of more unity and dramatic intensity. That would be a question more of ingenuity than money.

Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the rural towns and communities of this Nation are presently under great pressure. Farm population in some of these areas has been steadily decreasing. Young people, raised, educated, and trained at great expense, have gone elsewhere to make their contribution to society. The cost of public services has skyrocketed in the face of declining area income.

Ironically, while many of our rural towns are caught in a squeeze between declining incomes and rising costs, our cities and industrial areas are struggling desperately to meet the overwhelming demands put upon them by an influx of people attracted by the high level of jobs and wage rates prevalent over the past decade.

The decline of many rural trading centers and crowded conditions in our cities are two sides of the same coin. Both problems arise from the same cause. Both can find a partial solution in sound programs to develop, to their fullest potential, the resources of our rural towns, trading centers, and farm communities. The Nation needs more effective programs of resource development in rural areas: industry dispersal, strengthening of small businesses, better organized farm marketing and processing, and programs of training and education that will build skills into the area.

It is true that Federal and State agencies and many private groups, such as chambers of commerce and civic clubs, are spearheading resource development programs in many parts of the Nation. Certainly the Federal-State rural development program now going forward in some 30 States, is a big step in the right direction. Ohio's two pilot counties, Guernsey and Monroe, in this program are located in the 15th Congressional District.

However, I wish to point out that we have only begun to scratch the surface. A much greater effort will be needed at all levels, an effort that fully mobilizes both Government and private services and personnel, if "rural development" is to solve the grave national problem of our declining small towns, with all the economic, social, and political calamity this problem implies.

Pointing out that "the situation calls for some real thinking on the part of leaders in all farm communities," the American Farm Bureau Federation's magazine, Nation's Agriculture, printed last year an objective review of the whole issue of farm-town development. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR YOUR COMMUNITY?

What happened last time a farm house burned down in your community? Was it rebuilt or did the family move off, leaving a neighbor to work the land?

Look around and see what happened to the 80-acre farm that used to support a family. Chances are it has been combined with another to make a practical-sized family farming operation.

Consider the main street of the closest town of less than 500 population. Think about how many business firms there are compared to 10 or 15 years ago.

Does your church have more trouble making its budget than it used to? How is the local school getting along? Capable teachers won't work for a song any more. Also they want good buildings and equipment.

If your community has been keeping education up to standard, you have probably found that the taxload per acre is getting rather heavy.

After you have thought about these various problems you may come to this conclusion. Farming as a business has gone through some terrific changes in recent years, adapting a great many new methods.

Most of the communities in which this business is carried out have not yet adjusted to these rapid changes in agriculture. Technical advances are often made in a short time—the social adjustments that they cause may take a generation.

It is difficult for the smaller number of people you have left on the farm to support the same churches, schools, organizations, and business firms that were formerly used by many more folks.

In 1940, farm people made up 23 percent of the total population. Now they represent only about 12 percent. This fact has meaning for every farming community in the Nation.

Looking ahead, it appears that the heavy migration of workers from farms is apt to continue. Dr. Harry J. Reed, Coordinator for the rural development program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, points out that there is underemployment on more than one-third of the farms in this country.

The U.S. Department of Labor predicts that between 1955 and 1965 the number of professional and technical workers will increase 37 percent—at the same time they expect a 15 percent drop in employment of farmers and farmworkers.

This situation calls for some real thinking on the part of leaders in all farm communities. A decision must be made—either by default or after some careful study. The decision is whether to do nothing and watch these people leave the home community or to attempt to provide employment for them where they are now.

Assume you do nothing and the number of farm people in your area continues to decrease at the same rate as in recent years. There are some changes that will eventually occur in your neighborhood and community, whether you like it or not.

Reorganization of schools is one of the first things that you will face with a shrinking farm population. In many places this has already happened. The total number of school districts in the United States decreased from 110,000 in 1944 to 66,000 in 1954.

Most people hate to see the small, local high school pass out of the picture. There is lots of loyalty for the basketball team and so on.

However, there is a need to be realistic. Over one-half of the young people growing up in rural areas today will not farm. They deserve the best of schooling so they can compete on an equal basis in whatever occupation they choose. Also, college can be difficult

if you don't have thorough training in chemistry, physics, and higher mathematics.

Not only is it difficult to provide topnotch education in too small a high school, but it is costly to taxpayers. By expanding the boundaries of the high-school district, the tax cost per acre may be held down somewhat.

In reorganizing school districts, one approach is to maintain local grade schools close by and then send the high-school students to a larger, centrally located school. PTA groups can be built up around the elementary schools and they can be a center for some social activities.

If the school leaves, chances are the local church will go also. Rural churches in all parts of the country are finding the going is tougher each year. We find that in some denominations, national church organizations are now wrestling with the problem of what their policy shall be toward providing ministers for small, rural churches.

With a rapidly growing population, there often are not enough young clergymen to meet the needs. In many cases country churches will be forced to consolidate because no minister will be provided.

With today's modern roads and automobiles, it is not unreasonable to drive 10 miles to church. By joining together with another church in a larger town, you may be able to have a strong active group that does not face the perennial problem of raising enough money to keep going. Often small towns are trying to support two or three churches of different denominations and it is very discouraging because of small attendance and heavy costs.

There is much reluctance to give up small country or village churches because of memories and tradition. However, the young folks are going to the larger towns for amusement and it may be better to have the church there, too, so that more of their recreational activities can be associated with the church.

You can easily see that if the high school and the church move to the larger county seat town, much of your social activity is going to take place there also. This is a gradual thing but it is taking place all the time. More farmers are belonging to service clubs in town. Farmer-merchant dinners and other such activities pull them into town.

Also farmers' interests are more similar to townspeople's than in past generations.

The passing of the smalltown merchant is one of several sad things in all this transition. Many of them today are living on their capital, unable to realize that the need for them has passed.

An Iowa State College sociologist comments: "Small grocery stores, the small independent hardware stores, general stores, and men's and women's clothing stores of the typical small Iowa community now have to compete with the larger, more specialized business houses of the county seat town. They no longer have the advantages which were gained from monopoly of position in the days when people were restricted pretty much to shopping in the area in which they lived."

"The local merchant who has a relatively small volume of business cannot operate on the markups that are being used by his large competitors who make their incomes on the basis of a rapid turnover of inventory."

The further decrease in farm population in the future will aggravate the problems of the smalltown businessman even more. This is especially true if the school and church are moved on to a larger town.

Farmer cooperatives also have to consider their position in this changing agriculture. Midwest creameries are an example of a need

for consolidation in order to cut down per unit costs of production. One dairy industry expert mentions that in some areas as many as 6 to 12 plants are handling a volume of milk that might be processed cheaper by 1 plant. These co-op plants often compete fiercely for milk or cream, and routes overlap considerably.

Let's say that the leaders of your community decide to try and keep the people where they are, rather than to make the many adjustments listed above. The first thing necessary is to provide gainful employment for them. Basically, this can come from a more intensive type of agriculture or from industry.

If there is an outlet for specialty crops, they can use up a lot of extra labor. For instance, a Tennessee community found they could profitably produce peppers for a canning factory.

A Louisiana parish, going out of cotton production, faces a choice as to what type of farming to go into. Some suggest going into cattle. This will not require many of the farm workers now living there and will eliminate most of the existing business firms. One planter suggests using supplemental irrigation to raise sweetpotatoes, strawberries, or other high labor crops so the small farmers can remain in the area.

In an agricultural development program for Gadsden County, Fla., our research people suggested raising fall vegetables to use the available labor after the shade tobacco was harvested. With the coming of supplemental irrigation and new marketing practices, it is now practical to raise vegetables in places where they could not be considered a few years ago. The demand is growing for many specialty crops.

Bringing in a new industry is certainly an effective way to provide employment for people not needed in agriculture and to keep local business concerns going. A survey has shown that each 100 factory jobs create enough new business to provide \$590,000 more personal income each year and \$360,000 more in retail sales.

Attracting a new factory to your town is not easy. Hundreds of other towns are working hard at the job. It is not uncommon for a company to pit two or three towns against each other and give the plant to the one that will promise the most.

Many towns have established industrial development corporations for the purpose of encouraging the location of industry in their areas. Sometimes a tract of land is bought and set aside for industrial use.

It is often best to obtain outside help in deciding the types of industry that will be most desirable and those that can operate profitably in your town. Companies want to know their costs if they locate there and what labor conditions are like. It takes skilled research to size up a town and present the information about it in the best form.

Recreation is a possibility that you don't want to overlook in considering opportunities for employing local people. With the large amount of leisure time available to city workers, there is more interest in fishing, boating, camping, and hunting than ever before.

The main thing is to get a really good inventory of the resources in your community and then act in an organized manner to develop these to their fullest extent.

It takes real leadership and some effort on everyone's part, but many communities have found that they can do a good job of farming, attract an industry to provide extra employment for workers not needed in agriculture and then weld all of this together into a group that is proud of its churches, schools, and its good standard of living.

The Puerto Rican in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Ruth Gruber, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of December 6, 1958:

THE PUERTO RICAN IN NEW YORK

(By Ruth Gruber)

Street gangs, until this year, were almost unknown in Puerto Rico. Not only are street gangs a new phenomenon, according to Puerto Rican authorities, they are a New York export.

The leaders of the two or three gangs that have made headlines this year are largely boys who were in trouble in New York and whose families brought them home to Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico's youth are still not "shook up" at home. Gangs, vice, and narcotics, though they exist, are still largely alien to the Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico. Less than one-third of 1 percent of Puerto Rico's youth are registered as delinquents. What happens to them when they migrate to New York is another story, a story of the tragedy of upheaval, of rejection, of prejudices.

The leaders in Puerto Rico are doing a good deal of soul-searching to understand these changes. During a recent visit to Puerto Rico I spent long hours with Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, his wife, Dona Ines, Commonwealth officials and the man on the street, discussing the problems of Puerto Ricans in New York.

Certainly anyone who has driven through the hills of Puerto Rico, talked to the kindly jibaros living a pastoral unhurried life in a little wooden shack, or watched the people in the mountains, dressed in their Sunday best, clustering happily around their little country store, the "colmado," listening to juke-box music which floods out to the road, or seen a whole family at night in a one-room shack, the door wide open, securely absorbed in a television program, soon realizes the problem these people face in adjusting to the hectic, competitive, pressure-ridden life in New York.

In the hills, the jibaro lives in a small shack surrounded by sunshine and air and green living things. When he washes his face in his bowl of water, he throws his water out of the window. He is sharing his water with the universe. But when he comes to New York and throws his water out of the window, it is not the universe. It is a slum on East 110th Street. Up in the hills, sitting under the stars, he doesn't worry about time. If he feels like singing at midnight, he sings and he disturbs no one. But in New York, if he sings at midnight, he will probably be waking 10 families who have to get up at 6 the next morning.

Yet Puerto Ricans have adjusted faster to New York in 10 years than most immigrant groups adjusted in a whole generation. Puerto Rico is the only country that has followed its people to New York, to watch over them, help them adjust to the new culture, help them find jobs, and overcome some of the bewilderment and frustrations of being the last-comers.

Through the Office of the Labor Department of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, known familiarly to all Puerto Ricans as "the office," located at 322 West 45th Street, Governor Muñoz told me "we give help and information to the people in New York. We

have maintained a fruitful exchange of information with the governments of New York City, Chicago, etc. We send teachers of English into New Jersey to the farm workers' camps. We pay for the teachers. No other country ever did this. That's why I think the adaptation of the Puerto Ricans is quicker already, and will continue to be quicker than all the other groups which came in.

"Someday," the Governor said, "I hope to spend about 3 weeks living in New York incognito, and see how the Puerto Rican people are living and get a spontaneous relationship with them."

Earlier this year the Governor's wife spent such a day in New York, although it was as difficult for her to be incognito among the thousands of people who love her as it would be for her husband.

"I am sick at what I saw," she told me one evening in San Juan. "I think we should try to keep our people here. It is a terrible destiny for people to emigrate. They are better off here. They have schools here, milk stations, everything—but not enough work. They talk of progress when they go to New York. It is heartbreaking. I know what they are going through for progress. They are warm and kind people. But look what happens to them in New York."

"Gangs prosper in New York partly because there the young people try to go out of their anonymous existence. They become a kind of Robin Hood—to get publicity, to get their pictures in the papers. Here gangs won't prosper because here the boys are not anonymous. A seamstress is a very respected person here. Her son is a very respected person. We have no gangs here because the family is very strong. In New York this changes. Family life is broken. The woman usually gets the first job—in needlework. If the husband doesn't get a job, he deteriorates. In New York, he is no longer the head of the family. The children begin to leave the house. How can they live in that terrible housing? People make fine conciliatory speeches. That is not enough. Now is the time to be strong and honest. They have to enforce the law on the landlords. We need leaders, real leaders, who will live right among the people and teach them to help themselves. That's what we are doing in Puerto Rico and that's what we must do in New York. It doesn't matter whether the leaders are white or Negro or Puerto Rican. It just matters that they help our people to help themselves."

Not all the Puerto Ricans in New York live in slums. According to Joe Monserrat, director of the New York City office of the Migration Division of the Commonwealth, about half the Puerto Rican population lives in decent houses in the city and in the suburbs.

"The painful and tragic thing," he told me, "is that most New Yorkers assume the Puerto Ricans are all living in slums. But New York is divided into 352 health areas. Puerto Ricans live in every one of them. There isn't a section of the city where Puerto Ricans don't live. Yet you don't hear of those people. The great majority of Puerto Ricans are fair-skinned enough to be able to buy houses in Westchester, N.J., and even Greenwich, Conn., and many of them do."

"There is a tremendous dynamic and cultural life being lived by Puerto Ricans in this community," he said. "There are Puerto Rican art exhibits. There are Puerto Rican plays being produced in Spanish. Two groups of young people are struggling to develop off-Broadway theaters. We have a group of young second-generation Puerto Ricans called the Hispanic Young Adult Association who maintain a list of every available scholarship in the United States, so that qualified students may apply. A lot of industries would fold up if there were no Puerto Rican workers."

The young second-generation Puerto Rican men and women working at the office of the Commonwealth, fine-looking men like Joe Monserrat and Joe Morales, wince under the stereotype of the Puerto Rican. They feel they have their own contribution to make to life in New York. Some of them disagree emphatically with the argument that the Puerto Ricans were better off in Puerto Rico.

"My father," one of them said to me in New York, "would never agree that he should have stayed in Puerto Rico, instead of coming here when I was a baby, and giving me my chance to go to college. Nor would the fathers of my friends who are engineers, doctors, social workers or flyers in the Air Force. Sure we began in the slums. But I don't know that the slum left a mark on me. I think the fire-escape education made it possible for me to understand my people better and to help them."

"Yet even we second-generation Puerto Ricans know what prejudice means. My 6-year-old daughter is darkskinned. She came home from school one day and said, 'Daddy, why am I different?'"

He swallowed hard as he said it. "Maybe that's why I'm working so hard for the Puerto Ricans coming here now, so that their sons and daughters and my daughter's daughter won't have that kind of wound."

Effects of the Federal Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, with the possibility of an additional Federal tax of 1½ cents per gallon on gasoline, I believe we ought to take a good look at just what we are doing to automobile travel these days.

Just how far Government is going to go to absolutely smother the American automobile owner, I don't know. But it would seem to me that we are heaping more and more onto the shoulders of the folks who drive automobiles, 75 percent of whom use their cars for business purposes or to drive to and from their place of employment. Automobiles are more of a necessity than a luxury these days.

It has been suggested in justification of this legislation that this additional tax revenue is needed to foot the bill for the Federal highway program. If this is true, then why was only \$2.1 billion of the 1958 revenue from gasoline taxes allocated to the highway trust fund, while \$1.5 billion was funneled into the general fund of the U.S. Treasury?

At the present time, taxes on the most modestly priced new cars with a discount price of \$2,500 amount to \$600. This is \$100 in excess of the \$500 distribution cost and nearly half of the \$1,400 manufacturing cost. But this is only part of the story. First, the manufacturer pays \$490 in taxes, including the Federal excise tax, which amounts to about \$200; property, income, and other classified taxes must be figured at approximately \$150; and taxes in the price of purchased materials and parts, about \$140.

Then the car moves to the dealer, who, in turn, is gouged by the tax bug. Prop-

erty, income, and other such taxes are levied against him to the extent of \$20. This is one of his costs of doing business and helps get the final price of the automobile up to \$2,500.

Finally comes the buyer or consumer into the picture, and if he looks closely he will find that taxes are not playing him any favorite. Boldly included in the \$2,500 discount price are these items: State sales tax, \$75; license and title fees, \$15; total, \$90.

How simple it would be to exercise just a little fiscal prudence when we are voting on the appropriation bills and on those pet projects that eat into the Federal budget each year. A little bit of fat trimmed from one pork-barrel project and a little bit from another would easily fill the hole in the Federal highway trust fund and the proposed 1½ cents tax on gasoline becomes unnecessary.

I petition the Members of this body to read carefully the article from the publication *Oak Leaves*, of Oak Park, Ill., which so vividly points out the inequity of the increased tax on gasoline—a necessary commodity for the American people who are already overloaded with State and Federal levies:

PROPOSED GAS TAX INCREASE WOULD COST VILLAGERS PLENTY

Forty times around the equator. Place the pennies from a suggested increase in the Federal gasoline tax around the hemisphere, and in 1 year as estimated by the Automobile Manufacturers Association, they would reach around the globe 40 times.

What would this increase, proposed by President Eisenhower in his annual budget message to Congress, mean to residents of Oak Park and River Forest?

In Oak Park, it could result in owners of passenger automobiles paying out \$201,262 more in gasoline taxes in 1 year than they paid in 1958.

In River Forest, passenger car owners could pay an additional \$48,850 over the amount they paid in Federal gasoline taxes last year.

The President proposed that the tax on every gallon of gasoline be raised from 3 cents to 4½ cents. Proceeds from the increased tax would go into the highway trust fund to "preserve the pay-as-we-go principle, so that contributions from general funds to build Federal highways will not be necessary."

Enactment of the tax rests with Congress.

To determine the effect of this proposal on suburbanites who drive automobiles, Oak Park and River Forest officials were asked about the number of cars and trucks owned in these suburbs.

Figures taken from the number of auto stickers issued during the past year indicate that Oak Park residents applied for tickets on 20,600 passenger autos and 796 trucks. In River Forest, 5,000 applications were filed for autos and 350 for trucks.

If the new tax increase were passed, how would it affect your pocketbook for the next year? From A.M.A. statistics, it has been estimated that the average suburban car owner drives his car 9,348 miles per year, averages 14.36 miles to the gallon, and uses 651 gallons of gasoline per year.

As an Illinois resident, you pay about 30 cents per gallon for gasoline. Of this amount, 5 cents is earmarked for the State tax, 3 cents for the Federal tax, and seven-eighths one hundredth the cent for an occupation tax.

The total tax on each gallon of gasoline amounts to about 30 percent of your gasoline bill. For comparison, you are paying about three times as much for gasoline taxes, as you would pay for a luxury tax on furs or jewelry.

Determined from the average figures quoted, you are paying about \$56.64 per year for State and Federal taxes on gasoline. If the suggested cent and a half increase were passed, you would be paying 10.2 cents on every gallon. Apply this amount to your car's yearly consumption of fuel, and it will boost your tax bill from \$56.64 to \$66.41—an increase of \$9.77.

Federal receipts from gasoline taxes are not providing enough to meet the costs of the new highway program, stated Washington officials. The word is that the highway trust fund will wind up this year about \$900 million short. How much would the Federal Government stand to gain by the tax increase from Oak Park and River Forest residents?

Multiplying the number of autos in Oak Park (20,600) by the individual revenue which the tax would bring (\$9.77), it seems motorists would be paying out \$201,262 above what they paid last year. Truck owners (796) would be taxed for an increase of \$19.53, yielding additional revenue of \$15,545.

The suburbanites of River Forest, who own 5,000 automobiles, would be assessed for an additional \$48,850, while firms owning trucks (350) would increase the Federal purse by \$6,835.

J. W. Lemon, of the American Petroleum Institute, 624 South Michigan, Chicago, read a report from the institute. "In the fiscal year of 1958, the Federal Government collected \$3.6 billion from special excise taxes on gasoline.

"Of that amount," he continued, "\$2.1 billion was allocated to the highway trust fund while the remaining \$1.5 billion went into the general fund of the Treasury."

A Proposal for Individual Voluntary Deferral of Tax in Peak-Income Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I respectfully submit the following article, which appeared in the *Journal of Taxation* of October 1958. The authors of this article, Mr. Carl M. Esenoff and Mr. Herbert L. Beckett, are good friends and outstanding citizens of the district which I represent. Their thoughtful and unique appraisal of this one facet of our country's income tax structure is worthy of your attention:

A PROPOSAL FOR INDIVIDUAL VOLUNTARY DEFERRAL OF TAX IN PEAK-INCOME YEARS

(By Carl M. Esenoff and Herbert L. Beckett)

(NOTE.—The high tax cost of bunching income into a few peak years is acknowledged to be one of the great evils of our progressive income tax system. Many proposals for averaging to eliminate this harsh tax treatment of those with fluctuating incomes have been offered. All such plans have suffered from being too complicated. The plan proposed here is exceedingly simple. It would permit the taxpayer to control his top bracket in any year, would spread out peaks of income, and would not reduce Government revenues and would have all the necessary controls built into it. Administration by the Government would be simple. While policy matters of this kind are not

the usual business of the Journal, your editors are so struck with the appeal of this plan that we want to expose it for consideration by taxmen. Comments will be welcomed.)

Many authorities on income tax matters recognize that a means of averaging income over a period of years would be a desirable change in the Federal income tax laws. The results of measuring and taxing earnings on an annual basis are extremely harsh on any taxpayer whose income fluctuates from year to year. Taxpayers thus affected include farmers, members of professions, executives, wage earners, actors, athletes, businessmen, and many others.

A number of relief provisions have been adopted to alleviate somewhat the inequities of the annual tax. Particular reference may be made to the tax treatment of compensation for services rendered over 36 months or more (sec. 1301); the special provisions relating to income from certain inventions, artistic works, back pay, and compensatory damages for patent infringement (secs. 1302, 1303, 1304); the net operating loss carryover and carryback (sec. 172); reporting of income on an installment basis (sec. 453); the capital gain provisions of section 1202; and the regulations which permit farmers to report on a cash basis even though required use of inventories would more clearly reflect income as generally defined.

The deferral of income has received much attention in recent years. Pension and profit sharing plans (sec. 402) are becoming very popular; the increasing millions of dollars which are placed each year in these trusts and income from such trust investments are, to a great extent, escaping the current annual tax and the special relief provisions will permit many millions of such funds to escape Federal income taxes entirely. The employee stock option provisions of the code (sec. 421) permit deferral of income and special tax treatment for taxpayers who qualify. Adoption of the Jenkins-Keogh bill would permit deferral of income by another group of taxpayers, the self-employed. (Reference to the Jenkins-Keogh bill here is not intended to indicate an objection to such a bill, since in equity self-employed taxpayers should be entitled to treatment similar to employees.)

Other methods of deferring income are constantly being devised, without specific congressional or Treasury Department approval; by executives, entertainers, and many other taxpayers whose income may be expected to decline in later years. All of these plans for deferral of income seriously diminish the current revenues from income taxes with benefit to a very small percentage of all the taxpayers. If such plans for deferral of income are to be expanded, the resultant burden on taxpayers who cannot participate will consequently become greater.

Many plans for averaging of income have been advocated and considered by congressional committees and other authorities on income taxation. However, all such plans which have come to our attention have involved serious accounting problems with respect to maintaining income averages and recomputing taxes for the millions of taxpayers. Further special legislation to provide the relief for special groups or particular types of income would only make our tax laws more complicated. All of the income averaging plans of which we are aware provide for methods whereby the taxpayer keeps his income, but adjusts the tax based on retroactive computations. Our proposal considers only prospective elections.

Furthermore, our proposal presents what we believe to be a practical and easily administered plan which is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Remedy the present inequities which result from the graduated tax rates as ap-

pled to income determined on an arbitrary period of 12 months.

2. Provide the U.S. Treasury with greater funds than are presently received during years of high income and high tax rates.

3. Permit the U.S. Treasury to hold certain funds without interest.

4. Provide a means and an incentive for all taxpayers to save for retirement or periods of economic depression.

5. Provide a method whereby Congress could exercise better control during inflationary periods, as well as periods of depressions.

6. Eliminate the necessity for further special group tax relief and perhaps allow for the repeal of some such laws previously adopted.

The plan briefly is this: Every individual taxpayer would be permitted to take a deduction in computing adjusted gross income for amounts deposited with the U.S. Treasury Department. Such deposit would be represented by a deferred income certificate. The certificates would bear no interest and would be redeemable on demand subject to a deduction for the estimated tax applicable to such certificate. In the year of redemption, the face amount of the certificate redeemed would be included in gross income and the deduction for estimated tax would be taken as a tax credit.

This plan would permit each individual taxpayer to average his income in the future at his own election by turning in to the U.S. Treasury any amount of income on which he did not desire to pay income tax in that year. In exchange for the cash thus deposited, the taxpayer would receive the non-interest-bearing certificates. The deferred income certificates would be nontransferable and could not be used as collateral on loans. However, since the certificates would be redeemable in cash at the option of the taxpayer, he could have income whenever he chose to pay tax on the deferred amounts.

Thus, under the plan, in the year of deposit, instead of receiving income taxes which might vary from 20 percent to 91 percent of the income, the Treasury Department would receive 100 percent of such deferred income. These funds would be used without payment of interest until the taxpayer redeemed the deferred income certificates. A simple procedure could be that, at the time of redemption, the taxpayer would prepare a form which would be comparable to the declaration of estimated tax form. The face amount of the certificates redeemed, less the estimated tax attributable to taking such income into account in the year of redemption, would be paid to the taxpayer. The taxpayer's tax return for the year of redemption of deferred income certificates would include the face amount of such certificates as income. The income tax would be computed in the regular manner, just as if the income had been earned in that year; the taxpayer would claim credit for tax withheld from salaries and wages, tax withheld from deferred income certificates, and other payments on estimated tax.

The deferred income certificates included in the estate of a deceased taxpayer could and probably should be subject to a special income tax. Any of several formulas might be applied. The deferred income could be treated in a manner similar to compensation for services rendered over 36 months or more (sec. 1301); or perhaps the tax could be computed as if earned in a period of not more than 5 years, the only variation in years being the first 4 years after enactment of the plan.

At first glance, it might appear that this income deferral plan would provide undue benefit to the taxpayer with a large income. This would undoubtedly be true with respect to the taxpayer who deferred large amounts of income for a few years; then realized little or no income and spread the deferred income over many years. However,

it is our guess that this would not be the case with an unduly large number of taxpayers. Furthermore, interest savings would compensate for some of the loss of tax revenue from such taxpayers. On the other hand, the interest savings and the special taxes at death would probably equalize the long-term tax burden of most of the taxpayers.

This plan for deferral of income would surely appeal to all classes of taxpayers. There would be an incentive to save by deferring income—always with the thought of providing financial security in the future and the possibility of paying less income tax.

The wage earner and the small salary earner might well make deposits for deferred income certificates—80-cent dollars which might some day come back to him as tax-free dollars.

The cash basis farmer could sell his crops at the most propitious time without regard to his income in that particular year. The excess income could well be deferred to a time when his farm income was down. He might defer income for 1, 5, 10 years or even longer, but that deferred income could always be a source of great satisfaction as well as very helpful in time of diminishing income.

The businessman, professional man, and the executive would probably defer considerable income. All could look to financial security as a result of the backlog of deferred income. Inasmuch as the income of these taxpayers is often greater during the later years of their lives, it is probable that substantial sums of deferred income would be held interest free for many years.

The highly paid actor, entertainer, athlete, or others who might have high earning capacity for only a few years could earn without regard for taxes and could defer income.

The present schemes for income deferral, converting ordinary income to capital gains, and earnings abroad might be less attractive. Taxpayers could devote time once more to earning income and security rather than searching for tax loopholes. Incomes would surely be increased and more money would flow into the U.S. Treasury in the form of taxes and deferred income. Some groups of taxpayers might benefit more than others, but surely the Treasury would benefit through interest savings and higher ordinary income during the normal productive lives of taxpayers.

During inflationary periods, high tax rates would cause more deferral of income. This would provide the U.S. Treasury with extra funds and would be more of a curb on inflation than high tax rates alone.

Lowered tax rates when there was danger of recession or depression would encourage taxpayers to realize their deferred income. This could place money in the hands of many taxpayers and would have a stabilizing effect on our economy. Taxpayers holding deferred income certificates who suffered unemployment, ill health, or other temporary periods without earnings could be helped over such period by cashing their certificates. While there might be a loss of tax revenue in individual cases, the income produced from spending of the deferred income could well produce more tax revenue from others.

The Challenge of Educational TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most exciting recent development in the field of education is the impact of educa-

tional television. In response to the promise of this new media, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] and I are sponsoring bills—H.R. 1981 and H.R. 2926—which would provide grants of \$1 million to each of the 49 States to encourage the establishment of statewide educational TV networks. A similar bill, sponsored by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the senior Senator from Washington, passed the other body last year, and hearings have already been held this session by that committee on identical legislation.

In order to underscore the challenge presented by educational television and the hope it holds out for improvement of our educational system, I am appending to these remarks an article written by Loren B. Pope, education editor of the New York Times, which appeared in that newspaper a few days ago. The principle points made by Mr. Pope are these: First, that educational TV offers striking new opportunities for better teaching; second, that ultimately educational TV may both improve teaching techniques and produce substantial accompanying savings in basic school operation outlays; third, that educational TV may open a new door to a broadened program of adult education; fourth, that educational TV has already proven itself as an effective media for specialized instruction and programs which enrich the school curricula.

Mr. Pope's article follows:

EDUCATION IN REVIEW: TELEVISION CLASSES ARE SEEN AS MEANS TO BETTER TEACHING AT LOW COST

(By Loren B. Pope)

Teaching by television is the fastest growing development in the history of American education. This powerful means of communication offers new opportunities for better teaching at—many educators believe—a saving in teachers and buildings, since it makes much larger classes feasible.

While there was practically no use of television in the schools 4 years ago, more than 550 school districts and 110 colleges use it today. Another 240 colleges give credit for a nationally televised physics course.

Last week the Fund for the Advancement of Education completed a report on the results of the first year of a 3-year test. And New York State started the second semester of a much less specific experiment to learn the value of television as a supplement to the classroom teacher's efforts. The two projects have produced many of the same benefits and problems.

The fund's program involved 223 schools and 40,000 students in 14 States. In 110 comparisons, the performance of television students was superior to that of control students in 68 cases. The differences were large enough to be statistically significant in 38 of the 110 cases, and 29 of them were in favor of the television classes.

LARGE CLASSES

Because the television students were taught in large classes—ranging from 175 in elementary schools to 500 in high schools—several systems reported substantial savings. Dade County, Fla., with 5,600 pupils in the television schools, reported saving the equivalent of 27 teaching positions and 29 classrooms. The savings, the fund reported, were not made at any sacrifice in quality.

No student received all of his instruction by television. The courses taught varied widely. In the elementary schools, television classes usually were in science, social studies, physical education, health, and safety,

Reading, writing, and arithmetic were taught by conventional methods in small classes.

In junior and senior high schools and television instruction was usually in mathematics, English, physics, chemistry, and history.

Methods also varied, but in general an elementary teacher had about 5 minutes to prepare the students, with the aid of a teacher's guide, for a 20-minute telecast. Afterward, the teacher answered questions, stimulated discussion, reinforced the main points of the telecast or went beyond it. In junior and senior high schools the telecasts were usually about 30 minutes long.

ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

In New York the State Department of Education finances what it calls an enrichment program of about 15 hours a week of television instruction plus offerings for teenagers and adults and for inservice training of teachers. The programs, broadcast over channel 11 from New York City, use outstanding teachers in the metropolitan area.

They can be viewed over an area in which 60 percent of the States school children live. But, because of lack of television sets, it was estimated that only about half, or 1,500, of the schools in the viewing area outside the city, and 262, or one-third of the schools in the city, use any of the television lessons. There are an estimated 350 sets in the city schools. Parent groups and the board of education are buying 110 more sets.

The program's use is largely limited to elementary schools because the television classes, which began after the start of the term, do not mesh with many junior and senior high school's rigid class schedules.

For elementary schools, 7 hours of 20-minute telecasts are offered in languages, science, art, music, and social studies. For junior and senior high schools there are nearly 8 hours of 30-minute telecasts in physics, history, English, mathematics, science, and languages. Board of education officials report that fewer than 20 junior high schools, and still fewer senior high schools, use any one of these courses.

FAVORABLE REACTION

The reactions of both teachers and students in two elementary schools were generally favorable. Typical were the responses of the third grade in Public School 40 at 320 East 20th Street to a televised science lesson. Nearly every child gave full attention when the television teacher announced she would tell how phonograph records and tapes save time. When she asked who was the first to make records, a dozen hands shot up. When she asked semirhetorical questions, there was a scattering of spontaneous answers.

Afterward, they said they looked forward to the lessons and volunteered a half a dozen things they had learned. A few contended the programs were either too elementary or too advanced, but most of the class pronounced them just right.

Their teacher, Mrs. Cynthia Thorne, found the television lessons stimulated an interest that helped her to do a better job. The television teachers usually are well prepared and have a wide variety of resources and visual aids not available in most classrooms.

As in the fund's program, the television lessons filled in weak or special areas—music, art, and science. They also function, by example, as an effective teacher-training device.

PROBLEMS MET

Identical problems were confronted in the New York and the fund programs. One of the principal ones was welding the telecast and the classroom followup into a unified teaching effort. One aspect of this problem is how to get a steady feedback of questions from students and suggestions from classroom teachers. Another is how to adapt the

new technique to the varying abilities of students reached in a single telecast.

The New York program is being evaluated this semester by surveys and by controlled tests. The fund's tests are continuing this year, with 402 schools and 90,000 pupils.

Those involved do not see television going beyond a supplemental role. Rather than displacing teachers, they see it helping to hasten a better or more efficient way of using instructors, which is needed just to stay even with demand. They predict it will be used increasingly to spread the influence of the very best teachers, or to give small rural schools the benefit of courses and teaching available to large ones.

They also predict that because television's potential for presenting new concepts has such unplumbed possibilities it will stimulate important new revisions and expansions of course content.

Alabama Waterways Development a Major Municipal Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, we in Alabama are acutely conscious of the importance of our waterways and in recent years our State has made remarkable progress in waterway development.

The Honorable I. I. (Zeke) Fox, mayor of Alexander City, Ala., discussed municipal interest in the waterway programs at a recent meeting of Alabama mayors with our congressional delegation here. Mayor Fox's statement was of considerable interest and I would call the attention of Congress to Alabama's river development program.

Following is Mayor Fox's statement:

ALABAMA WATERWAYS DEVELOPMENT A MAJOR MUNICIPAL INTEREST

(By I. I. (Zeke) Fox, mayor of Alexander City)

Alabama's system of waterways is one of her greatest assets. There are more than 1,600 miles of navigable and potentially navigable streams within the boundaries of the State as determined by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army. Alabama ranks fourth in the Nation in improved waterways for navigation, although less than one-half of the potentially navigable streams are improved.

There are approximately 700 miles of navigable waterways that have been improved and have a channel of at least 9 feet in depth. These include the Tennessee, Warrior-Tombigbee, the Chattahoochee to Columbia, Ala., the Gulf Intracoastal Canal, and Mobile Bay.

Development of the above rivers for navigation and allied purposes has materially increased the economy of not only the adjacent areas, but has strengthened the economy of the entire State and the southeastern region. This is evidenced by the expansion and location of industrial plants along and within the basins of the improved waterways. New industries located within the Tennessee and Warrior-Tombigbee Basins will approximate 65 percent of all industries that have located within the State of Alabama during the past several years. Records indicate that since 1955 the Warrior-Tombigbee Valley has

secured a total of \$287 million in capital investment in industry. The Tennessee Valley since the improvement of the river some 20 years ago has shown a phenomenal growth in the expansion and location of new industry and commercial enterprises which represent capital investments totaling hundreds of millions of dollars. Another indication of the growth of the area is the increase in tonnage on the river—in 1933 there were only 930,000 tons of commodities transported on the river system, and in 1957 shipments in excess of 12 million tons were moved on the river, representing a saving in transportation costs of more than \$21 million for that year.

WATER FOR TRANSPORTATION AND INDUSTRY

The excellent economic conditions prevalent in the Tennessee River Basin are directly attributed to the ample water and power available for transporting, processing, and manufacturing which has lured industry to that area. The resulting growth and improved economy here is in sharp contrast to that in areas not possessing improved navigable waterways.

For many years the Tennessee River has been developed for navigation, hydro-electric power, flood control, soil conservation, and other water resource programs. The entire system has a total of 31 major dams (the majority of these are multiple-purpose) and in addition has seven large steam plants producing electricity.

The Warrior-Tombigbee River is one of the oldest Federal navigation projects in the United States, the original system of locks and dams having been completed in 1915. A modernization program which has been underway for the past several years has replaced some of the old locks and dams with high dams and modern locks. The Corps of Engineers' program is well under way with two new locks and dams having been completed, a third now in its third year of construction, and recently a fourth dam was approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

FAST STEPUP IN TRANSPORTATION TONNAGE

Records indicate that the first year following improvement of this river for navigation a total of only 407,245 tons were transported, whereas today the river system is handling approximately 5 million tons of various commodities annually. Indications are that tonnage on this system will continue to mount as it serves not only the industrial center of Alabama, namely, Birmingham, but numerous other towns along its course which are rapidly forging to the front industrially.

The Intracoastal Canal has for many years been operated by the Federal Government and is of untold value to the economy of the State of Alabama and especially to the southwest or Mobile area. Mobile has more than doubled its population within a period of 20 years and its rapid growth has been attributed to improvement of the waterways along the coast, Mobile Harbor, and improvement of the State docks. This area has come to be known as an industrial empire and the majority of the industry has located in the area within the past two decades. It is evident that the Mobile area will continue to grow more rapidly than other sections of the State because of its accessibility to ample water for all purposes.

The Corps of Engineers are now improving the Chattahoochee River, having completed the Jim Woodruff multiple-purpose dam near Chattahoochee, Fla., in 1957, and are now in the process of constructing the Walter F. George multiple-purpose dam at Fort Gaines and the Columbia lock and dam at Columbia. It is assumed that Congress will continue to make appropriations to complete these dams and their completion will provide navigation from the Gulf of Mexico to Phenix City, Ala., and Columbus, Ga. Development of this river system will provide greater economic

benefits to the southeastern area of Alabama, southwestern Georgia, and northern Florida. Indications are that commerce has already been stimulated by the improvement of this waterway and the economic growth of the area is certain to follow completion of the projects now under construction.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS VOTES FUNDS

The 85th Congress appropriated sufficient funds for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a traffic survey of the Choctawhatchee-Pea River system to determine the feasibility of navigation on these rivers. The citizens of this area have been exceedingly enthusiastic in their requests to the Corps of Engineers and Congress for improvement of this waterway. Again it can be stated that the entire area will prosper from the improvement of this waterway if it is found to be economically justified.

The proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal was authorized by Congress several years ago, however to date no improvements on this proposed waterway have been initiated. The Corps of Engineers has recently completed a study to determine the continuing economic feasibility of this proposed connection of the Tennessee River with the Tombigbee at Demopolis, Ala. The Engineers have not released the report to date, consequently it is not known whether or not the project will be economically justified. In the event the feasibility of this connecting water link is established, it will make accessible the north, midwest, and east, save approximately 700 miles of water transportation, provide markets for the South's many products, and reflect considerable savings in transportation costs on grains and other products from the North and Midwest. While navigation is available from Demopolis to Mobile, three additional counties in Alabama would be served by this connecting waterway and, of course, these counties would greatly benefit from the improvement.

IMPROVEMENT OF COOSA-ALABAMA NEEDED

The largest unimproved and longest river system in the State of Alabama is only partially developed and this development has been accomplished by private capital. The Coosa-Alabama River System is the second largest in the southeastern region and is only exceeded in size by the Tennessee River. This waterway traverses the State from the southwest to the northeast, a distance of approximately 600 river miles. The commercial tributary area comprises approximately 26,000 square miles in the States of Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee. There are 29 counties within the State of Alabama wholly or partially within the drainage area of this river system, more than one-third of the entire area of the State is within its basin, and it contains a population of approximately 1 million. For many years the upper section of the river has produced hydroelectric power at the three dams constructed by the Alabama Power Co. more than 30 years ago. You will recall that Congress authorized the issuance of a license to the power company to construct four additional hydroelectric power dams on the Coosa River and the first of these namely, Weiss Dam, is now under construction. When these dams are completed they will double the capacity of electric output for the river system.

The Coosa-Alabama River System was authorized by Congress in 1945 and additional studies have been made since that time, the most recent one being completed last year by the Corps of Engineers. This report definitely indicates the continuing economic feasibility of the entire river system for navigation. Plans for development of this river system consist of two multiple-purpose dams and one navigation dam on the Alabama River and installation of locks in the three dams already constructed on the Coosa

and the four dams to be constructed by the power company.

RIVER NEEDS FIT INTO EXECUTIVE POLICY

The river system is unique in that it complies with the present administration's policy and was brought to the attention of Congress by the President of the United States on January 6, 1955, and I quote from his state of the Union message as follows: "At the foundation of our economic growth are the raw materials and energy produced from our minerals and fuels, lands and forests, and water resources. With respect to them, I believe that the Nation must adhere to three fundamental policies: first, to develop, wisely use, and to conserve basic resources from generation to generation; second, to follow the historic pattern of developing these resources primarily by private citizens under fair provisions of law, including restraints for proper conservation; and third, to treat resource development as a partnership undertaking—a partnership in which the participation of private citizens and State and local governments is as necessary as is Federal participation."

"The Federal Government and local and private organizations have been encouraged to coordinate their developments. This is very important because Federal hydroelectric developments supply but a very small fraction of the Nation's power needs. Such partnership projects as Priest Rapids in Washington, the Coosa River development in Alabama, the Markham Ferry in Oklahoma already have the approval of this Congress. This year justifiable projects of a similar nature will again have administration support."

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR WATERWAYS DEVELOPMENT

Traditionally through the years it has been the responsibility of the Federal Government to improve waterways throughout the Nation for navigation and other purposes as the founding fathers of this Government stated in effect that the inland waterways of the Nation would always be free for transportation of commerce.

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to construct the projects as authorized by the Congress and in accordance with the established plans of the Corps of Engineers. Local participation in certain improvements is already underway and it is now time for Congress to expedite construction of the locks and dams on the rivers that have been determined economically feasible.

Complete development of these rivers will ultimately mean more to the cities and towns of Alabama than any other single natural resource.

We urge your continued efforts to secure funds to expedite construction of these projects in order that the entire State of Alabama may reap the abundant economic benefits that are rightfully hers.

Good Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the spenders are now engaged in a fantastic effort to convince the Nation that black is, after all, really white; that evil is composed largely of good, and that a balanced budget is, after all, only the last refuge of scoundrels.

These attacks on the idea of a balanced budget are nothing less than attacks on the idea of responsibility itself. They are, to me at least, incredible. I cannot believe that the American people, with their instinctive distaste for the welsher, will succumb to the argument that our national strength lies in the permanent refusal of Congress to pay for what it proposes to spend.

Yet, as the President has asked, if we cannot live within our means in these prosperous times, when are we going to do it? As the editorial from the Washington Star which I include as part of my remarks points out, if we do not have a balanced budget in 1960, we will never have one. We will have adopted perpetual deficits as a national policy and inflation as a national way of life and the outcome of that fatal decision can only be national weakness and ruin.

GOOD QUESTION

President Eisenhower answered a question with another question at his news conference yesterday. Queried about his repeated insistence that the Federal budget for fiscal 1960 should be balanced, the President replied: If we cannot live within our means as prosperity is growing and developing, when are we going to do it?

This is, perhaps, a distressingly old-fashioned sort of attitude and quite out of keeping with some of the fuzzy-headed theories of today that only budgets written in red ink are worthy of forward-looking governments. Of course those who are walling loudest in protest against a balanced budget today would wall even louder, if possible, in a time of depression. And it is a matter of record, as the President pointed out, that no "fetish" was made during the sharp 1957-58 recession of trying to maintain a balanced budget in a period when emergency Government aid helped turn the tide to recovery. But the economic indexes show that this recovery has been steady and substantial since last spring.

There must be others who share with Mr. Eisenhower his wonder at the fact that "suddenly a balanced budget is getting to be a bad word," and his belief that "it is rather a good thing to be a bit frugal and say that we can live within our income." Our answer to the President's question is that if we do not do it in a time of developing prosperity, we will not do it ever. And if we do not, then we can set our sights on disaster—rather than progress or security.

A Triumph of Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to join with the friends and admirers of John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, in wishing for him a speedy recovery. While I may not have always agreed with Secretary Dulles, I have respected his devotion to duty, in a most exacting job, on behalf of the people of the United States. He has truly been a Rock of Gibraltar in his dealings with Communist Russia and, in

these times of crisis, Berlin, his advice and guidance is essential in steering our future course.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial by David Lawrence which appears in the February 27, 1959, issue of the U.S. News & World Report.

The editorial follows:

A TRIUMPH OF CHARACTER

(By David Lawrence)

They ridiculed his phrases—but now they are singing his praises.

Why is there today wide acclaim for John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, when only yesterday there was such bitter criticism? Americans have been told repeatedly by Democratic Party spokesmen for the last 2 or 3 years that the United States has "no friends in Europe," that our allies have been "alienated," that the administration really has had "no foreign policy," and that Mr. Dulles is to blame.

Still more recently, certain Members of Congress made the headlines by crying out that our policy is "inflexible," that Mr. Dulles is "too rigid," and that we should get off "dead center."

The Kremlin, of course, has long been saying through its propaganda—over the radio and to newsmen through Soviet Ambassadors everywhere—that the main obstacle to the ending of the "cold war" is John Foster Dulles. If only he could be removed as Secretary of State, the Communists have said openly, everything would be rosy.

Plainly the Soviets do not like Mr. Dulles because he will not appease, he will not surrender, and he will not barter away the basic principles of international morality for the sake of expediency.

Events have proved Mr. Dulles was right in his stoical resistance to the insidious propaganda of those who sought peace at any price. That's why there has come, at last, a true appreciation of his services, just as he faces the tragic months ahead in fighting cancer.

There have been some occasions when Mr. Dulles has incurred the displeasure of our allies, especially in his stern stand against a punitive war over Suez. But what has happened since proves he was right.

Time and again Mr. Dulles has been assailed for views which were deliberately distorted in the press of the world. Even today, some critics still say he was wrong in espousing the cause of liberation for the peoples of the captive states of Eastern Europe. His plea for liberation was twisted to mean a threat to use military force.

The critics did not—or would not—perceive that moral force has always been the principal weapon in the arsenal of John Foster Dulles.

The Secretary is, however, no pacifist. His phrase "massive retaliation" has stood the test of time—the concept has proved a powerful deterrent of war. He has always been ready, as he once acknowledged, to go to "the brink of war" to show the sincerity of American purpose and a willingness to make every sacrifice for principle. The critics derided this as "brinkmanship," but they witnessed a successful manifestation of it recently in our decision to protect Quemoy and Matsu if it appeared that any military measures taken there by the Red Chinese were to be the forerunner of an invasion of Formosa itself.

Although Congress, by joint resolution in 1955, had given the President full power to deploy our military forces in defense of Formosa, there emerged in recent months some faint-hearted men in Congress and elsewhere who exhibited peace at any price weaknesses. They were inclined to a deal whereby Red China would be taken into the bosom of the free nations of the world and we would let bygones be bygones. But Mr. Dulles never forgot the sacrifices made by American

boys in Korea—the many who died or suffered grievous wounds to repel the attack of the Communist Chinese, aided openly, as they were, by the Soviets. He could see no reason to reward an aggressor.

In its latest threat, the Kremlin startled the world by trying to detach Berlin from West Germany. The Moscow Government thought the time had come to test out the strength and determination of the West. This was promptly countered by the conference of Secretary Dulles with the heads of the British, French, and West German Governments. Though suffering excruciating pain physically, Mr. Dulles, undaunted, continued to perform his great mission. He was able to bind together the members of the Western alliance. A demonstration of allied unity has in itself proved to be one of the best ways to prevent the Soviets from assuming that the West is weakening. A miscalculation on that point by Moscow could plunge us into war.

John Foster Dulles has steadfastly adhered to principle. He has tenaciously maintained the ideals of free peoples everywhere. He has refused to be bullied by the Communists abroad or disheartened by the snipings of the partisans at home. He has fought for the best interests of the United States just as bravely as if he were a soldier facing the fire of the enemy. The world has indeed witnessed in his skillful conduct of American policy a heroism which will be engraved on the pages of history.

While the years of life itself are numbered, the years of a man's fame are unnumbered. In the career of John Foster Dulles, we see a triumph of courage, a triumph of unselfish devotion to public service, and, above all, a triumph of character.

Senator Hayden Views the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from my State, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, last week began his 48th consecutive year of service in the Congress, a record unequalled by any person since the founding of our Republic. In addition, since March 4, 1927, Senator Hayden has been a member of the Appropriations Committee of the other body, and thus has participated in the preparation of more appropriations than any other Member of the Congress.

In my opinion, Senator HAYDEN's wide experience as a legislator and the deep insight he has acquired over the years into fiscal matters makes his views unusually valuable in analyzing the present budget pending before the Congress. Last week there appeared in some Arizona newspapers a statement by the Senator regarding the controversy over Federal fiscal policies. Mr. Speaker, I believe Senator HAYDEN's perspective on the budget will be of interest to many of our colleagues, and consequently I am inserting the full text of his statement below:

I can think of no better way to begin a prompt response to your letter of January 29, and the attached editorial than to ask you to look over the enclosed copy of The Federal Budget in Brief for the fiscal year

beginning on the first of next July, which is just off the press. The details set forth in the pamphlet should be helpful to you in appraising the financial problem with which the Congress is faced.

At page 18 is a breakdown of the \$45,805 million for the costs of major national security which requires 59.5 cents out of the taxpayer's dollar. Paying for the cost of past wars by benefits to veterans, p. 30, and interest on the public debt, p. 32, requires an additional 17.1 cents or a total of over 76 cents of high priority demands against his dollar. Add to that about 5.4 cents for welfare costs, p. 26, and 2.2 cents to maintain the general Government, p. 34, where there is no prospect of reduction, leaves a margin of 16 cents out of which, with difficulty, some cuts could be made.

Only a small part of the \$45 billion requested by the President for national security would be required if we could live our own lives in our own way without regard to what is being done in the rest of the world. But to do so we would have to ignore completely the fact that Russian controlled communism is an actual menace which must be met by the free world being prepared to either win a war against it or by being so strong that the dictators in Moscow will be afraid to start a war.

So much has happened in the meantime that there is no possible way to get government back where it was intended to be—in 1776. We now live in a nation where many men, from the Revolution to this day, have been perfectly willing to give up their lives ahead of time to make our Nation free and to keep it free. That very freedom has made it possible to create such favorable living conditions that the average American can now expect to live 20 years longer than he could hope to do when I was born some 80 years ago. That there is an ever increasing number of older people who are no longer capable of supporting themselves is a fact from which we cannot escape. The present social security system and the other welfare activities undoubtedly have their defects, for which time and experience will find a remedy; but something very much like them just has to be in existence, and Congress will do well to hold what they will continue to cost close to 5 cents out of the taxpayer's dollar.

The objective of all Federal aid for the construction of highways is to make it possible to move people and things from where they are to where they are needed in the least time and at the least cost. It is a capital investment which is certain to pay good dividends. To supply the money required to build the needed highways, Congress has provided that the receipts from the Federal excise taxes on gasoline, motor oil, automobiles and accessories shall be deposited in a trust fund in the Treasury, to be available only for the construction and improvement of highways. Since the highway users rather than the general taxpayers pay their costs, highway funds are not included in the Budget.

The tabulation on page 58 of the Budget pamphlet shows that during the New Deal from 1933 to 1940 the public debt was increased by \$20,429 million. From 1941 to 1946, the World War II period, the public debt mounted rapidly from \$48,961 million to a peak of \$269,422 million. The Budget was balanced in 1947 and 1948 with resulting debt reductions, but the costs of the fighting in Korea again caused deficits and there were no payments on the national debt until 1956 and 1957. Expenditures due to the cold war are the primary cause of the existing deficit.

I point out these figures to indicate the situation with which the Congress is faced. The one sure way to balance the budget is to increase the rates of Federal taxation, but nobody wants to pay more taxes. The Constitution provides that all revenue legisla-

tion originate in the House of Representatives. The indications are that the Committee on Ways and Means, which reports revenue bills to that body, will not do more than recommend the enactment of legislation designed to plug loopholes in the existing tax laws which may possibly produce about a billion dollars in additional revenue. That sum will not go very far in taking care of an estimated deficit which could amount to over \$10 billion if business conditions do not improve as the President has predicted that they will. We can all join in the hope that he has made a good guess.

Except in time of war, Congress has never, during my service as a member of the Appropriations Committee, granted to any President as much money as he asked for in his annual Budget estimates. At the last session of Congress the appropriations were \$600 million less than the Budget requests.

Puerto Rico Is Like Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Ruth Gruber which recently appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. Miss Gruber directs attention to the many similarities between the problems of Puerto Rico and those of the State of Israel:

PUERTO RICO IS LIKE ISRAEL

(By Ruth Gruber)

Puerto Rico and Israel are startlingly alike. Both are new democracies on old soil.

Both are pulling themselves up by the bootstraps with the same dynamic and creative spirit. Both countries, still underdeveloped lands, have begun their own point 4 programs to teach other underdeveloped lands the exciting things that each has learned through 10 years of trial and error.

Both have strong ties to the United States, and stronger and more emotional ties to the people of New York than to any other city in the world.

Each country is led by a man who is a dreamer, an idealist, a statesman, and a shrewd hardheaded politician who controls his party completely.

Luis Munoz-Marin, now 60, the chief architect of Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap, became the island's first elected Governor in 1948. David Ben-Gurion, now 72, the chief architect in the re-creation of Israel, became Israel's first Prime Minister in the same year.

Both are strong men in a hurry. Both are philosophers who need constantly to withdraw from the madding crowd to find themselves again, to think, to be purified and regenerated. Ben-Gurion goes to the desert; Munoz goes to the mountains.

Both are prophetic men, poets deeply concerned with ideas and words. Ben-Gurion at 60 was studying Greek to read the classics, and at 70 was studying Spanish to read Cervantes. "To read the classics in translation," he once told me, quoting the Hebrew poet Blauk, "is like kissing a woman through a veil."

Munoz, as a young man, left his native Puerto Rico to live a Bohemian life in Greenwich Village as a freelance writer.

Both want to lead a society based not on materialism but on creativity and a better life.

The Puerto Ricans have risen from anguish and misery with a threefold bill of rights dreamed up by Munoz and carried through like the stages of a battle. In the forties, he created Operation Bootstrap, which established new industries, health centers, schools; he led the people up the long road out of poverty, sickness, and despair. In 1952 came Operation Commonwealth. Puerto Rico became a strong democracy within the American Union, the most creative political system of our time. Now Munoz is working on Operation Serenity.

Sitting on the terrace of his mountaintop retreat in Jajome Alto recently, I asked Munoz to tell me about Operation Serenity. He leaned back in his chair. The green fertile land dropped almost perpendicular below us. The sun was setting behind dark mountainous clouds.

"OUR PEOPLE FEEL PROUD"

"Operation Serenity," he said, "is mostly an affirmation of purpose—of not letting our civilization be blinded by economics as an end in itself. To create more personal freedom, deeper, better education—to make it possible for every citizen to have the chance to be just as good as God meant him to be."

"Its essential meaning," he said, "is that through political consciousness and education, the people will realize that the economic effort is a servant of the spiritual purpose, not an end in itself."

"Its practical implications, when it begins to get into policymaking, is the policy of decentralizing cities through zoning and green belts, so that our cities don't grow too monstrous. It is the decentralization of the whole island, placing the new factories in smaller towns."

"You can see Operation Serenity," he said, "in the whole change that has taken place in our country, materially and spiritually. Spiritual energies, creative powers have been released. After 450 years of colonialism, our people no longer feel ashamed. They feel proud."

Last year two and a half new industries opened every week on the island. More jobs were created. More Puerto Ricans stayed in Puerto Rico to live the good life.

Operation Serenity, though less tangible than Bootstrap and Commonwealth, gives deeper meaning to them both.

"You can see Operation Serenity," he said, "in the Puerto Rican who migrates. He carries it with him. You see it in the Casals Festival. You see it in the faces of our people here. In 1940, 35 percent of the families of Puerto Rico had an income for a whole family of \$200 to \$300 a year. That's terrific poverty. Now about 3 percent of the population, instead of 35 percent, are down to \$300 per family. You still have pockets of extreme poverty, but they are being reduced all the time. We have a growing middle class. Our per capita income is growing all the time. We don't have great wealth but we don't have extreme poverty either."

The miracle of Israel's rebirth and of Puerto Rico's regeneration have brushed off on the rest of the world. Robust children whose modern history is less than 10 years old, they have both become teachers as well as students under their own point 4 programs.

Burma and Ghana have now turned to Israel for technical aid. People from 107 lands have come to Puerto Rico to learn of the three operations. Puerto Ricans have been invited to most of the underdeveloped countries of the world to teach them Operation Bootstrap and Operation Commonwealth, and ultimately Operation Serenity.

Puerto Rico and Israel are showing what small nations can do for each other, teaching other small powers what they have learned in housing, health, sanitation, agriculture, and in building a decent life for the people. Their contribution is more, too—it

is the fearlessness of their spirit and the joyousness of their youth.

Each year Puerto Rico receives more than a thousand official visitors who come under the U.S. International Cooperation Administration which has succeeded point 4. Some come as representatives of the United Nations or the Organization of American States. Others are students on scholarships given by the Puerto Rican Department of State. These people care little about propaganda from the United States. They want to learn about Puerto Rico for the benefit of their own people in their own lands.

THEY CAN SWAP KNOW-HOW

The two countries have much to learn from each other. In agriculture, Israel has taken giant steps. Israel was a desert which the Jews are turning fantastically green. Puerto Rico could learn from Israel the art of large-scale industrial farming. True in the west and on the coastal plains, Puerto Rico is doing some good mechanized farming. But in the mountains and the valleys of the interior, Puerto Rico's farmers are still farming like sharecroppers, and some of them are still peons on the land.

In industry, Puerto Rico has taken the giant steps, while Israel's industries have not kept pace with her agriculture. Puerto Rico's gross national income, since she has begun attracting industries from the States, is now over \$50 million a year. Israel could learn much too from the island's self-help program, low-cost public housing, slum clearance, and the inspired program of \$300 co-operatively built houses.

It is in the problem of migration that the two countries are completely dissimilar. Israel has two million people, Puerto Rico has 2,300,000. But Israel is a land of immigration, Puerto Rico is a land of emigration. The solution to Israel's problem of defense, of security, of making the desert bloom again, lies in the people. Israel needs people and the people need the land. Puerto Rico still cannot feed all its people, whose death rate keeps falling, and whose life expectancy is now 68 years.

There are ties in New York to both Puerto Rico and Israel, ties of friendship, ties of religion, ties of family, and friends. But Israel has created a reservoir of good will in New York, while Puerto Rico remains little known and vastly misunderstood.

Daniel A. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 22, final respects were paid to our late colleague Daniel A. Reed at Dunkirk, N.Y.

On February 21 there appeared in the Dunkirk Evening Observer an editorial which I know all of his colleagues will want to read. It is a wonderful tribute to a great man.

GREAT IN DEED, BELOVED IN OUR HEARTS

Men die, and if they were great enough, an epoch dies with them.

Was Daniel Alden Reed of that stature? The four decades and more in which Dunkirk's first citizen served the nation as one of the most revered and respected men in the Congress bridge the gap from old concepts of America to new; from Victorian attitudes to these modern times; from the

horse and buggy to the space age; from the days when the young giant which was America had not yet flexed his muscles, until today this, our country, is the world's greatest power.

From the days of the First World War, through the greatest and most grievous of depressions, in another great war, in times of perilous peace, in all the days of Hitler and Mussolini and Lenin and Trotsky and Churchill and Stalin, in the time of Franco and Chamberlain, of Roosevelt, of Hoover, of Coolidge, of Wilson, of Harding, of Truman and of Eisenhower—through all these days Dan Reed was on the stage if not in the precise center. In the grave issues which involved these historic figures and their dramatic times, Dan Reed had to form his judgments and make his decisions.

In four decades Daniel A. Reed as your Representative in your Congress made historic voting decisions in your behalf. He was under your guidance even as he guided and led you. Your grandfather, perhaps your great-grandfather, voted for or against Dan Reed in his long span of service. Perhaps you agreed with him always; perhaps never, perhaps on some occasions, not on others, but you always knew you were represented by an honest, conscientious, utterly sincere, well-informed and completely courageous man. You might or might not agree but you could always be proud of the man who represented you, proud of his appearance, his integrity and his intellectual capacity. He could defy Presidents when he believed they were in error.

As history unfolds it will be shown that Dan Reed, as a legislator, made some errors, but we think on balance it will be clear that his judgment was right far more often than it was wrong, that his ideas were clear cut, direct and followed a pattern of the oldtime and deeply respected virtues which characterized his country and his countrymen. Conservative? Indeed, yes, but not to the point of obstructionism. Progressive? Yes, but not to the point of radicalism. He could countenance change, and sought it, but he believed that a mighty country need not move on impulse or whim, or be guided by illogical theory. He sought the sound course to a sound destiny. The Nation did not always follow the course which Dan Reed might have charted but it kept closer to it through the vigor of his labors, the persuasive force of his eloquence and his prodigious influence among the colleagues who respected his sincerity and loved him for the sterling qualities of his character.

Dan Reed was in the Congress for a period which embraced virtually one-fourth of the life of the Republic. His life span covered one-half of all the years since this Nation was founded. His public service career, in one form or another, covered well over half a century. In his earlier years he preached civic rectitude in cities from coast to coast. He organized the instruments which guided the growth and development of hundreds of cities. He could move men to a better concept of their civic responsibilities and inspire a spirit of nobler, more unselfish public service. His influence, nationwide, was immeasurably extensive, and always for good. It is doubtful if his hometown or home district audiences have much knowledge or appreciation of the thousands of citizens who were inspired to better citizenship by the towering, almost majestic speaker who preached a lofty doctrine of community service. He believed and put into practice every word he preached.

Reed's great theme in the days of his civic campaigning was the Athenian oath. He inspired hundreds to the grand ideal of transmitting their cities, not only not less, but greater, better, and more beautiful, than they were transmitted to them.

It is not possible to do justice to so distinguished a career in one column, or two, or

a hundred. Nor are the paltry words lesser men may write adequate to the task.

Mr. Reed achieved a great age. Only a few, a very few, men now surviving were witness to all the years of his many-faceted career. The aged, stalwart oak may fall but the forest remains. Other branches extend to continue the serenity and protection of the soft shadows. Life goes on and there are no records to tell in adequate fashion the long and beautiful story of what the mighty tree has seen in its day and the service so freely given to those who walked beneath its spreading leaves.

The cold summary which might be written in the record can reveal so little of the real warmth of the life story. For as the mighty oak was the stalwart of the forest, Dan Reed was the stalwart among men. He was a great legislator in the service of all, both a leader and a servant of men. His capacity to serve either as a powerful representative in your business with your government, or as a neighbor, was never withheld. His obligation to his fellows was never evaded. He was never too busy for a friendly greeting, an interested inquiry, a letter of introduction, the adjustment of a pension, a personal contribution, or intercession with a government department in your behalf.

What manner of man was Reed? The word great is a relative term, sometimes loosely and cheaply used. Could you find 200 or 300 men in all the history of your country who played so long and so useful a part in its political guidance? Probably not, and so you will have to conclude that Dan Reed's name belongs in that little list of the outstanding men of the generations. This district will not find his like soon, for even if we be served by approximate capabilities it will take long years to match the experience.

How did Reed rate with all men? No one can say, but to many of us who have known and watched him through the years he was a beloved friend, an inspiring leader, and a splendid example of the sincerity, the decency, the courage, and the intellect we have a right to expect of all men in public life but so rarely get in such rich abundance.

Great men, good men, prominent men, useful men die from time to time and the Nation pauses for mourning in the formal use of the term.

But the mourning becomes personal when the great, the good, the prominent and the useful was also a beloved friend. Great in the records, beloved in the hearts of so many, and in that respect there is no replacement for Dan Reed.

For Limited Warfare, Strong Marine Corps Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that a recent editorial, entitled "For Limited Warfare, Strong Marine Corps Vital," from the February 11, 1959, issue of the San Diego Union, be inserted in the RECORD.

The article, reasoned and thoughtful in tone, mirrors the growing anxiety of millions of citizens as they observe the current severe cut in combat-ready Marine Corps units.

We all recognize the difficult problem which faces our country in providing

an adequate defense structure in these times. Certainly the decisions as to where our available resources may be most effectively applied are not easy ones to make.

Yet I would be remiss if I did not say that the deep cuts in ready Marine forces are causing grave concern. Certainly, in the atmosphere of these times and in light of the known Communist record of constant pressure, incursions, and criminal adventure, a ready, fighting service such as the Marine Corps should be the very last to suffer cuts in combat units.

The combat units of this famed corps have demonstrated time and again in recent years the highest order of combat readiness, flexibility, and ability to be on the spot in time to stabilize a dangerous situation—prevent a minor conflagration from literally mushrooming into total disaster.

The meaning of these oft-demonstrated capabilities has not been lost on the vast majority of thinking citizens. None of us need be deep students of international relations or high-level strategy to look about us and see no relaxation in the world struggle between East and West. None of us need be military experts to note that time and again we have been forced to move, not with atom-tipped missiles or intercontinental heavy bombers, but with the very type of versatile Marine combat units now being lost to us through deactivation.

It is my sincere hope that just such public expressions of anxiety as are contained in this editorial from the San Diego Union will alert Congress to the prudent need for renewed attention to this serious weakening of our national ability to cope with the ever-present threat of limited war.

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 11, 1959]
FOR LIMITED WARFARE—STRONG MARINE CORPS
VITAL

The Marine Corps is going up against the political gun. More than a third of its fighting strength is due to be cut off in order to reach manpower reductions.

This famed fighting force, the epitome of courage and loyalty, is being reduced from 200,000 to 175,000 men while at the same time the need for a military organization of this type and training is rising with the growing possibilities of future limited wars.

This seems a strange anomaly but that is often the way of government and politics. The American people perhaps may want to have something to say about their Marine Corps.

Public Law 416 specifies 3 Marine divisions, 3 air wings, and support troops. Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, commandant of the Marine Corps, told Congress that in order to reach the required end-strength of 175,000 Marines by June 30 the Marines are being forced to deactivate 2 battalions in each of the 3 divisions, and to delete 6 aircraft squadrons and 100 other aircraft from its 3 aircraft wings.

This, presumably, is a way around the requirements of the law, and also, as General Pate testified, will enable the remaining battalions to be kept at combat strength. Experience in Lebanon and the Far East proved the fallacy, he said, of maintaining units below combat strength.

What has happened to the Marines?

Budget considerations, of course, always dictate the size of military establishments,

But that is in overall strength of a country's defense. The suspicions arise that the Marine Corps is being asked by the Pentagon to surrender some of its fighting role on behalf of the Army—to keep the Army in business, as it were. Too, the drive of the Democrats in Congress to increase domestic vote-getting spending will take more and more money that could go to beefing up the military services. There are just so many tax dollars.

The role of the Marines today is as important, or more important, than at any time in our history. A growing nuclear stalemate increases the possibility of more actions as around Formosa, in Lebanon and perhaps Berlin.

The Marines should be the first to go in. And they should always be ready. The cuts will make it difficult, if not impossible, to keep the Marines a sufficiently large and powerful enough combat force to blunt or counter such major moves of the enemy, or beat him to the first punch.

The Marines may be reduced to a police force, instead of a fighting force.

America never more needed a Navy-Marine team than it does today. This country must be able to reach across the seas, not only with missiles, but with guns, tanks and planes, and men.

You have to apply force, or a threat of force, of the type needed where it is needed—at the moment it is needed. No fighting team can do this better than the U.S. Navy and the Marine Corps. Why dull the spear of our ready power?

Memo From Havana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Look magazine was one of the first publications in the United States to take seriously the Castro rebellion in Cuba. A year ago, this publication anticipated the downfall of the Batista dictatorship.

A few weeks ago Mr. William Attwood, the foreign editor of Look, went to Cuba to learn firsthand the temper and reaction of the people. His report, to be found in last week's issue of Look magazine, is worthy of the most serious consideration and it is for that reason that I insert it in the Record:

INSIDE CUBA'S REVOLUTION

(By William Attwood)

HAVANA, CUBA.—Not many Americans gave Cuba's Fidel Castro much of a chance when Look reported on his rebel movement a year ago (Look, Feb. 4, 1958). He was a Robin Hood figure in the hills—a screwball to some, a bearded bandit to others, a dead man according to one U.S. news agency. Now, he's Mr. Cuba—a winner. But he's still controversial. So I came down here to have a new look at a story that has been making headlines all winter.

Havana has become a gay and relaxed city. The gaudy cruise ship Havana is dead: the tourist brothels empty, the luxury hotels in trouble, the gambling hotels shut down. But the Cuban Havana is joyful. People are no longer afraid. The press, muzzled for so long, is free. I saw Castro's bearded, gun-toting partisans swarm through the streets and hotel lobbies looking like brigands and

acting like Boy Scouts. (You couldn't buy one a meal or a drink: "Thank you, but Fidel said no.") There were no cops, but traffic moved and crime was hard to find—perhaps, as someone said, because all the crooks were in Batista's police force.

This was a clean and disciplined revolution. In the words of a longtime Cuban friend, "It was an uprising of decent people against indecency." And for some reason, we wound up on the wrong side.

That is what makes it embarrassing to be an American in Havana these days. As a reporter, you are made welcome everywhere. People are eager to talk to you. At demonstrations, they make room for you—"so that you can see the truth and write about it." But they are hurt and angry, and full of questions: Why did you support Batista so long? Why did you send him military missions? Why do you criticize the executions? Why are you against us?

Some of their questions are hard to answer, especially after you have been here a few days, talking to people you know and trust, getting an idea of what was and has been going on: As a reporter for 20 years in a lot of countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain, I am satisfied that seldom did a regime so deserve to be overthrown as Batista's, and seldom did men—if they can be so called—more richly deserve execution than the thugs who carried out his orders. Yet Batista was our ally—a partner in "hemispheric defense."

This is the real story that has been inadequately reported in America. The few hundred executions of murderers (whose crimes were attested to) have been thoroughly reported because the press has been free to witness them. They made the headlines—as violence seen always does. And they provoked pious indignation among many Americans who didn't know or didn't stop to think of what had gone on before.

The press was not invited to the torture chambers of Batista's police, where sadists were free to indulge in perversions that cannot be printed here. Disgusting things were done to certain parts of people's bodies, things were done to prisoners' wives in front of their husbands, things were done to children. Castro claims that 20,000 rebel sympathizers were murdered during Batista's rule. I checked this figure with the most conservative Cuban businessman I know. He said it was probably accurate, since he knew for a fact that, just since last April, people were being killed at the rate of 50 a day.

This was going on just 90 miles from Florida, behind the respectable facade of a government whose army we were training and (until last March) supplying with weapons. It happened while American tourists frolicked with Havana's B-girls, or crowded its casinos run mainly by American gangsters (who split their take with Batista). And nobody wondered aloud why the city was so full of cops or why the chief of police came to gamble with a retinue of gunmen.

Is it any wonder that every Cuban I talked to was hurt and angry? "If you had protested then," I was told, "we might not resent your criticism so much today." And I was often reminded that Americans who deplored the trials of Batista's henchmen did not denounce the Hungarian freedom fighters for lynching the Communist secret police.

As of now, Castro is to Cuba what de Gaulle was to France in 1944. He can do no wrong. Wherever he goes—and he was all over Havana, day and night, during my visit—he is surrounded by adoring crowds. When I accompanied him through a hotel lobby one evening, it took us an hour to reach the door. He listened to anyone with something to say, and answered anyone with a question to ask. He was exhausted, hoarse, but sustained by that secret source of energy without which no genuine political leader could long survive.

Technically, of course, Castro is not a political leader, but only chief of the revolutionary army. The government is in the hands of his civilian supporters. And as this long victory celebration subsides, new political parties will begin to take shape. The dominant group will be Castro's 26th of July movement, whose program will be modeled on that of Roosevelt's New Deal. An opposition will eventually emerge, also democratic and anti-Batista, but built around elements of the Auténtico Party. Also among the opposition groups will be the Communists, now vainly trying to get aboard the Castro bandwagon; active mainly in Havana, they will do their best to fan the embers of anti-Americanism. (Castro has no use for them, but will let them operate in the open.) Elections will be held within 2 years. Whether or not Castro runs for office, he now plans to keep control of the new army as a kind of watchdog to make sure the government doesn't betray the goals of the revolution—that is, social and economic reform and an end to graft and corruption.

WHO WILL RUN THE GOVERNMENT?

Luckily for the Cubans, theirs is a rich land. It exports more sugar than any country in the world, nearly \$700 million worth a year, a lot of money for a nation of 6 million. If the new government succeeds in diversifying and rationalizing the economy and eliminating graft in high places, there is no reason why Cuba won't be stable and prosperous as well as democratic. Tourism may decline if the casinos stay closed, but only the hotel owners (many of them American) seem to be really worried.

The one big problem is finding people to run the government. This was a revolution of young people like Castro (who is only 32), of farmers, doctors, country lawyers, small businessmen, teachers, and clergymen. Or as one Cuban told me, "The peasants, the Rotarians, and the Lions beat Batista. They wanted to clean up the mess in Cuba, but they don't want to run the place now that it's done. They want to go back to their farms and their jobs. I spoke to one top official, just 40 years old, who said that, under Batista, the job he now held was worth a fortune in graft; now, it is just hard work and he is anxious to go home to Santiago and run his business."

Cuba's new government needs our sympathy and help more than our hasty sermonizing about how to finish a revolution we had no part of. It needs to sell us more sugar. Our new career Ambassador, Phillip Bonsal, may be able to win back some of the respect for America that was lost by our last two politically appointed envoys. With the knowledge and approval of the State Department, their contact with Cubans was largely confined to the wealthy Batistas they associated with at the Havana Country Club.

The American business community is going to have to get used to dealing with officials who won't demand bribes in exchange for special favors, and with police officers who can't be put on company payrolls in case of labor troubles. For many, the Batista dictatorship represented a kind of stability. But as one businessman remarked, "The competition we'll get now will probably be good for everybody—and we'll save on kickbacks."

SOME LESSONS WE NEED TO LEARN

A visit to Havana these days reminds you that we Americans have other lessons to learn—lessons we should have learned long ago. The first is that we'll wind up on the losing side every time we back unpopular rulers. What happened in Venezuela and Iraq only recently should have taught us this much. Yet we kept three military missions in Cuba right up to the end. Can anyone explain to the taxpayers of the United States what useful purpose the missions were serving there? Did anyone seriously expect that Batista's army was being trained to repel a

Russian cossack charge on San Juan Hill? His troops couldn't even lick Castro, whose army was just 12 strong a couple of years ago.

You hear the argument that since we recognized Batista we had to be nice to him. But we weren't so squeamish about helping the Guatemalan rebels overthrow their pro-Communist dictatorship. And our envoys to other police states like Hungary don't pal around with the power elite there the way we did with the Batista crowd.

Another lesson to remember is that we can no longer take Latin America for granted. The stereotypes don't fit any more. The drowsy pechs and the quaint palace revolutions are things of the past. Cuba's popular uprising was a fight for all ideals we claim to stand for against the kind of tyranny that we oppose in the cold war. Yet the Communists, seeing that Castro was bound to win, tried to get in his corner to cheer him on while we stood pat with our protocol and military missions. We can thank our lucky stars that Castro was no Communist; the situation was made to order for them. But if this was going on in our front yard, it might be a good idea to start wondering about the Dominion Republic, Spain, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia and a few of the other police states we are hooked up with. In this troubled and revolutionary world, it's not farfetched to say that the outcome of the cold war depends on our learning the lessons of this Cuban revolution—and applying them in the future.

Finally, we need better reporting. And we'll get it if we care enough. But who cared about Cuba—even though we fought a war to free it from Spain? Only a handful of American publications bothered to send reporters to see Castro in the hills. The brutality and corruption of the Batista dictatorship were scarcely reported, while millions of American readers were treated to pro-Batista Sunday newspaper supplements, loaded with Cuban advertising. The Washington lobbyist and the three New York public-relations firms employed by Batista served him well; so did all the Cuban editors and journalists who concealed the real facts in exchange for his bribes or subsidies. The U.S. embassy may or may not have reported the facts to Washington; if it did, the reports were filed and locked up.

Anyway, we didn't care enough, and the result is that an American in Havana is embarrassed today. Batista has fled to Ciudad Trujillo with his loot, but he would have been gone sooner and many lives would have been saved if the Americans now carping at Castro had shown some indignation a few years back. One of these days, if we don't learn our lesson, a lot of people may change their minds about what we stand for. And if that ever happens, however big our misdeeds, we are in trouble.

Union Economic Researcher Calls U.S. Deficit Inflation Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a very thought-provoking article written by Mr. Solomon Barkin, director of research for the Textile Workers Union of America, which

appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on January 5, 1959:

UNION ECONOMIC RESEARCHER CALLS U.S. DEFICIT INFLATION THREAT

(NOTE.—Everyone has an idea on what to do about inflation. In several articles over the past few months, the Christian Science Monitor has presented many views and many facets of the problem. Today, one of labor's most thoughtful research specialists, Solomon Barkin, director of research for the Textile Workers Union of America, discusses the question as he sees it.)

(By Solomon Barkin)

NEW YORK.—The country now faces the paradox of threats of inflation at a time when the price level is stable. Farm prices are dropping sufficiently to offset increases in other sectors of the market. Industry has not yet initiated a general wave of price boosts which would send costs skyrocketing. It is waiting for business recovery to proceed far enough to permit it to apply higher prices without immediate adverse effects. The pressure for rising costs from these sources for the immediate future will be moderate. But the real menace will come from the inept financing of the funds needed to cover our huge Federal deficit.

Big business, the U.S. Treasury, the administration, and the Federal Reserve Board launched an anti-inflationary campaign in the early summer to scare the American people and to thwart labor negotiations in the automobile industry.

The Committee for Economic Development, a businessman's organization, had hardly distributed its report urging tax reductions to aid business recovery when, in late spring, it published its program for controlling inflation aimed at getting restrictive labor legislation.

The administration in mid-August announced a shift from antirecession to anti-inflation policies. The Federal Reserve Board also began increasing its margin requirements for stock purchases, raising its discount rates, and curbing credit in the commercial banking field.

STOCK PRICE RISE RECALLED

Then followed the investors' flight from the Government bond and mortgage markets into the stock market. Stock prices soared and interest rates moved up. The Government must now raise its needed funds at higher interest rates. Treasury spokesmen are plaintively seeking to quiet these inflationary fears and appeal to the patriotism of investors to buy Government issues. The President, as head of the Republican Party, also changed his tune and began stressing the stability of the dollar. It was only after the election that he returned to the theme of the damage wrought by inflation.

To cope with the problem of rising prices, the CED, business interests, and a few economists urged amending the Employment Act of 1946 to instruct the administration specifically to seek not only maximum employment, production, and purchasing power but also a stable price level.

Most American economists have avoided this position; they believe the present act sufficient and see no need for amendments. This goal has been the overriding objective of the present administration; it requires no additional legislative support.

A third group has maintained that at no time should maximum employment and production be sacrificed for purposes of maintaining a level statistical index of prices.

BOOMERANG HINTED

More serious than the above dispute on legislative purpose are the wide differences among business and labor spokesmen and academic economists on the program needed to keep a stable price structure. Business leaders and the administration appear intent

upon achieving this end through the use of indirect monetary controls such as are now possessed by the Federal Reserve Board; the imposition of shackles on trade unions; and the curtailment of Federal expenditures.

Besides being inadequate to stop the upward price movements, they may tend to boomerang—as the current speculation on the stock market suggests—and produce group and class conflicts. They will stop necessary public works and activities and nip business recovery in the bud.

Actually a program for stopping inflation must be broader in scope and rest on a new set of administrative concepts and procedures. Pressures which raise the cost of living come from various sources. The money and capital markets are only one such set of forces. If a price-stabilization program is to be undertaken, many different programs must be coordinated; no one control will do the job.

PRICE PRACTICES HIT

Attention should be first directed to the practices of the large business firms which dominate American industries. Their price practices have been inflationary. Increases in recent years have tended to widen their profit margins. The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, in reviewing the testimony on the price rises in the steel industry, concluded that "the price increases substantially exceeded the cost increases in 1957 and apparently also in 1958."

It found that the break-even point for the United States Steel Co. dropped to 32 percent of capacity, indicating that higher levels of production would bring huge profit bonanzas. Similar conclusions would be reached with respect to most other large industries.

The proposal has therefore been made that Congress empower the Federal Trade Commission or other appropriate agency to consider the breaking up of some large corporations and to review the propriety of price increases and later informing the American public as to their justification.

Much blame for the current price increases has been directed at trade unions. Actually, they represent a limited area of the American economy. Moreover, salary increases made since 1953 have tended to outdistance wage increases, and the former are not negotiated through collective bargaining.

LEVELS PROTESTED

While there are cases where a trade union drives a hard bargain, they are the result of bilateral agreements and not unilateral decisions as are "administered prices." If restraints are to be imposed, they should be placed on business to limit its willingness to grant wage increases. Wage raises have been moderate where profits are modest.

Trade unions have protested the rising price levels and have sought to induce management to restrain them. But employers have rebuffed union efforts to secure price reductions as they consider them to be beyond the union's province. In this state of affairs, unions have had no alternative but to protect their members against inflation.

Indicative of the degree to which prices have outdistanced the increase in unit labor costs is the fact that unit labor costs in the durable-goods industries increased by 15 percent between 1947 and 1957, while wholesale prices in the same period rose by 53 percent.

One way out of this dilemma is for management and trade union leaders to meet annually to discuss management price and production policies and levels of wage adjustment and seek to reach a consensus on economic policies prior to each annual cycle of negotiations.

SERVICE COSTS NOTED

A third important area is agricultural prices. It is not necessary to maintain inordinately high agricultural prices to protect farmers' income. A full-fledged pro-

gram of agricultural adjustment should be combined with one designed to raise incomes of low-income farmers and help redevelop distressed rural counties.

In the discussion of the rising cost of living, many have underscored the importance of the higher costs of services. People have accepted them as inevitable, failing to realize that they are as amenable to improvement in efficiency as are other industries. Moreover, the efficiency of the services must be advanced if the consumer's price level is to be controlled.

From June 1955 to June 1958 commodity prices rose by 7.1 percent, but service costs increased by 10.7 percent. Medical care costs alone soared 12.8 percent. Many people are now seeking to reorganize medical care to provide better care at a lower cost.

It has, therefore, been suggested that a national productivity center for the services be established to promote higher efficiency in the service areas. The Government proposed such agencies to other countries under its foreign-aid program; they should be equally applicable in the United States.

PROPOSALS OFFERED

There is widespread recognition that the authority of the Federal Reserve Board is inadequate to deal with the inflationary and speculative problems of our economy. Current procedures and policies often accelerate speculation and higher costs. A number of different proposals should be considered for this purpose.

One is to increase the Board's authority beyond the commercial banks to embrace the credit and investment policies of all financial institutions and nonfinancial businesses engaged in leading activities. Consumer credit should also be under its supervision.

Closer coordination should be established among the Federal monetary, fiscal, tax, and debt managing agencies.

Special lower interest rates should be provided for loans to small business groups and public agencies which suffer in periods of tight money controls.

Key materials such as steel should be allocated in expansionist boom periods.

A program for controlling inflation in the United States during periods of economic expansion cannot be built on current monetary controls, restricted Federal expenditures, or a program for weakening the trade union movement.

The major sources of inflation are speculation, excessive power in the hands of the big business firms, the failure to improve efficiency in the service industries, and the excessively high agricultural prices. Specialized controls directed at these areas would help stabilize the price level.

Military Pension Law Discriminates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bloomington (Ill.) Pantagraph of February 19, 1959:

MILITARY PENSION LAW DISCRIMINATES

When Congress passed the military pay bill in 1958 it broke a 100-year tradition which has kept pay of retired military personnel tied in with active-duty pay. They

went up together and by like percentages. This bill provided that members of the armed services who retired prior to the passage of the bill would get a flat 8-percent increase in retirement pay. Those who retire after passage of the bill get much higher retirement pay.

This was done despite the recommendations of such reports as that of the Cordier Committee, which said:

"Military retirement and its firm tie-in with active-duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system. It represents a qualified equity of specific dollar value and is, in fact, the principal traditional benefit available to military personnel."

"The Committee has, therefore, concluded that the incentive value of its existing military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active-duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted by the Congress and the American people * * *"

The principle that retirement pay, once earned, will continue to be at the established percentages of active pay helps to attract men to military careers.

The bill passed last year and now in effect departs from this principle. It creates two classes of retired military personnel. Included in the inferior group are men who fought in three wars. Their sin is having been old enough to retire prior to passage of the pay bill last year.

The bill would at least have been consistent if it had made the break in this traditional policy apply to all retired personnel. But it applies only to those who had retired before its passage.

This is unfair discrimination and should be corrected. Some 31 Senators and 25 Representatives have opened a campaign to correct this defect by restoring the traditional relationship between pay of active officers and military pensions.

This correction would cost \$30 million a year, but the cost would decline in succeeding years as death decreases the number of retired personnel affected.

If we want competent military forces led by highly qualified men we must provide incentives. We can best do this by returning to the traditional relationship between retirement pay and pay of those on active duty restored.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Estonians are one of the smallest and bravest of the non-Russian nationality groups upon whom Soviet communism was forced in July 1940.

These sturdy and stouthearted people, living in their ancient homeland from time immemorial on the northeastern shore of the Baltic, have had difficulty in maintaining their national independence, yet they have never been completely subdued by their conquerors. For more than 200 years before the First World War their country was part of the Russian Empire, where they lived there under the oppressive regimes of the czars. Nevertheless they succeeded

in maintaining their distinct national character and clung steadfastly to their common goal, that of attaining their independence. When the Czar of Russia was overthrown, they had their chance, and on February 24, 1918, they proclaimed their independence.

That was 41 years ago. For about two decades they enjoyed their richly deserved independence in their newly constituted Republic. They lost their independence early in the last war and since then have been suffering under the worst of tyrannies. Today, these helpless but not hopeless people bear the heavy yoke of their Communist taskmasters in the firm belief that in the end they will once more regain their freedom and independence. We in the free world, in observing the 41st anniversary of Estonian Independence Day, ardently join them in that expectation. We pray that they all will live to see that day.

Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of this legislative body to a newspaper editorial that appeared in the Floyd County Times under date of February 19, 1959, supporting my own efforts to produce a sound, workable piece of legislation that should persuade industry to come into the depressed areas of our Nation, yet would require no appropriation, would add no Federal employees to the payroll, would engage in no Socialistic experiment. My bill is H.R. 3696, a measure that would give Federal income tax exemptions to corporations willing to come into stricken eastern Kentucky and into other depressed areas of our country. The Floyd County Times and the Lexington Herald have both supported editorially my efforts and yet both papers are, I believe, Democratic in political affiliation and they both know of my Republican affiliation. Nevertheless, their interest in eastern Kentucky transcends their partisanship in a matter that should always be entirely nonpartisan. The editorial is as follows:

THE USUAL HAIR-SPLITTING ACT

Congressman FRANK BURKE, of Louisville, this week got into the hair-splitting act that invariably holds center stage when any plan is proposed to help eastern Kentucky in its economic distress.

He gave with the sage opinion that Congressman EUGENE SILER's bill providing for special tax exemptions to industries that locate in depressed areas is unworkable. BURKE said it would be "too hard to tell which plants qualify for special exemptions."

Which, to us, is another way of dodging the eastern Kentucky issue. Why too hard? Could not the legislation itself define what industries would be exempt? Coal mines, it might be agreed, would not be exempt, since the region is a coal-mining center. Nor would any old business or any that would

not employ men or women in numbers sufficient to improve the economy of the area.

Surely this would not be a task too arduous for the Federal Government which has so many thousands on the payroll, this job of determining those bonafide industries entitled to special tax exemptions in return for venturing into this part of America that has so long been verboten to those industries which make and sell things to other parts of America.

Congressman BURKE, according to a news dispatch, left off till the last the clincher. He commended SILER for his efforts but said Congress would "emerge with another type of solution" to the eastern Kentucky problem.

And that is exactly what we fear—another type of solution that doubtless will mean more beans and cheese, more of the dole, nothing of a constructive, permanent nature.

Lessons From Canadian Experience With Self-Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Mr. Glenn Garbutt, which appeared in the December issue of *Trusts and Estates* magazine. Mr. Garbutt is an independent management consultant in New York City and an experienced observer in the collective investment and fiduciary fields. He is a former associate editor of *Trusts and Estates*. His article is based on a marketing study conducted for the Bank of New York, through whose courtesy the article was published:

LESSONS FROM CANADIAN EXPERIENCE WITH SELF-PENSIONS

(By Glenn Garbutt)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Under the encouragement of special tax provisions, retirement programs for employed persons have become widespread. But self-employed individuals cannot be their own employees, hence they cannot qualify for favored tax treatment. The inequity in the position of the self-employed was put to an end through legislative action in Great Britain in 1956, and in Canada and New Zealand in 1957. In 1958, the Keogh proposal to permit self-employed individuals in this country to set aside tax-deferred dollars into restricted retirement savings was reported favorably by the House Ways and Means Committee—for the first time since its original introduction in 1951. Late in July the bill passed the House by an overwhelming vote, but, in the Senate the bill was stalled in the Finance Committee for lack of time to schedule hearings and finally, on August 12, after debate on the floor of the Senate, was sidetracked by parliamentary maneuver when offered as an amendment to another tax bill. Nevertheless, the resulting vote on the amendment brought forth a strong show of strength for individual self-pensions, with 32 Senators going on record as in favor—despite the fact that the Senate policy position of both parties at the time opposed such legislation. The opposition, in general, was based on the prospective loss of tax revenue and, in particular, on inadequate time to study the measure. Inasmuch as persons close to the legislative process ex-

pect the Keogh bill to be reintroduced substantially in its present form when the 86th Congress convenes in January, the following authoritative report on the Canadian experience with self-pensions is both timely and revealing.)

Taxpayers in Canada, under the terms of legislation enacted on April 12, 1957, are allowed a deduction of amounts up to 10 percent of earned income set aside for the purchase of retirement annuities commencing any time before age 71. The dollar amounts so set aside may not exceed \$2,500 a year for self-employed persons, or \$1,500 in the case of an employee under a pension plan, including his own contributions to both employer-sponsored and individual plans.

The new legislation represents something more than is implied in the phrase "removal of discrimination against the self-employed," explained Dr. A. K. Eaton, Canada's then Assistant Deputy Finance Minister: "The new legislation opens up income spreading as a new positive policy of general application. It is available to everybody."

This significant tax change was introduced by the Honorable Walter Harris, Minister of Finance, with these observations in his budget speech on March 14, 1957:

"The cash effects on our revenue in the coming year will be negligible, partly because it will take some time for insurance companies and others to design policies and organize plans, and partly because taxpayers will in many instances derive their benefit from a tax refund at the end of the year."

"The subsequent years, if widespread use is made of the plan, it is possible that the annual yield of the income tax may in future be reduced by as much as \$40 million. Whatever the subsequent loss in revenue may be it can, however, be regarded as an indication of the volume of provision being made by Canadians toward freedom from financial worry at a time when their earnings power has lessened."

"To me this policy makes good sense. Moreover, the broad effect of this policy will be antinflationary since it will be an encouragement to increase immediate savings which will be productively employed. Encouragement such as that now proposed is, I think, amply justified and will, I believe, be well received on all sides."

The step taken by the Minister of Finance was in recognition of agitation by taxpayer groups over a 10-year period—primarily on the plea of inequity—rather than of views expressed by financial institutions or the life insurance companies.

The Ministry of Finance had an equally strong record of opposition over the 10-year period. Principal reasons: The expected decrease in tax revenue and the prospective increase in administrative detail, not the question of principle. However, with permissive self-pension an accomplished fact and the first year of experience behind them, finance ministry officials have disclosed that: (1) the changeover was far simpler than anticipated, and (2) the loss of revenue in the first year—unofficially estimated at \$7 million—was considerably less than the long-term projection of \$40 million made by the Minister of Finance.

PATTERN OF ACCEPTANCE

The Canadian taxpayer has a wide range of choice for the investment administration of his accumulated retirement savings. Commenting upon the freedom of investment, Assistant Deputy Minister Eaton, said:

"I mention this aspect of the law in relation to two matters which in current Canadian thought are frequently referred to on public platforms or in the press: The first of these relates to the degree of Canadian ownership in Canadian industry. The second is the question of the future stability of the purchasing power of the Canadian dollar, whether gradual inflation can be avoided or

whether prudence dictates a form of investment providing some hedge against a gradual decline of the value of the dollar. * * * This policy is in line with the removal last year of the restrictions on trustees investing pension funds."

The four general types of investment administration are: (1) Life insurance companies' contracts; (2) Dominion government annuities; (3) trust companies' plans; (4) mutual funds and negotiated investment contracts.

Although discussions leading to the tax amendment continued over several years, passage of the legislation found both the Government and financial agencies unprepared. Thus the Canadian development is revealing, because in the administration of individual retirement savings new methods and procedures had to be evolved.

Life insurance actuaries and officials, for example, were cool to the early proposals for permissive individual retirement plans. Reasons: Restricted policies with a locked up savings side might (1) upset the traditional relationship between the insurer and the insured, (2) encourage the cancellation of existing life insurance policies unless both old and new contracts could qualify for registration, (3) call for new types of policies with variable premium problems, and (4) bring forth agitation for variable annuities.

With the insurance fraternity divided in general as to the desirability of the new legislation, some companies started out with a negative approach, tending to point out problems rather than opportunities to their agents and field men. Consequently, they took a relatively minor part in the early marketing development of this new method of saving.

Companies with a positive approach, on the other hand, received a ready response from the field and a satisfactory experience resulted. Sales results, in fact, indicate that interest in retirement savings among individuals is communitywide and about evenly divided as concerns professional people versus proprietors and management people. A representative sample of over 800 contracts registered through two large insurance underwriters indicates that some two-thirds of registered policies were new contracts issued in 1957, the remaining one-third being old contracts from earlier years. Policies being registered in 1958 are mostly with new people.

Insurance officials in general have found that the new legislation created a considerable educational problem for salesmen and savers alike. While some officials feel that the market opened to the insurance companies is not impressive, other sales-minded officials find the tax-deferment privilege has served as good reason to review present individual insurance programs with satisfactory results, and they assess the possibilities presented as most favorable.

Trust companies, unlike the life insurance companies, had neither the products nor the sales power ready to seek individual tax savers. It was late in 1957 before most of the trust companies completed their plans for handling registered retirement savings.

In general, the trust companies' plans are designed for the use of collective investment, in order to achieve economy of administration and adequate diversification for the pooled accounts of individuals with annual contributions of \$2,500 or less. The plans range from a single fund to a combination of funds with different investment objectives.

Some of these plans provide special savings accounts to facilitate the accumulation of allowable contributions. A contributor thus might know his exact income before determining the final amount to be registered, inasmuch as transfers to a registered plan may be deferred to the end of February and still apply to the preceding tax year.

Lacking a field force, the trust companies employed direct-mail and newspaper adver-

tising to call attention to their registered plans, and particularly to point out the advantage of equity investment in the event of further inflation. Now, with retirement savings funds in operation, trustmen feel they have broadened their range of services and that, while the educational problem is formidable, indeed, it opens to them a mass market not heretofore available on a practical basis. In future years, they feel, a large portion of the moneys set aside in retirement savings will be administered by corporate trustees.

Mutual funds worked out two types of retirement savings plans—one similar to the trust companies' type of plan, with a corporate trustee acting as custodian and the mutual funds providing the investment medium and management; the other similar to annuity contracts of the insurance company, with a face amount certificate payable over a period of years.

Canadian Government annuities drew the largest single group of the registrations of retirement savers. There is no comparable investment medium in this country to these annuities, which are administered by the Department of Labor and may be purchased by Canadian taxpayers in amounts between \$10 and \$1,200 a year. The annuities system is provided at cost—the Government pays all administration expenses and guarantees the fixed yearly income. Premiums may be paid to the Receiver General at any Accounting Post Office.

Director Charles R. McCord, who heads the Government annuity program in Ottawa, commented: "A review of first-year results indicates: (1) A stimulation of interest in general in Government annuities, (2) a revival of interest in many old and dormant contracts, and (3) the attraction of interest in new contracts among men and women under 40 years of age in particular."

Altogether some 60,000 contracts were found to be eligible under the amended tax legislation and these annuities were advised during 1957. Director McCord revealed that about 15,000 plans were registered—two-thirds of them old contracts, one-third of them new.

Association plans were worked out by professional groups to enable members to take advantage of the tax exemption privilege through contributions to a professionwide program. The Canadian Medical Association, for example, registered a plan with (1) an insured annuity segment—guaranteeing fixed dollar income—administered by a life insurance company, and (2) a common stock investment fund administered by a trust company. The program was designed in the belief that the split-fund type of savings plan would go a long way toward answering the problem of how to put aside for retirement and yet protect savings against the inroads of inflation. Contributing members may decide for themselves how much they wish to invest in each segment of the plan.

The pattern of acceptance of the Canadian Medical Association plan was described by Dr. A. D. Kelly, general secretary of the association, as follows:

"Late in September we mailed information on the plan to 16,000 members and received in return roundly 2,000 registrations, most of them within the tax-year 1957. The split-funded allocations approximated two-thirds to the trusted common stock fund, one-third to the insured group annuity. In dollars of contributions, this amounted to approximately 60 percent in common stocks and 40 percent in group annuities."

This indicates early acceptance of the plan by one of every eight members of the association. However, an equal number of medical men were found to have chosen other channels of registration. Here again, therefore, one out of four is believed to be a proper proportion to use as the early pattern of acceptance by physicians.

Other association plans have been formed but have not been as successful in general as the Canadian Medical Association plan. Some, however, were formed too late for full consideration in the tax year 1957.

OVERALL PICTURE

Taxpayers in Canada have until April 30 to file their income tax returns. Registrations for the retirement savings privilege must be made by December 30 of the tax year, with an additional two months allowed for making the contribution commitment.

Within the tax year 1957, following enactment of the law in April, a total of 32,000 individual registrations were filed with the Department of National Revenue. An estimated breakdown of the different types of investment administration used follows:

Investment administration	No. of plans
Government annuities plans.....	15,000
Life insurance contracts (regular cases of annuities and life insurance with savings side registered).....	9,000
Trust companies' own plans (excluding association plans).....	3,750
Association plans (funded through group annuities and trust companies).....	2,250
Mutual funds plans.....	2,000

Total of registered plans (estimated)..... 32,000

Of particular interest is the finding that almost one of every four taxpayers who registered through the trust companies failed in the foreshortened first year to make a contribution to their plan within the allowable time limit. Principal reason: Lack of immediate savings ready for long-term commitment.

In summary, then, the study of Canadian experience with self-pensions during the first year indicates that—

Individual interest in tax deferment is widespread, but a relatively small proportion of taxpayers have immediate savings ready to commit under permissive self-pension legislation.

Government and investment administrative officials alike find that 2 to 3 years or more will be required for the pattern of acceptance of individual retirement savings to become fully formed.

The tax revenue loss for the first year—estimated at \$7 million—was substantially less than the \$40 million projected loss estimate of the Finance Minister.

The educational problem posed by this new form of saving for investment administrators and savers alike is formidable.

These findings lend support to the statement made by Dr. Roger F. Murray¹ at the hearing of the House Ways and Means Committee last January 24, when he said with reference to the proposed Keogh bill:

"This kind of provision takes a long time to become fully effective. The bill is only enabling legislation, in a sense; it does not automatically make available the arrangements for a single individual to make his retirement deposit. The needed facilities require time and effort for their development. Even a widespread understanding of the bill's provisions would require months of educational work. We are probably talking about 1960 before really large numbers of the self-employed would know how or where to make a retirement deposit."

Therefore, Mr. Murray concluded, "The loss in current tax revenues represented by the tax deferral would be very modest for several years."

¹ S. Sloan Colt, professor of banking and finance, Columbia University Graduate School of Banking.

Divine Instructions Relative to Nations That Reject God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and apropos to my reintroduction today of a resolution proposing a Christian amendment to our Constitution, I wish to quote the radio message of the Reverend R. J. G. McKnight, delivered on the "Christian Amendment Hour" under the title of "Divine Instructions Relative to Nations That Reject God."

The message is as follows:

"DOWN TO THE REVOLUTION"

That phrase, in Justice Story's "Commentaries on the Constitution," has the deepest significance. Let us recall it, in its setting.

He says: "Every American Colony from its foundation down to the Revolution did openly, by the whole course of its institutions, support and sustain, in some form, the Christian religion." We have seen the evidence for that statement in the Rhode Island Compact, which is representative of all the colonial compacts.

To make absolutely clear that they did support and sustain the Christian religion, let us look again at the enacting clause of the Rhode Island Compact. It says: "We whose names are underwritten do solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, incorporate ourselves into a body politic; and as He shall help, will submit our persons, lives, and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings and the Lord of lords, and to all those perfect and absolute laws of His, given us in His holy word of truth, to be judged and guided thereby."

Where did the men of colonial times get their conception of a proper enacting clause to stand at the beginning of a civil compact? They got it from God's holy word of truth. Two-thirds of the Old Testament deals with God's relation to nations. They had read the Bible—God's holy word of truth. They believed what they read. For example, they had read the Second Psalm.

Let us read it.

The Psalmist has taken his stand, in vision, upon a high vantage point from which he surveys the nations of the earth. He listens: he hears the sound of rebellion. He waits: the picture becomes clearer. Then, he speaks:

"Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing?" He can scarcely believe it is true. "Yes," he says, "it is true."

Verse 2: "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against His Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us."

What will be the reaction of the eternal God upon His high throne? The Psalmist tells us: "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh" (there is no mirth in that laugh—it is the laugh of absolute scorn)—"He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet—(notwithstanding this vocal rebellion) yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion."

Then God's "Anointed"—His eternal "Son"—against whom the rebellion is most vocal—steps forward to deliver His inaugural address: "I will declare the decree: the Lord

hath said unto me, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."

Christ is the only begotten Son of God. To Him God the Father has given authority over all nations. And when "the kings of the earth . . . and the rulers take counsel together" against God and His Son—whom He has anointed to reign over the nations—God has made plain what will happen: (verse 9) "Thou shalt break them" (the nations) "with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

It is no small thing for a nation to reject the sovereign King whom God has appointed to rule over all nations. The consequences are tragic. And the history of nations is evidence that the nation that rejects God's Anointed will be shattered like a brittle piece of pottery under a heavy blow from an iron rod. The size of the nation, the importance, the wealth, the influence, the wisdom—these things are no protection against the "rod of iron," when God's hour strikes.

God is fair in His dealings with nations. He gives repeated warnings before the "rod of iron" strikes.

He sent Moses to Egypt; Pharaoh refused to bow to God's demands. Egypt went down into the graveyard of nations.

God sent Jonah to Nineveh, at the peak of Assyria's dominance. The city repented for a period. But the repentance period soon passed, and the "iron rod" descended, and Assyria today is but a memory.

God sent Daniel to Babylon where King Nebuchadnezzar was boasting: "Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?" Quite a boast. But read on: "While the word was in the king's mouth, there fell a voice from heaven, saying, O King Nebuchadnezzar, to thee it is spoken: the kingdom is departed from thee." And today great Babylon is buried beneath the sands of the Euphrates Valley.

God sent His servant Paul to Greece and to Rome, at a time when Greece boasted of the excellence of its human philosophy, and Rome ruled the world. The Roman legions were irresistible. Rome was the eternal city—they thought. Paul went to Rome as a prisoner. He was in chains. He told the Romans of Christ, and of His love. He said: "I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power (dynamite) of God unto salvation." Rome rejected the gospel, and the "iron rod" fell and the Roman empire was shattered like a potter's vessel. The ruins of the Coliseum are today a warning to powerful sinful nations. How long will it take the world to learn that battleships, airplanes and bombs mean nothing when God's hour strikes and the "iron rod" descends in wrath.

So the Psalmist counsel the nations—every nation—any nation: "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him."

Lincoln: A Guide for Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the San Diego, Calif., Union, February 12, 1959:

LINCOLN: A GUIDE FOR NIXON

During this month, which marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the still-meaningful words of the rail-splitter are being quoted widely again.

There is inspiration for all in the life of Mr. Lincoln.

But if we were called upon to single out one man to whom Mr. Lincoln's life should mean most, our nomination would be RICHARD M. NIXON.

This would be true if we looked only upon the controversy which surrounded Mr. Lincoln during most of his political life. He was a man who gave his views directly. His debates with Stephen Douglas were openly argued and acclaimed. He was widely criticized by all three of his opponents as he ran for President. As President he was denounced often in the press. Things reached a point where his sons were taunted by schoolmates.

Even on the eve of the Gettysburg Address there were fights in the street below his hotel.

Mr. Lincoln remained above it all with "malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness for the right."

RICHARD NIXON, too, has been controversial during most of his political career. He won his seat in Congress after widely publicized debates against Representative H. Jerry Voorhis. As a Senator and as Vice President of the United States, few have criticized his ability or devotion to duty. But political opponents of this administration have made him their center of attack. Cartoonists have caused one of his daughters to cry as she was taunted in school.

Mr. Nixon is dedicated to young people. He visits many schools to advise students to take an interest in government.

The parallel does not stop there. Mr. Lincoln was greatest during crisis. Mr. Nixon has this quality, also—witness his 1952 fund speech, the President's heart attacks, his experiences with mad mobs in Latin America.

Both were strong in their Republican philosophical fervor for the rights of the individual.

Both men struggled to finish law studies. Both were greatly influenced by early religious training. Both were marked by personal courage. Both profit from the quality of humility.

No one knows what the next chapter will be in Mr. Nixon's life. But he, like most of us, can find inspiration and guidance in Mr. Lincoln's words:

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

over the years, demonstrated great community interest and local concern with their own problems and have had the courage to do something about it.

Columbus, Ohio, is a fine example of a city that does not find it necessary to always look to the Federal Government for benevolent assistance but to the contrary, in true American tradition, is better satisfied to solve its own problems.

I wish to quote an article from the Columbus Dispatch which details the events at the time the award was made to Paul R. Ginger, chairman of the metropolitan committee, who accepted the plaque on behalf of the city of Columbus:

ALL AMERICA CITY FESTIVITIES OPEN

"All America City" Year in Columbus officially opened at a noon luncheon Friday as Paul R. Ginger, chairman of the metropolitan committee, accepted the plaque on behalf of the city.

Approximately 800 persons attending a luncheon in the Deshler Hilton Hotel were told by Ginger the award came to Columbus because citizens did what they knew had to be done.

The All America City Award is cosponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. Columbus was honored as a 1958 All America City for high standards of citizen action realized through public improvements made possible by voter approval.

Ginger said no one had to tell us we needed new schools, hospital facilities, and sewage improvements.

Columbus knew and met its need through the combined efforts and cooperation of all its citizens, Ginger said.

We have been successful because we are a great American community, he said, with greater things to be done tomorrow.

Philip C. Ebeling, of the National Municipal League, who presented the award to Ginger, congratulated Columbus for its accomplishments since civic improvement efforts were started in 1945.

Joel Harnett, the magazine representative, said "you are better citizens because of your fight and victory in overcoming traffic, school, and municipal problems."

"You are passing another milepost on the road of success," he said. "There are many more mileposts ahead of you."

Alvin W. Jones, president of the Chillicothe Chamber of Commerce, accepted an honorable mention award for his city from Ebeling. Chillicothe placed in the top 22 cities in the 1958 judging although not the top 11 All America Cities.

Protest Against Further Increases in the Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include a letter I received from Harry J. Kennedy, president of the Western Petroleum Refiners Association of Tulsa, Okla. I feel the comments in Mr. Kennedy's letter are very timely and to the point.

The Western Petroleum Refiners Association, organized in 1912, is national in scope, and represents a major segment of the re-

Columbus, Ohio—All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Municipal League and Look magazine honored the city of Columbus, Ohio, as an All America City for high standards of citizen action realized through public improvements made possible by voter approval.

This national award is particularly pleasing to me since Columbus, Ohio, is in the heart of my congressional district. The citizens of that community have,

fining industry. Its member companies are located in various areas of the United States. Its roster includes refiners, both large and small. A number of its members have grown from humble starts, to organizations that are large in stature.

The Western Petroleum Refiners Association protests vigorously the proposal recently made to increase the Federal gasoline tax.

The excuse given for this increase is that the Federal highway trust fund, now derived from the Federal taxes on motor fuels, tires, tubes, retread rubber, truck use and one-half the tax on trucks and busses will not be large enough to defray the cost of the Federal road-building program.

The original program, designed for the construction of 40,000 miles of interstate highways, was expected to cost \$27.6 billion of which the Federal Government was expected to provide \$25 billion. The cost, as now estimated, will be \$40 billion and the Federal share \$36 billion. The increase in the gasoline tax is proposed as necessary to meet anticipated deficits in the highway trust fund.

This view is erroneous.

Under the present plan, the Federal road-building program is to receive only \$2.2 billion in 1959 and \$2.3 billion in 1960, but at the same time an additional \$1.3 billion in 1959 and \$1.3 billion in 1960 is anticipated from Federal excise taxes on automobiles, parts and accessories, and the remaining half of the tax on trucks and busses, which are to be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

This diversion of the automotive tax receipts from proper allocation to the highway trust fund is the cause of the so-called "deficit." This diversion is also the occasion for the proposal to increase already heavy taxes on gasoline. The answer lies in the deposit of these additional automotive tax receipts in the highway trust fund, where they should have been assigned from the start of the program.

An alternative plan, which assumes a continuation of the present diversion, is to extend the life of the project. Under this plan of "stretching out" the highway construction, only so much of the program would be accomplished within each year, as there is money in the highway trust fund available to pay for it.

GASOLINE TAX INCREASE THREATENS U.S. ECONOMY

The proposal to increase the gasoline tax ignores the function of gasoline in our economy. What has gasoline become in American life? Not so long ago we were considering gasoline as something of a luxury. Now, it affects everybody. It affects everything that is grown, or manufactured, or sold. The automobile, which depends on gasoline, after being thought of as a novelty, a pleasure vehicle, a show-piece for the rich, has become a workhorse, a necessity. The truck, fueled by gasoline, has become a transportation factor involved in literally innumerable business activities. With automobile and truck, you can go anywhere, and take anything.

The American economy is geared to motor transportation. Its cost must not be made prohibitive.

Those who are proposing an increase in the already burdensome share of the tax load which gasoline carries, fail to take into account the fact that no necessary commodity can bear, without limit, the increases in price which are proposed and implied for the future by the proposal.

The vicious cycle is this: More tax—higher prices; higher prices—more tax, etc. The consequence of imposing constantly mounting gasoline tax is that the cycle is unending and self-defeating. When transportation costs rise, they jeopardize the volume to be moved, and an increase in the tax on

gasoline is an automatic increase in automotive transportation costs. The national economy needs free-moving commodities. A higher tax on highway fuels is a restraint of trade.

The relation of the gasoline tax to the price of basic petroleum shows in itself how highly the tax on gasoline has been imposed already:

The gasoline taxes of the States already average 6 cents a gallon; the Federal tax on gasoline is already 3 cents a gallon; combined, this is an average of 9 cents a gallon. This average of combined taxes is equal to 80 percent of the refinery price; 54 percent of the tank-wagon price; and 41 percent of the retail price.

If the Congress were to finance the so-called deficits in the highway trust fund by successive increases in the gasoline tax, the combined average of Federal and State taxes would become 115 percent of the refinery price of gasoline; 78 percent of the tank-wagon price; and 59 percent of the average retail price.

It is a fixed principle of taxation that if a tax is to remain productive it must be moderate in amount and it must be reasonably related to the market price (before tax). There gets to be a point in the increase in a tax with relation to the market price of the commodity where the tax defeats the sale of the commodity, or weights it down so as to destroy sales volume and also tax receipts.

THE GASOLINE TAX INCREASE AND INFLATION

Everybody knows that transportation costs must be added to price. The current effort to curb inflationary price increases is wholly inconsistent with any proposal which inevitably increases costs—whether transportation costs or otherwise. Anyone who defends increased taxes on gasoline used on our highways must be prepared to defend inflationary price increases.

Jobs for Relatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial will be of interest to the Members:

[From the Des Moines Register, Feb. 21, 1959]

JOB FOR RELATIVES

Two of Iowa's new Congressmen have hired close relatives for jobs in their offices. It is difficult to understand this disregard for the long-established public disapproval of this practice.

Representative STEVEN CARTER, Democrat, of the Fourth District, has placed his 19-year-old son on his office payroll at a salary of \$11,000 a year. The boy is a part-time student at a university in Washington, D.C.

Representative LEONARD G. WOLF, Democrat, of the Second District, has employed his wife as secretary in his congressional office at \$11,000 or \$12,000 a year. The exact salary still appears to be in question.

Both Congressmen have defended their actions on the grounds that these members of their immediate family are highly capable and will render very valuable service in their respective capacities.

Both recognize that their actions will be sharply criticized but indicate that they do not intend to be swayed by this criticism.

Both have attempted to justify their actions by pointing out that it is a common practice among Members of Congress.

Representative WOLF added that his predecessor, Henry O. Talle, had his wife on his office payroll at a salary similar to that paid WOLF's wife.

These explanations and justifications do not make the practice of political nepotism—the hiring of relatives—any more acceptable. It still has all the attributes of overcrowding the public trough. It still bears the label of the worst form of the spoils system.

Much in the manner of smallpox, it does not become a more desirable disease because it has been allowed to become an epidemic and has infected an entire community.

Nepotism isn't so new that a first-term Member of Congress might innocently fall victim to its financial attractions.

The "Encyclopedia of Social Sciences" traces its origin back to the practices of the early popes of the Catholic church who distributed powers, principalities, and titles among their immediate relatives. The practice served to undermine the prestige of the church and contributed greatly to the reformation.

Describing nepotism as an embryonic type of the spoils system, the encyclopedia adds that "nepotism is still common in many countries, although it is frowned upon in communities with more advanced political morals."

If Congressmen WOLF and CARTER have not had the benefit of encyclopedia references they can find discussions of nepotism in almost any high school civics textbook.

Congressman CARTER has spoken very highly of his son's usefulness in research work. Both he and Congressman WOLF might benefit considerably if young Carter were put to work researching the history of nepotism.

Knowledge of the fundamental principles of good government is sometimes as useful and important to the continued tenure in office of a Member of Congress as guiding visiting constituents around the Capitol on sightseeing tours.

Ike Pinpoints Labor Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial "Ike Pinpoints Labor Issues," which appeared in the Daily Pantagraph of Bloomington, Ill., on Friday, February 20.

This editorial is worthy of insertion because it clarifies a major issue confronting us with respect to the much-needed remedial labor legislation. My hope is that this Congress will have the courage to meet the issues with respect to secondary boycotts and certain types of picketing squarely. To do so is in the interest of the workingman himself, as well as the general people:

IKE PINPOINTS LABOR ISSUES

President Eisenhower said at his recent press conference that Congress should enact legislation to curb secondary boycotts and some types of picketing. These proposals, he said, are decent and just.

Therein lies the biggest difference between the administration labor bill and that proposed by Senator KENNEDY.

The administration proposes to deal with the secondary boycott by prohibiting direct coercion of employers to cease doing business with another. It also would ban inducement of individual employees to refuse to perform service.

This is not covered in the Kennedy bill.

The administration bill would make picketing an unfair labor practice, subject to mandatory injunction, where a union cannot establish sufficient employee interest in having a union represent them in cases where the employer has observed the law.

The Kennedy bill proposes only to prohibit picketing for the purposes of extortion.

There are other differences. The administration covers provisions on representation elections, non-Communist oaths for employers, reopening bargaining agreements and procedures for naming an Acting General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

These are not covered in the Kennedy bill.

The Kennedy bill would tighten the definition of a supervisor. The effect would make more supervisors eligible for union membership and thus take them out of the management group.

This is not covered in the administration bill.

The two bills are substantially the same on reporting of union financial conditions, union elections, and collective bargaining elections.

Chairman BARDEN, of the House Labor Committee, has offered a bill aimed at curbing the power of union heads through required revision of the union constitutions. This may not get the support of either group.

Senator McCLELLAN, head of the labor racketeers committee, is drawing up his own bill which should be introduced any time. This may be a good compromise between the two.

But the issues of the secondary boycott and picketing where neither the workers nor the employers want a union should be dealt with in any measure getting congressional approval.

Defense Before All Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the San Diego Union, February 9, 1959:

DEFENSE BEFORE ALL ELSE

This Nation—its people and its politicians—must divorce themselves of the idea that sacrifice is reserved exclusively for shooting wars. The harsh truth is that cold wars require disciplines that must be met as soberly and realistically as the sacrifices demanded by shooting wars.

The word "sacrifice" apparently is not in the lexicon of the Democratic spending block in the Congress. The effort to ramrod through multi-billion-dollar housing and airport construction bills is symptomatic of the budgetary schizophrenia which President Eisenhower has attributed to the Democratic spenders.

Schizophrenia is a loss of contact with reality. It certainly is unrealistic to persist in the idea that we can supply all we need in national defense without cutting back on

social welfare and without using restraint in desirable but not vital projects.

As yet we have no idea what the final bill will be for national security. Indeed, there is no end in sight. Defense needs are constantly under scrutiny by our military experts. They may well exceed the \$40 billion asked by the President in his budget of \$77,300,000,000.

National security must take priority over everything else. It is the big issue. Every effort must be made to balance the budget. But if an imbalance results, it must be in behalf of defense, nothing else.

We do not fight wars with pork-barrel legislation. We fight them with hard-muscled air, land, and sea arms. We fight them with missiles and nuclear power. The largesse of the Democratic spenders would be better directed to the Marine Corps, which stands to lose one-third of combat strength; to the retaliatory naval forces asked by Adm. Arleigh Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Burke has warned that antisubmarine warfare is lagging considerably behind the capability to combat enemy submarines.

By July, he said, Russia will have four times as many submarines as the United States.

These are the voices of national security. They must be heard above the clamor of pressure groups, lobbyists, and vote-seeking politicians.

The security problems posed by the nuclear and space ages do not permit a life as usual attitude. They require toughmindedness, a willingness to sacrifice for the greater good. And they require putting first things first. Either we tighten our belts, or we tighten the noose around military and economic survival.

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the third of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia is inserted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1959]
DEBTORS' DILEMMA—BAD RISKS IN EASY CREDIT SYSTEM PROVE COSTLY TO DISTRICT TAXPAYERS
(By Morton Mintz)

District taxpayers foot a hidden part of the bill when an easy-credit operator sells something to a poor credit risk and the debt goes bad.

The costs to the public are largely incurred in both tax- and charity-supported welfare programs, the municipal court and crime.

Richard D. Gibbs, secretary of Peoples Drug Stores, was one of two witnesses who touched on the crime aspect in testimony on May 27, 1957. He told a House District Subcommittee hearing on proposed reforms of the District's garnishment or bad debt law.

"We cannot tolerate these [employees] who are bad credit risks where we are dealing in open merchandise and cash, and we have found them to start stealing in a great many cases. . . . When they do not draw a salary, they are going to eat, and they will get it any way they can. . . ."

Most authorities believe only an insignificant amount of crime stems from attachment of wages. Some observers, however, make these points:

An employer who would unhesitatingly seek the arrest and prosecution of a thief who is unknown to him is less likely to do the same to an employee caught stealing. He may only fire him, being aware that garnishment has left the employee, a human being he knows, without funds for food or shelter.

It is hard to detect some thefts, especially those from a cafeteria or restaurant.

Authorities do not make a special point of looking for garnishment as a root of crime. University of Maryland Criminologist Peter P. Lejins said he knows of no study of the question but added that one should be made.

Previous articles have pointed out the inner and outer pressures on poor persons to buy on easy credit, the tricks used on them, and the calamities that frequently follow for themselves and their families. Here are more costs to the public relating to the same source of trouble, the District's garnishment statute:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

The Washington Post pointed out in 1956 that under the garnishment law the head of a household could be stripped of every cent he earns, even if it means his children will go hungry. Members of the juvenile court advisory committee heard a father plead he was unable to meet support payments because he had to pay other bills. If his wages were attached, he said, he would be fired and unable to support his family or pay his debts. The then juvenile court judge later said this situation is fairly common.

A man fired because of garnishment legally remains "employable," and so he and his family are ineligible for relief. A man who deliberately deserts his family so it can get a support order—and Welfare Director Gerard M. Shea agrees the statute provides an incentive to do this—becomes liable to a year's imprisonment and/or a \$200 fine.

But in doing so he makes sure, once the court order is issued, that his children will eat. Authorities say there are many such cases, but no one knows how many. The Department of Public Welfare makes varying welfare payments; an adult with four children gets a maximum of \$195 a month.

UNITED GIVERS FUND AGENCY

The Salvation Army estimates it spends at least \$3,750 of UGF funds for direct relief—food and rent—to families impoverished by garnishment. Also affected are Family and Children's Service and Catholic Charities.

On a bookkeeping basis, the Legal Aid Bureau, in representing about 500 garnishment defendants a year, accounts for about 1,300 of UGF funds.

THE MUNICIPAL COURT

Last year, deputy U.S. marshals set out to serve 47,877 writs of attachment on employers. There were countless court hearings on requests for exemptions. Just how much waste of both litigants' and taxpayers' funds is involved in all this no one can say for certain.

However, one estimate from a most reliable—and cautious—source is that a more reasonable garnishment statute would save the taxpayers "several thousand dollars a year."

Oregon's First Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1959, Gen. Joseph Lane was

sworn in as Oregon's first U.S. Senator to serve in Congress from the newest State in the Union, Oregon. Editor Charles V. Stanton of the Roseburg News-Review, in my district, has summed up the work of this outstanding man who was later to be candidate for the second highest elective office in our land. His editorial of February 14, 1959, follows under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

OREGON'S FIRST SENATOR
(By Charles V. Stanton)

One hundred years ago today a man from Douglas County held up his right hand in Washington, D.C., and swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States. Thus Gen. Joseph Lane became the first Senator to serve in Congress from the then newest State, Oregon.

Today appropriate ceremonies are being held at General Lane's tomb. It is a tribute well deserved, for perhaps no man contributed more to Oregon's early success. At the same time perhaps no man in the State's history was more cruelly treated when he remained firm to his convictions.

General Lane was brave and vigorous. He was a serious worker on behalf of Oregon Territory and later the State of Oregon. But General Lane was a firm believer in States rights. When he threw in with the Confederacy on the question of States rights, he was immediately assailed by emotional abolitionists.

Although the War Between the States was fought on a question of States rights and southern rebellion against domination by Northern States, history books have all too often made slavery a primary cause of the war. Actually, slavery was a secondary issue. The Emancipation Proclamation was a document to destroy southern economy rather than settlement of moral issue. But it was a decided victory for the abolitionists of the day.

ELECTED TO CONGRESS

Gen. Joseph Lane was born in North Carolina and, as a youth, moved with his parents to Kentucky. Thus he was steeped in southern beliefs.

Interested in politics, he was an active party worker in Indiana, where he moved as a young man. He served in the Indiana Legislature when barely past 21 years of age, gaining election to the house and later to the senate.

He fought with Indiana volunteer troops during the war with Mexico, where he was advanced through successive ranks from major to general. He was wounded twice.

His prominence and bravery in the war caused President Polk to name him Governor of Oregon Territory, August 18, 1848. He set out overland, arriving in March 1849 to take up his new duties.

He served in 1851 as a Delegate to Congress from the Oregon Territory, then was again made Governor in 1853, but served only briefly before being again elected to Congress.

His congressional work was interrupted when he resumed his military career to conduct the successful Indian war in southern Oregon. Again he was wounded, but fought through the 1855-56 campaigns.

Returning from the Indian fights, he was once more elected to Congress and, when Oregon became a State, he was named as the first Senator from the State. He took office February 14, 1859, the day Oregon was admitted.

SETTLED NEAR ROSEBURG

He was an unsuccessful candidate for Vice President of the United States with John C. Breckenridge.

One of his first acts in coming to Oregon was to find a suitable place for a home.

He decided to locate in the Umpqua Valley. In 1851, 2 years after his arrival, he took up a donation land claim in Douglas County. His property was on Deer Creek, east of Dixonville, on what is now known as the Buckhorn Road.

Because of his sympathies for the South, he lost much of his political influence in Oregon, which had joined the North in the struggle between the States. Emotion was permitted to turn thought away from much of the good General Lane had accomplished for the State.

Today, however, Oregon is proud of this man who was so active in the politics of its early day and who did so much for the Territory and the State.

As we begin the celebration of our birthday as a State, it is most fitting, I believe, that one of the first to be honored is Gen. Joseph Lane, a Douglas County man who was Oregon's first U.S. Senator.

**Civil Affairs and Military Government
Combat Support Axioms**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the January 1959 issue of the Military Review, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College publication, as a supplement to "CAMG Operations in Atomic Age Warfare," which appeared in the January 1958 issue of the same publication.

This splendid contribution entitled "CAMG Combat Support Axioms" was written by our distinguished junior Senator, STROM THURMOND, brigadier general, U.S. Army Reserve:

CAMG COMBAT SUPPORT AXIOMS

(By Brig. Gen. STROM THURMOND, U.S. Army Reserve)

(This article supplements "CAMG Operations in Atomic Age Warfare" written by Brig. Gen. STROM THURMOND and published in the January 1958 issue of the Military Review—Editor.)

The primary objective of civil affairs and military government operations (CAMGO) is to provide CAMG combat support. Toward this end, all energies, all actions, and all thought must be focused.

For this reason, CAMGO personnel devote themselves to acquiring a more specific, a more practical understanding of the combat commander's needs and problems and of the CAMG support that they can give him to assist in accomplishing fully the combat mission which has been assigned to him.

Before proceeding it would be well to decide what is meant by the term "CAMG combat support."

Referring to the "Dictionary of U.S. Army Terms," published by the Department of the Army in November 1953, as Special Regulations 320-5-1, we find that combat support is defined as: "operational assistance furnished combat elements."

After considering also the definition, therein, of such other terms as combat element, tactical element, and tactical troops, the following synthesis is submitted:

CAMG combat support is CAMG operational assistance furnished in a combat operation. CAMG troops provide CAMG operational assistance in direct support of combat troops, and are engaged under a combat commander, to operate as a part of his unit in combat.

COMMUNISM

Another basic CAMGO objective is to support and implement our national policies. Foremost of these policies is to combat and neutralize Communist social and political orientation of an area liberated by military force from Communist control.

The combat commander, as the one personally responsible for achieving CAMGO objectives, must be fully cognizant of these political military objectives of the Armed Forces of our country. He is the one who must constantly consider the human, political, and economic aspects of the area of his combat operations. The CAMGO organization at his disposal is the instrument with which he removes or neutralizes all Communist influences in areas occupied by the military forces he controls. Any neglect of this responsibility will cause a vacuum quickly filled by Communist oriented policy.

Of value in this connection is a little-known study of the 3 years of intensive Communist CAMG planning and subsequent occupation of a community entitled *The Reds Take a City: The Communist Occupation of Seoul*, by John W. Riley, Jr., and Wilbur Schramm, and published in 1951.

It is evident that our own CAMG planning must include a full comprehension of Communist CAMG planning. As a minimum, our CAMG planning must be directed at neutralizing the effectiveness of Communist aggressive efforts.

Furthermore, we must be constantly vigilant in our awareness that, as an instrument of foreign policy, CAMG is for us as it is for the Communists a weapon for waging war. It is an adjunct to other military weapons, perhaps, but, nevertheless, an essential military accessory for winning not only the war, but also the peace.

MILITARY VERSUS CIVIL AUTHORITY

Still another basic objective of CAMGO operations is to provide for the early transfer of responsibility from the military commander to a designated civil agency of government.

CAMGO personnel are not engaged in social or economic experiments or studies for their own deflection or for academic professional interest.

The CAMGO job is to get things done as expeditiously as possible, to achieve actual military operational objectives, and to withdraw as soon as the military operational need has been met.

The pace is quick, not leisurely.

It must be kept in mind that prolonged military occupation is not the task before us.

TRANSFER TO CIVIL CONTROL

In order to facilitate the smooth transfer of control, civilian organizations under military supervision should be introduced early in the more stable parts of the area of operations and gradually replace specialized CAMGO units and activities.

It is a cardinal rule, though, that there cannot be divided responsibility for the control of an area. Either the civil or the military authority must control the area. The agencies of either, however, can be used to support the other before and after the transfer of control, which must be accomplished smoothly, whether control is being transferred from civil to military authority or from military back to civil authority.

Historical examples of civilian organizations which served under military control are the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) in World War

II and the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) in Korea.

Such civilian organizations, under the control of the theater army commander, and in turn under the supervision of his G5, definitely reduce the requirement of CAMGO personnel. CAMGO units replaced move forward to augment the CAMGO combat support units.

INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

The remaining objective basic to CAMGO operations is to comply with international treaties, agreements, or customary law.

For this reason, among others, there is in the modern nuclear age army a fifth general staff section concerned with all military-civil matters including the government, economy, inhabitants, and institutions in areas where U.S. Armed Forces are employed.

This insures that the combat commander is properly advised of his responsibilities, of the limitations on his courses of action, and of his capabilities deriving from political, economic, and social factors.

In his estimates of the combat situation, the combat commander carefully weighs these civil affairs and military government factors along with those dealing with personnel, intelligence, operations, and logistics.

The combat commander's decisions are influenced not only by his own and the enemy's relative combat power and disposition of forces, and not only by such factors as weather and terrain, but also by civil conditions in the area of his combat operations.

CAMGO ACTIVITY

The CAMGO activity is not new to the Army; only the organization of that activity is fairly recent.

Our CAMGO experiences during World War I, and the preceding foreign military engagements of our Armed Forces, strongly indicated early in World War II the urgency and importance of organizing the CAMGO activity that inevitably accompanies combat operations.

The scope of the CAMGO activity is vast; the details of possible actions are numerous; and volumes could be written on each functional segment of the CAMGO activity.

Because generalizations often seem vague, there is a need to search assiduously for clear, complete axiomatic statements to identify the elements of CAMGO activity.

Concrete definitions are needed, sufficiently comprehensive in scope and in conveying understanding, of the practical part performed by CAMGO personnel as an operational element in the combat commander's organization.

Toward this end, axioms of CAMGO combat support will be explored in an effort to determine how to achieve the basic objectives of CAMGO operations previously mentioned.

Where warfare conducted in an arena set apart, such as the jousts of medieval knights, or as in many modern military maneuvers on military reservations, the combat commander could limit his concern to the factors of terrain and weather and the dispositions of friendly and enemy forces, their firepower, and capabilities. However, this is not the way it actually happens on the fields of battle.

Wherever we fight there are people, except perhaps in certain parts like the interior of deserts, at sea, or in an arctic region. It is because people interfere with war and war interferes with people that military commanders must consider the effect on projected combat operations of people, their actions, attitudes, institutions, and resources.

COMBAT COMMANDER RESPONSIBLE

Independence of action often results in the belief that subordinates concerned with particular CAMGO matters are responsible for CAMGO operations.

This is far from true and we must reemphasize again that the responsibility for CAMGO operations is lodged only in the mili-

tary commander of the area to whom CAMGO authority has been delegated, whoever he may be, and regardless of whatever other concerns he may have.

The CAMGO mission is part of the combat commander's mission. He must accomplish it even without using the CAMGO personnel and units specifically designated and available to him.

The CAMGO organization assists the combat commander as any other service assists him in its particular sphere, but he is responsible.

Specifically trained SAMGO personnel, backed by CAMGO organizations extending from the front to the rear through all the echelons of command, increase the combat commander's CAMGO capability many hundredfold.

And, what is equally important, the combat commander is not compelled to divert from combat tasks personnel whose special training and competence is needed elsewhere to engage with the enemy.

COMBAT ELEMENT

It is the combat element which first contacts the civilian element upon the initial entry of our Armed Forces into enemy-held territory. It is the combat commander who first establishes the military control which must later be transferred to a civil agency.

The manner in which the people are handled at this early moment by the combat commander determines their first and most lasting attitude toward our Armed Forces. That attitude may become actively hostile or passively neutral. On the other hand, that attitude may be cultivated to become one of cooperation and, perhaps, even result in active assistance to the operations of the combat commander.

In view of the tremendous drain upon our own resources of modern atomic age warfare, it is essential that maximum utilization be made of the resources, including manpower, in areas where our Armed Forces are employed.

While it is true that international law requires the combat commander to restore and maintain public order and safety and to provide for the well being of the inhabitants of an area coming under his military control, the combat commander can do this in such a way as will contribute to his combat success.

CONVERSION PROCESS

The conversion of formerly enemy-held territory to reinforce and even augment the commander's combat power, in terms of resource utilization, is a significant aspect of CAMGO combat support.

A paradox arises, however, in this CAMGO conversion process. In order to exploit efficiently and effectively the resource potential in support of combat operations, it is not only necessary but also desirable to comply with the provisions of international law regarding restoring and maintaining public order and safety and providing for the well being of the inhabitants.

In the resulting climate of good will, CAMGO personnel, by working through civil officials, can make labor available for building military roads, bridges, warehouses, bunkers, and other facilities. They can locate and cause to be utilized for military purposes sawmills, stone quarries, workshops, pure water sources, stockpiles of construction materials, raw and processed materials, and many other civilian supplies, services, and facilities.

CAMGO WEAPON

In the search for weapons of greater combat effectiveness, it is found that the CAMGO weapon, as an instrument of the foreign policy of our Government, has proved itself on many battlefields throughout the world. It delivers on the ground, in the combat environment, an augmentation of

combat power—in terms of usable resources—of tremendous magnitude.

Every person, organization, and echelon in the military structure, from the front to the rear, is required to contribute to the support of combat operations. This is equally true of the CAMGO organization, and all CAMGO actions must be directed toward this common goal, even at the expense, if necessary, of long-range rehabilitation and reconstruction programs in rear areas.

PERSONNEL COMPETENCE

It is of primary importance not only to have the CAMGO organization, as such, but also to have the technological and professional competence of CAMGO personnel brought to peak efficiency for functioning in the combat environment.

Because CAMGO concerns primarily are operational in nature, it is necessary that CAMGO personnel be thoroughly grounded in the various aspects of military science and tactics. To perform their part in combat operations, CAMGO personnel must have a comprehensive knowledge of the functions of the G3 section. Only in this way can they understand how the G5 section plays its operational role in the integrated staff of the combat commander.

The precept of Thomas Paine unqualifiedly applies: "Where knowledge is duty, ignorance is a crime."

It is the duty of every CAMGO officer to qualify himself fully as an alter ego to the combat commander, capable of contributing to estimates of the combat situation and of participating in the formulation and implementation of combat decisions.

COMBAT SUPPORT TASKS

The exploration for axioms of CAMGO combat support reveals that there are certain actions which are conditional, while there are others which recur in all cases. It may be concluded from this that CAMGO combat support has two categories of tasks—conditional and recurring.

Conditional tasks are such as arise out of U.S. policy with regard to a particular area and the limitations imposed by the natural conditions of the area.

Recurring CAMGO combat support tasks, on the other hand, may be defined, in general, as gaining assistance and avoiding interference of the inhabitants, their economy, and institutions in areas where U.S. Armed Forces are engaged in combat.

More specifically stated, recurring CAMGO combat support tasks fall into six additional categories:

1. Civil conditions: Preventing and suppressing disease, starvation, unrest, and other conditions which derive from combat relationships and which would handicap or obstruct tactical and logistical operations, and combating enemy efforts to exploit such conditions.

2. Resource utilization: Promoting the availability and utilization of local resources, facilities, and services, and of governmental, economic, and social agencies, for the benefit of the tactical and logistical effort, and denying their use to the enemy.

3. Civil security: Assuring the security of combat troops from civil sources, using public safety agencies to eliminate active and passive sabotage and guerrilla activity, and coordinating civil defense with military area security and damage control operations.

4. International law.—Complying with international law and agreements. This includes provisions for restoring and maintaining public order and safety, for civilian relief supply, and for the care and movement of civilian war and disaster victims, such as casualties, refugees, evacuees, concentration camp internees, displaced persons, and other needy persons.

5. Civil authority.—Reestablishing civil authority; transferring the area from mili-

tary to civil control; and providing assistance to established civil authority in emergencies and disasters and, where indicated, in the routine conduct of government.

6. Military-civil matters.—Providing a focal point for handling all military-civil matters and, thereby, avoiding a diversion of combat and other military personnel from their primary military tasks by concern with civil as well as with military-civil matters.

CONCLUSION

This presentation is intended only to be suggestive of the vast range of CAMG combat support. A great deal of effort is yet required to define in practical terms all aspects of the CAMG capability to support the combat commander's operations.

There must be a mutual understanding on the part of combat commanders and CAMGO personnel of the responsibilities and capabilities of each in this increasingly vital field.

(Brig. Gen. STROM THURMOND is a 1923 graduate of Clemson College. He was admitted to the South Carolina Bar in 1930 and to practice in all Federal courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court. He has served as county superintendent of education; State senator; circuit judge; and Governor of South Carolina. He volunteered for service in World War II and served from 1942 to 1945 in Europe with Headquarters, First Army, participating in the Normandy invasion with the 82d Airborne Division. He served in the Philippines until the war with Japan terminated. A past national president of the Reserve Officers' Association, he is President of the Military Government Association. He was elected to the U.S. Senate from South Carolina in 1954 as a write-in candidate for the term ending January 1961.)

An Address by Adlai E. Stevenson, "Improving Education: A Free People's Responsibility"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, more and more the people of America are coming to realize that if our society is to remain free, we must invest more of our material resources in our human resources, in the education of the children of our country.

As a member of the General Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I was deeply pleased to see the recent address delivered by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson on the subject of education and a free society. The speech was delivered by Governor Stevenson in San Francisco, Calif., on January 26, 1959, at a convention of the National School Boards Association. The address follows:

IMPROVING EDUCATION: A FREE PEOPLE'S RESPONSIBILITY

(Address by Adlai E. Stevenson)

You have asked me to speak on the subject of "Improving Education: A Free People's Responsibility." Certainly the improvement is imperative, and certainly it is the responsibility of all of us; because all of us, in one way or another, are teachers and teach ourselves and others. Parents are teachers. Churchmen are teachers. Editors are teach-

ers. Friends are teachers. Even politicians should be teachers.

But our chief concern today is with the part of teaching that goes on in the public schools where the shape of the future is cast.

The basis for those schools was laid down in a former era when our national air was charged with promise. America was to be a New Eden. And the individual American was to be a New Adam—granted a second chance to raise a new breed of men who would liberate and purify mankind.

This being the heroic hope, the plainest citizen was not long in seeing how and why its realization depended on public education. Let me read from "A Plea For Public Education," drawn up in 1830 by the Philadelphia Working Men's Committee:

"The original element of despotism is a monopoly of talent, which consigns the multitude to comparative ignorance and secures the balance of knowledge on the side of the rich and the rulers. If then the healthy existence of a free government be . . . rooted in the will of the American people, it follows as a necessary consequence, of a government based upon that will, that this monopoly should be broken up and that the means of equal knowledge (the only security for equal liberty) should be rendered, by legal provision, the common property of all classes."

When plain working men could think in these terms, when they demanded a wedding between liberty and learning, freedom and enlightenment, fate itself was bound to be kind to such vision. And so it was. It gave the American an open continent whose rich natural resources held out the promise of material bounties to come. It gave him two oceans as a shield behind which he could experiment, free from outside intrusion. It augmented the ranks of the original settlers with waves of vigorous immigrants who made their difficulties the source of their ideals, and who thought of success as but a down payment on tasks yet to be performed.

The performance of the early American often fell short of the idealized vision he had of himself and his mission. But on balance, America's solid achievements in cultivating the moral and material environment of the New World, captured the imagination of humanity everywhere. Wherever men felt the stirring of a will to remake themselves, it was to America that they looked for a guiding light.

But if this was true in the past, it is only a qualified truth today. In our national conscience, we have, I think, an even keener sense about social injustice than was the case with our forebears. Yet the ironic fact is, that we no longer hold a worldwide monopoly over the meaning of human progress and the way to attain it. Our Communist adversaries challenge our claim everywhere. At every point of human endeavor they exhibit the same restless drive we associate with the generation of Americans who sacrificed the comforts of the present, that they or their children might reap larger benefits later on.

The Russians have a saying that "with good schools and hard work we will earn our place on the earth—and on the moon, too." The zeal of the Russians for education, and their progress in converting an illiterate, backward, agrarian society into a literate, advanced, industrial state in little more than a generation, has been a spectacular achievement. It has not gone unnoticed anywhere in the world, and is profoundly attractive to the poor, less developed nations where illiteracy is still a curse.

Yet the Russians are dissatisfied with their system of education. Just as we are waking up and examining theirs, they are reexamining theirs and making dramatic changes. Already competitive beyond anything we know, they are making it more so. They told me—and Khrushchev is angry about it—

that too many of those with university educations are unwilling to work with their hands, and think manual labor beneath them. So instead of 10 years of precollege education, the rulers in the Kremlin are changing it to 8, followed by 2 years of work in farm or factory. During the 2 work years, those who are patient and industrious and demonstrate a thirst for learning will be allowed time off to go to school. If they persevere at both work and studies, they can qualify for higher education after the 2-year work interval.

There is one exception to this new system—those who apply themselves during the first 8 years and show exceptional ability in music, the arts, and mathematics, will not be required to put in 2 years on a farm or in a plant. But for all the others, advanced education will have to be earned on the job. And the effect will be to reduce and upgrade those who go on to higher education.

What the Russians propose to prevent is what we all know so well—that around 30 percent of our students have no purpose in higher education and only take up time of the teachers and hold back the more gifted.

It is well to remember that heretofore education has been the only road to material success and distinction in Soviet society—a society that puts the members of the Academy of Sciences, the professors, artists and intellectuals at the very top of the economic and social structure, both in pay and public respect. But in our fortunate country we have many roads to success. And that very fact has doubtless diminished the value that we place on education, and often, encouraged the average student to get by rather than to excel.

Is this attitude then more a product of our culture and our varied economic opportunities than of some defect in our educational system? And if so, what can the school boards and you educators do to create a better public understanding of the importance of education, irrespective of material rewards?

Dr. Robert Hutchins, who has never been accused of flabby complacency about our education, said something last week that is worth repeating:

"History will have trouble with American education in the 20th century. It will see a people who say they are dedicated to education and unwilling to pay for it. It will see an educational system that delivers less education per dollar than almost any other, saying that all it needs is more money. The people and the educators are united only in this: they both want education without pain, either intellectual or financial. History will find it hard to explain how a nation that is one, a nation in which the political subdivisions have almost no relation to social or economic life and very little to political life, can entrust its future to these subdivisions by relegating education to them. History will smile sardonically at the spectacle of this great country getting interested, slightly and temporarily, in education only because of the technical achievements of Russia, and then being able to act as a nation only by assimilating education to the cold war and calling an education bill a defense act."

"We might as well make up our minds to it. If our hopes of democracy are to be realized, every citizen of this country is going to have to be educated to the limit of his capacity. And I don't mean trained, amused, exercised, accommodated, or adjusted. I mean that his intellectual power must be developed."

That is your responsibility—you who are members of our school boards and charged with developing the thirst for learning and excellence of our young people. I don't envy you your job. I know none more difficult, more exacting, more necessary. You have both the anti-intellectualism of so many

communities, the inertia of so many pupils, and the poverty of so many school districts to overcome.

I wish you well—my future, my children's and yours are at your mercy and in your hands—far more of it is in your hands than in the hands of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Foreign Service, because if you fail they can't save us.

Admittedly American education has had serious defects. I suppose it is because we as a people have never given the education of our young a top priority in our sense of values. Nor is education at the top of the list of alternative uses to which our tax dollar can be put. In the uses to which we can put our individual time, thought, and energy, the problems of education have never had priority. The reason why our scholars and educators don't enjoy the social and economic status which most countries—especially the Communist—have accorded them is that education has never commanded the status which it merits.

Why is this? Now, that we have been jolted into a realization of our inadequacy, why do we find it so difficult to cope with the problem?

The political fact is that education is a national problem which, alone among our national problems, is not handled on a national basis. Such universal problems as security and defense are treated nationally. The Government studies the needs, appropriates the money, raises the revenue, and administers the program. But the governmental function of education has been left to the locality, to the separate community, to the separate school board. The fear of surrendering to centralized control the responsibility for the education of our young is, I think, still valid. Because in a vast country like this, the further you remove the responsibility for education from the locality, the more you endanger the interest and concern and the sense of responsibility of the individual citizens in the community. And what we desperately need is more, not less individual concern for education. Indeed I think this need transcends classrooms, teachers, and all other school needs.

So we are confronted with a great national problem incapable of a national solution. And the deficiencies of our schools are nothing new. As Governor of Illinois, I was struggling with them 10 years before Sputnik—that blessed, brazen angel which at last disturbed our slothful slumber.

You know better than I what the urgent needs are and what all the critics of the American schools—the Educational Policies Commission, the White House conference, the Rockefeller report, and all the other reports—say we must have for survival. I don't want to talk about the need for more classrooms, for more counseling and guidance, for better opportunities for the exceptional student, and for better instruction in mathematics, sciences, and languages. I know, too, that an improvement in the working conditions of teachers, in their compensation, in their social status is demanded in every report and every speech on education.

And I know, too, that to bring about these improvements there must be a substantial breakthrough in educational financing. I have talked about it during every congressional election in recent years—and even more emphatically during some recent presidential campaigns.

It is often said that we are now offering much more schooling of a more expensive sort to very many more pupils than was the case 50 years ago. Yet the truth is that, compared to all other public expenditures, the ratio of what we are spending on education is not more but very much less than was the case 50 years ago. And the further truth is, that unless we start at once to divert more of our resources to educa-

tion, even our physical plant will collapse once it is hit by the present explosion in our population.

The best estimates put the bill for elementary and secondary school education at around \$12 billion. In 10 years it will have to be raised to around \$22 billion. Today, the bill for higher education comes to around \$3 billion. In 10 years it will have increased to around \$9 billion—for a total rise of from \$15 billion annually to \$31 billion annually. With the best will in the world, State, and local governments cannot do the educational job unaided.

But it was not of these familiar themes that I wanted to speak here today. Moreover, I understand you are soon going to hear Dr. Conant's report on his exhaustive investigation of our high schools and their needs. There are, however, some other aspects of education in America which deserve, I think, more attention than they get.

One is teacher training. I will not go so far as to say that every advance in education is made over the dead bodies of 10,000 professors. But it seems to me that we should acknowledge the unhappy fact that our schools of education and teachers' colleges in the main live in isolation from the sources of intellectual ferment in the great universities. Chancellor Kimpton, of the University of Chicago, has reported that these schools of education over the years have developed their courses not in psychology, but in educational psychology, not in physics but in how to teach physics, not in history but in the techniques of teaching history. And all this, reinforced by State licensing laws, has made the student the ultimate casualty. There has been too much emphasis on how to teach a child, rather than what to teach him. Courses in education—especially at the primary level where techniques such as how to read and write must be taught—are certainly valuable. But the emphasis must be restored to teaching teachers the solid content of history, science, English, etc., instead of the techniques of teaching.

I was interested to find this same concern in the Soviet Union, where there is widespread feeling that the pedagogical institutes were overdoing the study of methods at the expense of subject matter. But in the U.S.S.R., a university graduate—who has had no courses in education—is qualified to teach. He may then compensate for this lack by attending one of the 100 in-service teacher training institutes. Here teachers, during free hours in the day or evening, can attend classes in their own fields or get help about specific problems. These schools are, of course, free and attendance voluntary.

Personally, I doubt if we ever again have enough teachers, let alone enough good ones. We will have to have more recourse to the new techniques of teaching by film and television. Happily, the American teacher, no longer dependent on the printed page, can now draw from a vast library of remarkable educational films to open the doors of a child's mind. At last we are learning—and so are the Russians—about the enormous potential in this teaching resource. The easiest, cheapest, best method of presenting more subjects—and sometimes the only method—is films. For example, the Harvey White elementary physics course—now I suppose familiar to all—will in the long run be cheaper than hiring the requisite number of qualified teachers, even if they could be had. And if they could be had, they would probably not be as good teachers as Professor White.

Every change in education is a change in the habits of teachers. Nobody of my generation ever taught with a film or was ever taught by one. And I suspect all teachers have some vague fear of technological unemployment. The facts are, of course, that

these new techniques could be used in every course in the United States without throwing a single teacher out of work. The educational demands of the present time cannot possibly be met without resorting to technology as we have in every other field when manpower was short.

I wonder if the introduction of the book seemed to the teachers of those days to threaten them with technological unemployment. Actually, the book, by helping to make possible the rapid spread of education, greatly increased the demand for teachers. The book also did what the film can do: it made it possible for the teacher to increase the value of his own contribution by making it unnecessary for him to do himself what the book could do for him. If the history teacher today had to recite the contents of the textbooks, he would never get around to making his own specific, personal contribution.

But I have saved for the last what is to me the most important problem of education. Some call it excellence—how to make our young people want to excel in their studies; some talk about motivation—how to make education desirable; others complain that our education is too soft, that it fails to challenge the talents of students.

But are they not all expressions of the same thing—the attitude of the parents and the community? Don't we always have to look to the adult community for our ideals and values? Isn't our education, like our politics, just a reflection of us—of the prevailing attitudes and ideals of the adult community? Won't our politics pump up a cross-section of the community? Won't our schools mirror the respect for excellence, and the intellectual motivation of parents and community? Doesn't the curriculum, hard or soft, reflect the demands of the school board, and doesn't the school board reflect the demands of the parents, and are not the parents a cross-section of the community? Isn't it the community that decides whether the school bond issue passes and the board has the money it needs? And, let's face it, don't those among us who emphasize cost too often prevail over those who emphasize value?

I read that students and their families are reluctant to borrow for education. They will buy TV's, autos, washing machines, even travel, on time and credit, but not education for their children. Is it less necessary?

And isn't Dr. Hutchins too often right when he says that what we seem to want is education without pain, either intellectually or financially?

A member of the Chicago Board of Education recently said to me: "A school system reflects with almost terrifying accuracy the concerns of the community it serves. If parents are interested, if children are brought up with books, the whole system shows it. Principals and teachers, of course, can make an enormous difference, but by and large the community's attitude is the controlling factor."

It has been said that a study of the education of a people can be a clue to what a given culture considers important. The overemphasis in our schools and colleges on athletics and athletic ability at the expense of intellectual attainment wouldn't last a day without public approval—probably more accurately public demand.

And when I complain about the status of teachers in this country—that here in the healthiest, strongest, richest democracy the world has ever seen, the teacher, the intellectual, the scholar, by and large, have less prestige, status and compensation than in the Communist countries—couldn't I say the same thing about many school boards? We insist on managing our education locally; yet how much attention does the average taxpayer give to the selection of the school board? And how much respect, honor, and

recognition do the members get from the community?

And, worse of all, the spurt that sputnik gave us is dying down.

It seems to me that education in the importance of education is the most important job of education. Dr. James Killian, of MIT, put it this way recently:

"What we are concerned with basically is the importance which the American people give to the factor of excellence in our society. It is basically important that we achieve a greater respect for learning, a greater pride in intellectual achievement."

I conclude that it is we the people, we the parents, we the community, that are most to blame for the failures of our education. If in their homes and their environment outside the school the child is indulged, how can the school be expected to turn out a better product? The courses that are taught will not be independent of the feelings, attitudes and demands of the surrounding community. If the community wants driver education or bachelor cooking instead of Latin and mathematics, it will get it. And if colleges give scholarships to boys with coordinated bodies rather than to those with coordinated minds, what will a student value?

I think it is time we, all of us, asked ourselves some searching questions about our values, about what kind of people we really are, about who we are, as the psychologists say. As I have said, if our freedom means ease alone, if it means shirking the hard disciplines of learning, if it means evading the rigors and rewards of creative activity, if it means more expenditure on advertising than education, if it means in the schools the steady cult of the trivial and the mediocre, if it means—worst of all—indifference or even contempt for all but athletic excellence, we may keep for a time the forms of free society, but its spirit will be dead.

I believe we have had enough of adjustment, conformity, easy options and the least common denominator in our social system. We need instead to see the pursuit of happiness in terms which are historically proven and psychologically correct. There is no boredom or misery to equal the pursuit of distraction alone. We do not slip into happiness. It is strenuously sought and earned. A nation glued to the television screen is not simply at a loss before the iron pioneers of the new collective society. It isn't even having a good time. No society has ever spent as much as we do on drink and tranquilizers. Can one argue that this is evidence of universal fun?

But perhaps this misunderstanding of the true nature of happiness and of the conditions of its pursuit is simply an aspect of something else—our misunderstanding of the real nature of freedom. I recall the words of the wise Judge Learned Hand, who warned us that freedom would not survive in our Constitution if it had already died in the hearts of the people. We shall not have a free society unless we have freemen.

I doubt if any society in history has faced so great a moral challenge as ours, or needed more desperately to draw on the deepest sources of courage and responsibility. Ours is the first human community in which resources are so abundant that almost no policies lie beyond our capacities for purely physical reasons. What we decide to do, we can do. The inhibitions of poverty, lack of resources, lack of power—do not hold us back. We can accomplish what we aim at. Thus, perhaps for the first time in the world, choice, not means, ends, not instruments, are decisive.

I hope we choose to upgrade education, and quickly. For as Alfred North Whitehead said 43 years ago: "In the conditions of modern life, the rule is absolute—the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social

charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

The Cotton Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. COFFIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from areas relying on the cotton textile industry are accustomed to two lines of reasoning: First, the industry is ailing and going downhill; and, second, measures seeking to assist the industry involve subsidies or other types of governmental assistance and should therefore be avoided.

Both statements ignore one vital phenomenon which affects no other industry in so great a degree as cotton textiles. I do not know of any other industry where our Government follows a policy of paying about one-fourth of the price of cotton going to an overseas manufacturer. Indeed, what the Government is actually doing is giving an overseas manufacturer a free bale of cotton for every three he buys. Think what our own manufacturers could do if one bale in four were free. As it is, however, not only must they pay the full price for all bales, but they have the doubtful pleasure of knowing that their taxes have helped pay for that extra fourth bale that is given to their competitors.

The recent news of an increase in the cotton export subsidy ran through all the cotton mills north and south like a wintry breeze. It was almost unbelievable that, at a time when the Congress has been working toward a lessening of this differential, the official policy of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has served to aggravate the situation, thus putting our domestic manufacturers at a greater disadvantage in competing with foreign manufacturers and contributing to unrest in cotton growing areas in other nations by further depressing the world market price.

On February 4, 1959, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that it will pay a subsidy of 8 cents per pound on cotton exports during the crop year beginning August 1, 1959. This is 1.5 cents per pound more than the export subsidy which the Department has been paying this year.

Under the program we will be furnishing foreign cotton mills with U.S. cotton at a price of 23.5 cents, while our own manufacturers will be paying 31.5 cents a pound for the same cotton. This will mean a 34-percent differential in raw material costs, to the detriment of American mills.

In announcing the projected price drop on export cotton, the Secretary of Agriculture served notice on foreign buy-

ers that by holding off on purchases of U.S. cotton until after August 1, great savings could be realized. This reduces our exports and contributes further to cotton surpluses. It hurts the farmer, the exporter, and the manufacturer. Unless the administration is willing to modify its approach to this problem, Congress will have no alternative but to adopt legislation which will effectively protect domestic manufacturers in the pricing of domestic cotton.

The Municipal Interest in the Hill-Burton Hospital Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, municipal interest in the Hill-Burton hospital program was outlined to the Alabama congressional delegation last week by one of the outstanding city officials in Alabama, Mayor W. H. Powell, of Centre.

Dr. Powell was here with a number of other Alabama mayors to discuss municipal programs and needs with members of our State delegation. Every congressional district in the Nation has benefited from the Hill-Burton program, and in view of the wide interest in hospital and health legislation I submit Mayor Powell's remarks for the benefit of my colleagues.

Dr. Powell's statement follows:

THE MUNICIPAL INTEREST IN THE HILL-BURTON HOSPITAL PROGRAM

(By Dr. W. H. Powell)

In the 11 years of the Hill-Burton program in Alabama, the progress in the fields of hospitals and related facilities has been one of the bright spots in the development of the State. Through the generous assistance of the Hill-Burton Act, the State is now, for the first time in its history, approaching the accomplishment of a system of general hospitals which can provide the hospital and medical care necessary to the achievement and maintenance of a healthy, growing population. In 1947, Alabama had 4,804 acceptable general hospital beds. In 1958, the State hospital plant reached a total of 9,981 general hospital beds. Of these, 3,871 have been or are being provided under the Hill-Burton program. The percentage of need met has increased from 39.16 percent in 1947 to 69.36 percent in 1958. Thus it is seen that although the progress has been remarkable, the goal of achieving a truly adequate system of general hospitals has not yet been met.

GREAT PROGRESS MADE SINCE 1947

In 1947, only 34 of Alabama's 67 counties had acceptable hospital facilities. Nineteen of the sixty-seven counties had no hospital facilities of any kind. Through the Hill-Burton construction program, the number of counties without general hospital facilities has been reduced to three. But these figures, while showing advancement toward extending general hospital services to the entire State, cannot be considered a measure of adequacy. On January 1, 1959, only 20 of the 67 counties could boast of having met 90 percent or more of their needs for general hospital beds. And in the face of this increase in beds, there has been a sig-

nificant increase in the utilization of general hospital services. Every year more and more hospitals report overcrowded occupancies and are requesting assistance in making additions and alterations to meet the public's increasing demand for hospital care.

During the same period, considerable progress toward the provision of adequate facilities for public health has been made through the construction of 38 public health centers and 7 public health laboratories. This has been a commendable extension of public health services. But 18 counties still do not have adequate public health facilities.

Probably the only field in which the State is approaching adequacy in hospital facilities is in the provision of tuberculosis sanatoria. Four sanatoria with 530 beds have been constructed. But even the adequacy of this type facility is open to question. There is a critical need for a 100-bed addition to the sanatorium in Montgomery and all of the existing sanatoria are operating at or near maximum occupancy.

While some progress has been made in providing mental hospitals and schools of nursing, Alabama has a critical need for additional facilities of these types. The increase in the number of hospital beds has concurrently enlarged the need for competent, trained, and capable nurses. Leaders in both these fields, as in the others included within the scope of the Hill-Burton program, are ready and anxious to meet these needs with the assistance of the Hill-Burton program.

THE GREAT NEED FOR NURSING HOMES

Due to the limited appropriations, only minor progress has been made in the fields represented by the 1954 amendments to the Hill-Burton Act. Without question, the most critical need in the health facility program in Alabama is for the provision of modern, well-equipped, efficient, and adequate nursing homes. Everyone is in general agreement that we have, in this Nation, an aging population. The remarkable advancement of medicine in recent years has materially increased life expectancy and more and more of our citizens are reaching the age where nursing homes are essential to their life and well-being. In 1958, Alabama had only 514 suitable nursing home beds whereas a total of 6,232 were needed. Due to limited funds available, only 100 nursing home beds had been constructed through 1958.

Progress in the provision of adequate facilities for the care and treatment of chronic diseases has also been slow due to the serious limitation of funds. In 1958, the State had only 160 chronic disease beds, of which 120 had been constructed under the Hill-Burton program. During the same year, the State needed 6,252 beds to meet its needs in this field.

Progress toward adequacy in the vitally needed field of rehabilitation centers has been appreciable. One of the finest comprehensive rehabilitation centers in the Nation has been completed in Mobile and a small center has been opened in Huntsville, both constructed under the Hill-Burton program. In addition to these, Alabama should have comprehensive rehabilitation centers in Montgomery and Birmingham and four small centers to serve local needs. In addition, the comprehensive rehabilitation center in Tuskegee should be enlarged and remodeled.

FACILITIES FOR AMBULANT PATIENTS

The only category of facilities included within the scope of the Hill-Burton program which has not been wholeheartedly and widely accepted by the people of Alabama is diagnostic and treatment centers. Completed projects include an outpatient department of a general hospital, and a tuberculosis screening center. One mental health clinic is under construction and one has been

approved for construction. The actual need in this field is rather nebulous, but it can be truthfully stated that there is a real need for additional facilities for ambulant patients.

A summary of the hospital construction program in Alabama shows that the 139 facilities completed, under construction, and approved are located in 69 cities and towns in 56 counties. The total value of these projects is in excess of \$76 million. In addition to these facilities, the State department of public health has on file applications for 55 additional projects located in 38 cities and towns in 33 counties. These 55 projects are estimated to cost in excess of \$35 million. There is, in addition to these proposed projects, the extensive medical center being planned in Birmingham. Although the full scope of the medical center is yet to be determined, it is known that it will include one or more facilities such as general hospitals, outpatient services, chronic disease hospital, rehabilitation center, nursing home, school of nursing, public health facilities, and several specialized hospitals.

WE ARE STILL SOME DISTANCE FROM OUR GOALS

Progress toward a truly adequate system of health facilities to serve the citizens of Alabama has been remarkable. But there is still a very long way to go before Alabama can reach its goal. The people of the State, its municipalities, its county governing bodies, and the State itself have all proven their genuine interest in providing an adequate hospital system. This interest is increasing, but help is needed from Hill-Burton sources to permit Alabama to provide the facilities it needs. Alabama's share of the maximum authorized Hill-Burton program is vitally needed and both can and will be wisely spent for many years to come.

Dulles: Exemplar of Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an excellent editorial by Msgr. Joseph C. Walen, editor of the Western Michigan Catholic, published at Grand Rapids, Mich.:

DULLES: EXEMPLAR OF DEDICATION

(By Msgr. Joseph C. Walen)

The request of President Eisenhower that Americans pray for the recovery of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles should gain a ready response from all who believe in prayer—and even from those in our country who don't.

The sense of public service which drove Dulles on to work ceaselessly is altogether too rare. As he faces the battle with cancer for his life, Americans in a spirit of gratitude should seek God's help that this dedicated man be spared suffering, and if it be the will of Providence, that he continue for a while to fight for peace for the human race of our time.

STOOD UP TO RUSSIANS

In the fantastically complex business of international relations of modern times Dulles has consistently sought the good of all freedom-loving nations. He has been criticized, sometimes mercilessly by our own allies. This is not to say that some disagreements with his views were not justified by

other leaders in the United States or in other countries. The fact stands out, however, that his firmness in the face of Russian demands for everything they can get is much more to be admired than the pleas of the appeasers who have urged that we learn to live with the Soviets. Dulles was willing to do the latter, too, but not that the life would be one of slavery.

I liked the appraisal of Dulles' spirit by Joseph Alsop, syndicated columnist whose writings appear in this territory in the Grand Rapids Herald.

In his Tuesday piece Alsop pointed out that such a spirit is becoming more and more rare. Alsop wrote that Dulles' critics have accused him of being moralistic in the approach to the cold war. These critics berated him, observes Alsop, as seeing this war too much in terms of right and wrong.

NOT FOOLED BY MIKOYAN

Alsop also refers to the fact that Dulles' view of Anastas Mikoyan as a murderer was better than the view of the big businessmen who were charmed by the insinuating Mikoyan manners, or who saw him as the people of Chicago saw him, who mobbed his opera box to get the Mikoyan autograph. Since Mikoyan is very obviously an immensely complex character, necessarily mingling some good with evil, the Dulles' view of him no doubt is too uncomplicated.

"By the same token, the Dulles' vision of the cold war as a gigantic contest between good and evil, in which one could not give an inch without being guilty of surrender to the powers of darkness, is immeasurably more accurate than the vision of the cold war held by those who denounce Dulles for inflexibility."

John Foster Dulles has served his country untiringly, without regard of partisan politics in the face of national crises. He has felt the whiplash of unjustified criticism often while he went about in the performance of his duties.

AMERICANS, PLEASE NOTE

His exemplary Americanism should not go unnoticed nor unacknowledged. It is tragically true that many Americans are so unwilling to serve their country that they are too lazy or too indifferent to vote, to say nothing of their lack of willingness to give up some of their recreation time to render community service. The exaggerated devotion to the concept that after 40 hours of work a week, Americans should be totally absorbed in recreation and loafing in recent years has brought about a lamentable unwillingness to work and sweat among many of us, and that starts with the young people in our schools, from elementary grades on up, to many workers at varied jobs.

Secretary Dulles on his bed of pain is a solemn reminder that morality and love of freedom has a martyr in our time, but also another reminder that a scarcity of such martyrs can bring about the loss of this freedom to the tyranny of communism.

A Resolution Adopted by the Council of International Relations of San Antonio, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a resolution adopted on Feb-

ruary 9, 1959, by the Council of International Relations of San Antonio, Tex.

The Council of International Relations is an organization of dedicated citizens of San Antonio sincerely interested in foreign affairs and the participation of our country therein.

I solicit the attention of the membership of the House to the resolution adopted by this organization.

Whereas the Council of International Relations is an international group of more than 400 men and women with a board of governors of military and civilian leaders from civic, cultural, patriotic, professional and educational organizations, and

Whereas the council has for its major objective the strengthening of the ties of friendship and understanding between our land and the free nations of the world; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Council of International Relations in regular session assembled, does tonight express its sincere appreciation of the firm, courageous stand taken by our beloved President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and our illustrious Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, in support of our ally, the Republic of China, during these difficult months through which she has been passing; be it further

Resolved, That we as citizens of a Christian nation urge a continuance of our unswerving support of these noble people who have suffered so greatly at the hands of their ruthless oppressor, Red China; be it further

Resolved, That we as intelligent men and women realize that to admit Red China into our United Nations Organization would be a disastrous mistake. By its admission we would condone the actions of those who have desecrated every noble principle and ideal upon which the great nation of China was established and have enslaved millions of liberty loving people behind its iron curtain; we urge our great leaders to continue their wise stand against its admission; and be it further

Resolved, That the more than 100,000 men and women who are represented through our board of governors join us in a united protest of any official recognition of the godless, Communist nation, Red China; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Hon. Watson M. Wise, United Nations delegate, Chinese Consul Raymond S. H. Hoo, Houston, Tex., the press, and that a copy be spread upon the minutes of our organization.

Approved this the 9th day of February 1959, San Antonio, Tex.

Resolutions committee:

JOHN D. PALMER,
Mrs. HENRY SHAFFER, Sr.,
L. C. ROBALIN,
Mrs. CHARLES R. ALLEN,
Maj. Gen. J. R. SHEETZ,
Mrs. PRESTON H. DIAL,
President.

Address of E. S. Fields to Indiana Technical College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, during the past few years there

has been considerable attention given to the quality of training available in the scientific and technical fields. One of the educational institutions in this country which is making a fine and valuable contribution to the Nation's needs in this respect is the Indiana Technical College at Fort Wayne, Ind.

The midwinter graduating class of the college was addressed recently by one of the country's outstanding executives, E. S. Fields, president of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.

His remarks are of such significance that I feel my colleagues in the House should have the benefit of his observations. Mr. Fields' address follows:

Mr. President, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, guests, and members of the graduating class of Indiana Technical College, I am deeply appreciative of the opportunity to participate with you in your program today and speaking to you on this very important occasion.

Several weeks ago I made a visit here to the college. As I was flying to Fort Wayne on that occasion, the particular thought came to me in that temporary detachment from the business world which usually occupies me on such a day, that it was a rare privilege for a businessman to be able to spend a day on the campus of an institution of higher learning.

This particularly so for a person whose college life was many years behind him—more decades than he cares to remember.

In looking through some papers I had brought along for reading on that trip, I came across a leaflet issued by the Council for Financial Aid to Education which intensified my interest in making that visit and the anticipation of being here today.

In that leaflet was the information that now 1 out of every 3 young men and women of college age in the United States is attending college while 50 years ago it was only 1 out of 24. This is indicative of the growth of our country in size and quality and the vast demand for college-educated men and women in all walks of life.

As the plane on that earlier trip came into Fort Wayne, the element of growth of our country was evidenced by the new industries and homes that could be seen spreading out in all directions around your city, a characteristic scene these days throughout the length and breadth of our land.

My attention was attracted, quite naturally I presume, to the sight of the great steel tower electric transmission lines and the scars on the ground marking the presence of high-pressure underground gas lines, both converging on the city. To me, those great transporters of energy exemplified the quality aspect of our country. They represented the contributions of college-educated people to the development of adequate energy sources that are vital to the needs of our modern existence. Their importance lies in the fact that the energy requirements to support the expanding economy of the country are increasing at a rate 10 times that of our population increase.

The leaflet on education went on to state that by 1970 the country's college enrollment will be double what it is now. I am sure that this fantastic increase in demand for higher education does not disturb the administrative heads and faculties of the colleges and universities, as they are dedicated to the proposition that our future well-being depends upon increased numbers of highly educated men and women.

There was ample proof of this at the ninth Thomas Alva Edison Foundation Institute held 2 weeks ago at the University of Cincinnati. The theme of the meeting was "Appraising Science Education." The study of science education in this country has been

intensified, and justifiably so, since our leadership in this field has been recently challenged, as evidenced by the Russian launching of the sputniks and their progress in the nuclear fields.

You would have been impressed by the scrupulousness with which the several hundred teachers of science in attendance at this meeting discussed the student, teacher, and subject relationship to increase the amount of take-home knowledge right down to the preparatory work in the high schools.

If these educators have any concern at all, I believe it is involved in the questions whether there will be sufficient teachers and have available to them the facilities to do the job adequately.

With evidences of expansion of our country on all sides of us, it seemed to me to be appropriate to this occasion to sketch out some concepts of the future, using the next 15 to 20 years for the picture. Here is how you, the members of this graduating class, will be involved. At that time the members of this class will be approximately 40 years of age; you will have matured in your chosen field of endeavor; and it is you and your contemporaries coming out of the colleges of the country that must be depended upon to assume positions of leadership and responsibility in the business, social, and political structures of the time.

The forecasts for the period ahead that are used are those developed by the country's most qualified students of economic trends and they are generally accepted as possible of attainment.

There are two basic premises underlying these forecasts: First, that the population of the country will continue to grow at a rapid pace; and second, that the people of this country will continue to exert their efforts, skills, and ingenuities to raise their standard of living.

In a general way, the economists use two measures to forecast the business volume at any near future date—the number of customers (population) and how much in goods and services it takes to supply them. Simply stated, the expansion derives from more people requiring more things.

As to the first point, the population of the country is now 175 million and there will be some 57 million more people; that is, consumers of goods and services, by the year 1975, an increase of 34 percent. There could be a lesser increase in number of workers, as it appears that the populations at the two ends of the age scale will increase more rapidly than those of employable age in the middle of the scale. In any event, to achieve our ambitions for a higher standard of living, each worker must then be producing about 50 percent more than he produces today.

Concerning the second point, there is no reason to speculate here on what specific things will be provided to meet the people's future demands other than to reiterate that there will be more people requiring more things such as housing, clothing, food, automobiles, home appliances, and so forth, and many new things not yet in the minds of men. Our total energy requirements at the time, another measure of our standard of living, could be three times what they are today.

We are a Nation with only 7 percent of the world's population, yet we have approximately half of the things that add to the pleasures and comforts of modern living.

Keep in mind that this status has been acquired under a freedom of life that brought our ancestors to this country and a freedom of enterprise under which each of us can profit from the fruits of our own genius and labor.

While it is not the subject of this discussion, we must be eternally on guard against the siren calls of those advocates of the easier life through dependence upon the Government—the result can only be a further erosion of the liberties that we prize so highly.

The split world and the split atom dominate the onrushing current of events of our time, and the only way we can possibly attain the goals set for ourselves is to use to capacity our most powerful resource—our brainpower. This is too wonderful and exciting a time for loafers or free riders.

A year ago outer space was something for the cartoon strips and the science-fiction magazines. Today there are satellites in the edge of space; submarines powered and homes lighted by nuclear fission; computers solving problems for business and industry; radar in daily commercial use; and people watching television in remote places of the world.

Not one of these phenomena was happening 20 years ago. Yet, startling as those changes are, they are a mere foretaste of what will almost certainly happen during the next 20 years. For the rate of change is continuing, possibly even accelerating.

New materials, new products, and new machines will present a host of challenging opportunities to individuals willing and able to exploit them.

We are already in the shift from mass production, for which we are noted, into that technological revolution we term automation. Many processes we use today will become obsolete and supplanted by larger and faster machines, and manual effort will be supplemented to an ever-increasing degree by mechanical power.

The laborer will lose out to the semiskilled, as some of the jobs formerly performed by laborers are done by machines. The semiskilled, in turn, will lose out to the skilled, as the machine-operative jobs and servicing of the machines become complicated in the automated process. Many new processes requiring special skills will appear, and many with which we are now familiar will disappear. Please keep in mind, however, that machines cannot think, they cannot exercise judgment, nor do they have imagination. That has to be the contribution of quality educated and trained people in this new order of things.

As we look into the era ahead, it is interesting to trace man's quest for power to supplement the sole efforts of his own muscles. It was centuries before he learned to use the muscles of animals, and it was relatively recent that the wind was resorted to for pumping water and that mill towns grew up along the rivers and streams where falling water could be harnessed to drive machines. Modern industry began with the invention of the steam engine for conversion of the energy of our stored-up fuels—coal, oil, and gas—into mechanical power to drive more machines. And with the advent of mass transportation and electric power the limitation as to location of people and industry was removed.

Human progress has been in proportion to the adaptation of power to the world's work. Beyond the time of exhaustion of our coal, oil, and gas reserves lie the inexhaustible potential power resources available from the most recently discovered process of atomic fission and the possibilities for the controlled use of hydrogen fusion. Our continued progress, which these new sources of energy make possible, can only be assured by the increasing numbers of people freed from manual labors devoting themselves to creative work.

And I would like to say here, parenthetically, that one of the most creative fields, both present and future, is that of teaching.

Now for some thoughts for your consideration upon graduation.

Since a young engineer cannot continue his formal education on a full-time basis indefinitely, he must continue to grow after graduation if he is to equip himself adequately to assume a place of leadership in the future.

Closing the gap between the attitudes of the college campus and the realities of earn-

ing a living and making progress in the complex situation of modern business is not an easy task.

While many companies have definite training programs for the young college men that join them, there is much a young man can do on his own initiative to contribute to his self-development by being alert and inquisitive and learning all he can about his employer's business.

The march of progress is constantly occurring and the young engineer must continue to advance his knowledge or be left behind. His college education is a firm foundation on which he can continue to build throughout his lifetime. In addition to advanced technical knowledge he will profit by a deeper understanding of human behavior and motivation; and from a broader appreciation of the business and social institutions of our environment.

It is equally important that the young engineer understand himself. Periodic self analysis can serve as a means of strengthening confidence by recognition of admitted shortcomings. This he can do within his own counsels.

Two of the most important attributes the successful man must possess are first, the ability to deal with men and affairs and second, the ability to read and absorb the written experience of others. A planned reading program of good books and articles of lasting value to broaden and deepen social and technical knowledge will add much personal enjoyment.

Those of you who aspire to leadership of business enterprises must take note of the new and dynamic concepts in the business management fields. The new ideas concerning management now emerging are predicted upon the assumption that management is an identifiable, measurable, and transferable activity that can be mastered, as can any other skill.

In closing, let me leave one more thought with you that is aside from these more or less materialistic points of view.

We are in an international technological race, because a formidable adversary has made it a race. We emphasize the need for technological speed-up, but on the need for a spiritual speed-up much less has been said.

We must not simply overwhelm ourselves with the physical sciences leading to the materialistic; rather we must gain for ourselves an understanding of man's spiritual and emotional progress as reflected in his literature, art, music, history, and philosophy. The man or woman who concentrates on "things" can hardly be trusted to use those "things" for the essential good of mankind.

Only those who have guided the development of their spirit as well as their mind are really educated and qualified to use wisely the things that man's reason has enabled him to fashion out of nature's raw materials.

I extend to you my heartiest congratulations and best wishes.

The Value of the Federal Grant Program for Sewage Treatment Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, last week a number of Alabama mayors came to Washington to discuss the various mu-

nicipal problems with Alabama's congressional delegation. There are several Federal programs which provide much-needed help to cities and towns across the country and we were anxious to hear the views of our local officials on these programs.

The Honorable Hugh Patterson, mayor of Gadsden, Ala., my hometown, discussed the value of the Federal grant program for sewage treatment plants and I am sure that his remarks apply to hundreds of towns and cities. I submit Mayor Patterson's statement for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE VALUE OF THE FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM FOR SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS

(By Hugh Patterson)

It is a privilege to appear before you in the interest of Federal aid to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment works. Alabama's municipal officials appreciate the unfailing support our congressional delegation has given to Public Law 660 and to appropriations authorized by this law—for grants to cities and towns. Your record on this legislation and appropriation measures speaks for itself and we take pride in the delegation's unanimous support of the entire program.

Each and every community has the responsibility for providing adequate sewage collection and disposal systems to protect the health of its citizens and of those residing in adjoining areas that may be affected by the discharge of improperly treated sewage from the community. Community sewage must also be treated and disposed of in a manner that will be least objectionable, will protect property values and will permit reasonable use of waters into which it is discharged.

A community's growth and prosperity depends upon its facilities and services. There are Alabama communities in which residential expansion has been restricted by the lack of adequate sewage collection and treatment works. I also feel sure that some municipalities have been bypassed by industries seeking a location because of inadequate sewerage facilities.

COST OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT CONTINUALLY RISING

The cost of municipal government continues to rise and municipal governing officials are repeatedly requested to expand services and utilities. Revenues have not kept pace with costs and we have been forced to impose higher tax burdens or increase the utility cost to our citizens. The Federal grant program for municipal sewage works construction has made it easier for many communities to undertake improvements in sewage disposal. Many communities cannot finance construction of these improvements without help from this or other sources. These grants have also stimulated interest in providing for adequate sewage treatment works and are a definite incentive to a community.

Since July 1956, allotments of grant funds to Alabama from appropriations under Public Law 660 have been made to 21 municipalities—an average of 7 new projects per fiscal year. The total construction cost of these 21 projects is approximately \$23,700,000, of which \$3,272,000 will be from Federal grants. The high proportion of this cost borne by local government—86.2 percent—has led one of Alabama's leading daily newspapers to editorially praise the Federal grant program to municipalities. It should be recognized that the Federal Government participates only to the extent of 30 percent of the cost of sewage treatment works with the maximum of any one grant set at \$250,000. The municipality must bear the total cost of col-

lecting sewers, which are ineligible for Federal participation.

WILL SERVE 700,000 PERSONS

The sewage treatment facilities made available by these 21 projects will have a capacity for 700,000 persons. During the 2-year period the grant program has been in effect 12 projects with a capacity for 42,000 persons and involving construction costs totaling \$1,970,000 have been started without grant aid. As a comparison, 15 projects having a capacity for 230,000 persons and costing \$3,300,000 were begun during the 3 years prior to the effective date of Public Law 660. It is apparent that municipal sewage disposal problems of long standing are being corrected and public health hazards eliminated through financial assistance from the Federal Government.

While accomplishments during the first 2½ years of the aid program provided by Public Law 660 have been outstanding, we have only scratched the surface in our efforts to correct problems created by unsatisfactory sewage disposal. I am told that 105 communities in Alabama are in need of sewage disposal improvements. These 105 projects would represent an estimated expenditure of \$29 million for sewage treatment works alone and, under the present method of grant allocations, will require \$5,600,000 in Federal funds. According to the Alabama State Department of Health and the State water improvement commission, these figures do not include replacement and expansion of systems that may become inadequate within the next 5 years. Replacement and expansion costs are estimated to run as high as \$2 million annually.

SMALLER COMMUNITIES SERIOUSLY AFFECTED

Among the 105 communities with pressing problems of sewage disposal are Alabama's smaller municipalities which find it more difficult—if not impossible—to finance the cost of necessary improvements without aid. In my own city of Gadsden, we are faced with the necessity for expanding our sewage collection system and replacement of overloaded and inadequate sewage treatment facilities. Our problem has been discussed with representatives of Alabama's health agencies and we have been promised financial assistance if, and when, Federal funds are available for this purpose. We know that Alabama's annual allotment for the Federal grants to municipalities has been slightly over \$1,100,000 and recognize that this amount will help only a few and must be distributed on a priority basis. Our city is not alone as I am informed that 23 other communities have requested grant aid to the extent of over \$2 million.

Although accomplishments under the grant program have been most encouraging, we are far from attaining the level of sewage works construction necessary to eliminate the many situations of sewage pollution. We must bear in mind that municipal improvements delayed during the war years left our communities with a tremendous financial burden. While the present grant program is most helpful, it is obvious that it must be expanded if we are to meet our responsibilities.

NEED FOR SUPPORT OF BROADER PROGRAM

I am confident that you recognize the importance of adequate sewage disposal and the urgent need for continuing and expanding the grant program authorized by Public Law 660. Three bills introduced in the 85th Congress, H.R. 11472 by Mr. PRICE, of Illinois, H.R. 11714 by Mr. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and S. 3576 by Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, sought to increase Federal aid to municipalities for sewage treatment works construction. These bills were supported by municipal government. Alabama's municipal officials join me in asking you to continue your support of appropriations authorized by

Public Law 660 and to exercise your influence in securing passage of legislation to expand this program.

ABOLISHMENT OF PROGRAM IS INCONCEIVABLE

I understand that President Eisenhower has again asked the Congress to bring to an end the Federal grant-in-aid program for sewage treatment facilities. This is a shocking attitude for a man supposed to be big enough to preside over the governmental affairs of the world's greatest Nation. In that connection I would like to quote from an item appearing in a recent issue of the American Municipal News, indicating that even the President's advisers differ with his viewpoint on this great program. I quote:

"Presidential advisers on water pollution problems again have taken issue with the administration's proposal to end Federal grants to local communities for construction of sewage treatment plants.

"The nine-member Water Pollution Control Advisory Board at its December 16 meeting, by unanimous vote, urged that the present grants-in-aid be continued.

"Milton P. Adams, Vice Chairman of the Board, is reported to have stated, 'The President could have been better advised,' when he recommended that the Federal Government turn the program over to the States. 'He did not ask us,' Adams told a press conference.

"Adams, who like the other members of the Board, is appointed by the President, described the proposal as 'a hot potato' and pointed out that the telephone companies are lobbying for repeal of the tax which was a wartime measure.

"Board members approved a resolution stating that the budget that will be presented to Congress next month should contain at least the \$45 million that was appropriated for the program during the current year. Consideration should be given to increasing the amount available for construction, they said.

"The Federal Government now makes the grants under a 1956 law providing an incentive for communities to build sewage treatment facilities by contributing up to 30 percent of the cost. The law calls for a 10-year program and authorizes up to \$50 million a year.

"Board members estimated a need of \$70 million to \$75 million each year in Federal grants to bring community participation up to a satisfactory level."

I thank you, gentlemen, for your courteous hearing of our comments on this very worthwhile Federal-municipal program.

Three Winning Essays by Elementary Students at Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Los Angeles County, Calif., in the Great 23d Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I herewith present to your attention the text of three essays on Abraham Lincoln written by students at the Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Calif., which is in the great 23d District, Los Angeles, Calif., which I represent in this legislative body

Mrs. Amy J. Sherlock is the principal and Donald D. Reber is the superintendent of schools.

I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, join in congratulations to the principal of this school and to the teachers and instructors thereof for emphasizing the birth and life of Abraham Lincoln. That school also had a special assembly in commemoration of this great American and who knows but that one or more of these youngsters in my native State of California writing these essays may someday sit in Congress as a Member thereof, in a joint meeting of the House and the Senate as we present Members joined with the Senate and the Supreme Court and the President's Cabinet and the Ambassadors on the recent date of February 12, when the distinguished historian, Carl Sandburg, read his magnificent tribute to Lincoln and when the distinguished American, Fredric March, read the Lincoln's Gettysburg Address so feelingly:

THE 16TH PRESIDENT

(An essay by Hillary Barsky, a member of the fifth grade class at Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Calif.)

Even though Abraham Lincoln had a humble beginning he went to the White House. Abe Lincoln was born on February 12, in a small log cabin. Lincoln had little schooling, but he taught himself. He liked the river too.

Lincoln liked politics also, but failed on his first attempt. He served in the Illinois Legislature.

When Lincoln was President, the Civil War broke out. But Lincoln was strong, he believed in democracy, he preserved our Nation and held together what our forefathers fought for. If it had not been for Lincoln our country might have been split in two.

The war lasted nearly 4 years. Then Lincoln was elected for another term.

Then a terrible thing happened. Lincoln was shot while watching a play, by John Wilkes Booth.

Abraham Lincoln will always be remembered one of America's greatest men. Sometimes he is called the Second Father of our Country.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(An essay by Rodney Henke, a student at Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Calif.)

Abraham Lincoln was born in 1809 and died in 1865. He was our 16th President. He was one of the most hated as well as one of the most loved American Presidents.

He was born in a log cabin on a farm in Kentucky. His father was Thomas Lincoln, a pioneer farmer.

The greatest thing Lincoln did during his term as President was when he set the slaves free in the States on January 1, 1863.

On April 14, in a theater with his family, he was shot by John Booth and died the very next day. This caused the whole world much grief and sorrow.

There have been lots of monuments, shrines and memorials erected and dedicated to his memory.

OUR LINCOLN

(An essay by Deborah Cosman, a fifth-grade student at Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Calif.)

"Fourscore and seven years ago, our forefathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

The Gettysburg Address had its beginning in Abe's younger life. Born in a crude log cabin, of humble parents, he studied and worked hard. Rising from town postmaster, he was elected to the State legislature. Defeated in the election for U.S. Senator, he went on to become the 16th President of the United States. He remained true to his ideals of human equality by freeing the slaves and finally giving his life for this cause.

In his lifetime, Lincoln was one of the most hated, as well as one of the most loved, of American Presidents. Time has erased hatred, and today Lincoln is known throughout the world as "The Great Emancipator," champion of freedom, and hero of American history.

Dedication Ceremonies, New Supreme Court Building, Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James V. Mangano, general clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, second judicial district, at the dedication ceremonies of the new Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959, together with an address by Hon. J. Vincent Keogh, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES V. MANGANO

Reverend clergy, associate judge of the court of appeals, Charles W. Froessel; presiding justice of the appellate division, Gerald Nolan; the representative of the mayor of the city of New York; associate justices of the appellate division; chairman and senior justice of the board of justices of the supreme court, second judicial district; Anthony J. DiGiovanna, borough president of Brooklyn; the Honorable John Cashmore, commissioner of public works; Frederick Zurmuhlen, State administrator of the judicial conference; John B. Johnston, justices of our court; distinguished guests; representatives of the bar and of the bench; public officials; ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the board of justices of the second judicial district may I extend to you a most cordial welcome on this memorable occasion, the dedication of the new Supreme Court Building, Kings County.

At this time as general clerk of the supreme court and its administrative director, and by the direction of the board of justices of the supreme court, second judicial district, I hereby declare the formal and official opening of these ceremonies and of the business of this court.

We are about to start a new year and a new era in a new building. As I have watched this building rise to completion, I have been mindful of the following words:

"If we work upon marble, it will perish; if we work upon brass, time will efface it; if we rear temples, they will crumble into dust; but if we work upon the immortal soul, if we imbue it with principles, with a just fear of God and love for our fellow men, then we engrave on that tablet something which will brighten all eternity."

May we carry on with that thought in mind, ladies and gentlemen.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks to the chairman of the new courthouse committee, the members of that committee, the board of justices for the cooperation and coordination which were extended to me and my staff during my incumbency as the general clerk of this court and during the transition from the old to the new courthouse.

I cannot permit to go unnoticed the efficiency and interest manifested by the chairman of our justices' committee on the new courthouse during his many dealings with many agencies.

I am sure that through his efforts and energy there evolved a better, mutual understanding among the board of justices, the city administration, the department of public works under the commissionship of Commissioner Zurmuhlen, and the department of purchase under the able commissionship of Joseph Spagna, culminating in this beautiful temple of justice, this new Supreme Court Building.

I also cannot permit to go unnoticed the efforts and the energies extended by the chairman of the house committee in the past, and who will continue to cooperate with our staff, the Honorable Justice Walter Hart.

I also wish to publicly acknowledge the able leadership of our chairman of the board of justices. We are very proud of the members of our judiciary in this court, but I am particularly grateful and appreciative to the chairman of our board of justices.

Now it is my extreme pleasure to present to you a man who has done a Herculean job in bringing about the orderly arrangement between city departments and this court. I hope that this is the beginning of a great and mutual understanding between the city departments and our court. I present to you the energetic, able jurist, the chairman of the new courthouse committee, the Honorable J. Vincent Keogh. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE J. VINCENT KEOGH

Mr. Mangano; reverend clergy; our borough president; Mr. Cashmore, associate judge of the court of appeals; Judge Froessel; Judge Nolan, and all other distinguished justices and judges of this great court and of all other courts represented here today; distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, as chairman of the justices' committee of this new Supreme Court Building, which at one time not too long ago wasn't even a gleam in a budgetary eye, I should like to express composite appreciation of my colleagues, the staff and personnel of this court.

Particularly do we realize that my immediate predecessor as chairman, now still of this supreme court but by gubernatorial appointment a distinguished member of our appellate division, really must be given credit for the accomplishment that we dedicate today, the Honorable Henry L. Ughetta, not only a lawyer but an engineer and judge.

To our mayor, borough president, our commissioner of public works, Commissioner Zurmuhlen, commissioner of purchase, Mr. Spagna, and to all of you, our taxpaying friends, our heartfelt thanks.

A modest, efficient, and quietly industrious member of our court personnel anticipated the many details, heard suggestions, listened to what was usually constructive criticism, and in general was the complaint department. He went down the line to this very end and supervised, as you all saw, today's ceremonies. I want to pay public tribute to my loyal assistant, Max Benjamin. [Applause.]

To the members of the committee on the new building, Judges DiGiovanna, Brown, McDonald, A. David Benjamin, and Surrogate Moss, my sincere thanks.

And to another member of the committee who has been indefatigable in making cer-

tain the highest traditions and standards are ever maintained, the man you just heard, the Honorable James V. Mangano, our general clerk. [Applause]

To you, Mr. Mangano, I am very happy to throw the housekeeping torch because the committee on the new building is no more. After all, we are here and, as they say in condemnation, the improvement is complete and, technically, depreciation has already set in. [Laughter]

Joseph H. Choate of international legal reputation must have had in mind a man with the credentials of a beloved colleague of ours who we are proud to call chief. Mr. Choate remarked, "Law is the expression and perfection of commonsense." The "expression and perfection of the law" come only from men endowed with a rich spirit, full learning, and humility of soul.

It will be no new experience for our friend to preside at these historic ceremonies. The highest ranking judicial officer of this department, he is presiding justice of our appellate division, which appellate division has and, we all know, will continue to enjoy, a formidable reputation among the members of the bench and bar. Our new 10th home, this building which we dedicate today, represents, to a very great extent, this man's kindly and intense interest in legal and judicial standards.

It is my great pleasure to present our presiding officer of the day, the Honorable Gerald Nolan. [Applause]

Address by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, Charleston, S.C., Friday, February 20, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a speech given at the Francis Marion Hotel, Charleston, S.C., Friday, February 20, 1959, by the distinguished Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke.

This magnificent speech was delivered at the 182d annual meeting of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, which is the oldest chamber of commerce in the United States. This timely address is a warning to all Americans who want this country to survive in the days that lie ahead:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, USN, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF CHARLESTON, S.C., CHARLESTON, S.C., FEBRUARY 20, 1959

It is a pleasure to be here in Charleston—and I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to talk to leaders of a community which has always been important to the U.S. Navy—and which is now becoming even more so.

Charleston is becoming more important as the Navy goes forward with its fleet dispersal program. This is a program which has been instituted in recognition of constantly changing needs in national security.

World conditions are very fluid. The situation is constantly changing. We have seen rapid advances in technology. We are wit-

nessing rapid and sometimes unpredictable progress in weapon-system development.

For this reason we must constantly reexamine the nature and degree of the threat facing us, and we must keep under constant review our needs to meet it. This means that we must continually reevaluate our military posture.

In reexamining the threat confronting us, we must recognize at the very outset that the Soviets have no intention of gaining their objectives slowly by the use of military force.

This is one of the most misunderstood facts of life today. The Communists have demonstrated over and over again—both in word and deed—that military force is only one of many means which they expect to use in their efforts to take over the world.

Indeed the danger could come more from an economic Communist offensive leveled against the free world.

It is important for us to understand that a cardinal rule of the Soviet leaders is that the destiny of communism must not be jeopardized by harebrained risk.

It is not saber rattling to say that the Soviets know that the United States has the ability—right now, in being—to destroy the Soviet Union. We can do it in several ways—and several times over with our powerful Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force—with carrier striking forces of the U.S. Navy—with tactical air—and with intermediate range ballistic missiles which are now being installed in certain European sites.

The Soviet Union cannot prevent our retaliatory strikes should the Kremlin leaders decide to initiate general nuclear war.

Therefore, the probability of general nuclear war is remote, for it would be suicide for the U.S.S.R.

The advent of ballistic missiles for delivery of mass destruction warheads has raised some basic considerations in the role of armed force as an instrument of national policy.

Missiles have placed new emphasis upon the importance of concealment and surprise. This makes our own installations and cities more vulnerable than ever before.

In the remote possibility that the Soviets might undertake to initiate a general nuclear war—their prime objective would be to eliminate the ability of the United States to retaliate.

To do this the Soviet Union would launch its missiles against our known positions. Everybody knows where our bases and installations are located. Everybody knows the locations of our strategic air bases here at home and abroad. Our missile sites also will be known no matter how many we build—or how much we attempt to keep them secret.

This poses a major problem for the United States. In the past 100 years of history of our wonderful country—we have considered that anything in the continental limits of the United States was relatively safe.

With the distances involved—and the limitations then inherent in the weapons of war—when the United States became a first-class seapower we recognized that it was a good thing to base our military strength primarily in our own homeland until it was needed in war.

In an age of ballistic missiles—it is now just the opposite. The security of bases in the continental limits of the United States will no longer be fully available to us when ballistic missiles become fully operational.

We face the further problem, on the other hand, that we will not have knowledge of the location of each and every enemy missile site. Even if we could expect to have this knowledge, we recognize that in general nuclear war missile forces can no longer attempt to destroy their enemy counterpart without destroying the corporate body of

the enemy state itself, provided all these forces are stationed within the heart of the homeland.

This works both ways. All the world knows that the United States will not initiate war, or take steps designed to provoke war. In such circumstances—what do we do in the face of a growing Soviet missile capability?

There has been considerable concern in this country about a missile gap. Most of this concern has been centered primarily upon a numerical difference between U.S. missile strength and that of the Soviet Union.

However, it is not a quantitative gap we should be concerned about. Rather it is a qualitative gap we must be careful to avoid.

In this connection the United States is ahead of the Russians in retaliatory powers. It is far more powerful than the Soviet Union, and this is a status which we can and will maintain.

As we move into the age of ballistic missiles, however, we must have missile sites whose locations are not known to the Soviets. This would reduce any advantage of enemy surprise or initiative. This would present to the enemy a U.S. ballistic missile posture which assures the enemy that he will be destroyed if he launches a nuclear attack against us or any of our allies.

The real question, then is, can we avoid the qualitative gap which could develop in the years immediately ahead? The answer is yes.

It has been in response to these problems that we designed the Navy's fleet ballistic missile system—Polaris—to be carried in submarines. A seagoing system answers these problems. It provides the best answer now in sight. It is a system which will be hidden and moving in the depths of the sea.

The enemy will be unable to pinpoint these fleet ballistic missile forces in advance for a surprise attack because their locations at sea will not be known, and the nuclear submarines carrying Polaris will be constantly on the move. Any attempt to neutralize these forces will draw the enemy's attacks to sea—away from population centers on land.

We will not need many of these fleet ballistic missile systems. We will need enough to do the job. But the United States should not place its reliance for deterrence solely on Polaris—or any other single system. We should retain diversified capabilities.

We must, of course, keep in mind what has to be done. We must make sure that Russia knows we have enough to destroy the Soviet Union, and that we will use it if she launches a nuclear attack.

There is no point trying to equate our requirements and capabilities with the enemy's. Our requirements are entirely different and our capabilities must be developed around our own needs. We do not need to engage in an endless arms race with the Soviets in ballistic missiles—any more than we have attempted to race them in numbers of submarines or army divisions.

The really important thing about a deterrent force is not numbers—but invulnerability not total numbers built—but numbers we will be able to use. In making our retaliatory forces secure from enemy attack—we do not need great numbers of missiles and bombers.

Whether the U.S.S.R. has one-half as many or several times as many missiles as the United States—is really academic as long as we have the assured capability of destroying Russia—and as long as the Soviets know it—and are really convinced of it.

There is—in fact—far greater psychological advantage for the United States in having this capability than in allowing ourselves to be drawn into a fruitless and unnecessary race on Soviet terms.

Hiding behind the Iron Curtain the Kremlin can tell us what they want us to know—

and they are able to conceal fairly effectively that which they don't want us to know.

If they had a particular capability, would they make such statements as to cause us to build an appropriate response to that particular threat?

If the Kremlin really intends to exploit an advantage, would it not be better for them to remain quiet and surprise us with deeds rather than words?

The United States is embarked upon a defense program aimed at meeting our security needs. By not entering a numbers race with the Soviets on their terms we also avoid the limitless economic drain which such a race would involve.

We can afford what we have to afford for U.S. security, but also we must spend our funds for what we need. We must apportion our funds carefully to meet all the contingencies facing us.

A general nuclear war deterrent will deter mainly that, little else. Our powerful retaliatory capability has not always deterred lesser assaults in the past, and it will not in the future.

We know that the Soviet expansionist policy is continuing. There have been local aggressions—local uprisings, local crises in the past—which could not be dealt with by the use of mass destruction capabilities.

These will continue to face us in the future, and we will be able to deal with them effectively only by measures which fit the local circumstances.

This means controlled—precision forces which can be operated with discrimination and finesse—forces armed with conventional weapons and small atomic weapons—forces which can apply the right degree of power with pinpoint accuracy.

Our military requirements cover a very wide spectrum of possible situations. But even this is not enough. Military measures by themselves are not enough.

Let us look for a moment at what the Communists themselves have been telling us.

We can debate at length among ourselves on what proper military measures to take in our own defense. We can discuss budgets, military posture, and the various forms of modern warfare. We can examine our weapons systems and our progress in research and development.

But we can lose the entire stamina and integrity of our civilization if we do not recognize the challenge presented to us by a nation sworn to take us over.

Distinguished American visitors to the Soviet Union in recent weeks have told me that the most dangerous thing they saw in Russia is the look on the faces of the people.

What Americans have seen in their visits to Russia is the grim look of determination, the cool and deliberate confidence of people who are going places who know they are missing a lot of life, who know they are being forced to sacrifice both tangible and intangible human values—but who are resolute in their aim to beat the United States in everything.

And what do they expect to gain by this? Simply this, they expect to gain prestige in the eyes of the rest of the world. They expect to gain greater respectability in the world. They expect to demonstrate that their way is the way of the future. How better can they prove all this than by beating the United States in everything—in athletics, in the arts, in scientific achievement, in industry, political maneuver, and everything else.

This is the challenge which faces the United States. The Soviets have not said they were going to take the world through general war. What they have said is that communism is the wave of the future—and will take over the world.

Fifteen years ago we thought the Soviet Union would build a massive force of long range aircraft. They certainly had the capa-

bility of doing it. But they did not build many.

Two years ago we were given a jolt with their unveiling of a new and powerful long-range jet bomber—the Bison. But the Soviets did not build many of these either.

Today their space achievements are impressive. Their objectives are twofold. First, they want to be really able to develop the military capability which is implied by such achievements. They need not necessarily do it, but they want to be able to if they think they have to.

Their second objective is to demonstrate to the world the technological proficiency of the U.S.S.R.—they want to show the world that they can do it.

Both of these have their roots in Soviet psychological pressure on us—on our allies—and on the rest of the world, both within and outside the Sino-Soviet bloc.

We fall into their mousetrap when we ourselves become so obsessed or preoccupied with these worthy accomplishments as to ignore all the other things they are doing to undermine freedom, to upset the stability of independent nations, and to insinuate their philosophy into the thinking of freemen everywhere.

Let us not underestimate the capabilities of the Soviets. Their scientific achievements along certain lines have been superior. But let this not blind us to all the other much less spectacular things they are doing—the many little, devious, conspiratorial inroads they are making everywhere.

We have many problems before us in facing up to this Communist challenge. We must not become enchanted with the prospects of military power in the space age at the expense of the many other demands upon us. The competition covers a far wider range of effort than military effort alone. The range now extends to include everybody—not just the military.

Ladies and gentlemen, our country has grown strong in an environment of personal liberty in which the spirit of competition runs strong among us. The United States has become a world leader as a result of the effort of many hardworking people to whom the concepts of private enterprise and individual initiative have real meaning.

But today we run the grave risk of becoming complacent in our position of world leadership, and of becoming indifferent to the hard realities of the competition we face as a nation.

The U.S.S.R. long ago declared cold war on us, and they have been working hard at it ever since. We cannot stay aloof from this challenge. We are in a competition now for our national existence. We are engaged in a war of attrition in which the Communists intend to make each victory irreversible—no matter how minor it may seem to us. Taken together over the long haul these victories could be decisive.

We are ahead of the Soviet Union now. We are industrially ahead. We are ahead of the Soviets in the application of nuclear power in our naval forces. We are ahead in the development of solid propellants for ballistic missiles—a capability, incidentally, which was first developed by the Navy over 30 years ago at the Naval Engineering Experiment Station, based on early work by Dr. Robert H. Goddard.

We are ahead in the development of a fleet ballistic missile system—the Navy's Polaris missile.

The United States is ahead in its ability to use and exploit the sea, in antisubmarine warfare doctrine and capabilities, in the application of naval air power from carriers at sea, in guided missiles at sea.

These capabilities did not come overnight. They are the result of solid thinking and hard work—hours, days, and years of attention to the many jobs the Navy has to do. They are the result of cool determination,

and the intelligent application of always limited resources.

This is the challenge which faces the entire Nation today. It is the challenge of facing Communist competition in every line of human endeavor. It is a challenge which will not be met with slogans, gimmicks, and simple answers.

It is a challenge which summons all Americans once again to reaffirm our purpose in the world community of nations, and to pursue that purpose with vigor, and not be deflected by the cold winds of communism.

Let us take a hard look at what is happening in the world—a hard look at what is happening to our markets in the world—and let us look at the Soviet economic offensive and determine how well we are responding to it.

Let us take a hard look at what we need in military hardware.

The answers will not be found in mathematical equations or with masterstroke answers. We are talking about the whole spectrum of human endeavor, for which there is no single or simple formula.

The United States is ahead today, but we will stay ahead only by the dint of hard work, by higher standards of individual achievement, by the exercise of free initiative, and by placing our personal comforts and interests second to the interests of a strong, virile, and dynamic United States.

This is not a one-man job. It is not a 100-man job, nor a job only for a million men. It is a challenge to 170 million Americans. It is a job for you and for me, for all of us—for your children, and your children's children—for as long as they live they will live in competition.

Dealing With Unemployment—An Editorial Appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, Friday, February 20, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, to a very timely and pertinent editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Friday, February 20, 1959. It seems to me this editorial is very timely on account of the reported high load of unemployment throughout our great Nation:

DEALING WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

The exchange of barbed pleasantries between President Eisenhower and Walter Reuther has not helped noticeably with the unemployment problem. Both men could make more useful approaches to the situation than they have so far.

We question whether the Reuther plan for a march on Washington by unemployed workers holds any real solution. But the best White House answer would be such manifest awareness of human distress as Mr. Eisenhower displayed last year when he proposed extra Federal aid. Assumption that returning prosperity is wiping out special problems like that in Michigan only supports the argument that a dramatic gesture is required to focus attention on them.

The jibe at labor leaders on Puerto Rican beaches boomeranged all the way to Aca-pulo—leaving the problems of slow reemployment and of special distress areas still unsolved.

The unemployment problem is spotty and might well be dealt with by spot remedies. We fully understand the President's feeling that in a period of strong economic recovery the Federal Government should not continue a general program designed for last year's recession emergency. But we question whether he can with equal reason reject measures for aid to distressed areas where unemployment remains heavy.

Both humanity and sound economics argue for stopping the waste of idle men and idle plants. This is not primarily a national responsibility. In Michigan, for instance, concentration on one industry is proving a weakness. Both labor and management have made mistakes that contribute to unemployment.

Reported plans of Detroit's "Big Three" to bring out new small cars reflect recognition of a market which rejected the bigger, gaudier—and costlier—sales pitch. Union policies which push wages faster than productivity or prefer high wage rates to high employment are also in the picture. And a thriffter State government—one which had not built political power on welfare generosity—would now be better able to carry burdens Washington is asked to lift.

The responsibility of private industry, labor, and local government can rightly be emphasized. Yet the whole Nation is affected by weak spots in the economy. There is much reason for rejecting general inflationary spending programs as a cure. But by the same logic there is reason for seeking effective spot treatment.

Last year the President vetoed a bill to give special aid to distressed areas. It had some glaring faults. Yet the method makes sense. A better measure, requiring more evidence of local self-help efforts and providing safeguards against abuses, should win wide support. And the President might well encourage such steps. They could prove a real help to the Nation directly by relieving distress and indirectly by easing pressures for unwise "shotgun" spending programs designed to spur employment.

Connecticut Area Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article by W. F. Jennings, president of the Postal Transport Association for the first division, in Lynn, Mass., which appeared in the Postal Transport Journal for February 1959:

CONNECTICUT AREA PLAN

(By W. F. Jennings)

There is an old saying that nothing remains the same for any length of time—things either improve or retrogress according to conditions. All eyes are looking to the operation of the Connecticut area plan to estimate its value as an efficient method of mail distribution. At this writing, opinions are mixed as to the improvement over the previous methods of mail handling.

As time goes on we will see new plans of distribution in all parts of the country. The

Department has launched a program calling for such systems in all large centers, terming them metro systems. The first one was developed in the New York City area comprising 27 counties in New York and New Jersey, together with Fairfield County in Connecticut. Results of this first plan were judged to be favorable and so we have the expansion of the idea in all parts of the country.

The metro system is a development of the old trapping centers which were established a few years ago. It was found that the use of the word "trapping" was ill-advised because the word connoted delay. New terminology was recently applied to the trapping centers. They were designated as "mail expediting centers," and this term was used in the "Operation Christmas" orders of 1958. To identify some units in the metro system the term "sectional centers" was used, but the abbreviation "S.C." was confused with South Carolina. Now the terms "area centers" and "concentration centers" are applied to the appropriate units.

The objectives sought when the Connecticut plan was devised were to provide next-day delivery for all mail in the post offices at 5 p.m., development of a 24-hour scheme of distribution that would never change, and removal of distribution from mobile units. From the viewpoint of postal patrons next-day delivery is highly desirable, but surely the guarantee of such delivery on 5 p.m. mailing is not an ambitious objective. In an area as thickly populated as Connecticut, distances between offices are comparatively short, and it would be reasonable to expect next-day delivery if the letters are mailed at any time during the evening. At one time, such service was the rule and taken as a matter of course. Now it seems to be something to strive for.

It is obvious from an inspection of the plan that large quantities of mail will be massed on area centers and this mail cannot move out until processed. A problem is thereby created, a problem that troubled post office people over 100 years ago. Those were the days before mobile units, and all mail was massed on some distributing post office for processing. The problem became acute in such centers as St. Joseph, Mo., where mail for the West was distributed. After the arrival of the day's mail by railroad many hours would elapse before the dispatches could be made ready. The problem was solved by the assistant postmaster of St. Joseph, William A. Davis. He received authority to equip two baggage cars with distributing facilities so that clerks could sort the incoming mail en route. The Hannibal & St. Joseph Railroad cooperated and remodeled the cars so that 65 separations could be made. The first trip was made on July 7, 1862, and the first mobile unit in this country was put in operation. The results were spectacular because the en route distribution advanced the transcontinental mail by 14 hours. This bit of history is mentioned because prior to 1860 all large post offices were trapping centers and congestion at the centers was eliminated by en route distribution. Surely, reverting to the methods of over a century ago will bring about the same problems.

The idea proposed by Mr. Davis received attention in Washington, and 2 years later George B. Armstrong, assistant postmaster at Chicago, Ill., was instructed to test the plan of en route distribution. The tests showed the plan to be an unqualified success, and so the railway mail service was born. In the following few years other routes were established. Opposition soon developed, however, because the postmasters of the great eastern distributing centers became alarmed for they thought that the sorting of mail en route would somehow reduce the importance of their offices.

Now we have the Connecticut plan, which is designed to operate without en route distribution as far as possible. I submit to the reader the thought that a comparison of the plan with the methods of a century ago will show that they are identical. Time has not marched on in this case.

The costs of the Connecticut plan are not available, but the additional truck routes necessary to implement it have been published. Using the average cost of truck operation, the new routes would cost an additional \$100,000 to \$120,000. Clerk hire necessary in area centers is another item, no figures being available on this expenditure.

We in the N.P.T.A. believe that good mail service will come in direct proportion to the amount of en route distribution that is performed. Any plan of distribution, no matter how efficient, would be better if implemented with mobile distributed units.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of all the Members, a firsthand account of the situation in Cuba as told by Mr. Robert M. Cox, the president of one of the local radio stations in my district as well as a prominent businessman of McKeesport, Pa., upon his recent trip to Cuba.

His story from the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News, of January 28 and 29, 1959, follows:

MON-YOUGH BROADCASTING CO., INC.

McKeesport, Pa., January 31, 1959.

HON. ELMER HOLLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ELMER: Enclosed herewith are copies of articles covering my recent visit to Cuba during which I observed, among other things, that the political prisoners are being treated well in La Cabana Fortress, that they anticipate fair trials, that communism in Cuba does not appear to pose the threat that we often are led to believe that it does, that the revolutionary soldiers are courteous and well-behaved and that Fidel Castro is respected as a modern-day "Zorro", liberator of an oppressed people.

From 1956, when I first visited Havana, to 1959, the change from dictatorial oppression to revolutionary freedom is like the change from night to day, for now the Cubans are a happy, laughing and free-talking people.

In my opinion, too much of what we have been told by our reporters has been anti-Castro while Batista's murdering went unnoticed. My own interviews in Havana and in the fortress indicate that the people feel strongly that the United States stood by idly when Cuba was being mutilated by a dictator, while now we are being all-too-critical of their attempts to bring their murderers to justice.

The feeling, in some quarters at least, is that an understanding U.S. Ambassador could do much to help in this period of readjustment and to cement a good relationship between the United States and the 7 million people on this neighboring island which should be our friend and ally.

It is my earnest hope that our Government will temper its criticism with sym-

pathy and understanding in an attempt to make friends of these fine people and if there is any way in which I, in my small way, may contribute toward the accomplishment of this friendship, please be assured that I stand ready, willing and, I believe, able to serve.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. COX,
President.

[From the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News, Jan. 28, 1959]

CITY MAN TALKS TO PRISONERS IN HAVANA
FORTRESS—ROBERT COX FINDS BEARDED AND
ARMED CASTRO FOLLOWERS SET TEMPO IN
CUBAN CAPITAL; MADE TRIP FROM FLORIDA
VACATION

Bearded young men, armed with smiles and a various assortment of weapons, set the tempo in Havana today, according to Robert M. Cox, McKeesport businessman, who returned recently from the Cuban capital.

Mr. Cox said he was one of the few Americans permitted to enter La Cabana Fortress in Havana to interview Fidel Castro's political prisoners.

He went to Cuba on sudden impulse last week while vacationing in Florida. "I wanted to see what was happening," he said.

His 1-day journey into the troubled country began from Fort Lauderdale, where he took off by plane at 9:15 a.m. last Tuesday.

In 90 minutes, the Mackey Airlines plane had touched down in Havana. Castro at the time was preparing for a huge demonstration called in support of the revolutionary Government's summary execution of captive followers of the deposed dictator Batista.

WORE TENNIS SHOES

Having read accounts of rioting in Havana, Mr. Cox said he wore tennis shoes to permit fast footwork just in case it was needed.

Upon landing in Havana, Mr. Cox said the first person he saw was a young bearded soldier who approached him with a stern command to halt.

Having forgotten the little Spanish he knew, Mr. Cox explained that he used the international language to greet the soldier—a smile. He said:

"From that minutes on the soldier was very friendly and courteous. He led me to the immigration desk where I was passed through with little trouble."

The next phase of his trip was by taxi to the tourist office of Mike Magua where he hired a limousine, chauffeur, and interpreter.

The agency was recommended by the plane's pilot, Capt. Joe Bruby. The pilot had attempted to dissuade him from going to the fortress.

AMONG FRIENDS

"But when I saw the smiles on the faces of the soldiers at the airport, the taxi drivers and people in the streets, I felt I was among friends," Mr. Cox said.

"In fact the only trouble I had up to this time was at the airport when a tyke approached me from behind, stuck a toy pistol in my back and asked, 'Shine, mister?'"

Mr. Cox had been in Cuba in June 1956 when Fulgencio Batista was in power.

"I felt the oppression under the Batista regime at that time," he said, "the people were afraid to talk. Feeling sympathetic to the Castro cause, I felt I had to go back. I went there as a friend."

"The streets of Havana now are filled with smiling faces. The soldiers are courteous. It appears that they want the United States to understand their position."

After picking up his interpreter, Rudolfo Alfonso, and chauffeur, Mario G. Mesa, Mr. Cox said he would like to interview the prisoners in La Cabana Fortress.

DECIDES TO TRY

The interpreter told him that under the Batista government no Americans were permitted to enter the prison, not even the U.S. Ambassador. But he added, with a shrug: "We try."

Mr. Cox said his rented limousine was stopped 50 feet from in front of the fortress by another young, bearded soldier who carefully examined his press card.

The entrance to the prison was guarded by a score of soldiers "all of whom were in gay spirits, laughing and very respectful," he said.

After gaining entrance, Mr. Cox was met by Capt. Alfonso Zayas, who wore a 22-month growth of beard and who further questioned him on his motives and again examined his press card.

The captain then led him to the prison proper and conducted him on his tour of interviews with the prisoners.

[From the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News, Jan. 29, 1959]

CUBAN CAPTIVES DENY GUILT TO CITY MAN—COX INTERVIEWS INMATES OF FORTRESS JAIL; FORMER BATISTA CABINET MINISTER SAYS HE RESIGNED BECAUSE HE OPPOSED REGIME'S POLICIES

La Cabana fortress in Havana, Cuba, is a huge military prison where Fidel Castro keeps many of the revolutionary government's political prisoners awaiting trial.

Robert M. Cox, McKeesport businessman, said he is one of the few Americans who was permitted to enter the fortress to interview the imprisoned people. He went to Havana last week and spent part of a day there.

He said he was guided through the prison by a polite captain named Alfonso Zayas, who wore a 22-month growth of beard and carried a 45-caliber automatic.

He was led first into a large courtyard filled with prisoners who were milling about at will. The courtyard was bordered on two sides by tunnel-like cells. One side housed the Castro soldiers and the other the prisoners.

CELL DOORS OPEN

Mr. Cox said all the cell doors were open at the time of his visit with the exception of two, where persons accused of murder were imprisoned.

He emphasized the point the prisoners' living quarters were equal, if not better, than those of their rebel guards. He said every man interviewed stated that he was receiving fair treatment.

The first prisoner interviewed by Mr. Cox through a hired interpreter was a young army lieutenant, accused of persecuting Communists.

Mr. Cox said he then asked about the number of Communists in Cuba. He was taken by Captain Zayas to a prisoner who held the post of Minister of Information under the Batista regime until 1954.

The former Cabinet member, who said he was arrested January 4, told Mr. Cox that there are 12,000 Communists and perhaps 80,000 fellow travelers out of Cuba's population of 7 million.

"The man said he resigned from his post because he disagreed with the Batista policies and practices," Mr. Cox reported.

WROTE ARTICLES

"The prisoner said he then began writing a series of articles subtly condemning the Batista practice. Some of these articles, I was told, appeared in two of Cuba's major magazines."

The next prisoner to converse with Mr. Cox was a former Havana police chief who said he fled that post from 1956 until last March. He said he quit because he did not agree with Batista policies.

The prisoner was dressed in a colorful sport shirt and slacks and wore sunglasses.

"He was smoking a large cigar as I interviewed him," Mr. Cox said. "The man anticipated a just trial. The majority of the prisoners wore blue denim trousers and jackets with a white P printed on the jacket."

Mr. Cox then talked to a man accused of murder. He said:

"The prisoner had been a captain in the Cuban Army for 34 years and was stationed at Santa Clara, where he was accused of murdering 16 people and burying them in a common grave."

BURNS ON FOREHEAD

"The prisoner had burns on the forehead. My guide said they were received when a sugarcane field in which he was hiding was set afire to flush him out."

"The man told me he was innocent, while his tearful daughter clung to his shoulder. The prisoners are permitted visitors three times a week."

Another prisoner interviewed was a former colonel in the Cuban Army with 40 years of service. Mr. Cox said he was accused of mistreating rebel soldiers and taking a considerable amount of government money for private use.

"The man claimed he received the money from a former wife," Mr. Cox said. "On the mistreating charge, he said he merely gave captured rebel soldiers a kick in the pants before sending them on their way."

Mr. Cox added:

"Every prisoner I interviewed said he was getting fair treatment and expected to receive a just trial."

He asked Captain Zayas if he were a Communist, to which the rebel officer replied:

"Certainly not. I am a Catholic and Catholicism and communism do not mix."

The captain, like many of the soldiers, wore a Catholic medal on a chain around his neck.

INTERPRETER WONDERES

After leaving the fortress, Mr. Cox said his interpreter declared that he could not understand why executions under Batista either were condoned or not noticed in the United States even though they ran into the thousands, while the execution of war criminals after trials now are severely criticized.

Mr. Cox said he boarded his plane back to Florida at 6:30 p.m. last Tuesday, only about 7 hours after he first landed in the Cuban capital. He concluded:

"As I left Cuba, I could not help but be impressed that here was a large island with now happy people ready to be our friends and allies if we just showed some brotherly consideration in this time of need."

Legislation To Prevent Free or Special Travel Rates to Government Officials on Private Passenger Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce the introduction of a bill to regulate the granting of free or reduced travel rates to Federal employees and their families.

Last July, during House consideration of the conference report on a bill to authorize construction of two superliner passenger vessels, I expressed regret that the conferees had not retained a provision from the Senate version prohibit-

ing private shipping lines from extending free or reduced rates to Government officials and their families. This new bill would correct that situation.

It has seemed to me that Members of Congress or anyone on the Government payroll either in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches, or any of their relatives, should not be permitted by law to receive favorable treatment as against the general public in travel. No such privilege is allowed in connection with air or rail transportation and I see no reason for there to be any difference when it comes to travel by water. It certainly is inappropriate for persons who adjudicate, regulate and negotiate as well as legislate on shipping matters to be recipients of special favors. The contracts and subsidies involved amount to hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and public confidence, it seems to me, requires a strict standard in this respect.

In my bill I make a distinction as to the historic custom of invitational cruises of newly constructed or modernized ships in that I specifically exempt excursion or trial run voyages when all guests are on an invitational basis.

My bill does not affect the right of the U.S. Government to contract with these same shipping companies for reduced rate costs involving the transportation of military or civilian personnel when such employees are traveling on official business and when such transportation costs are being paid by the U.S. Government.

My bill would restrict, however, any shipping company from giving to any official or employee of the U.S. Government or to any member of that employee's immediate family free or reduced transportation rates below those rates which are offered to the general public.

Lithuanian Resolution for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held February 15, 1959, at the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, Worcester, Mass., under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Society.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the 16th day of February 1959 marks the 41st anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent republic.

Whereas the unlawful, by force of arms, occupation of the Republic of Lithuania by Russia, and the commitment of atrocities against her people, the destructions of her institutions, and her democratic form of government, by Russia, are continued at the present day.

Whereas the Soviet Union has consistently and unilaterally violated all the pacts and declarations solemnly underwritten by the

Soviet Union, viz: peace and nonaggression pacts with the Baltic states, the Atlantic Charter, Four Freedoms, United Nations Charter, Yalta Declaration, and the Potsdam Agreement: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful by force of arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, and the commitment of atrocities against her people, the destructions of her institutions and her democratic form of government, the violation of pacts and peace treaties; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., petition the Government of the United States of America, to reassert the principles of the Atlantic Charter, by demanding that all Russian military forces, government, and agents be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania and all other countries now behind the Iron Curtain, and that Lithuania, her people, and all other enslaved and occupied countries and their peoples, be liberated and restored as free and independent nations among the nations of the world as enunciated according to the principles in the Atlantic Charter.

Freedom in United States of America for U.S.S.R. but Not Vice Versa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under our Constitution, freedom of speech extends not only to citizens of our country, but as well to noncitizens within our borders. It even extends to members of the Diplomatic Corps of foreign nations who are assigned to United States of America posts. It extends not only to the spoken word, but as well to written words and the media to convey them, the mails, radio, newspapers, and so on.

A recent example of the extent to which our constitutional freedoms extend is the mailing via first-class U.S. mail by the Embassy of the U.S.S.R. in Washington of a press release to an extensive list of U.S. newspapers. The obvious purpose was to have the information further transmitted to the newspaper's readers by way of the news columns. The press release concerned the text of a telegram from Mikoyan to Dulles. It was, in fact, carried as a news item by a number of newspapers at the discretion, in each instance, of the individual editor.

No U.S. censor in the Post Office Department intercepted the press releases. There are no such censors in the United States of America. There occurred no censorship of U.S. news editors. There are no such censors in the United States of America. No secret policemen sought to check off the names of readers who read the story in the newspapers. There are no such secret policemen in the United States of America.

In fact, the whole incident was so typical of the characteristic freedom which is part and parcel of the American

way of life that nobody even thought to comment on it.

But what would have been the result if the U.S. Embassy in Moscow had mailed to Soviet editors a press release on a similar telegram from Dulles to Mikoyan, using the Soviet postal system?

Here is how the Soviet Tass News Agency's dispatch to Chinese Communist news agencies might have read:

Moscow (Tass).—Comrade Premier Khrushchev disclosed that alert People's police have discovered a Capitalist warmongering plot against the Soviet free people financed by Wall Street and masterminded by the spying American Ambassador from inside the spying American Embassy.

Comrade Khrushchev declared the despicable American plot is further proof of the warmongering American warlike attitude toward the peace-loving Soviet free people. The arch-criminal American-hoodlum, Dulles, attempted to send secret counterrevolutionary instructions to enemies of the free peace-loving Soviet People's Republic.

Reactionary criminal conspirators against the glorious People's Republic who infiltrated our glorious Soviet postal system have been discovered by the glorious people's police and the usual glorious penalties for traitors have been imposed.

The criminal-hoodlum-reactionary-traitor-spy-American paid-conspirator counterrevolutionary editor of the Petropovlovsk Daily Free Soviet People's World attempted to print the cleverly coded arch-criminal American-hoodlum, Dulles', capitalist warmongering instructions to criminal-hoodlum-reactionary-traitor-spy-American paid counterrevolutionary conspirators.

He has been given the penalties prescribed by the Free Soviet People's Code of Supreme Justice. His deviationist staff of reporters has been replaced and assigned to reindoctrination centers.

Simultaneously alert Petropovlovsk police rounded up other criminal members of the Wall Street-financed capitalistic-hoodlum-reactionary - traitor - spy - criminal - reactionary-American plot against the glorious freedoms of the peace-loving Soviet peoples. They were apprehended brazenly decoding the arch-criminal-American Dulles' foul instructions printed in an early edition of the Petropovlovsk Daily Free Soviet People's World.

These traitors have been dealt with appropriately. Their families have been sent to reindoctrination centers. They have voluntarily turned over their possessions to the glorious People's Republic in atonement of their sins.

Long live glorious Comrade Premier Khrushchev and our glorious People's Free Republic.

Forty-first Anniversary of Declaration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we of the free world should always keep in mind the character of the Government of the U.S.S.R. There are today many who are presently living involuntarily under the domination of this Government. In commemoration of the 41st anniversary

of the declaration of the independence of Lithuania—one such nation of captive people—I should like to present for the consideration of my colleagues the following resolution which was adopted on February 15 at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Miami, Fla.:

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Miami, Fla., sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of Miami, Fla., and held February 15, 1959, in Miami Lithuanian American Citizens Club, 3655 NW. 34th Street to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the declaration of the independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas in 1940 the Soviet Union in conspiracy with the Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all the treaties and obligations, signed by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and against the will of the people, annexed her to the Communist empire; and

"Whereas since that time the freedom of Lithuanian people is suppressed by cruel means of Communist dictatorship which strives to dominate all the world; and

"Whereas the fate of Lithuania as well as of other subjugated eastern European nations will depend on the success of the foreign policy of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting of Loyal Americans of Lithuanian Descent of the city of Miami calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism and do all in its power to liberate the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain; be it further

Resolved, That this gathering urges the Government of United States to continue its opposition to the United Nations' Draft Code of offenses which prohibits lending assistance to and liberation of captive nations; and be it finally

Resolved, That the Government of the United States refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to Lithuania and the other enslaved European nations."

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF MIAMI, FLA.,

ANTANAS ZDANIS,

President.

HELEN VERBELA,

Resolutions Chairman.

MIAMI, FLA., February 15, 1959.

Pedernales Soil Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us are familiar with the excellent work being performed by the soil conservation districts throughout the Nation.

Those of us from Texas are proud of the constructive and effective program conducted by the officers and members of these districts in our State.

I am particularly proud of the Pedernales Soil Conservation District which is located in the 10th Congressional District of Texas which I am privileged to

represent. This district was named as one of the three outstanding districts in the State of Texas during 1958. I have just received a copy of the annual report of the Pedernales Conservation District and from reading this report I can well understand why it received this splendid recognition.

The Pedernales Soil Conservation District is doing considerable work with the young people living in its area. In addition, the churches in the area are included in its programs. The business people are informed of the work being done.

I believe that this annual report will be of great interest to the Members of Congress. Therefore, I respectfully request that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The report is as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF PEDERNALES SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT, 1958

I. The District received its certificate of organization in 1944. Technical assistance was received in 1946. The Board meets regularly on the first Thursday of each month at Johnson City, Tex. In 1958 the Board held 18 regular and called meetings with an average attendance of 85 percent.

II. (a) During 1958, 20 tours and meetings were held with neighborhood groups, rural clubs and other groups of cooperators. The Board of Supervisors participated in 10 of these tours. Other tours outside the District were made by the Supervisors to learn new techniques and enable them to be of better service to the Cooperators. The committees selected by the Board in 1954 are still active and assisting the District. The Legislative Committee has contacted legislators on State appropriations for District needs.

(b) There are 620 operating units in the District with a total of 450,981 acres in farms and ranches. Five hundred eighty-two Cooperators with 440,000 acres of land are actively cooperating with the District. Contacts are made regularly with non-cooperators in an effort to interest them in becoming District Cooperators. Basic conservation plans have been developed on all but 50 of the above agreements.

(c) Considerable work with young people was carried out by the District during the year. Five conservation movies were shown to students this year. Information was furnished the Vocational Agriculture departments of each school for land and grass judging contests. Both schools were urged to write essays for the Fort Worth Press awards program. It is an assignment in the Johnson City school.

(d) The attitude of the business people has been good and they are supporting the District's work. Ads were sold for the District's calendar for the 6th straight year. The District is able to advertise conservation and make a small profit to meet incidental expenses. All business people contacted let the District put displays in their windows during Soil Stewardship Week. Most churches observed Soil Stewardship Sunday in some way. The Board arranged a tour for the ministers so that they could see conservation applied on the land. The District participated in the Fort Worth Press awards program, Goodyear contest, National Farm Life contest, and the Soil Stewardship programs. The District won first place in the Goodyear contest for the second time. This is the seventh consecutive year in which some award has been received by the District.

(e) The District has continued to have a strong publicity and information program. The Johnson City paper carries a regular

weekly news column. Feature stories are carried on different practices during the year. Radio stations in San Antonio and Fredericksburg feature the district's news releases on their farm programs. A conservation booth was again erected during the Blanco County Fair and Centennial. To correspond with the centennial, the exhibit was entitled "100 Years of Range Use." Pictures showed the decline of rangelands and then the improvement through the use of improved management practices. Several magazine articles were published concerning conservation carried out by district co-operators.

(f) Statistical report on practice application:

Practice applied in 1958: contour farming, 829 acres; cover cropping, 341 acres; crop residue utilization, 1,002 acres; rotation hay and pasture, 1,237 acres; brush control, 3,386 acres; deferred grazing, 31,235 acres; fertilizing, 283 acres; pasture planting, 444 acres; proper use, 27,764 acres; range seeding, 355 acres; wildlife area improvement, 56 acres; diversion construction, 2.5 miles; ponds, 17; spring development, 1; terracing, 4 miles; fencing, 7 miles; wells, 2; waterways, 3.

Above average rainfall was received in the district for the second year in a row. Some of the rains came as hard downpours with large amounts of runoff. Results from such practices as deferred grazing, proper use, and grass seeding gave good results in most cases. Conservation farming and ranching has continued to pay off for district co-operators. J. J. and J. C. Stewart report that their calves weighed over 550 pounds. Mr. Stewart contributes this to maintaining a cover on the land by proper stocking and to good quality livestock. Bill Stribling again got more than a 100 percent kid crop from his nannies. Good range cover and excellent management during kidding time helped him to obtain this high figure. Willie Haas has continued to improve the physical condition of his soil through the use of soil improving legumes. Hubam clover, alfalfa, and Brabham peas are used regularly in rotations with other crops. Crop yields have been increased due to improved soil condition and fertility. Melvin Ross seeded a field to blue panic and got good grazing from it during the summer.

(g) All of the appropriated funds have been used to buy equipment for landowners to use. Some of the older equipment was disposed of due to high cost of maintenance. An additional appropriation would enable the district to give more and better service to its co-operators.

(h) Relations with other agencies are good. The Board cooperates with the Lower Colorado River Authority, ASC, FHA, and the Extension Service. These agencies are co-operative at most times and quite helpful to the Board in carrying out its objectives.

III. The attitude and understanding of the co-operators are good. Many have carried out conservation practices this year. As a whole, they have been encouraged by favorable rainfall conditions during the past 2 years. The largest need is for such practices as proper use, deferred grazing, and establishing grass on old fields. The Board feels that a 3-man technical staff is needed to give adequate service to the large number of co-operators. More financial assistance is needed to carry out promotional work and replace worn out equipment.

IV. The Soil Conservation Service personnel spent all their time promoting and assisting with district activities. A total of 25 meetings and tours were held during the year. A large ACP load during most of the year prevented carrying out some of the planned activities.

IRVINE AHRENS,

Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Pedernales Soil Conservation District.

H.R. 2412

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Commander in Chief Thomas Hammond, of the United Spanish War Veterans, who as a boy of 17 fought with the 2d Massachusetts in all the battles around Santiago in Cuba, I have introduced H.R. 2412. As to the merits of this bill, I respectfully urge upon my colleagues the careful reading of the following editorial from the National Tribune of February 19, 1959:

JUST AND GENEROUS

Among the many hardships, which veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection suffered were poor rations—at times none at all—and fighting in tropical jungles in climates to which these volunteers were unaccustomed.

As a result of the poor food and campaigns under fierce heat or torrential rains, these campaigns developed many types of disease for which, due to a lack of medical help, they tried to treat themselves.

Even when medical care was available either the element of time coupled with no facilities for keeping records of treatment brought about a situation in which many of these veterans carried for years the residuals of disease, some even to their last days.

This was also true with respect to injuries received in line of duty in service. Failure to keep records resulted in failure on the part of veterans to prove service connection and thus receive proper recompense for their maladies.

A report from the Veterans' Administration shows that on December 20, 1958, there were 41,531 veterans of these campaigns on the VA rolls and of this number only 258 were able to prove service connection for their disabilities.

Under the terms of the World War Veterans Act of 1924 Congress enacted into law a provision whereby veterans of World War I with disabilities not shown to have resulted in service were granted hospitalization in Veterans' Administration hospitals whenever beds were available. A few years later Congress passed an amendment to the World War Veterans Act granting similar privileges to the veterans of 1898-1902.

Both of these provisions were just and reasonable and showed that a grateful nation was willing to discharge its obligation to the men who had fought the Nation's battles.

Only a few years ago Congress, realizing the fact that the absence of medical records in the case of the men of 1898-1902 had prevented practically all of them from proving service-connected disability, passed a law granting service connection for all disabilities to this group for the purpose of receiving outpatient treatment from the Veterans' Administration. This was a step in the right direction and one for which the Congress of the United States received the gratitude of the veterans concerned.

There was introduced in Congress on January 15, a bill—H.R. 2412—by Representative BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, which would extend to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion the same eligibility for hospital care for any disability from the

Veterans' Administration as they now enjoy with respect to out-patient medical service.

In view of the service rendered this group of veterans this would seem to be the next logical step in the care of these aged veterans. It is interesting to note that Representative O'Hara is the only veteran of the Spanish-American War in the House of Representatives—one who knows of the hardship his group suffered.

It must be thoroughly understood that H.R. 2412 does not contemplate granting compensation for these disabilities, merely service connection in order to secure immediate hospital care when needed so that these men would not be required to wait weeks, sometimes months, to receive care from the VA whenever a bed was available.

As we have said, this move is the next logical step in the care of these veterans and there are many reasons why it should be made a part of the laws relating to veterans' welfare.

We have already pointed out that the lack of medical records has deprived many of these men of compensation to which they are justly due.

It would appear that inasmuch as Congress admitted that these veterans were service connected for outpatient treatment, they should also be service connected for hospital care.

As was the case for many veterans of later wars, this earlier group gave no thought to securing aid from the Government until their disabilities grew more serious in later years and when they attempted to secure affidavits from comrades to prove their claim they were unable to do so because many of their comrades were dead and the others scattered to all portions of the world.

It must be borne in mind that this older veteran class did not receive the benefits granted to those who served in later wars. They were paid no bonus as were the men of World War I nor was any GI bill of rights enacted to aid them in reestablishing themselves upon their return from service.

As we have also pointed out, they were not given medical care by the Veterans' Administration until some years after such privileges had been granted to the men of World War I.

In other words, these were truly the forgotten men of a country's war—a war which among other things, was the only one which reaped dividends for their country, a war which brought about the construction of the Panama Canal, a war which united the North and the South and improved conditions under which men who wore the uniform in later years served, a war which was the beginning of a standing army which would find the country not entirely unprepared in any future war.

As the latest figures from the Veterans' Administration have shown, there were on the rolls 41,531 of the men who fought from 1898-1902, as of December 20, 1958. Since that date, not quite 2 months ago, hundreds of those then listed have died.

Actually, they are dying at the rate of more than 7,000 a year, and it is sad to contemplate that with another 6 years there will be but a handful left to receive any type of aid from their Government.

For these reasons we believe that enactment of H.R. 2412 into law would be the final action of a grateful country—one that would enable these men, who are now in their eighties, to face the few years remaining to them with the knowledge that they would be certain of hospital care when it was needed. The satisfaction of knowing that their service was recognized in their greatest hour of need should alone be almost sufficient reason for passing H.R. 2412 and we trust that our aging veterans will not be disappointed.

Frank L. Magee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Frank L. Magee, president, director, and member of the executive committee of Aluminum Co. of America, was born April 13, 1896, in Shamokin, Pa., the son of Bethlehem Business College President William F. Magee, and Ida Lillian Boyer Magee.

He attended Bethlehem, Pa., public schools and Bethlehem Preparatory School, and was graduated from Lehigh University in 1917 with a degree in electrical engineering.

In college he was a member of the soccer team and president of the Electrical Engineering Society and Alpha Chi Rho fraternity.

Upon graduation from Lehigh, Mr. Magee joined Alcoa as an apprentice at New Kensington, Pa., but soon entered military service for 2 years' duty in the United States and France as a sergeant in the Army's Signal Corps during World War I.

In 1919, he resumed his Alcoa training program at New Kensington and Pittsburgh, and a year later was assigned to the New Haven, Conn., sales office.

From New Haven, Mr. Magee went to a number of sales offices, including New York City; Edgewater, N.J.; Pittsburgh; and Newark, N.J. He was named manager of the Albany, N.Y., office in 1925.

In 1926, Mr. Magee became a plant representative at Alcoa's Massena, N.Y., works, and assistant product manager for wire, rod, and bar products. From 1929 to 1937, he was district sales manager at Atlanta, Ga.

Subsequently, he served as manager of sheet sales, general production manager, and assistant to the vice president. In 1946, Mr. Magee was elected vice president and general production manager, and in 1952, became a director of Aluminum Co. of America. On April 21, 1955, he was elected executive vice president. In April, 1956, he became a member of Alcoa's executive committee, and in 1957, was elected president. Mr. Magee is also an officer and director of a number of Alcoa subsidiaries.

Mr. Magee was named Pittsburgh's 1958 Man of the Year by the junior chamber of commerce. He was Pittsburgh's United Fund campaign chairman in 1958, and currently is chairman of the finance committee, Pittsburgh Bicentennial Association.

A director of the Presbyterian Hospital, Health and Welfare Federation of Allegheny County, Community Chest of Allegheny County, and Fidelity Trust Co., Mr. Magee also is a corporate trustee of Lehigh University; member of the executive committee, Pennsylvania Economy League, and a member of Oakmont, Pa., County Club. He also is a member of the American Institute of

Electrical Engineers, Western Pennsylvania Engineers Society, Longue Vue Country Club, University Club, Rolling Rock Club, Fox Chapel Golf Club, and is a former president and director of Pittsburgh's Duquesne Club.

In 1948, Mr. Magee was awarded the President's Certificate of Merit in recognition of his contribution to the military production effort during World War II.

In 1956, Lehigh University presented him with an honorary degree of doctor of engineering. In 1958, he received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Maryville, Tenn., College.

Mr. Magee is a member of Calvary Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh.

His first wife, the former Marie Janet Weston, died in 1935. A son, Curtis W. Magee, is attached to Alcoa's Cleveland sales office. In 1938, Mr. Magee married the former Dorothy C. Hurlock, of Pittsburgh. She has two sons by a previous marriage, George L. Hoffman, Jr., and William H. Hoffman, the latter an Alcoaan at Lafayette, Ind.

Mr. and Mrs. Magee reside at 301 South Linden Avenue, Pittsburgh.

The following special award winners deserve mention: Peter Muller-Munk, art; Michael Late Benedum, business; C. Lee Rumberger, chemistry; John C. Weaver, communications; Mildred E. Everett, education; Jerome R. Reeves, entertainment; Maurice H. Goldstein, good government; E. E. Moore, human relations; Hal C. Davis, labor; Hon. Hugh C. Boyle, law; Charles Fletcher Lewis, literature; Dr. Edmund R. McCluskey, medicine; Alan G. Nicholas, President's award; Dr. Clarence Zener, science; Daniel Edward Murtaugh, sports.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record a speech by Mr. Magee given at the 19th annual Man of the Year awards dinner:

SPEECH BY F. L. MAGEE GIVEN AT 19TH ANNUAL MAN OF THE YEAR AWARDS DINNER, THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1959

The fabric of history is not made by the few whose names have been recorded for posterity. Instead, its strands are the lives of thousands rarely honored nor rewarded for their participation. It is with keen awareness of this fact that I accept the honor you have awarded me tonight.

My embarrassment in accepting this award is somewhat relieved by your parallel and well-deserved recognition of 15 distinguished fellow citizens. I am sure if all 16 of us were asked right now "Who did the most to build up the spirits of Pittsburghers in a year of some discouragements?" we would unanimously vote Danny Murtaugh and his Pirates top Men of the Year.

In all fairness, it must be admitted that my honor tonight resulted largely from the great publicity effort during the united fund campaign. Many of you worked with our team of 38,000 in making the 1958 united fund campaign a success. In a very real sense, you men of the Jaycees are all Men of the Year and share in the awards.

Jaycees have made important contributions, both individually and as a group, to the rebirth of Pittsburgh. You are widely known for your recreation and education program, naturalization ceremonies for new citizens, teenage rodeo, amateur art show, junior golf tournament, and get-out-the-vote drive for Allegheny County. Through

leadership and service, your organization has built an enviable reputation; your active participation in community affairs is a vital element of civic progress.

There are many subjects that would be appropriate for a Pittsburgh audience in this bicentennial year. With only limited time available, however, I should like to focus our attention on a single, constructive message that seems vitally important to the future of our area and our Nation. Since the shape of things to come depends so greatly upon our younger generation, I am taking the liberty of directing this message to the organization that is our host.

As a dynamic element of our business economy, the Jaycees are certain to find increasing opportunities for community service. Business and industry have the important responsibility of providing the talent and energy of their leaders to deal with problems which affect the general welfare. Your services will be welcomed and, as you complete your work with the Jaycees, I hope you will be encouraged to seek even greater horizons of responsibility.

Not the least of these responsibilities for members of the business community is that of conveying, through deeds and persuasion, the broader economic understandings of our free enterprise system. Much good can be accomplished through speeches, forums and even indirect financial support of activities that strengthen our heritage of freedom. But there is another form of civic participation in public affairs that I would like to have you consider with me for a few minutes—a form of participation that all too often has been an anathema to the businessman of my generation. I am referring, of course, to personal individual participation in politics.

Active political participation on the part of interested, informed Americans is essential to the survival of the American way of life, as we know and enjoy it. This fact is axiomatic. It is no more true today than it has been in the past, but the disturbing indifference of recent years on the part of good citizens has certainly lent it a sense of urgency.

Broad participation in politics—regardless of party affiliation—is the substructure of good government. Politics, in this sense, is the basis of our democratic way of life—the machinery that offers the privilege of dissenting—that collective personality that achieves conclusions through an interchange of differing concepts and opinions. If you want to share in this all-important process, I urge each of you to become as active as possible in the party of your choice.

To the framers of our Constitution, politics was a living reality. They themselves spent much of their lives and substance in the performance of political responsibilities they regarded as supremely important. You may all remember the familiar story told about Benjamin Franklin, who was present at the critical moment in history when our Government was being established. As he left the session, Franklin was besieged by anxious citizens with questions. "Mr. Franklin," shouted one questioner, "do we have a monarchy or a republic?" Franklin's answer was a challenge to which every generation must respond: "You have a republic, if you can keep it."

In no way do I discount the many selfless public servants who are devoting their lives to this cause. Each one who does his part is worthy of commendation, regardless of political affiliation. But the general public apathy where political affairs are concerned is a well-known, though deplorable fact. Today, we still have a Republic in form, but somewhere along the line, we have lost much of the substance.

One highly important aspect of participation, of course, is voting. But voting alone

is not enough. The ballot is simply the visible end product of our political system—somewhat like the glittering automobile body that is lowered into place in the final stage of assembly. The all-important political machinery of our Republic functions—like the motor under the hood—quietly and out of sight. The real power behind the ballot is an active, informed citizenry, and an alert, devoted group of elected officials.

Our first duty is to learn as much as possible about the machinery of government, and the needs and responsibilities of the communities in which we live. No voter, and certainly no public servant can perform his role intelligently without acquiring as much information on each issue as he can obtain; an uninformed voter may be even more harmful than a nonvoter. Armed with this information, we must then be willing to use our influence to the utmost and, if necessary, bear the burden of office.

Our second, but no less important duty is to take an active, personal interest in the political affairs of our community. If we want good laws in this country, it is timely that the businessman should give his attention to two participants in our governmental system which are nearest to the level where the lawmaking process begins: namely, the precinct captain and the county chairman. Any lawmaker will tell you that in his confusion of pressures from organized groups—whether they be identified with business, labor, farmer, or any other vocal element—he ultimately returns to the grassroots politician for his guidance. If more Americans were concerned with what takes place in their local political organizations, we might have a better choice of candidates, and more effective laws.

The tendency to observe rather than participate is one of the greatest dangers that our free society must face. In reality, political inactivity is alien to the concept on which our Government was based. Our Constitution and Bill of Rights assume that free men can and must work out their mutual destinies—not as victims, but as masters of their political system. If this theory is to function as it was intended, we must not be satisfied with the role of an observer, a Monday morning quarterback or an arm-chair general.

The willingness of citizens who are not professional politicians to enter politics has been one of the great strengths of our republic. Wherever freedom has been won or retained, people have always thought it worth the price of personal sacrifice. Even though political activity sometimes requires sacrifice, it rewards are great. For it provides the opportunity to perform dedicated public service, and to maintain confidence in popular government.

Win or lose, a good candidate contributes greatly to the democratic process—by informing the public and by putting the opposition on its mettle. Moreover, the example of a respected, qualified citizen participating in an election is far more effective than mere exhortation in combating the inertia of fellow citizens.

Groups of various kinds have a significant and important role in politics, but they cannot substitute for individual participation. And selfish minority pressure groups can cause the passage of laws which transgress the rights of individual citizens in opposition to the concept of constitutional liberties.

The way to make our representative form of Government work is for civic-minded individuals to replace political opportunists as office-seekers. I trust that you who are members of the Jaycee organization will consider this a challenge, for if enough people of your experience and ability become active participants in Government, we have no need to fear the future.

Frank Galliano Dies, Beloved Union Advocate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, last week a friendly, understanding, and gentle man passed on in the Providence Hospital, Oakland, Calif. James Frank Galliano had long been a leader among the liberal thinking people of Alameda County, Calif. He was a lawyer who specialized in labor law and was the counselor of the Central Labor Council for over two decades.

"Gally," as he was familiarly known to thousands of people, was one of those spontaneous individuals who was never too busy to greet his friends or never too much in a hurry to do them a favor. He was an understanding man and loved by all.

Some 8 years ago he was appointed as a commissioner of the port of Oakland and continued to serve in that capacity until his death.

James F. Galliano will be missed in the Oakland scene.

I make part of these remarks an article which appeared in the East Bay Labor Journal for Friday, February 20, paying tribute to him:

FRANK GALLIANO DIES, BELOVED UNION ADVOCATE

James Frank Galliano died in Providence Hospital early Tuesday at the age of 83.

The night before, at the meeting of the Central Labor Council, when Secretary Robert S. Ash told the delegates that the beloved union advocate, counselor of the CLC for two decades, was very ill, a great sigh went through the room. For everybody knew Frank Galliano, and some of those present thought of troublous days in the thirties, when "Gally," as many affectionately called him, was in effect godfather to their union.

Ash paused a moment after making the painful announcement, paused to get control of his voice, and then added that "any of you who pray, pray for Frank Galliano, that he may stay with us."

But already the counselor, who had been found unconscious on the floor of his bedroom by his wife Emille early Monday morning, was very near death, and earnest prayers were unavailing.

The funeral services were scheduled for Thursday, February 19, at 10 a.m., at the Laurel chapel of the Albert Engle Mortuary Co., the rosary was recited the evening before at the chapel.

The counselor is survived by his wife Emille, and by a son, Traynor Galliano, and by a grandson.

Galliano was a graduate of the Stanford University Law School, and was admitted to the bar in 1925. A lieutenant in the U.S. Infantry in World War I, he attended Trinity College, Dublin, for a year after the war.

Many of the labor people who were active in this area in the thirties remember how unfailingly Galliano stood by them in those difficult days. Among those who knew him so well at that time were Charles Wagner of the Butchers, Otto Munschner of the Bakers, Bill Franklin and Fred Irvin and Bill Conboy of the Teamsters, Ernie Vernon of the Auto-

motive Machinists, Jim Suffridge of the Food Clerks, and of course G. A. Silverthorn and the late Bill Spooner, secretaries of the Central Labor Council.

Galliano was made counselor to the Central Labor Council in 1939, and had continued as that to the day of his death. He was appointed to the Oakland Port Commission in 1947 by the then mayor of Oakland, Joseph E. Smith, and was still a member of the commission at the time of his passing.

Repeatedly Galliano won cases for unions which established principles for dealing with labor cases in California jurisprudence.

One famous case was that of the Food Clerks and Guy's Drug Stores years ago involving the question of picketing and other important points. Over in San Francisco, M. O. Tobriner was handling a similar case for the Auto Salesmen against the Howard Auto Co. Galliano and Tobriner pooled their abilities in these cases and won for the unions.

Another famous case involved a dairy in Stockton and this one was won by Galliano for the Teamsters. Bill Conboy has vivid memories of this case.

Galliano's relationship with the Retail Clerks was very close. In 1937 he was instrumental in landing a good basic contract for the Food Clerks and he kept a fatherly eye on all their doings ever since. Some years ago, when Dave Beck was at the height of his power, it was Galliano who supplied the legal acumen and the friendly patience through the great struggle in the courts with Safeway.

No one familiar with the labor movement in Alameda County would ever make the mistake of thinking of Frank Galliano as just one more labor lawyer. He was so much more. He was the union advocate in every sense of the word, their skilled legal advocate, but, so much more than that, their advocate for a place in the sun and for an honorable place in American society.

Galliano, in line with his feeling he had for unions as children of his heart and, so many of them, as offspring of his powerful intellect, did not believe that a lawyer achieved greatness by the size of his fees. As a matter of fact, some members of the famous closed shop of lawyers had a feeling that on occasion, when a union was poor and in a desperate plight, Galliano would hand out some free advice of priceless value to the struggling organization. At any rate, all realized that wealth was not Galliano's prime interest. His profound interest was not in money, but in people, the people in the unions. His heart was in the "good and welfare of the union" part of the agenda.

It is already, long since, written firmly into the invisible heartfelt minutes of the unions of Alameda County that goodness and greatness were the traits of James F. Galliano. And now that he is gone those traits are remembered and lovingly dwelt upon.

Washington State Legislature Pays Tribute to First Woman To Represent State in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington by formal resolution has honored our colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May].

— This resolution speaks for itself especially as it is a tribute to a Republican from a legislative body two-thirds Democratic.

Under unanimous consent, I include the resolution for printing in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

Whereas Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY of Yakima has been recently elected from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington to the U.S. House of Representatives, being the first woman from the State of Washington to be elected to the U.S. Congress, and

Whereas CATHERINE MAY ably served three terms as a Member of the House, contributing to the progress of the State in many ways, and particularly in her dedicated efforts to improve the institutional programs and the programs for retarded children, and

Whereas, during these three terms the Members of both parties of the House have developed a very real affection for CATHERINE and a great admiration for her ability and effectiveness and her friendliness and charm, and

Whereas CATHERINE MAY has made a unique achievement in combining a successful political career with a successful career as a wife and mother: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the house of representatives do hereby express to CATHERINE MAY their deep appreciation for her past assistance and contributions to the State and their warmest wishes for all success in her new position; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, and to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

America's Outstanding Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a well-deserved editorial on America's outstanding Democrat, National House Majority Leader JOHN W. McCORMACK:

AMERICA'S OUTSTANDING DEMOCRAT: McCORMACK ROLE AS LEADER CITED
(By Frank Daley)

Propelled by the positive conviction—based on 1958 election returns from countless American communities—that our public needs are only adequately met under the guidance of Democratic leadership, the Democratic Party has never had a more brilliant future. Nor has it ever had the certain assurance of continuity in office and for greater gains in State and national offices as it now faces.

The net gains made by the Democratic Party in the 1958 elections of 6 Governorships, 15 U.S. Senate seats, 47 House seats, and 12 State legislatures, presents a political picture of the thinking public.

It brings forth the resentment of the people against the Republican blueprint for stagnation program and the approval of the more positive and vigorous action of Democratic leadership to make democracy work as an instrument to promote human happiness.

When we think of Democratic leadership, its only natural to think of the leader of leaders, the National House Majority Leader

JOHN W. McCORMACK. No other Democrat has done more for the Democratic Party in the past 25 years or was more responsible for the party's landslide victories in the last November elections than Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK.

He sponsored or directed the enactment into law which gave labor the right to organize although 94 percent of the House G.O.P. voted no.

Congressman McCORMACK has played a vital and extremely effective role in having enacted into law social security, minimum wage, and fair working conditions, and he has been a part, a prominent part, in every major legislation enacted into law which provided economical, education and social gains for the people during the past 25 years.

It should be noted that 93 percent of the House G.O.P. voted no against social security, 61 percent of the House G.O.P. voted no on minimum wage and 80 percent of the G.O.P. House voted to oppose fair working conditions.

The House, in fact, was once the breeding place for Presidents. During the first 8 decades of the Constitution, 12 of the 25 Presidents could look back to service in the House. Years later came the first national conventions, and gradually the nominating machinery passed into the hands of leaders outside Congress.

The tremendous victory for the Democrats last November, when it is all said and done, adds up to one simple fact and that is, the elections proved that Americans do not want a veto of the 20th century.

An amazing thing is, from what the Republicans have been saying since last November 4, it does not appear that they have even yet grasped this simple fact. Perhaps they never will.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during their entire modern history Estonians have enjoyed national independence for a very short time, for only two decades. After living under the mild sovereignty of the Swedes during the 16th and 17th centuries, and after enduring the oppressive regime of the Russian czars in the 18th and 19th centuries, early in the 20th they attained their freedom and national independence toward the end of the First World War. That was the culmination of their long struggles, and the realization of their national dream. When the autocratic Russian regime was shattered, they proclaimed their independence and on February 24, 1918, established the Estonian Republic. Thenceforth in the midst of hard but pleasant work, they all were happy and joyful in their homeland. And all seemed to be going well for about two decades. Then the evil forces of the world were let loose; the Second World War started, and the Estonians, with a host of other countries, saw the doom of their independent status as a nation and the loss of freedom as individuals. In 1940 Estonia was overrun by the Red

Army and in July the country was annexed to the Soviet Union.

Since then, for almost two decades, Estonians have been suffering under totalitarian dictatorship, and have been bearing the brunt of alien philosophies imposed upon them by godless Communists. In this indescribable suffering all seems gloomy, and the immediate future does not look bright. But these courageous and tough fighters for freedom, long schooled in adversity, cling tenaciously to their ideals of freedom and never entertain any doubt about the victory of their righteous cause, the cause of freedom and independence. On this 41st anniversary celebration of their independence day we can heartily echo their genuine and patriotic sentiments and hope for the realization of their goal.

H.R. 209 and H.R. 210

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unless we do something about it, and do it quickly, new slums will spring up in our big cities as quickly as we remove the old slums. All the money and effort we are spending on urban renewal programs, laudable as is their purpose, will be wasted if we do not provide means of financing and the incentive for the modernization of residences in districts, once most desirable, that step by step are approaching the slum state. All that is needed to restore them to their former state of high desirability for family homes is a program such as envisioned by H.R. 209 and H.R. 210, which I introduced early in the session and on which I hope the Banking and Currency Committee, operating through its very efficient Housing Subcommittee, will schedule public hearings at the very earliest date possible. This is an entirely new approach to a solution of the problem of the slums. It furnishes a preventative remedy and is based upon modern medical thought that the best way to cure an illness is to prevent it.

In drafting H.R. 209 and H.R. 210 I was aided by the findings and recommendations of the Shinner Foundation of Chicago, which made an exhaustive nationwide study of the causes of slums and their prevention. If our big cities are to escape the spread of the "gray belt" of decay to the city limits" envisioned by Dr. Raymond Vernon in an article by Homer Bigart in the New York Times of February 22, 1959, it is imperative that we step on the gas and quickly enact H.R. 209 and H.R. 210. The article from the New York Times follows:

SPREAD OF SLUMS IN CITY FORESEEN

(By Homer Bigart)

Slums will march from downtown business districts to the suburbs in New York and 12 other major cities, according to a paper published yesterday by the Committee for Economic Development.

This gloomy evaluation was made by Dr. Raymond Vernon, director of the New York Metropolitan Region Study. He saw a "gray belt" of urban decay spreading from downtown skyscrapers to the city line.

He also saw scant prospect of arresting the flight of middle-income families to the suburbs. When this group abandons an area, he said, the vacated buildings are converted to intensive low-income use. Thus the wave of slums moves gradually outward to the edges of the city and into the older portions of suburban towns.

STUDIES POPULATION TRENDS

The Committee for Economic Development is a business research and policy group consisting of 150 leading business executives and educators. Its main purpose is to explore national economic problems in the hope of establishing sound policies for the guidance of our economic life.

Dr. Vernon has been engaged since 1956 in various studies of the New York metropolitan area sponsored by the Harvard Graduate School of Business. He is attempting to project the economic and population trends of this area for the next 25 years.

About the only comfort he could offer the cities was: There will always be a downtown.

Downtown will keep its vitality as a center for finance and amusement, Dr. Vernon said, as well as for the sale of products and services that involve a great deal of comparative shopping.

But even the affinity of the financial community for downtown areas may be weakened by the redistribution of population, he warned.

INSURANCE COMPANIES CITED

Insurance companies, for example, he noted, put their main offices in cities where a large pool of literate women clerks is available. However, he said, as the central cities decline in population and as Negroes and other groups with more restricted job opportunities dominate the remaining population, young women who form the labor force for the insurance companies tend to move to the suburbs.

With commuting distances lengthening and mass transit facilities deteriorating in most cities, he warned, downtown may cease to be the best point for recruiting the preferred office labor force.

Moreover, he said, a considerable segment of banking activity has followed the general outward redistribution of population and jobs.

Still, he said he expected continued vitality downtown because office activities would expand even though "the central cities may not capture quite as high a proportion of such activity as they have in the past."

It was the rest of the city, the "gray belt", that seemed doomed to Dr. Vernon. For this area he predicted only a growing obsolescence.

He saw the blight spreading outward from the old slum districts where there has been a sharp decline in population.

MOVEMENT OF SLUMS

The old slums, he explained in an interview, are now inhabited by a growing proportion of aged couples whose children have moved to other areas. Although population is down, there are few vacancies in the tenements. Consequently the low-income groups are settling in brownstones vacated by middle-income families.

In this expanding gray area Dr. Vernon predicted in his report a long-run decline in the intensive use of space as sites for homes and jobs. The high cost of recapturing obsolescent factory sites would rule out the return of industries, he believed.

He cited two possibilities for arresting slum growth: a return in great numbers of middle-income families to the city and government subsidies to low-income housing or park projects. He discounted the first pos-

sibility by saying that such a movement would fly in the face of deep-seated historical trends based on powerful sociological forces.

The use of Government subsidies would require a scale of intervention much larger than any previously contemplated, he said.

Examining the comparative advantages to industry of locating in the city or in the suburbs, Dr. Vernon said that the old multi-story mill-style building found in the cities was inappropriate to assembly-line techniques and other developments in handling materials.

FACTORY STRUCTURES CHANGE

The preferred type of structure is a long one-story building requiring large sites with the easy possibility of expansion—sites that usually cannot be found in the cities.

Small plants are still being pulled to the central city, but the big ones are being pushed away, Dr. Vernon said. One reason is that the size and internal organization of the big plants has freed them from dependence on many of the services in the congested areas that the smaller competitors find indispensable.

"This independence of larger firms from their environment is reflected," he said, "in a dozen different ways—in their reliance on truckload, instead of less-than-truckload, freight; in their ability to install their own transformers; in their ability to provide their own protective services, and so on."

Eventually the big cities of America will lose large manufacturing plants and become more and more like Manhattan, an island of office workers, he predicted.

His conclusions were pessimistic:

"The outward movement of people will be matched by an outward movement of jobs. Retail trade will follow the populations. Manufacturing and wholesaling establishments will continue to respond to obsolescence by looking for new quarters and by renting in structures in the suburban industrial areas where obsolescence is less advanced. The movement of jobs will reinforce the movement of residences."

Dr. Vernon's study was confined to the New York area, but he stressed that the same problems were to be found in 12 other major cities—Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and San Francisco.

Cuba Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following speech which I delivered last Saturday night in Santiago de Cuba in Oriente Province, Cuba. I was invited to speak there under the sponsorship of the Committee for the Industrialization and Progress of Santiago. However, representatives attended the dinner meeting from a number of other organizations including the 20-30 Club, the Rotary, the Lions Club, and the chamber of commerce. In all, some 250 businessmen attended in the dining room of the Casa Grande Hotel. The hospitality of Santiago was typically Cuban—that is, wonderful and gracious.

CASTRO'S CUBA: A CHALLENGE FOR CUBANS AND AMERICANS

I am sure that a year ago, I could not have addressed you as I am today. In the first place, I am sure Fulgencio Batista would not have permitted an invitation to be extended. In the second place, I am told that your organization, as a demonstration of protest against Batista's tyrannical regime, had refused to convene any meeting or hold elections until civil liberties were restored. Your distinguished president informs me that this is your first meeting of 1959 in free Cuba. Let me say, therefore, that all of us owe a debt of gratitude to Fidel Castro.

Cuba is called the Pearl of the Antilles; she is described as one of the most beautiful islands in the Americas, but how much more beautiful she is now that freedom is restored. Yet, what Castro has won for the Cuban people is but a promise of what great expectations lie ahead.

It is customary in speeches by visiting politicians from one foreign country to another to stress traditional ties. Sometimes this is done as nothing more than a gesture, a courtesy extended as a matter of form. With me, I assure you, it is not merely a formality when I say that Fidel Castro has done more than perhaps any other Cuban to stir the consciences and emotions of the American people and to remind your friends to the north of the deep-rooted historic ties of friendship that bind Cuba and the United States. Ours is a relationship born in a common tradition. It is a tradition of democratic idealism, of revolution. Castro has captured the spirit of that tradition of democratic idealism and has elevated it to a new level of prominence not only throughout the Western Hemisphere but also throughout the world.

More than anything else the spirit of democratic idealism, it seems to me, was one of the primary motivating forces underlying Castro's 26th of July movement. There is something remarkably attractive about the drive, the dedication, the sense of nationality of all these men. A year ago they were regarded in some countries as a group of dreamy idealists caught up in a hopeless cause, adventurers of a sort guided more by self-delusion than by any serious, genuine compulsion. Yet, against apparent overwhelming odds the men of this movement have succeeded with almost miraculous speed in sweeping away a regime of terror, violence, and corruption. Press reports in the United States have stressed the totality of Cuban support behind the Castro forces. This was, indeed, a national revolution; of dimensions like that of the Mexican Revolution. Perhaps, this fact coupled with the democratic idealism that is at the heart of the 26th of July movement and the leadership of a young Oriente lawyer, driven by an inner compulsion to bring democracy to his people, were more responsible than anything else for the success of democracy in Cuba and the overthrow of the Batista regime.

At first, many persons in my country were shocked by what seemed to be the excesses of the Castro forces. The belief became widespread that a virtual reign of terror was being directed against the Batista followers. It was difficult for them to comprehend the reality of the situation. They had had insufficient evidence of Batista's oppression. It was difficult to grasp the seeming contradiction of a democratic leader governing in apparent irresponsibility, and, as it seemed to them, governing ruthlessly. Americans neither understood the implications of this crisis nor the complications engendered by a nation caught up in violent revolution. Nor did they understand that the pent up indignation of a morally sensitive, oppressed people had to have some outlet, and that the public trial of known murderers was in fact a safety valve for a nation that demanded retribution against its oppressors.

Now, I believe, the American people realize the magnitude and the high morality of the 26th of July movement. Gradually the knowledge is becoming more widespread in the United States that these revolutionaries are not a rabble in arms but are a restrained, disciplined, and dedicated group of patriots who have the overwhelming support of the Cuban people and who are trying under great difficulties to bring to Cuba genuine democracy. The *norteamericanos* are becoming more and more conscious of the great problems facing your young lawyer and as a consequence a genuine feeling of sympathy and understanding seems to be taking shape.

Certainly, Cubans do not have to be reminded of the great political and economic problems besetting their new government. In any revolution there always follows a difficult period of adjustment once the fighting has stopped and the tyrant has been overthrown. The legacy of the old regime is always a tremendous burden for the new government. The general problem of firmly establishing the legitimacy of the new government in a period of transition is fraught with grave dangers. The problem of reconciling the broadening of democracy with the necessity of maintaining a steady, centralized authority to insure public order and national progress, all in a revolutionary atmosphere, is a tremendous task for any new government. In our own national history it took almost a decade to establish a viable constitutional order after our war of liberation.

Nor are the economic problems facing Fidel Castro and the Cuban people any less burdensome. The economic legacy of the Batista regime would certainly be sufficiently oppressive to crush the enthusiasm of a far less devoted and energetic leader. Corruption and waste had completely enveloped the Batista regime. It is said that many Batista officials deposited millions of dollars in United States and Swiss banks. I hasten to add, money that was taken from the Cuban people. It is also reported that Batista himself has set aside upward of \$200 million to \$600 million for himself, for the most part no doubt in Swiss numbered accounts, before his flight to the Dominican Republic—again, money that belongs to the Cuban people, and which, by the way, I am encouraging our Government to locate and return if at all possible.

The war for Cuban liberation has also added to the great economic burden. Destruction by the revolution has been estimated at an insured cost of about \$15 million. Damage and destruction to railroad bridges, and other means of transport and communication has been extensive. In all, the Government faces a staggering national debt of some \$1,500 million.

The political and economic problems facing the Castro government are great, but they are not impossible. From abroad one gets the impression that political stability and orderly government prevails in Cuba. This is a happy beginning because out of political stability economic and social progress will emerge and flourish. Unless he removed himself entirely from politics for a while, Fidel Castro was right to assume the premiership and to participate actively in the management of governmental affairs. Political responsibility, it seems to me, cannot be disassociated from political authority. To govern effectively, and efficiently, responsibility and authority must be indivisible. He now has both the actual and the legal authority.

It is gratifying also to hear that the Castro government is planning extensive reforms within Cuba. Certainly plans for agrarian reforms calling for the distribution of government land to the people, proposals to ease unemployment, and the reorganization of the government and the army will be widely acclaimed in the United States and else-

where as demonstrations of the genuine democratic idealism of the Castro movement.

Serious problems face Fidel Castro and the Cuban people in their quest for a solid democratic order. Yet, I am confident they will meet the challenges thrust upon them. Certainly, the United States can do much to make these challenges more bearable. I am gratified by the speed with which the United States recognized the Castro government, and I am equally gratified to know that our Ambassador to free Cuba, Philip Wilson Bon-sal, is a man who knows Latin America and has a genuine sympathetic understanding of the problems that beset the area. His position with respect to dictators is unequivocal. He doesn't like them.

Problems are bound to arise in Cuban-American relations and the great burdens borne by Castro and his Cuban people are not mainly the concern of persons solely in executive authority. It is important, of course, that understandings be reached on the government level, but it is even more important, I believe, that as a people, we in the United States should more clearly understand the real meaning of the July 26th movement, not only for Cuba, but also for the Western Hemisphere and even the whole world. It is well, it seems to me, that we should think of Cuba and recent events here in the broad perspective of Latin American affairs.

The winds of democracy are blowing fresh and vigorous throughout Latin America. The Cuban experience is not only the most recent, but the most dramatic, demonstration of the rollback of totalitarianism in the Western Hemisphere. The Cuban revolution is the fulfillment of a dream of a great leader; it is the rededication of a people to democracy. There is, of course, no way of measuring the impact upon the world this event has made, but I am sure that the emergency of a democratic Cuba gives cause for grave concern to all dictators whether of the left or the right, not that Cuba could ever be a physical threat to them, but that Cuba can be the symbol of what they fear most, the rule of the people.

We in the United States are beginning to see the deep implications of the 26th of July movement, and many of us, indeed I hope all of us, are trying in every way to make the golden opportunity of Castro's revolution a reality. As a Nation we must maintain an undiminished confidence in the Cuban people to achieve a genuine democratic order. We must work desperately hard on the practical level to help the Cuban people succeed.

We can give Castro undiminished support in the solution of his political problems but there is also much to be done on the economic side. Here, the United States is prepared to help Cuba in this period of revolutionary transition. American economic aid to the Batista regime had been negligible. If I had had my way, there would have been none, economic or military. Even the military aid, which regrettably was given and widely publicized, actually amounted to very little. In the past a small technical assistance program operated in Cuba costing an average of \$500,000 a year. At present only 12 technicians are active in Cuba under this program. These technical assistance activities carried on by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) were designed to aid in the solution of specific problems in the Cuban economy. The broad objective of the program was, however, to point up the spirit of mutual cooperation between the people of Cuba and the United States. Specifically, the program was geared to consultation and in-service training of personnel in agriculture with a view to increasing production of a variety of crops such as tomatoes, cucumbers, cacao, coffee, and tropical fruits for domestic consumption and also for export. This operation undoubtedly

contributed to Cuba's economic welfare and diversification. It is even said that production of some crops has increased to such an extent that some imports are no longer needed and small amounts of produce are being exported.

Assistance has also been given in Cuba's mining industry. A civilian aviation project, we hope, has been helpful in working with the Cuban Aeronautical Commission on technical matters such as air traffic control, air safety, equipment procurement, and training. This project has aided in improving air safety and contributed to the growth of Cuban aviation. The technical assistance program has also contributed to improvements in Cuba in the education of aircraft mechanics and the technical advice in public administration provided to the census and statistics services of the Cuban Government in preparation of the coming 1960 census. These activities were carried on throughout all Cuba. I would like to note particularly that a U.S. technician has carried on some specific research work in Cacao here in Oriente Province.

Cuba has, however, received no grant aid from ICA and no loans from the Development Loan Fund. On the other hand, she has received credits from the Export-Import Bank. The most recent of these in the last 8 years was the \$17,500,000 credit to expand Cuba's telephone system, an installation that should be of benefit to large numbers of people regardless of the regime which ruled here.

On the whole, official American aid activity in Cuba appears to have been very small, although, of course, private investment of U.S. capital has been substantial. According to one estimate, the total U.S. investment in Cuba is more than \$1 billion. Apparently, there was at first some concern in American business circles during the change in governments, but the promise of Provisional President Manuel Urrutia to "actively encourage" U.S. investments in Cuba undoubtedly has reassured the fearful. Reportedly, the system of graft prevailing under the Batista regime has been a deterrent to investment capital, but recently one American businessman was quoted as saying, in reference to the Castro government, "With an honest government, this island could be an economic paradise—it could go ahead and realize its potential." It is possible that if the revolution can be consolidated efficiently and in order and political stability achieved along the lines Castro has promised, Cuba may well become an economic paradise and the development of its great economic potential a reality.

In conclusion, and in all humility, I want to make three suggestions for your consideration, as you go ahead to build a free, honest, and prosperous Cuba.

First, realize that you have the sympathy and support of my country. Call on us for assistance, whether it be more food and clothing for impoverished victims of the revolution, advice on how to attract and hold new industries, or ideas from our experiences how best to solve various social problems. We don't pretend to have all the resources or answers but please realize, as many of you do, our wish to help you establish yourselves in freedom and prosperity.

Second, don't expect too much too soon from the revolution. Insist on civil liberties, yes, and preparations for free elections, but do not expect increased profits and higher wages for everyone immediately. It is one thing to topple a dictatorship, another to build a democracy. Freedom means the right, indeed often the duty, to criticize. It means being able to disagree without being

disagreeable. Sometimes it looks awfully sloppy and disorganized, but no better method has been devised for human happiness and governmental strength.

Here I want to leave Cuba a moment and talk about proposals by Cuban and Venezuelan leaders to kick the tyrannies out of the Organization of American States. Certainly this is something to discuss at Quito next year when the O.A.S. convenes there. For my part I believe in universal membership in international organizations, but of course with constant reminders of and obedience to the governing charters. Article 5, part (d), of the O.A.S. charter reads as follows:

"The solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy."

I am reliably informed that the O.A.S. at Quito will have an opportunity to consider a concrete, specific definition of "the effective exercise of representative democracy," a yardstick which would disclose at once the respective shortcomings of Trujillo, Stroesner, Somoza, and Duvalier.

It can't all be done in a day—but it will be done if Cubans exercise self-control, tolerance, a sense of humor, and faith in democracy.

Finally, and this injunction is also not needed by most of you, beware of Communists who would try to make you believe they speak as Cubans, Cubans devoted to Cuba and speedy social and economic changes. Communists, of course, thrive on disorganization and are trained to take advantage of it. Their social justice anti-U.S.A. and pro-Cuba themes should fool no one, certainly not any Cuban who hated Batista and would fight against the resurgence of his counterpart in Cuban politics. Cuba's destiny is not that of Hungary today, Hungary where a local revolt cannot win because of the Soviet Union's intercession from outside its borders.

In Oregon, my home State, last week I heard Vice President Nixon—with whom I often do not agree—say something we all might ponder: "We should be more concerned about the meaning of the American Revolution," he said, "and less afraid of the Russian revolution." High officials in our Department of State would do well to heed the Vice President's timely advice.

In the final analysis, therefore, the greatest burden seems to rest upon Fidel Castro and his associates. In a very real sense he is a man of destiny; for if he fulfills the promise of his revolution and succeeds in imparting throughout all Cuba the zeal, the energy, the dedication to duty, and the democratic idealism that is so much part of his personality, there can be no doubt that Cuba and her people will emerge in a new age of progress and prosperity. But, we must all be patient with this man; as he himself recently said: "I am a man, not a god. We cannot do everything in 1 day." Indeed he can't do everything in 1 day. Nor can he do what is to be done without the support of the Cuban people and his friends in the Western Hemisphere. I do not doubt for one minute that Fidel Castro has the overwhelming support of the Cuban people. Nor do I doubt that there are millions of my own countrymen who feel as I do that this man deserves the sympathy and support of our Nation.

Fidel Castro has advanced the trend toward total hemispheric democracy one more significant step. Neither we in the United States, nor you in Cuba can permit him to fail, for, after all, he is the symbol of what all of us desire most: a world of freemen.

Prompt Start on Libby Dam—Resolution of Montana Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Montana's 36th Legislative Assembly has sent a joint memorial to the Congress in support of legislation providing for a prompt start on Libby Dam, the most important multipurpose project remaining to be built in the Pacific Northwest.

Libby, a \$285 million project, would rise in the Kootenai River in northwestern Montana. It would back up 5,985,000 acre-feet of flood control storage, or more than one-fifth of the 27 million acre-feet of upstream storage which the Corps of Engineers says is necessary to control floods of record in the Columbia River Basin.

In addition to its ultimate installed generating capacity of 800,000 kilowatts of power, the corps project would provide regulated streamflow to add 805,000 kilowatts of energy to production at Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, the Dalles, and Bonneville Dams. It is estimated that another 90,000 kilowatts would be generated in Canada by Libby storage. Libby also would provide substantial recreation, navigation, wildlife, and other conservation benefits.

The project was authorized by Congress in 1950. But, because this major unit in the Columbia River power and flood-control program would back up a reservoir into Canada, its construction is contingent upon an agreement with Canada under terms of the Boundary Water Treaty, signed on January 11, 1909, by the United States and Canada. Canadian representatives on the International Joint Commission have refused to approve the project, meantime proceeding with studies of development plans which could shut off the water of the Kootenai in the United States.

Proposed Canadian diversions of the Kootenai north of the border could cut the average annual flow of the river at the Libby site by more than 70 percent, thus making the project unfeasible.

Instead of sitting around until Canada shuts the water off, I propose to amend the authorization to provide for construction of the dam in two stages. The first stage would back water up to the Canadian border. The second stage would be added when agreement is reached with Canada. This measure, H.R. 3339, is sponsored in the Senate by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken].

We have the assurance from the Corps of Engineers that the two-stage construction idea is sound engineering.

It will take about 3½ years to do the detailed planning and design work. Agreement with Canada while this planning work is going on could speed up completion of this needed project by up to 3 years.

House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the 36th Montana Legislative Assembly follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

Introduced by Sheldon (Lincoln), Jensen, Helling, Gill, Broeder, Harball, and Tonner

A joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Congress of the United States; James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; Lee Metcalf and Leroy Anderson, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana; the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate; the Committee on Public Works of the United States House of Representatives; the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, Maj. Gen. E. C. Itchner; and the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans; urging construction of Libby Dam in two stages, with work beginning on the initial stage as soon as possible in order to protect the national interest in water and water resources rising in the United States; and requesting sufficient appropriations so that detailed planning and design work can begin immediately

Whereas Libby Dam site is located in Lincoln County in western Montana and Libby Dam will be constructed across the Kootenai River some 15 miles upstream from Libby, Mont.; and

Whereas preliminary geological and engineering investigation and planning of the Libby Dam project have been carefully completed and the findings compiled; and

Whereas Libby Dam, the biggest storage project remaining to be built in the Pacific Northwest, will be designed to provide flood control, hydroelectric power, recreation and navigation benefits to Montana, the Pacific Northwest and the Nation; and

Whereas the Libby project's tremendous storage of water—5,985,000 acre-feet—would provide valuable flood control for several hundred miles along the Kootenai and Columbia Rivers and also would substantially aid flood control and navigation on the Columbia River below Pasco, Wash.; and

Whereas Libby Dam will have an initial installed electric generating capacity of 600,000 kilowatts, an ultimate installation of 800,000 kilowatts of power, which Montana and the Northwest need to bring in new industry; and

Whereas Libby Dam storage would also firm up power production in the projects downstream on the Columbia River; would provide a regulated streamflow which would add 805,000 kilowatts to the production at Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, the Dalles, and Bonneville dams; and

Whereas no other proposed single dam on the Columbia River system would provide for generation of as much salable power at site and downstream; and

Whereas the rapidly increasing population of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation places upon this generation a special responsibility for the maximum utilization of all the great natural resources bestowed upon this country by divine providence; and

Whereas any lesser development of the Libby damsite would result in great loss of storage capacity and both, at-site and downstream power benefits, which can create thousands of jobs urgently needed to provide for our burgeoning population and the future defense and welfare of our region and the Nation; and

Whereas the Pacific Northwest is isolated from the major population centers of the Nation by great distances and high freight rates and must rely upon the full development of its own natural resources in providing for its future growth and economic welfare; and

Whereas hydroelectric power is the only truly inexhaustible energy resource available to a civilization whose entire future growth and economic strength will be increasingly dependent upon the provision of adequate supplies of electric energy; and

Whereas the industrial development of Montana and the entire Pacific Northwest will be greatly enhanced by the large amounts of low-cost power made available by the full development of the potential of the Libby Dam site; and

Whereas the people of the State of Montana have seen in the examples of Hungry Horse Dam on the south fork of the Flathead River in their State and many other dams in the Pacific Northwest the immense benefits which accrue as a direct result of the construction of such great projects not only to the State in which they are constructed but also to the entire region and the Nation; and

Whereas revenues from the sale of power from Libby Dam represent the most feasible source of funds to aid in the rapid construction and the maintenance of major future irrigation projects in the State of Montana, which developments can provide homes for any farm families which may be displaced by the construction of Libby Dam; and

Whereas large amounts of storage are required in the Columbia River and Clark Fork River Basins to provide adequate protection against the seasonal floods which periodically cause great loss of life and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property, causing great hardship throughout the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas many of the large storage projects planned by the Army Engineers for the control of floods in the Columbia River Basin have been and are being lost due to conflicting uses and inadequate development, so that it is seriously doubtful that even the minimum flood control storage requirements of the region can be met; and

Whereas Libby Dam, with 5,985,000 acre-feet of usable storage in its reservoir is one of the few remaining great storage projects still feasible and not involved in serious controversy in the Columbia River Basin and can provide more usable flood control storage than a combination of all the other feasible potential projects in the Clark Fork River Basin; and

Whereas Libby Dam, as planned and authorized, must have the approval of the International Joint Commission; and

Whereas the International Joint Commission has for years been unable to reach agreement on the project and says it will not give approval until the Canadian Government's investigation of alternative uses of the Kootenai waters in Canada has been completed; and

Whereas one of the Canadian proposals is to divert part of the Kootenai River flow into the Columbia River at Canal Flats, in order to generate additional power at sites in Canada; and

Whereas such a diversion would materially reduce the amount of water available for storage and generation at the proposed Libby site, and could reduce the amount to the

point where Libby Dam would be unfeasible; and

Whereas in order to protect Montana's and the national interest in water and water resources rising in the United States, in order to provide for at least partial flood control and storage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Representatives of the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States be urged and requested to introduce and the Congress of the United States be urged and requested to enact into law an amendment to the existing authorization of the Libby project, necessary to provide for construction in two stages, the first backing water up to the international boundary, the second to be added when agreement is reached with Canada; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to provide sufficient appropriations so that detailed planning and design work for two-stage construction can begin immediately and that construction can begin as soon as design work is completed; and be it further

Resolved, That the amendment include reservation of a block of power for Montana; and be it further

Resolved, That this assembly request the Congress, in making appropriations for the construction of the Libby project, to define the compensations that shall be received from the Government of the United States by the County of Lincoln and by affected cities and school districts in said county for extraordinary expenses resulting from expanded services required in the fields of school and hospital facilities, health and sanitation, and police protection incidental to the construction of said projects; and to provide all necessary funds and take all needed action to insure the construction of all transportation and other facilities needed to provide opportunity equal to that now existing of access to mines, to forests in Federal, State, and private ownership, and to manufacturing and refining plants, to the end that the present steady and continuous employment of Montana people depending upon forests and mines for their livelihood will not be adversely affected; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to each of the individuals and to the chairmen of each of the committees named in the title of this memorial and also to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN.

JOHN J. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.
PAUL CANNON,
President of the Senate.

Installation Banquet Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Boston Naval Shipyard Barrack No. 1240, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein part of an address delivered by me at the installation banquet conducted by the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Boston Naval Shipyard Barrack No. 1240, held at the Linwood

Grille, near Fenway Park in Boston, Mass., on Monday evening, February 23, 1959. Outgoing Comdr. Anthony D. Tieso officiated as the toastmaster of the evening, and the welcoming remarks were given by Department Commander Melvin D. Eddy. The installation of the newly elected officers was conducted by Department Senior Vice Commander Frank Farnham. The newly elected Comdr. William Francis Cooney extended the thanks of the organization to all invitees and the members, and presented an appropriate gift to Past Department Commander Francis W. Powers, and Department Commander Melvin D. Eddy.

It was George Washington who recommended that all officers who should continue in service to the end of the Revolutionary War should be entitled to half pay during life.

The Congress took favorable action on his recommendation.

We have come a long way since those days, regarding the coverage and the substance of pensions for veterans.

In spite of the fact that there is a movement underway—in 1959—to renege on the Nation's obligation to its veterans.

Those who are conducting this campaign do not dare to make a frontal attack for they know it would arouse a storm of opposition.

Instead, they are trying to divide the veterans by making a distinction between needy and nonneedy veterans in order to promote confusion and dissension. This is the opening wedge to reduce present pensions, and to throw a permanent roadblock in the way of pensions for all honorably discharged veterans of World War I which they see coming up over the horizon.

Unfortunately, many corporations and wealthy individuals seem to have persuaded the President that the budget must be balanced at all costs at the expense of our missile and space programs, the economic expansion of our country, and the American tradition of providing pensions for its ageing veterans.

These are the very same people who solemnly asserted that "nothing is too good for our boys" back in 1917 and 1918.

But today they want to forget those assurances and those promises.

During the very month that they honor the birthdays of two great Presidents they conveniently overlook George Washington's recommendations, and they avoid Abraham Lincoln's reminder that we must "care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

But no matter how hard they try, no matter what devious techniques they employ, and they cannot get around the precedent, and the moral obligation of providing pensions, that are deeply rooted in our history.

The first national pension law was passed by the Continental Congress on August 26, 1776. Every officer, soldier, or sailor losing a limb in any engagement, or being so disabled in the service of the United States as to render him incapable of earning his livelihood, was promised half pay for life, or during disability.

The Revolutionary service pension law of 1818, introduced a new principle into this field of legislation. Before this time, disability was the firm requirement for the payment of any pension. With the new law, mere service in the Armed Forces, together with poverty, became the basis for entitlement.

Congress adopted a pure service pension schedule for the Revolutionary War survivors, on June 7, 1832. This act granted full pay for life to veterans who had served a minimum of 2 years.

The Mexican War Pension Act of 1837 granted a pension, if the veteran was suffer-

ing from disabilities to a pensionable degree. Veterans 62 years of age or older, were entitled to a disability pension, regardless of any disability.

The trend was plain to see. Congress was becoming more liberal with the experience of each successive war.

In the debate on the Mexican War Pension Act, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, pleaded for uniformity, for consistency of action on the part of Congress. He explained that if the Government were bound as a matter of principle, to pension soldiers or sailors who do not need a pension, and who are under no disability, then it is a universal principle, and, as such, the veterans of all wars are entitled to the pension. Enactment of the bill, said the Senator, would very shortly compel the Congress to take the next step—a pure service pension for the Civil War veterans.

The Mexican War Pension Act was debated for 3 years, but logic and honor finally prevailed, and Congress passed the bill in January of 1837.

The Dependent Pension Act of 1890 was a service-pension law. Pensioners, however, were required to demonstrate their inability to perform manual labor as a means of supporting themselves. Because of this strange twist, the law spawned many abuses, and gave rise to much dissatisfaction.

Widespread agitation led to the act of May 11, 1912, setting up a formula whereby the Civil War veteran must have served at least 90 days in that conflict, and that he must be 62 years of age or older. The payments, provided for on a graduated scale according to length of service, were increased by subsequent legislation.

The act of June 5, 1920, was entitled "An act to pension soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition."

It provided that any such veteran who has reached the age of 62 years shall, upon making proof of such fact, be placed upon the pension roll.

As for pure service pensions, the Spanish-American War is the most recent conflict where such provisions have been authorized by the Congress. Obviously, the veterans of World War I are next in line for this entitlement.

When Congress passed a bill to provide adjusted compensation for the veterans of 1917-18, it was vetoed by President Harding on September 19, 1922. In the message explaining his action, the President was looking to the future when he said that it is inevitable, as the years pass, that pension provision for World War veterans will be made, as it has been made for those who served in previous wars.

That prophecy was made over 36 years ago. When we average out the length of time that the veterans of five previous wars in American history—up to and including the Spanish-American War—had to wait before service pensions were authorized, we find that it takes nearly 43 years.

We, the veterans of World War I, with over 40 years behind us, are getting close to the time of our entitlement.

When we consider that our honored seniors, the Spanish American War veterans, only had to wait 22 years for their pensions, it would appear that favorable action on our claim cannot be delayed much longer.

In the last session of the Congress, when my bill to provide a Federal charter for our organization was being debated, there were a few who opposed the bill. They insisted that our group was organized for the sole purpose of "lobbying through Congress a general pension bill that would provide \$100 monthly to all World War I veterans regardless of need or length of service beyond 90 days."

I objected to that general accusation, pointing out that our organization serves the

social and fraternal needs of its members. It also makes a positive contribution to every community in which there is a barracks, by its example of good citizenship, and by its perpetuation of those ideals that give young Americans in every generation, the faith and the courage to work for, and if necessary to fight in the defense of our freedoms.

But as to the charge that we are seeking a pension I say, "So what?"

There is nothing sudden or surprising in such a proposal—more than 40 years after World War I, and following a precedent that was firmly established long ago.

We believe that the veteran who is 62 years of age or older is entitled to a pension of \$100 per month upon proof of age and honorable service, as a matter of right.

We are confident that this formula is the simplest and fairest method by which the Nation's obligation to the aging veterans of World War I will be honored.

In the school of practical experience, we have learned that few people in positions of leadership and influence showed any interest in our objective, until our organization was founded. Its rapid growth within the period of several years, has opened the eyes of our legislators, and is reminding a grateful, but sometimes absent-minded nation, that the pension issue is approaching decision day.

We are building unity and strength and inspiring comradeship through our membership in the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. We realize that only by such mobilization of our forces, directed toward the goal of a pension for all veterans of that conflict, can we win to our side, the public support that is necessary for victory in this campaign.

That is why we attack the administration's sly proposal, whereby the benefits for needy veterans—covering both compensation and pensions—might actually be increased.

No self-respecting veteran is opposed to additional aid for our needy comrades.

But we resent the deception inherent in this proposal.

Under the guise of helping the neediest veterans, it seeks, eventually, to determine eligibility on the basis of need alone, and thus completely undermine the obligation to provide a pure service pension to all aging veterans.

It is a clever maneuver, but it does not fool us.

We will not permit this administration to turn back the clock.

An old trick, being dusted off for use again, is to scare the public by estimating the cost of veterans' benefits some years from now. But this one-sided slanting of the facts fails to mention the mortality rates.

There are few survivors of the Spanish-American War.

The ranks of World War I veterans have been thinned in the space course of 40 years. Even as the veterans of World War II, are beginning to decline in number. In any case, about 22 more years must pass before they, in turn, become eligible for pensions.

It is no coincidence, therefore, that the administration and its big business advisers would like to readjust the Nation's pension program.

It is designed to block the veterans of World War I.

We would like to believe that it is motivated by fear of our growing strength, and that it merely represents a last-ditch effort to stop or slow down our drive.

That is only true in part.

They have had this idea in the back of their minds for a long time.

Some years after every war, when they think that people have forgotten the promises that were made in time of national emergency, certain financial interests always attempt to sabotage veterans' benefits so that they can keep more for themselves.

Under the current excuse of balancing the budget they believe that the opportunity they have been waiting for has arrived.

But the people on November 4, 1958—and in no uncertain fashion—demonstrated that they are in no mood for the Federal Government to abandon its responsibilities.

As employees of the Boston Naval Shipyard you are well aware of other moves they would like to make in the name of economy.

If they had their way, everything would be farmed out to private contractors—including the U.S. Navy, the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the civil service, and perhaps the Government itself.

If they had their way.

But the people have the final authority over their representative form of government. As long as we have truly enterprising organizations like the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., the economizers will not be able to default on their obligations.

We know that we are on the right course, and we intend to follow it until we reach our goal.

Report of Water Pollution Control Advisory Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting here in mid-December, one of President Eisenhower's advisory groups took an unheard of action. Its members unanimously opposed a recommendation by the man who had appointed them.

The group is the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board. The recommendation of President Eisenhower is that the Federal Government in fiscal year 1961 discontinue Federal grants to States and local governments to help them plan and build treatment works to prevent discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into public waters.

Indirectly, at least, the Board also endorsed the principal objective of H.R. 3610, by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], now pending in the Committee on Public Works.

The Blatnik bill would double the \$50 million a year construction grants program for 10 years. It would likewise increase the grants available for individual projects from \$250,000 or 30 percent of the estimated cost, whichever is smaller, to \$500,000 or 30 percent, whichever is smaller. It would provide for reallocation of funds from States not using them to others having approved projects for which grants have not been made because of the lack of money.

For the information of my colleagues, I append the Board's report to the Surgeon General under date of February 11, 1959. I have deleted the section headed "Acknowledgments." In addition to the usual thank you's, Acting Chairman Milton P. Adams reported that "some members expressed to me the hope that they might count on a larger share of your—the Surgeon General's—time at future meetings."

Mr. Adams said this meeting "will stand out as the one containing subject matter most pertinent to the discharge of our duties under Public Law 660." He also noted that all actions taken were by unanimous vote by the members present.

The report follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE.

Washington, D.C., February 11, 1959.

THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Public Health Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. BURNEY: The fifth meeting of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board was held in Washington on December 15 and 16, 1958. The purpose of this meeting was to discharge the responsibilities prescribed under the terms of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for reviewing the policy and program of the Public Health Service and making recommendations to the Surgeon General.

Several important matters affecting certain phases of the water supply and water pollution control program have developed since our last meeting. Being fully aware of this situation, we devoted our time and energies to considering all of the issues possible during the 2 days we met.

Having in mind the policy of the Congress, as stated in Public Law 660, "to recognize, preserve and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution . . ." the Board gave careful consideration in its deliberations to the results of a survey of the States, conducted by one of the Board members, Mr. Milton P. Adams. A questionnaire was sent to all State and interstate water pollution control administrators and State sanitary engineers to ascertain their opinions on the effectiveness of the Federal program, or what changes they believed should be made.

Answers were received from all States, four of the six interstate agencies, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia. Replies to the survey were incorporated in a 14-page memorandum dated December 12, 1958, addressed to the Chairman, Members of the Board and staff of the Public Health Service.

The Board found this memorandum of great interest and of much value in certain of its deliberations. The members directed that it be accepted and made a part of the official minutes of the meeting.

"Summary of Results of Poll" (p. 5 of the memorandum) is reproduced here as part of this report. The number of affirmative and negative answers received has been placed after each of the 10 specific questions as asked.

MUNICIPAL SEWAGE DISPOSAL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

1. Are current Federal allocations resulting in stimulation of sewage plant construction within your jurisdiction? Yes, 43; no, 9.
2. Do you favor doubling the authorization of construction grant allocations through reintroduction and enactment of the Blatnik bill (H.R. 11714, 85th Cong.) or its equivalent? Yes, 38; no, 13.
3. Do you favor elimination of further Federal construction grants by repeal of section 6, Public Law 660? Yes, 2½; no, 48½.
4. Do you favor repeal of section 6 with future sewage disposal construction grants to become an exclusive State function financed out of proceeds of a State excise tax on local telephone services as per Federal-State action committee recommendations? Yes, 2; no, 48.

Footnote at end of speech.

5. If your answer to (4) is "yes," do you think your legislature would enact such a tax in 1959? Yes, 1; no, 12.

6. If your answer to (5) is "yes," do you think your legislature would appropriate from the proceeds of such a tax, funds in an amount equal to or greater than you are now receiving for sewage disposal construction grants? Yes, 1; no, 10.

OTHER MATTERS

7. Do you favor creation of a new position of Assistant Secretary of Water Pollution Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as per H.R. 13839 (Blatnik), 85th Congress, or its equivalent? Yes, 16; no, 28.

8. Do you favor continuance of Federal program grants to States and interstate agencies (sec. 5, Public Law 660)? Yes, 49½; no, 3½.

9. Are you satisfied with progress to date toward solution of interstate water pollution control problems in which the Public Health Service has participated? Yes, 44; no, 1.

10. Since industry cannot qualify for grants, but its taxes assist in providing grants to cities, States, and the Public Health Service, would you favor amendments of the internal revenue laws to permit industry an accelerated amortization rate for such capital investments as are necessary to meet State or interstate water pollution control objectives? Yes, 51; no, 3.

This report covers those items of major concern to us, and which, we believe, need your immediate attention.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board submits to you its recommendations on the following:

1. The proposal of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee of September 9, 1958, that Congress on its part amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit to the States against the local telephone service tax for a 5-year period, and the States on their part enact and collect a 3-percent excise tax on local phone service. This credit would equal 30 percent of the Federal tax, or 3 percentage points of the present 10 percent tax conditioned, of course, on each State's enacting a 3 percent phone service tax satisfactory to the Federal Treasury. In addition, the committee proposed that Congress authorize the Treasury to distribute the revenue equivalent of 1 percent tax on local telephone service to certain low income States. The combined tax credit and revenue distribution to the States would equal 40 percent of the Federal revenues now derived from the local telephone service tax, if, as, and when each State had met the Federal requirements. Whether the proceeds of the 3 percent State excise tax on phone service, if enacted, would ever be made available for sewage disposal construction grants to take the place of Federal funds now authorized, rests within each State legislature, and, of course, is not subject to the will either of Congress or the Federal Treasury. Present grants for vocational education and sewage treatment projects and the related Federal responsibility for administration, would become an unfunded State obligation if and as a new system goes into effect. The Treasury's distribution of these revenues would be discontinued at the end of 5 years with the States assuming full financial responsibility for the two programs.

The Board rejected the committee's proposal as not feasible, despite the knowledge and understanding on the part of each member that the current plan reportedly had administration blessing. Here are some of the reasons discussed leading up to their unanimous action:

(a) The telephone companies have already alerted their customers to seek repeal of the entire 10 percent Federal excise tax on local phone service as an unfair tax on them.

(b) The plan described above still fails to meet requirements of the resolution adopted at the Governors' conference at Miami, Fla., last May.

(c) The plan further leaves the States within the control or even dictation of some Federal official.

(d) There would be an unnecessary loss and dissipation of \$60 million of Federal revenue annually, even if every State enacted a federally approved 3-percent State excise tax on phone service (see Dr. Flemming's press statement of October 6, 1958, released October 10).

(e) Our members are convinced that few, if any, State legislatures could be prevailed upon to enact a 3-percent State excise tax on local phone service because of the following reasons: (1) Adverse lobbying pressure against such a new tax; (2) the fact that phone service is not a measure of sewage disposal or vocational benefits and cannot be sold as such; (3) legislators from such cities as Pittsburgh, New York, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and a host of smaller places where sewage treatment has been provided, without the aid of Federal grants, could hardly be expected to support such local excise tax legislation for the benefits sought, or as a substitute for present Federal funds.

We believe that the construction grants program is operating effectively at the present time and should, if anything, be increased. If an increase is impossible, then we recommend that it be continued at its present level of operation.

2. The bills introduced in the 85th Congress to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, H.R. 13420, H.R. 13839, and S. 4321, which we understand will be reintroduced in the 86th Congress. In general, these bills proposed to amend Public Law 860 to: (1) Increase the maximum grant limit on an individual project to \$500,000; (2) permit municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities with the amount of grant allocable to each community as if it were a separate project; (3) increase to \$100 million for construction grants for each annual appropriation; (4) permit reallocation of unused allotments; and (5) establish an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the administration of the Water Pollution Control Act and transfer all functions and responsibilities for water pollution control from the Surgeon General to the Assistant Secretary.

Though the Board approved of doubling the limitation on individual grants, and the provision for reallocation of unused construction grant funds, we resolved that the annual budget be increased only to the level necessary for meeting the States' construction grants needs.

We unanimously opposed the provisions of H.R. 13839 and S. 4321 establishing an Assistant Secretary for the water pollution control program. However, we are deeply concerned with the present low status of this program within the Public Health Service. We strongly recommend that you take immediate action to elevate the program's status in order to offset the congressional sentiment for removing the water pollution control responsibilities from the Service.

3. The impact with the expiration of program grants (sec. 5, Public Law 860) on June 30, 1961, will have upon the State and interstate agencies in their efforts to control pollution.

In view of the overwhelming number of State administrators who favor continuing the Federal program grants, the Board firmly believes that Congress should be requested to extend these grants to June 30, 1970.

4. The need for an accelerated tax amortization rate on the construction of industrial waste treatment facilities.

Since industry cannot qualify under Public Law 860 for grants to aid in the construc-

tion of such treatment works, the Board favors amending the internal revenue laws to provide an incentive for building these necessary treatment plants. Thus, industry can fulfill its role in the effort to abate and control water pollution.

5. Public awareness activities by the Public Health Service to educate and inform the various publics on the serious pollution threat to this Nation's water resources.

The Board is still deeply concerned with this lack of public knowledge, though we commend the water supply and water pollution control program for its accomplishments with a limited budget. We therefore reaffirm our previous recommendation that more definite steps be taken to formulate an organized public awareness program that will not only inform the people, but make them acutely aware of this problem.

We urge that adequate funds be requested to conduct such a program effectively and that the Surgeon General and his staff utilize national radio and television networks to further enlighten the general public, and consider calling a national conference on water pollution similar to the recent national air pollution conference held in Washington.

6. The budget resources and needs of the water supply and water pollution control program.

The presentation by the chief of the program confirmed our prior impressions and opinions that his program accomplishes a great deal with very limited resources. There is need, however, for even greater accomplishment. The Board therefore urges that immediate consideration be given to requesting a budget increase so that the program will be more effective.

7. The activities of the interstate enforcement section in carrying out its responsibilities under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The Board is eminently satisfied with the activities and progress to date. We strongly support the Service's efforts to protect this Nation's vital water resources against pollution through its vigorous application of the letter and spirit of the act's interstate enforcement provisions.

In addition to the above items, the Board also considered: (1) Pollution control from Federal installations; (2) working relationships, Corps of Engineers-Public Health Service, title III, Public Law 85-500; and (3) Model Water Use Act, State legislation.

We are looking forward to seeing you again in the spring.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON P. ADAMS,
Acting Chairman, Water Pollution
Control Advisory Board.

Members present at fifth meeting: Milton P. Adams, Irwin T. Bode, William F. Duckworth, Dr. Harold M. Erickson, Seth Gordon, Fred C. Heinz, Anton Hulman, Jr., Frank E. Long, William W. Wise.

Official:

ROBERT C. AYERS,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Adams is executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission. Mr. Bode is director of conservation, State of Missouri. Mr. Duckworth is an auto dealer and mayor of Norfolk, Va. Dr. Erickson is the Oregon State Health Officer. Mr. Gordon is director of the California Fish and Game Commission and a member of the California Water Pollution Control Board. Mr. Heinz is vice president of the H. J. Heinz Pickle Co. Mr. Hulman is a Terre Haute, Ind., industrialist and chairman of the Indiana Flood Control Commission. Mr. Long is a Buffalo, Wyo., rancher and banker. Mr. Wise

is director of the Connecticut Water Pollution Control Commission.

¹ In jurisdictions where the responsibility for water pollution control is divided as between a State water pollution control agency and a State health department or its sanitary engineer, one-half vote was assigned to each. In some cases, the two agencies voted differently. A one-half vote was also registered where the administrator of one State voted both "yes" and "no" on a question.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., Va.		Cannon, Clarence, Mo.		Garmatz, Edward A., Md.	
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St. Miss.		Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.		Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.	
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.	4000 Mass. Ave.	Carter, Steven V., Iowa		Gathings, E. C., Ark.	6377 31st Pl.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.		Casey, Bob, Tex.		Gavin, Leon H., Pa.	
Albert, Carl, Okla.	5115 Allen Terrace	Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.		George, Newell A., Kans.	
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.		Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.	The Mayflower	Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.	
Alford, Dale, Ark.		Chamberlain, Charles E., Mich.		Glenn, Milton W., N. J.	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Alger, Bruce, Tex.		Chelf, Frank, Ky.		Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), Pa.	
Allen, Leo E., Ill.	University Club	Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.		Grant, George M., Ala.	4801 Conn. Ave.
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.	4000 Mass. Ave.	Chipperfield, Robert B., Ill.	1713 House Office Building	Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.	
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.	911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.	Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), Ill.	2122 Mass. Ave.	Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.	
Andrews, George W., Ala.	3108 Cathedral Ave.	Clark, Frank M., Pa.	3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.	Green, William J., Jr., Pa.	
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.		Coad, Merwin, Iowa		Griffin, Robert P., Mich.	
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.	4815 Dexter St.	Coffin, Frank M., Maine		Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), Mich.	
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio		Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.	2920 Ordway St.	Gross, H. R., Iowa	
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.		Collier, Harold R., Ill.		Gubser, Charles S., Calif.	
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.	Colmer, William M., Miss.		Hagen, Harlan, Calif.	
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.	113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.	Conte, Silvio O., Mass.		Haley, James A., Fla.	
Avery, William H., Kans.		Cook, Robert E., Ohio		Hall, David M., N. C.	
Ayres, William H., Ohio		Cooley, Harold D., N. C.	2480 16th St.	Halleck, Charles A., Ind.	4926 Upton St.
Bailey, Cleveland M., W. Va.		Corbett, Robert J., Pa.		Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.	
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.		Cramer, William C., Fla.	6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.	Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.	
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.		Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.	Hargis, Denver D., Kans.	
Barden, Graham A., N. C.	2801 Woodley Pl.	Curtin, Willard S., Pa.		Harmon, Randall S., Ind.	
Baring, Walter S., Nev.		Curtis, Laurence, Mass.	3314 O St.	Harris, Oren, Ark.	1627 Myrtle St.
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.	Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.	Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.		Harrison, Burr P., Va.	
Barrett, William A., Pa.		Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.		Hays, Wayne L., Ohio	1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.		Dague, Paul B., Pa.		Healey, James C., N. Y.	
Bass, Perkins, N. H.		Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.		Hébert, F. Edward, La.	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Bass, Ross, Tenn.		Davis, Clifford, Tenn.	4611 Butterworth Pl.	Hechler, Ken, W. Va.	
Bates, William H., Mass.		Davis, James C., Ga.		Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.	
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio		Dawson, William L., Ill.		Henderson, John E., Ohio	
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.		Delaney, James J., N. Y.		Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.	
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.		Dent, John H., Pa.		Hess, William E., Ohio	
Belcher, Page, Okla.		Denton, Winfield K., Ind.		Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.	
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.	1530 38th St. SE.	Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.		Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.	3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.	Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.		Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.	3018 M St. SE.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.		Devine, Samuel L., Ohio		Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.	
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.	118 Schotts Court NE.	Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.		Hogan, Earl, Ind.	
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio		Dingell, John D., Mich.		Hollifield, Chet, Calif.	
Blatnik, John A., Minn.		Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah	1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.	Holland, Elmer J., Pa.	
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), Ga.		Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.		Holt, Joe, Calif.	
Boggs, Hale, La.		Donohue, Harold D., Mass.		Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.	
Boland, Edward P., Mass.		Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.		Horan, Walt, Wash.	
Bolling, Richard, Mo.	3409 Lowell St.	Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.		Hosmer, Craig, Calif.	
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), Ohio	2301 Wyo. Ave.	Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.		Huddleston, George, Jr., Ala.	
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.	Calvert-Woodley	Dowdy, John, Tex.		Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.	
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.		Downing, Thomas N., Va.		Ikard, Frank, Tex.	
Bow, Frank T., Ohio	4301 Mass. Ave.	Doyle, Clyde, Calif.	3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.	Irwin, Donald J., Conn.	The Coronet
Bowles, Chester, Conn.		Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.		Jackson, Donald L., Calif.	
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.	The Washington	Durham, Carl T., N. C.	The Lee House	Jarman, John, Okla.	
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.		Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), N. J.		Jennings, W. Pat, Va.	
Brandemas, John, Ind.		Edmondson, Ed, Okla.		Jensen, Ben F., Iowa	2120 16th St.
Bray, William G., Ind.		Elliott, Carl, Ala.		Johansen, August E., Mich.	
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.		Everett, Robert A., Tenn.		Johnson, Byron L., Colo.	
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.		Evins, Joe L., Tenn.	5044 Klingie St.	Johnson, Harold T., Calif.	
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.		Fallon, George H., Md.		Johnson, Lester R., Wis.	
Brooks, Jack, Tex.		Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.		Johnson, Thomas F., Md.	
Brooks, Overton, La.	4413 46th St.	Fascell, Dante B., Fla.		Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.	
Broomfield, William S., Mich.		Feighan, Michael A., Ohio		Jones, Paul C., Mo.	1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Charles H., Mo.	3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.	Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.	3725 Macomb St.	Jones, Robert E., Ala.	
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio	Alban Towers	Fino, Paul A., N. Y.		Judd, Walter H., Minn.	3083 Ordway St.
Brown, Paul, Ga.	Boston House	Fisher, O. C., Tex.	Calvert-Woodley	Karsten, Frank M., Mo.	
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.		Flood, Daniel J., Pa.	The Congressional	Karth, Joseph E., Minn.	
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.		Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.		Kasem, George A., Calif.	
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho		Flynn, John J., Jr., Ga.		Kastenmeier, Robert W., Wis.	
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.		Fogarty, John E., R. I.	1133 House Office Building	Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.	Sheraton-Park
Burke, Frank W., Ky.		Foley, John R., Md.		Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), W. Va.	
Burleson, Omar, Tex.	2737 Devonshire Pl.	Forand, Aime J., R. I.	4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.	Kelth, Hastings, Mass.	
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.		Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.	Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.	
Byrne, James A., Pa.		Forrester, E. L., Ga.		Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.	The Mayflower
Byrnes, John W., Wis.	1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.	Fountain, L. H., N. C.	The Westchester	Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.	
Cahill, William T., N. J.		Frazier, James B., Jr., Tenn.	Fairfax Hotel	Kilday, Paul J., Tex.	3507 Albemarle St.
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.		Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., N. J.	3014 N St.	Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.	4848 Upton St.
		Friedel, Samuel N., Md.		King, Cecil R., Calif.	
		Fulton, James G., Pa.		King, David S., Utah	
		Gallagher, Cornelius E., N. J.		Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio	
				Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.	
				Kluczynski, John C., Ill.	
				Knox, Victor A., Mich.	
				Kowalski, Frank, Conn.	
				Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.	
				Laird, Melvin R., Wis.	
				Landrum, Phil M., Ga.	

2279

Appendix

American Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a lucid and penetrating appraisal of the farm problem in America was made in a recent speech before a convention of Ruritan National by Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

This speech by Senator SYMINGTON, a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and the astute sponsor of intelligent farm legislation, should be required reading for every American genuinely concerned with recent trends in American agriculture and interested in restoring prosperity to our rural areas.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address by Senator SYMINGTON:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, OF MISSOURI, RURITAN NATIONAL, 30TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, JANUARY 26, 1959

It is a privilege to speak here before the 30th anniversary convention of Ruritan National.

I am especially proud to be here, because the speakers at your past conventions constitute a most distinguished group—one which includes my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD.

There is always a bond between a speaker and the audience when they share common beliefs and philosophies.

I believe this is true tonight.

As Ruritans, you recognize the true and enduring values of rural life; and you have dedicated your organization to promoting and serving those values.

Your basic objective is to bring about a closer union and a better understanding between the farmer and the business and professional man, so as to make the rural community a better place in which to live.

In serving rural communities as you do, you are making a great contribution to your country.

You are also serving a larger cause—that of our Nation.

The influence of agriculture extends far beyond the farm, or even the rural community.

While some 20 million Americans actually live and work on the farms, it is estimated that 42 million are involved in the transporting, processing and retailing of farm products, or in supplying the farmers' needs.

In other words, an estimated three out of every eight Americans are directly involved in the feeding and clothing of the Nation.

Remember those figures, when anybody tries to argue that agriculture is no longer important.

Each year agriculture uses more finished steel than is used in a year's output of passenger cars.

Each year, farmers use more crude petroleum than any other industry in the country.

Each year, American farmers keep 2 to 3 million nonfarm workers employed solely in supplying their needs.

So agriculture is today, as it always has been, one of the pillars of our Nation's economy.

As Ruritans, you are aware of, and concerned with, the close relationship between rural and urban America.

You know well that the small town cannot long survive, much less grow or prosper, in the face of continued depressed economic conditions in agriculture.

A decline in farm income is like an economic cancer. It spreads slowly at first, but soon covers an entire area.

It is only natural that, as farm income and purchasing power decline, the farm family is forced to postpone or curtail purchases of needed or desired goods.

If a farmer cannot afford to buy a new tractor, the sales of local implement dealers drop.

As a result, the implement dealer postpones his planned purchase of a new car.

This means the auto dealer must postpone his remodeling or building a home.

And the chain of reduced purchasing power soon engulfs the entire community.

But it spreads even further—to the factories, the firms, and the people of larger cities.

To see the effect, we need only look at the last few pages of our book of economic history.

Farm prosperity reached record levels in the post-World War II period.

In the early 1950's it began to slump.

Conditions continued to worsen, until in 1957 family farm purchasing power reached its lowest point in 17 years.

As farm income dropped steadily, our small towns and rural communities bore the brunt.

Gradually, however, it spread to the larger cities, to the point where, in 1957, and continuing throughout most of 1958, our entire national economy staggered under the most severe recession since the mid-1930's.

I do not want to imply that our most recent recession was caused solely by a sick farm economy. But most economists agree that continued drops in farm income and purchasing power helped bog us down as much as anything else.

This is why many farmers, farm leaders, and some of us—not enough—in the Congress, are so concerned when various people make light of agriculture—its people, its importance, and its problems.

Wouldn't we like to get hold of that Madison Avenue fellow who started the story that nearly all farmers are now driving Cadillacs?

Farm workers put in a 10-hour day. That we know.

I don't know of many farmers who work less than a 6-day week.

Do you?

The work of no one else is more directly concerned with the well-being of each of us.

For what could be more important than our food?

American farmers are the most efficient and productive farmers in the world.

And we are improving, every year.

Last year, average per acre yields on nearly every major commodity set new records.

On 57 acres, we now produce the same amount of food and fiber that we did in 1940 on 100 acres.

We can produce more pounds of meat, with less feed, than ever before.

Milk production, per cow, has increased 39 percent since 1944.

Yes, Americans are the best fed, and best clothed people on the face of the earth.

And this food and clothing is becoming less and less expensive, in terms of the amount of work required to earn the purchase price.

Thirty years ago the average laborer had to work 15 minutes to earn enough to buy a quart of milk.

This year, he will work just half that time for that quart; and his milk will come in a more sanitary package, pasteurized, homogenized, and irradiated with vitamins.

It now requires less than one-third the worktime of 30 years ago to buy a dozen eggs.

And half the time for a pound of meat.

Now in most industries, increases in efficiency or productiveness are rewarded by higher wages or profits.

This has not been true in agriculture. Despite the fact our farmers feed us well, and help to feed needy people in other lands, they have not shared fully in the benefits of their accomplishments.

Per capita income in agriculture is less than half the level of the nonfarm population.

In 1958, farm workers' wages averaged 76 cents per hour; whereas factory workers' wages averaged more than \$2 per hour.

Reports comparing rural and urban standards of living consistently point out that farm families are far short of the conveniences and necessities enjoyed by urban families.

One-fourth of the Nation's farm families have no automobile.

Only half have telephones.

Nearly 2 million farm homes have no running water.

The median income level in agriculture in 1957 was \$1,555. This is less than one-third of the median income in wholesaling, manufacturing, transporting, mining—and by far the lowest for any industry group.

Is it not truly a paradox that one of the most efficient and productive segments of our economy is earning so much less than any other?

How, then, can we find ways to help farm families earn a fair return for their effort, without resorting to programs which, in the long run, will hurt farmers, the rural community, and the national economy?

Before entering Government service, I spent nearly 30 years in private business.

Therefore I naturally view this farm problem, or any similar Government problem, from the standpoint of what we used to call "good business practice under sound accounting principles."

With that premise, may we look briefly at a current Government farm problem which invariably is one of management's most important problems, inventory.

All of us know the importance of sound inventory management, and the dangers incident to excess inventory.

We have an inventory problem in Government today which may be the greatest inventory problem ever faced by anybody in peace-

time—the inventory currently in the hands of the Department of Agriculture.

As we know, the Department of Agriculture price-support program operates through the making of loans on commodities.

Unless the loan is redeemed, the commodity is taken over by the Commodity Credit Corporation, a legal instrument created to carry out this operation.

In recent years, there has been a tremendous increase in the quantity of farm products moving into the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and it is now clear that this condition has been caused primarily by the Department of Agriculture giving price support without meaningful production controls.

In effect, the Department of Agriculture has been telling farmers in many crops to produce all they can; and at the same time has provided them with a guaranteed price.

There has been no adequate market for this guaranteed production. Therefore it has piled up in Government inventory at a truly appalling rate.

As of November 30, 1958, the most recent Department of Agriculture report, the CCC inventory of Government-owned farm commodities was valued at \$5.5 billion. (In January 1953, this inventory was \$1 billion.)

But that tells only part of the story. That \$5.5 billion represents the value of the crops actually owned by the CCC.

In addition, there is some \$2.7 billion of commodities pledged for loans, most of which will be turned over to the Government within the next few months.

According to the President's 1960 budget message, the CCC actual inventory will be \$6.7 billion by next June 30, and \$9.1 billion by June of 1960.

If these 1960 estimates are accurate, the Government holdings of surplus farm commodities will have been multiplied 9 times in an 8-year period.

And this does not include any loan pledges, the cost of which may be several billions more.

At the present time, two crops, corn and wheat, make up approximately 75 percent of this total investment; and the prominence of these two crops will continue.

The new corn program of the Department of Agriculture calls for higher price support for most corn farmers; and at the same time does away with all measures of production control.

So we are certain to have even greater corn production; and therefore an even larger Government inventory.

Wheat production is expected to continue at an equally high level.

The figures again.

This Commodity Credit Corporation inventory is nearly \$6 billion now; it soon will be \$9 billion; and the total obligation—loans and inventory—will be some \$10.5 billion.

Therefore the present policy, price support without effective controls just doesn't make sense.

To a farmer, with this gigantic supply hanging over his market, it guarantees heavy trouble.

To all of us, as citizens and taxpayers sharing the cost of this program, including the now heavy storage charges, it constitutes a heavy burden.

To the people who are now entering their 7th year in control of our Department of Agriculture, it is a problem which must now be faced up to.

For that reason all of us, in and out of Congress, hope for sound proposals from the Department of Agriculture this year.

Now what can be done with this \$9 billion agriculture inventory?

As I see it, here are the alternatives.

We can continue to store the inventory.

(At present inventory levels, the cost of storage and handling is \$420 million per year.

As the size of the inventory increases, this cost will, of course increase to, according to the President's state of the Union address, \$1 billion per year in storage charges alone.)

At this rate, we will soon run out of places to store our idle surplus crops. Then tens of millions more dollars will have to be spent to build more storage space.

Just not good business.

Secondly, the Secretary of Agriculture can sell these stocks on the market, for what they will bring.

That would be normal business practice, in manufacturing or wholesaling, or retailing. This latter action would result in sharp cuts in the price of beef and hogs.

Some believe, however, that this day of reckoning is due.

In fact, hog prices are already skidding. In recent months they have dropped from \$23 to \$17 per hundred pounds; and, according to Department of Agriculture reports, by next fall they may be down to \$10-\$12, as low as they were in 1955.

Cattle prices, which are now doing fairly well, can only drop heavily if we move our inventory of more than 2.5 billion bushels of Government stocked corn, and possibly wheat, into the market.

Thirdly, we could destroy these surplus stocks.

That would be a heavy levy on every citizen of the United States. All the money invested would be lost.

With hundreds of millions of hungry people around the world, that action might be misunderstood by many.

Fourth, perhaps we could move much of this inventory into the hands of hungry people, all over the world.

To that end, I have introduced a bill which requires that not less than 25 percent of our foreign economic aid be given in surplus farm commodities.

In this way we would be using more of the productive capacity of our American farm families as a weapon in the struggle for world freedom and a just and lasting peace.

Already we are selling some of our surplus stocks for foreign currencies. This is under the Public Law 480 program.

A bill has been introduced in this Congress to allow countries to purchase our food and fiber stocks under long-term contracts, so they can be assured of a supply while they are developing their own resources.

It has also been suggested that the free nations set up a world bank, in which storable food could be deposited, withdrawn, or loaned, in order to meet emergencies of the member nations.

As long as we are going to be in the business, and properly, of strengthening countries to resist communism, why not do it partly with food, of which we have plenty, instead of dollars, with which we are having increasing troubles.

So there they are, the four possible solutions to this growing agriculture inventory problem.

We can destroy this inventory.

We can sell it.

We can use more of it for economic aid.

Or we can keep on storing it.

As Ruritans you are vitally interested in a prosperous rural America.

But you know there can be no true farm prosperity so long as the Department of Agriculture continues to sit on this gigantic surplus of farm commodities.

It is a situation which must be faced; and in the interest of the country as well as the farmer, it should be faced now.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I am one of those eager to find the right answer, so the families on the farms, and in the rural communities of America, can share more fully in the unprecedented prosperity of our Nation.

Let us all dedicate ourselves to the right, and therefore the wise, solution to this farm problem.

We would then be striving to do our share toward the attainment of a free and prosperous America.

In that way we would be serving the objective of Ruritan, "to make our community a better place in which to live."

Some Problems of Our Neighbor to the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, our attention has been directed in recent days on our good neighbor to the south by the visit of President Eisenhower to Mexico.

A recent letter which I have received from an acquaintance, who has made his home for several years in Mexico, sets forth very dramatically and cogently some of the problems which that country has to solve.

This letter, I think, expounds very accurately the great potentiality of Mexico, and will impress upon the people of the United States the desirability of cooperation on the part of our Government with the new President of Mexico in his efforts to raise the living standard of the majority of the Mexican people and to make the Government more stable and responsible.

Mexico is another story politically. Although its heritage reaches back to more than 100 years before the pilgrims landed, politically and economically it is a younger country than the United States.

Mexico City is one of the most modern and cosmopolitan cities in the world which stands comparison with New York or Paris, but politically it is at the stage the United States was when trustbuster Teddy Roosevelt came on the scene. The wealth here is in the hands of the very few. In Guadalajara alone there are probably more millionaires than in the whole United States. Palaces, and mansions, unbelievably large and elaborate, are almost commonplace here. Yet in this very city hundreds of people go hungry, and the blind and crippled and fatherless are left to beg on the streets because the Government and its appointed or elected officers serve only the rich. A person here who is the equivalent of a Congressman in the United States begins his office with only one thought in mind—how to become as rich as possible before his term ends by fair means or foul, with no thought of serving the people.

There are no strong unions in Mexico with the exception of the railroad workers, telegraph workers, etc. who go on strike often, but the rest of the vast army of skilled and unskilled workers are virtually slaves of their employers. Men in politics who are honest are the rare exception here and often get shot in the back by the henchmen of less scrupulous rivals. It will take a host of Teddy Roosevelts and F.D.R.'s to clean up the Government and introduce welfare programs before this will be a real democratic nation. But, nevertheless, progress is being made. The new President, Lopez Mateos, issued a decree the other day. For the first

time in Mexico's history public schoolchildren next year will receive free textbooks. Many of the poor children couldn't afford to buy their books even though Mexico's laws state that public education shall be free. For the first time many children will be able to go to school.

Mexico is a wonderful and fascinating country in many ways. It has great natural resources, breathtakingly beautiful scenery, and the climate in Guadalajara is one of the most perfect in the world, as is the climate in much of Mexico. All the country needs is good government and a healthy system of unions to raise the living standard of the working people and to create a large middle class. The majority of the people are either filthy rich or desperately poor. Unlike the Hollywood stereotype of a Mexican, the average Mexican is hardworking, good natured, proud, high moral, and extremely devout. Surely a people with such qualities deserve all the privileges of a truly democratic nation, and little by little I think they will win them.

Every American should get on his knees and thank God that he has a political system which provides honest leaders. Unfortunately, most Americans take their democratic government too much for granted. Many a Mexican has sighed and said to me "If only our Mexico had a government like you have up there." I am sure others say the same thing in many countries all over the world.

One should be proud to be a public servant of the people in a land where no man starves to death while his millionaire fellow citizen looks on uncaring; where no blind or crippled person or orphaned child goes uncared for; where no rich man can build a palace while his very laborers are starving on the wages he pays for their back-breaking work.

I love Mexico and her people, but not her rich people. They profess to be devout Catholics but they're not Christians. I love the poor people, proud and even noble in their poverty; the struggling small shopkeepers and skilled craftsmen who barely make a living; the farmers who are robbed of their crops by the unscrupulous banks which lend them money on usurers' terms. They are the real Mexicans and in them lies the hope of Mexico's future, not in the few and privileged rich.

The New Inflation: Administered Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years everyone has become aware of the dangerous inflationary trend. The President, in his state of the Union message, called upon Congress to stop inflation. Although everyone is aware of the problem, no one seems to know just what to do about it. I think that all Members of this body, no matter to what committee assigned, should do everything in their power to set machinery in motion which would either solve the problem of inflation or in some way bring the power of public opinion to bear upon those responsible for it.

My attention was recently called to the testimony of Gardner C. Means, a distinguished economist, before the Senate Antitrust Judiciary Committee. Dr.

Means made a brilliant analysis of the situation which is summarized in an article, "Inflation Besetting Us Is of a New Breed," by Bernard D. Nossiter, in the February 8, 1959, Washington Post and Times Herald. Under unanimous consent, I include the article following my own remarks. Dr. Means' analysis indicates that the current price inflation is limited to the concentrated industries which includes steel, automobiles, and others in which a relatively few companies have dominant control.

It appears in these industries that an administered price system is operating. Under the administered price system, prices are not responsive to supply and demand. On the contrary, when demand falls off prices in the administered price industries go up. I will not take the time to recount the numerous instances in the last few years when prices were pushed up arbitrarily. It is significant that only a short time ago United States Steel raised its prices when demand fell to 49 percent of capacity and that the automobile industry raised its prices during the period when demand for passenger automobiles fell by about 50 percent.

Dr. Means' analysis also shows that we have, at the same time these prices are being pushed up, an entirely different situation in the competitive industries. Agricultural prices, for example, either have been declining or have come up very little. The farmer, in other words, receiving relatively low prices for what he had to sell, has had his net income further reduced by having to pay relatively high prices.

Legislation which I introduced today which is similar to the bill introduced by Senator O'MAHONEY on January 12, will put the big corporations on notice that they no longer will be permitted to raise prices unnecessarily without public review. This bill will not apply to small consumers or to small business. It is limited to the eight largest corporations in any manufacturing industry, if they account for 50 percent of the industry's sales. An analysis of the material introduced by Dr. Means indicates that the administered price system only operates in areas of economic concentration. It is easy to see why this situation obtains.

If two, three, or four large corporations account for most of an industry's production and sales, they are able, by sheer market power, to operate successfully a price-fixing system. I do not mean they necessarily conspire to do so. The corporations, over a period of years, have developed a highly sophisticated method of fixing prices. They merely follow the leader. If United States Steel, which is the leader in the steel industry, raises its prices, all the steel companies do likewise. If General Motors raises its prices, then other automobile manufacturers raise theirs.

The bill which I am introducing would require the 8 largest companies in an industry to announce their proposed price increase 30 days in advance. During that time, the Federal Trade Commission would hold public hearing and the corporations would be required to come in and justify their proposed increase.

Farm, labor, and other organizations would be permitted to come in and express their views. In this way, the price increase would receive public attention and consideration.

I believe that this procedure would have a healthy effect on our economy. The proposal admittedly will not necessarily solve the inflation problem, but it will be a step in the right direction.

The above-mentioned article follows:

INFLATION BESETTING US IS OF A NEW BREED

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

A pioneering approach to the peculiar price inflation that marked our recent past is embodied in the strange-looking charts at right.

[Charts omitted in RECORD.]

They were put together by Gardiner C. Means, of Vienna, Va., a distinguished but lonely economist. He held a slew of Government posts in New Deal days and was recently an adviser to a relatively sophisticated business group, the Committee for Economic Development. Twenty-seven years ago Means rocked economic thinking when he and Adolf A. Berle wrote "The Modern Corporation and Private Property."

What the Means charts show is that contemporary inflation is a very different animal from the classical demand inflation. The chief difference lies in whether big price increases come in competitive or concentrated industries.

In other words, what Means has done is violate a sacred taboo of economic thinking. He has actually gone and looked at where the price increases are taking place and asked whether the differences over separate periods of time aren't meaningful.

To compound his sins, he has married economic theory to economic fact. And, as everybody in the business knows, the gulf between the institutionalists (fact men) and theoreticians is as wide as the breach between Montagues and Capulets.

Classical inflation is pictured in the top chart, covering the war and immediate post-war years. This was a money phenomenon, an increase in money demand which was not offset by an equivalent increase in goods—what Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin likes to call too much money chasing too few goods.

In drastically oversimplified form, this is what happened:

The staggering war expenses were paid by the Government through borrowing (deficit financing). To the extent that the Government borrowed (sold bonds) to commercial banks, the Government was simply printing money. The goods this money bought were shot off, exploded, dropped on cities, or left to rot in military warehouses. So, when controls came off, the extra money in the hands of people and businesses bid up prices, much more than it induced increased production. Even with the best will in the world, increased production could not come about quickly enough because resources of men and materials were almost fully employed—too much money was chasing too few goods.

According to Means' charts, the biggest price increases came in the highly competitive industries—lumber, farm products, processed foods, textiles. In these, producers can't control their prices which are set by those impersonal market forces so dear to Adam Smith.

But the concentrated industries with few producers—steel, autos, aluminum, electrical machinery—held back. They do have considerable discretion over price and didn't take full advantage of the big increase in money demand.

Now, the new inflation presents a different picture. All the price push comes from the concentrated industries. The competitive industries in several cases cut prices—textiles, farm products, miscellaneous. And there is

a logic in this. The period under study, 1953 to October 1958 (the last month for which Means got data), was a time of much less than full employment. The period spans two recessions (1953-54 and 1957-58). The money supply did not zoom upward.

So, only industries who need not rely on impersonal market forces but have considerable control over their prices could make increases stick. And the charts show that they did.

Many economists will quarrel with Means' interpretation of his charts. They will contend that the ability to administer prices has nothing to do with whether an industry is competitive or concentrated. They will argue that all Means is showing in his new inflation chart is what you would expect in a period of investment boom—and the Nation certainly was enjoying one from 1955 through 1957—steeply rising prices in steel and other producer goods industries as the result of extra demand for producer goods.

This debate can't be settled in this space or anywhere else now because relatively little is still known about administered prices, or for that matter, concentration.

Let's take a closer look at the charts. The solid black bars are industries or industry groups which are highly concentrated—a handful of producers account for most of their production. The cross-hatched bars are mixed concentrated and competitive—chemicals, furniture and the like. The light gray bars are the competitive industries with thousands of producers, no one of them big enough to affect prevailing prices or production.

The bars are two-dimensional, but that's not as scary as it sounds. The height of each bar measures the percentage of price increase or decrease at wholesale in each industry. For example, in the bottom chart, steel prices went up 36 percent between 1953 and October 1958; farm products prices went down 5 percent.

The width of each bar measures the industry's weight in the wholesale price index—that is, the amount of sales of that industry in relation to the amount of sales of the other industries. If steel sales during 1953-October 1958 were \$8 billion and farm products sales were \$24 billion, then the farm products bar would be three times wider than the steel bar.

The height of any bar times its width is its area. In these charts, the height (price increase) times width (economic weight) gives a graphic picture of the economic impact of each industry on the price level. In other words, the area of each bar shows how much force each industry or industry group had on the price level.

We can see very quickly that the competitive industries accounted for almost all the pull in the war period. There is much more light gray than black in this picture.

But in the recent period, the push comes from the concentrated industries. Means figures that they account for 85 percent of the gross increase in the wholesale index. If they hadn't gone up in price, the wholesale index would have risen less than 1 percent instead of 8 percent. And this is what you would expect during a period when total output of goods is increasing little and so is the money supply.

There is one other point to note. In the bottom chart Means has broken out steel and fabricated steel from the broad category of metal and metal products. He did this to demonstrate the overwhelming force of the steel and steel-using industries (machinery and motive) in pushing up recent prices.

While Means appears to have demonstrated that the new inflation stems from the concentrated industries, he still hasn't answered the question agitating political debate: Is it the unions or is it the corporations?

Is it Roger Blough's United States Steel, Frederick Donner's General Motors, Ralph Cordner's General Electric? Or is it David

McDonald's United Steelworkers, Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers, James Carey's International Union of Electrical Workers? Or have both sides embarked on an unspoken wage-price or price-wage collaboration?

The charts are of no help here. But Means, who prepared his material for the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, went back into the committee's steel hearings for some arithmetic. After lengthy calculations, based on a series of arguable assumptions, he concluded that labor costs per ton went up \$1.75 during 1956-57; prices went up \$11 a ton.

This would appear to make United States Steel, the industry's price leader, the chief culprit. However, it must be repeated that Means' computation is derived from assumptions which can be debated. At best his conclusion is suggestive.

Who are these concentrated steel and steel-using industries? They can be reduced to 10 corporations. In terms of ingot capacity, steel is United States Steel (29 percent); Bethlehem (16 percent), and Republic (9 percent).

The motive end of the machinery and motive category is: General Motors (51 percent of 1958 auto production); Ford (29 percent), and Chrysler (14 percent).

The machinery end is tremendously complicated by definitions. But electrical machinery is General Electric (owned 16 percent of the industry's assets in 1947, the last data year); Westinghouse (13 percent); Western Electric Co., an American Telephone & Telegraph subsidiary (13 percent); and Radio Corp. of America (6 percent).

Some policy implications flowing from Means' analysis were spelled out by Chairman ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, of the Senate subcommittee. If Means is right, then:

A tight-money policy won't hold down prices without bringing on a recession because corporate giants are the least affected by a shortage of lendable funds. They raise their expansion money largely from profits, not borrowing.

A balanced Federal budget is irrelevant because this is not a money, but an administered price inflation.

To be sure, easy money and unbalanced budgets would, according to anybody's analysis, worsen the situation by piling a money inflation on top of an administered price inflation.

(However, a minority group of economists headed by Leon Keyserling paradoxically argues that easy money and budget deficits will stimulate an offsetting amount of extra production when, as now, men and resources are not fully employed.)

But what Means is really saying is that some new institutional devices must be invented to control concentrated industries and/or their unions if price stability is to be achieved.

What form the new devices should take might well be on the agenda of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's new Cabinet committee on inflation and the massive congressional study Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, once proposed for the Joint Economic Committee.

When Men in High Places Get Sick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to include a very interesting article written by Frances Burns for the Boston Globe and appearing in their issue for February 22, 1959:

WHEN MEN IN HIGH PLACES GET SICK—DISEASES REMAIN UNCONQUERED BUT WE HAVE MATURED MEDICALLY—AS A NATION AND AS INDIVIDUALS WE ARE LEARNING TO FACE THE FACTS OF NATURE OPENLY AND COURAGEOUSLY

(By Frances Burns)

One of Boston's ablest physicians has observed to colleagues that his crippling arthritis has been wonderful because there were so many things he was not asked to do.

His disease has cleared the decks and left him increasingly free as he grows older for the work that seems important to him.

It may be another generation before anyone knows the consequences of the illnesses that have bedeviled the administration of the American Government in the 1950's. But whether this Nation and the world prove to have been better or worse off because the President, his Secretary of State, and the leader of the opposition suffered severe illnesses and carried on their duties in spite of them, there will be a wealth of information available on which to base judgment.

For it has been a period of unparalleled candor about the health of people in high places.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles last week began the drastic X-ray treatment which is expected to prolong his life and, perhaps, save him pain, after the recurrence of cancer for which he underwent surgery a little more than 2 years ago. Barring what amounts to a medical miracle, known to doctors as a spontaneous remission, which rarely, for no observable reason, halts the disease, there is little likelihood that treatment will provide more than a temporary delay in its course.

AT CRITICAL TIME

The Secretary's illness comes at a critical time in the relations between the East and the West—though has there been any time in the past decade when relations were not critical—and the reaction among our allies in England, France, Germany has been one of great anxiety. For Mr. Dulles has conspicuously run a one-man State Department; his single, firm, and dominating grasp on the Nation's foreign policy. Other Western statesmen are said to fear that either there may be a lack of continuity in it, or that, partly incapacitated but carrying on, Mr. Dulles might freeze what has seemed to be necessarily a fluid situation, unwilling to start anything new that he would be unable to see through.

EXPERIENCE FACTOR

Yet this Nation remains calm. It may be that "Wolf! wolf!" has been cried too often in the past few years when interpreters of news predicted disaster from decisions made in the face of the President's illnesses. It may be that the American people are maturing medically. So many Americans are seeing cancer, heart disease, arthritis, at close hand, in themselves or members of their families, that they may agree with Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon, who is preparing to return to his job in Washington after 5 months of surgery and radiation for cancer, commented that no one really grows up until he realizes he has to die.

Certainly his own experience must be a factor in Mr. Eisenhower's refusal to let Mr. Dulles leave the Government so long as there is a possibility that he may be able to carry on. For the President has learned that it is possible to ignore the body and continue work, freed from the fear that most active people have of disease, and with an excuse at hand to escape some of the unessential burdens placed on heads of state today.

PUBLIC IN DARK

Part of the growing up of the American people has been an increased understanding of the nature of chronic disease and of the efforts to do something about it. People are, on the whole, less likely to fear the known than the unknown.

No one up to now has been able even to guess how much, if at all, history has been changed by the illnesses of those in high places. For many years these illnesses were concealed from the people, often from those in Government itself.

Grover Cleveland learned that he had cancer of the throat at a time when the Nation was threatened with financial crisis. He was spirited to a boat from the cape, where he summered, and somewhere off Long Island was operated on, successfully. Almost no one knew of it until nearly a quarter of a century later when, some years after his death, his surgeon reported it.

No candid report was given to the Government or the people on the illness of Woodrow Wilson, who suffered a stroke on a western tour to appeal for his League of Nations. In the multiplying rumors resulting from the secrecy, all chance for the success of this crowning of his life's work was lost.

The sequel to the blackout of news on the death of President Harding was a batch of scurrilous rumors. It is quite evident today in the light of the symptoms that he suffered a heart attack, and even then doctors must have known it.

F.D.R.'S ILLNESS

And it is doubtful if stories that grew out of lack of frankness about Franklin Roosevelt's physical condition and illness in his last years ever will be scotched. Yet he suffered from high blood pressure and a natural weariness. Candor about them might have avoided damaging reports after his death.

Whatever else the Eisenhower administration may or may not have done, it has showed that the details of disease suffered by those in high places may safely be given to the public. It is doubtful if, in this country, it ever again will be possible to conceal them.

Certainly no one knows whether the people are best served by continuing on active duty men who have had heart disease, cancer and arthritis, or whether there should be a conscious effort to have younger men in Government. At any rate, the question is out in the open, with something now on which to base an answer.

Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there are still some people in our great common country who reside north of the Mason-Dixon line that harbor ill will toward those who reside in the so-called Southland.

It has been nearly 100 years since that unfortunate fratricidal strife known as the War Between the States ended. Fortunately, the bitterness engendered by this tragic and unnecessary strife has been in the process of slowly dying out.

But with the advent of the equally unfortunate decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation case and the "civil wrongs" legislation, that spirit seems to have been revived by too many of our so-called northern brethren. A recent example of this tragic sectionalism was a letter written by someone here in Washington spewing his venom at my great State of Mississippi. Possibly such exhibitions of hatred and ignorance should be ignored but, for the enlightenment of any persons of like mind, my good friend, Mr. Oliver Emmerich, the distinguished editor of the State Times, a prominent daily newspaper published in Jackson, Miss., has taken justifiable pride in pointing out the great progress that is being made in the State of Mississippi in an editorial. The editorial follows:

NO, MY FRIEND, MISSISSIPPI IS NOT SLOWLY DYING

(By Oliver Emmerich)

The State Times is in receipt of the following message—a product of the campaign of hate waged in the East against the people of the South:

"Happy 1959, Mississippi. You are losing population. I hope you will die more slowly in 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, etc., etc., than you have been dying up to now. Please, Mississippi, die slowly."

"C. A. CASTLE."

Harry Emerson Fosdick once said, "Prayer is dominant desire." We feel sorry for any individual whose desire stems from hate. What spiritual foundation other than hate could wish slow death to a whole State?

The savagery of the Dark Ages aroused such vicious feeling that men were often condemned to the excruciating pain of slow death. Once a King of England decreed that two robbers be skinned alive. Their skins were tacked to the outer walls of Westminster Abbey.

In this more enlightened age it is tragic to find any person, whose vision is so blurred and whose understanding is so blighted, as to pray for a return of the spirit of the Dark Ages.

Any individual who wishes slow death for Mississippi will find disappointment in the revitalized spirit of this State. Here is the true story of Mississippi:

One hundred years ago Mississippi was the fifth richest State in the Union. Then came the devastation of war, the exploitation of Reconstruction, and finally the resurrection of a triumphant faith which now is sweeping this State to new plateaus of progress and glory.

Slow death? Let's check the industrial life of Mississippi. Twenty years ago Mississippi had only 843 factories, 47,890 industrial workers, and a total industrial output of only \$175 million.

Last year the new industrial life of Mississippi had increased our industries to 2,041, our industrial workers to 113,800, and our total industrial output to \$1,605 million, an increase of 850 percent.

No signs of rigor mortis here.

Slow death? Let's look at Mississippi's financial progress. Twenty years ago—in 1938—Mississippi banks had on deposit \$195,008,000. Last year the total deposits were \$1,153,157,000. We are very much alive in this category, as it is easy to see.

Die slowly? Take a peek at Mississippi's agriculture. Total cash farm sales in 1938 were \$134,964,000. In 1956 the total was more than 400 percent greater—\$596,065,000.

Mississippi dying? Let's look at the educational picture. In 1938 Mississippi spent

\$24.55 per pupil in elementary schools, or a total of \$12 million. Last year Mississippi spent \$81,500,000 on elementary education, or \$181 per schoolchild.

Mississippi also is in the midst of a \$120 million building program for new elementary- and high-school buildings, seeking to equalize the school facilities of the two races. This program was voluntary. It was enacted in 1953, before the U.S. Supreme Court's school-segregation decision.

In addition, our State has budgeted \$21 million for higher education, plus \$7 million for university and college buildings.

The State of Mississippi is second from the top among the States in the percentage of total tax budget spent for education. A State with this concept of learning is very much alive, forward looking, and on the march.

What's the racial situation? The answer is that racially, Mississippi is up and coming. This State has more Negro college presidents than all of the New England States combined; more Negro schoolteachers (7,217) than all of the Mid-Atlantic States. These teachers meet the same regulations and enjoy the same salary scale as white teachers.

Of the nearly \$40 million spent annually in Mississippi for old-age assistance, aid for the blind, dependent children, and total and permanent disabilities, Negroes who represent 45 percent of the population receive 60 percent of the total. White people, representing 55 percent of the population, receive 40 percent.

Eighty percent of public health funds spent for combatting venereal diseases go to Negro residents. Of the total expenditures for public health, our Negro people get a rightful share. This applies to our charity hospitals as well.

What about bombings? Unlike situations in Boston, Peoria, and some parts of the Southland, no churches or other buildings have been bombed in Mississippi. There have been no incidents of racial violence. The two races live here as friends in this, the hospitality State of America.

What about public health? In the past 20 years death from communicable diseases has been reduced more than 85 percent. Twenty years ago, Mississippi suffered from widespread effects of malaria and typhoid fever. In 1957, there was not a single death from either of these diseases in Mississippi.

Other communicable diseases are being blotted out. Mississippi is a place to live long for this is a State where good health prevails. There's nothing deathlike, slow or fast, in this progressive State.

Now what is the truth about Mississippi's population? The U.S. census figures for January 1, 1959, reveal that Mississippi is gaining population. She lost 4,882 in population between 1940 and 1950. But what mossback of the past wants to apply 1940 population figures in the year of our Lord 1959?

Mississippi had no large municipalities a few decades ago. Jackson, our capital, went from 48,282 in 1930 to 128,000 in 1959.

In the same period Hattiesburg jumped from 18,601 to 35,891; Biloxi from 14,850 to over 45,000; Greenville from 22,943 to 44,574; Pascagoula from 4,339 to more than 25,000; Natchez from 13,422 to 25,195.

This is the population trend today in Mississippi. In the next quarter of a century America will see happening in Mississippi what has happened in California during the last quarter of a century.

Remember this, friends, everywhere: The last half of the 20th century belongs to the South—and Mississippi intends to claim and acquire her share of it.

Slow death? How could any description fit less the revitalized and triumphantly growing State of Mississippi?

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, commemorating the 41st anniversary of Estonian independence is in fact a study of and a tribute to the spirit of nationalism and freedom. Estonia has demonstrated a spirit strong enough to outlive German landlords and Russian governors; strong enough to withstand, at the end of the First World War, first a Bolshevik invasion, then a German invasion, then another Bolshevik invasion; and strong enough to establish a republic and to maintain it through the trials of over 22 years.

Estonia had been independent from its early beginning until the 13th century. Then it found itself a pawn in the power politics of larger, aggressive neighbors, culminating in Russian rule in 1710. For more than 200 years they lived under oppressive Russian rule. Their chief desire during all that time was to be free, though they were unable to attain their freedom without help from others. But history took pity on these heroic people during World War I. With the Russian revolution of 1917 czarist autocracy was overthrown and that government's authority over other nationalities was shattered. Estonians felt a taste of freedom, and on February 24, 1918, they proclaimed their independence. In 1920 the U.S.S.R. signed a peace treaty renouncing all rights to Estonian territory. In 1932 a further guaranty was agreed upon, a nonaggression pact. Thus Estonia built its foundations of sovereignty upon the treacherous sands of Soviet paper promises.

But in 1940, the curtain came down on independent Estonia. As one of the first nations to be subjugated by the Soviet Union after the Hitler-Stalin Pact, Estonia was directly incorporated into the Soviet Union. After being occupied by the Nazis during World War II, Estonia was again returned to Soviet rule. Untold hardships and suffering have been inflicted upon this small nation—deportation, execution, imprisonment, and mobilization—total and brutal sovietization of Estonia.

The unhappy Estonians continue to suffer under totalitarian tyranny. But their hope for freedom and their desire for independence is not dead. It is living in the hearts and minds of Estonians still struggling for their liberty. Estonia no longer remains on the map of Europe, but it does remain in the hearts of all freedom-loving people. The United States still refuses to recognize Estonia as part of the Soviet Union de jure.

Estonians have a spirit—a feeling—of belonging together. This feeling has survived the centuries of division, invasion, and oppression. It was this feeling which, taking the 19th century form of nationalism, founded the Estonian state. The people of Estonia—with their ten-

nacity and their flexibility, their energy, and their courage, their stoicism, and their wit—have suffered the trials of invasion and oppression without being broken or embittered, without losing their capacity for self-government and toleration. We cannot fail to feel in their debt. We encourage the Estonian people in their hope for a complete restoration of freedom; heartily applaud their moral resistance to Communist tyranny, and humbly pay tribute to this long-suffering patriotism.

Irish Came Here With Governor Winthrop and Latchstring Has Been Out Since

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by George F. Weston, Jr., which will be of interest to my colleagues and which appeared in the Boston Herald Traveler on February 20, 1959:

IRISH CAME HERE WITH GOVERNOR WINTHROP AND LATCHSTRING HAS BEEN OUT SINCE

(By George F. Weston, Jr.)

The Irish form a large percentage of Boston's population, and there were many honored men of Irish ancestry here from the very earliest days.

The list includes such famous men as Gen. Henry Knox, chief of artillery under Washington; the artist, John Singleton Copley; and the patriot, John Hancock.

IRISH AMONG EARLY SETTLERS

It is generally believed that the first Irishmen to settle in Boston came at the time of the devastating potato famine in 1846-47. It is not the fact. There were many here long before that.

Governor Winthrop's fleet brought several: John Coggan, the first storekeeper in Boston, for one; and George Downing of Dublin, who later married Governor Winthrop's sister, for another.

The ship, *St. Patrick*, which belonged to Thomas Wentworth of Ireland, arrived in Boston, probably in 1632. The records show an edict issued by Governor Endicott which reads:

"It is ordered, that the Scottishe and Irishe gentlemen which intends to come hither shall have liberty to sit down in any place upp Merimacke Ryver not possessed by any."

The rebellion in Ireland in 1614-49 led by "Rory" O'Moore caused some Irishmen to emigrate to America. Governor Winthrop welcomed them by ordering "that the goods of these persone come from Ireland shall be free from ye rat."

The Governor was not thinking of rodents. He meant that the goods should be free from the rate—not taxed.

PURITANS WELCOMED THE NEWCOMERS

It is evident that the Puritans of 17th century Boston had a friendly feeling toward the Irish and gave a cordial reception to those who chose to make their homes in Massachusetts.

That this attitude was appreciated was amply demonstrated at a time when the courage and resources of the Bostonians were nearly exhausted.

The Indians under the leadership of King Philip organized a war whose objective was the complete extermination of white settlers. The Indians, themselves, were nearly exterminated, instead, and the war ended shortly after the death of Philip on August 12, 1676.

The colonists were victorious, but at a terrible price. Fully a tenth of the men had been killed, crops were ruined, and there were sickness and destitution everywhere.

At this tragic time the good people of Ireland sent to Boston a shipload of food and other necessities "for the reliefe of such as are Impoverished, Destressed, and in Nesessitie by the late Indian Warr."

LEPRECHAUNS CAME WITH THE POTATOES

According to tradition, potatoes and leprechauns first were transported to New England on this relief ship. The potatoes, thrive, but the leprechauns must have found the Puritan climate inhospitable. They apparently returned to their own country.

It was nearly 200 years before the people of Boston had an opportunity to repay this kindness.

In 1847 Ireland was famine stricken. It was no mere food shortage, but a complete crop failure which left the people starving.

New Englanders, remembering the help which their ancestors had received, sent prompt assistance.

The people of Boston persuaded the Government to lend them the man-of-war *Jamestown* as a relief ship.

The *Jamestown*, which was at the Charlestown Navy Yard, was promptly loaded with \$115,000 worth of food and medical supplies.

The Laborers Aid Society, composed of poor Irishmen, gave its services in loading the ship. Significantly, the loading began on St. Patrick's Day.

The ship, under Capt. Robert Forbes, put to sea on April 12, and arrived in Cork 15 days later—an amazingly fast trip.

ONLY ONE TACK IN ENTIRE VOYAGE

Captain Forbes was a remarkable man. His first voyage was at the age of 13. He was master at 20, and captain of his own ship at 26. He took the *Jamestown* across the Atlantic making only one tack in the entire voyage.

The ship was greeted by a band playing what they believed to be "Yankee Doodle" and by a reception committee whose chairman said, "A thousand lips pale with woe, and a thousand tongues half paralyzed with hunger utter the feeble exclamation, 'God Bless America.'"

The grateful people greeted Captain Forbes and his crew with cheers wherever they were seen. Many of the babies born at about that time were named "Forbes," "Boston," or "James." The last was, of course, short for "Jamestown."

Several other communities sent ships, also. One vessel from Isleboro, Maine, had great difficulty in finding a return cargo.

Finally her hold was filled with sods to act as ballast. These were placed on some of the farms in Isleboro and, a few years later, they were found to be producing genuine Irish shamrocks.

May they continue to grow there forever.

We Are Winning in the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to

insert in the RECORD a very fine editorial which recently appeared in the Selma, (Ala.) Times-Journal.

There follows the editorial:

WE ARE WINNING IN THE NORTH

An audience of 200 southern businessmen, in luncheon session at Augusta, Ga., to honor Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired board chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co., was surprised and delighted to hear this Republican stalwart from Chicago rip into the U.S. Supreme Court for its desegregation decree.

"This racial problem could have been settled—given time and patience—by the South itself," fiery General Wood declared.

His comments were greeted with spirited applause by businessmen gathered for unveiling of a plaque in his honor at a new Sears store.

"Hundreds of thousands of northerners feel the Court's desegregation decree was a mistake," he said. "I resent very much the interference of the States rights by the Supreme Court which, to my mind, is the worst Supreme Court we have had in 100 years."

The general, who said he voted straight Republican, described Georgia's Democratic Senators HERMAN TALMADGE and RICHARD B. RUSSELL as "two of the best in the U.S. Senate today."

Calling Earl E. Warren the President's "worst appointment," Wood said the Chief Justice's "own people in California found him out."

Here is new evidence that intelligent citizens of the North, as the Times-Journal persistently has predicted, are beginning to realize that legal abortions aimed at the South ultimately will cripple all other sections of the Nation, as well.

When that realization becomes general above the Mason and Dixon line, the demagogues who are willing to sell out Americanism for minority bloc votes are going to be driven into exile, and decent representation will become the rule in Washington.

Then the Constitution as interpreted and reinterpreted by able justices again will prevail, and the South will be given ample opportunity to solve its own problems in its own way.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial on this subject recently appeared in the Talladega (Ala.) Daily Home, and I ask also that this well-written article be inserted.

There follows the editorial:

TALKING TURKEY

According to the Associated Press story, it was with amazed delight that some 200 southern businessmen at Augusta, Ga., heard Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co. rip into the U.S. Supreme Court for its integration decree.

Present for a luncheon given in connection with the unveiling of a plaque in his honor at a new Sears store, the lifetime Republican and prominent business leader talked the sort of language it is strange to hear nowadays in the era of tacit censorship against any presentation of the constitutional viewpoint, which also happens to be the southern viewpoint.

"Hundreds of thousands of northerners feel the Court's desegregation decree was a mistake," he said. "I resent very much the interference with States rights by the Supreme Court, which to my mind is the worst Supreme Court we have had in 100 years."

The crowd, of course, was in hearty agreement with those words, as well as with the statement that Chief Justice Earl Warren is President Eisenhower's worst appointment.

For such expressions to come from such a source is to bring renewed hope that time is on the side of the South. If men like General Wood see so clearly the menace of

the Court's recent rulings, we may be sure that many others hold similar ideas and one day will impress them upon northern political leaders.

Urgent Need for Developing Coosa-Alabama Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Coosa-Alabama River is one of America's potentially great waterways. I am sure the Members will recall my many statements pointing up the benefits which will accrue Alabama and the Nation upon complete development of this waterway.

Very soon, the Congress will be asked again to keep the faith promised 14 years ago when Congress authorized three locks and dams on the Alabama River. You will be asked to provide the appropriation of \$150,000 needed for planning and design on the Millers Ferry lock and dam. We hope and believe Congress will not turn this request down.

An editorial on this subject appeared in the Talladega (Ala.) Daily Home of February 16, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was included as follows:

AN URGENT NEED

The importance of full development of the Coosa-Alabama Waterway system cannot be overemphasized.

The matter will come up again in Washington soon and it is urgent that backers of the waterway development lend wholehearted support to the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association which for many years has promoted this project.

A comparatively small sum is needed for advanced planning of Millers Ferry lock and dam on the Alabama River, a key phase in the development program.

There is nothing that could bring greater prosperity to the 29 counties in Alabama which are considered to be commercially tributary to the vast river system.

Completion of Millers Ferry lock and dam and installation of locks on existing dams and proposed dams on the waterway would provide navigation facilities which would bring great benefits to the valley and to all of Alabama and adjacent States.

The waterway would open up to the inland cities and towns trade and commerce with the world. It would bring new industries and industrial payrolls that could add greatly to the prosperity of the area.

Full development of the waterway would also bring great potentialities for recreation in the form of boating, fishing, and other sports.

But primarily it would mean more dollars, more jobs, and more prosperity for the area.

It is estimated that within a 20-year period the tributary area of the rivers would secure additional industry that would involve the expenditure of millions of dollars, an estimated 85-percent increase in population requiring 120,000 additional housing units costing more than a billion dollars, and an

increase in industrial employment by more than 55,000 with payrolls of \$150 million.

It is something that should receive all-out support of the people of the area and careful consideration of the congressional committees and Government agencies involved.

Mr. Speaker, I have an editorial pointing up the importance of development of the Coosa-Alabama River which appeared in the Tallahassee Tribune of February 19, 1959. I also wish to insert this editorial with my remarks.

The editorial follows:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA

It is to be hoped that representatives of the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association meet with success when they appear before the appropriations committees of the Congress to secure funds for advance planning of Millers Ferry lock and dam, Alabama River.

This is no "pork barrel" project, but the initial step in the development of the Coosa-Alabama River system.

Development of the Coosa-Alabama is important to our State and Nation. The area considered to be commercially tributary to the system includes all or part of 43 counties, 29 of which are in Alabama, 14 in Georgia, and 1 in Tennessee.

These counties have an area of approximately 26,000 square miles and include a population of 1,547,000, according to the 1950 census. Sixty-six percent of this population is in Alabama and the Alabama area contains a third of the entire population of the State.

One of the benefits to be obtained through this development would be lower transportation cost on bulk materials and stabilization of transportation rates throughout the river basin.

However, from where we sit, the principal benefit to be derived would be the attraction of new industries, a project which is of vital concern to all our citizens from Gov. John Patterson to many a small farmer who would have the benefit of at least part time employment to help compensate for the shrinking cotton acreage in our State.

The fact that many new industries are seeking waterside locations is borne out in a recent report of the American Waterways Operators which records a total of 404 waterside industrial locations for the first 9 months of 1958.

We hope our Senators and Congressmen will listen with great interest as representatives of the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association unfold their plans at the committee hearings. And we hope further that they will lend their good offices in cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, the Association of American Railroads has submitted a protest to the Corps of Engineers on development of the Coosa-Alabama River, and this subject is discussed in an editorial which appeared in the Anniston, Ala., Star of February 15, 1959. I also ask consent to have this editorial inserted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

RAILROADS STILL THINKING NEGATIVELY

It is no wonder that the railroads of this country have been having economic difficulties in recent years, for it seems that they are always thinking negatively instead of positively. If they had spent half as much on research as they have spent in fighting other means of transportation, their status would be much better today.

Instead of improving their own methods, however, they have wasted their time and energy in opposition to truck transportation, which they should have initiated, and now

they are sitting still and watching the airways take over their passenger service.

They are fighting the development of the Coosa-Alabama River enterprise and have filed a protest with the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in which they contend that the findings by the Engineers in this particular are erroneous and misrepresentative.

But this is nothing new. For here in Alabama the railroads fought the dock development at Mobile and river transportation on the Tennessee, not to mention their long battle against Senator John Tyler Morgan when he was leading the fight for an isthmian canal.

They even tried to bribe the eminent Alabama Senator, but they got kicked out of his office pronto.

If it had not been for their ability to barge heavy tonnage down the Warrior to Mobile, the U.S. Steel Corp. probably would never have organized the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co.

But all of these waterway developments have meant billions of dollars in revenue to the rails, in spite of their opposition.

The railroads should keep in mind the fact that there always will be instances wherein either they or the trucks will have to transport tonnage to the ports; and as far as we are concerned, we prefer the railroads, as they do not clutter up or tear down the highways.

But the fact remains that today industrial water is essential to the manufacturing process in a majority of instances. And the city or State that makes that facility available will make jobs for the railroads as well as for the seaborne or river traffic that justifies waterway development.

Last Sunday there was an editorial in this paper that referred to the vast tonnage that now piles up and down the Tennessee and the waterways of the Northwest. We now learn that industrial enterprises valued at \$13 billion have been located on the Ohio River and its tributaries since 1950.

The Coosa-Alabama River system is one of the greatest undeveloped waterways in the United States, if not in the world. And now that the Alabama Power Co. is investing more than \$100 million on these streams, it is a foregone conclusion that billions of dollars worth of new industrial development will follow suit in time.

If the Coosa and the Alabama had been located in almost any region north of the Mason and Dixon line, they would have been developed years ago and we would have prospered as much as have the people on the Ohio.

But both Senators Morgan and Pettus in their day found themselves stymied by sectional prejudice.

Those prejudices are giving way to a more enlightened industrial statesmanship today, however, and this part of the South is growing as fast in material development as any other American region. And in the field of chemistry we are leading the Nation, thanks largely to our abundance of water.

Alabama Mayors Discuss Municipal Improvement Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Alabama congressional delegation were privileged last week to meet

with a group of representatives of the Alabama League of Municipalities who came to Washington to report to us on the progress of various Federal-municipal programs. At the meeting the organization's capable executive director, Ed E. Reid, presented a number of Alabama mayors who each discussed for us an important, Federal-aid program. These reports by the mayors are most enlightening and, since they are concerned with the use of Federal funds for the betterment of municipalities, I think it is appropriate that they be shared with other Members of Congress. My congressional district was represented at this meeting by the mayor of Tuscaloosa, Ala., the Honorable George Van Tassel, and the mayor of Uniontown, Ala., the Honorable T. Ralston Long. Mayor Van Tassel gave a report on airport construction and Mayor Long reported on planning assistance. Their statements are as follows:

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID FOR MUNICIPAL AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION

(By George Van Tassel, mayor of Tuscaloosa, Ala.)

The recent action of the U.S. Senate in approving a \$465 million airport aid bill for the next 4 years was extremely gratifying to Alabama municipal officials. We strongly hope that the House will do as well for our future airport construction program. I would like to list some reasons why our towns and cities are interested in this type of legislation:

1. There is a national interest in municipal airports—as well as a local interest.

2. There is likewise a national responsibility as well as local responsibility for such airports.

3. Aviation is now an essential transportation element contributing to the economic strength of the country, in addition to contributing to national defense.

4. Because airfields, both large and small, serve or can serve national defense needs—because they are important to the national economy and because they are used for interstate flight operations—the development of an adequate airport system within the State, as a segment of an adequate national airport system, is a joint responsibility of the Federal Government in partnership with State and local governments.

AIRPORTS USED IN INTERSTATE FLIGHTS

5. In Alabama there is not a single public field—the small ones as well as large—that has not been used by aircraft in interstate flight. Many are used regularly.

6. Many Alabama airfields—including some very small ones with strips as short as 1,700 and 2,000 feet—have also been used for emergency landings of military aircraft and have thus saved the aircraft, thereby also saving the taxpayers, millions of dollars in aircraft losses. Wherever there is an airport there is insurance for emergency needs, as well as for general use.

7. If there is justification for Federal highway aid—and there certainly is—then there is justification for Federal airport aid. Both serve the transportation needs of the country and are vital to the entire national economy.

8. No one will challenge the statement that Federal aid is essential for highway construction. This is substantiated by steadily growing Federal appropriations. It should be recognized just as strongly that Federal aid is also necessary and essential for airport construction.

9. The two situations are very similar as to needs, as to utilization and usefulness and as to the inability of State and local governments to finance them alone.

IN THE AREA OF INTERSTATE OPERATIONS

10. Military aviation is in the area of interstate operations; airline aviation is likewise in the same category, as is most executive and business flying. Flying is no longer mainly a local operation. As the Federal Government assumes control and jurisdiction over all types of flying—both interstate and intrastate—it has an obligation to assist with the construction of facilities for their airport needs.

11. Federal aid should not be limited to any class or category of airport or landing area. There have been reports that the President believed Federal aid should be furnished only to jet airports during his proposed tapering off, transitional period. All airports, both large and small, are important to adequate State and national airport systems.

12. The cities must have Federal aid for the resealing of runways and for filling of runway joints. This is not just a simple maintenance job, as the CAA ruled, thus making them ineligible for Federal grants. Therefore, the proposed amendment covering the eligibility of periodic seal coating of flexible airport pavement and the filling of joints in rigid airport pavement is most important to the cities and should be approved.

Many small communities are now required to maintain airports with runways of 5,000 to 6,000 feet in length to accommodate the type of aircraft now utilizing them. As aircraft are now growing larger, heavier, and provide greater impact on the paving, the situation has passed beyond just fair wear and tear and has created additional heavy costs, which some cities cannot afford.

OUR STATE'S IS A \$13 MILLION PROGRAM

13. Alabama's Federal aid program to date has amounted to \$13,521,000, with the Federal Government providing \$6,754,000 and the State and cities providing \$6,767,000. Alabama could not possibly have financed this program alone. Neither could any of the other States.

14. It has been estimated by the Alabama Department of Aeronautics and the Civil Aeronautics Administration, just prior to the CAA transfer to the Federal Aviation Agency, that over \$24 million will be needed in local, State, and Federal funds during the next 4 years (1959-62), if Alabama is to be provided with the new airport facilities the State now needs or will need. It should be obvious that Alabama alone cannot provide this amount.

15. For 1959, the Alabama Department of Aeronautics recommended 76 Alabama cities to CAA for inclusion in the 1959 edition of the national airport plan. As airport needs are steadily growing and some suddenly developed because of new industrial requirements, this list is certain to be increased within the proposed 4-year extension of the Federal Airport Act, that the Senate has voted. Actually, we need a minimum extension of 5 years for the Federal Airport Act.

COMMUNITIES RECOMMENDED FOR AIRPORT PLAN

The 76 cities recommended are as follows: Abbeville, Albertville, Alexander City, Aliceville, Andalusia, Anniston, Ashland-Lineville, Atmore, Auburn-Opelika, Bay Minette, Bessemer, Birmingham, Brewton, Brundidge, Butler, Camden, Centerville, Centre, Citronelle, Clanton, Columbiana, Cullman, Decatur-Athens, Demopolis, Dothan, Elba, Enterprise, Eufaula, Eutaw, Evergreen, Fairhope, Fayette, Foley, Fort Payne, Gadsden, Geneva, Greensboro, Greenville, Grove Hill, Guntersville, Haleyville, Hamilton, Headland, Heflin, Huntsville, Jackson, Jasper, LaFayette, Lanett, Leeds, Linden, Livingston, Luverne, Marion, Mobile, Montgomery, Monroeville, Muscle Shoals, Oneonta, Ozark, Phenix City, Red Bay, Roanoke, Russellville, Scottsboro, Selma, Sylacauga, Talladega, Tallapoosa, Troy, Tuscaloosa,

Tuskegee, Union Springs, Uniontown, Vernon, Wetumpka.

COMMUNITIES DERIVE GREAT VALUE FROM PLANNING ASSISTANCE

(By T. Ralston Long, mayor of Uniontown, Ala.)

The 701 program of Federal grants through the Housing and Home Finance Agency to our State planning and industrial development board to assist in the preparation of comprehensive master plans for municipalities of under 25,000 persons has been of great value to the municipalities which have received this technical assistance. Ninety-one cities and towns in Alabama have received substantial technical assistance through this program. Our State agency has completed the work called for in three projects and they are currently performing the work called for in the Alabama P-4 contract. This latter project provides for work in 43 municipalities.

An additional project (Alabama P-5) which would have provided for assistance to 12 cities, had been applied for last summer and failed to materialize because of a shortage of Federal funds for the current fiscal year. All of these cities are in desperate need of help.

In addition to the above, several cities have asked the State agency for help on their planning problems and have been placed on a waiting list for the next application for a 701 grant.

MUNICIPAL PLANNING SHOULD BE CONTINUING

That the city planning, made possible through the 701 grants, has been of great value to the municipalities, the area of the State in which each is located, and to the State as a whole is unquestioned in most every informed mind in the State. This is demonstrated by the fact that practically every city which has prepared a city plan has continued their city planning program after the plan itself has been completed—usually with proper technical assistance. For instance, 26 municipalities which have had city plans prepared and completed with 701 grants, are receiving currently monthly consulting advice under a contractual arrangement with the State planning and industrial development board.

The desire for, and need of city planning derives from a number of causes in Alabama. Many Alabama communities are growing very rapidly and this condition imposes the real need for land use controls, and community facility planning to satisfy immediate needs as well as long range needs. The interstate highways and other important highway planning and construction is causing municipal problems which can only be solved within the framework of comprehensive city planning. Chambers of commerce and other municipal industrial development groups often feel that city planning is one of the musts that a city should have to successfully compete for commercial and industrial growth. Probably of greatest importance in creating the demand for city planning in Alabama, is the desire of our communities to rejuvenate or renew the physical plant of the city. City planning is probably the most important of the several tools necessary to achieve a worthwhile urban renewal program.

RECIPIENTS IN STATE GEOGRAPHICALLY DISTRIBUTED

All of these reasons are causing the requests for city planning Federal grants in Alabama.

The 91 municipalities which have received city planning assistance are fairly evenly distributed geographically throughout the State. The number of cities by congressional districts is as follows:

Municipalities	
District 1	9
District 2	10
District 3	13
District 4	10
District 5	9
District 6	9
District 7	13
District 8	9
District 9	9

It is anticipated that the future program from 701 grants to the State of Alabama will also be well distributed over the State.

Some reference has been made previously to the fact that industrial development is one of the causes for city planning. The point is sufficiently important to be emphasized. Certainly the Alabama State Planning and Industrial Development Board believes this to be so, since, for nearly 20 years they have allotted a part of their appropriation to maintain a staff of technically trained personnel to assist Alabama communities in city planning problems. This feeling of the importance of creating better cities to help spur industrial development of the State is also shared by the State chamber of commerce, and most local chambers of commerce.

REGIONAL AND METROPOLITAN PLANNING

Up until the present, the metropolitan and regional features of the Federal 701 program have not been used because Alabama State laws do not make sufficient provision for these types of programs. Bills have been prepared and will be introduced in the Alabama State Legislature which meets in regular session in May. It appears that the legislation will receive favorable action and the Housing and Home Finance Agency will likely have a number of requests for metropolitan or regional 701 programs during the next year.

We strongly believe that the 701 program of local planning assistance grants has been extremely valuable to the municipalities and the State of Alabama in the past. We strongly urge the strengthening of the appropriations for these activities whereby sufficient Federal money will be available to match local money.

Masonry Supports Public Schools and Freedom of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following article from the Knoxville Scottish Rite News, for November 1958, by Mr. E. E. Patton, a well-known historian of Knoxville, Tenn.:

MASONRY SUPPORTS PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND FREEDOM OF RELIGION

(By E. E. Patton)

On the back cover of the New Age, the official publication of the Supreme Council of Scottish Rite Masons, may be found the following sentence: "The supreme council favors the American public school, nonpartisan, nonsectarian, efficient, democratic, for all the children of all the people." Masonry favors an efficient teaching force—teachers elected and retained because of their

ability and not because of kinship, friendly relations, or political influence. The Masonic fraternity favors the teaching of civics, history, and government, including the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, with all its amendments. This should be done without prejudice or partisanship on the part of the teacher or supervisor. It favors democratic operation of the public school system throughout the Nation. In the public school the son of the section hand is given as much consideration, credit, and honor as the son of a millionaire. That is democracy in the Masonic manner.

The supreme council further favors the inculcation of patriotism, respect for law and order, and undying loyalty to the Constitution of the United States of America. It is true that the civic record of some Masons has not been so attractive and commendable, but 99 percent of American Masons are law abiding and loyal to the American flag. It should be remembered that Jesus had 12 disciples, and 1 of them betrayed him. American Masons do not criticize the loyalty of Masons of other countries to their flag and the concern for the safety and security of their native land. Jacob A. Rills was born, reared, and educated in Denmark and he said he loved the flag of Denmark better than any other flag, except the flag of his manhood and his children, the American flag. Americans honored him for his loyalty to the flag of his native country. If an American Mason is disloyal to the American flag, he is a Mason only in words, not in morality and affection.

The supreme council also favors the compulsory use of English as the language of instruction in the grammar grades of our public schools. The reason for this is so basic that discussion is not necessary. John Quincy Adams accompanied his father to Europe at the beginning of the Revolutionary War. He acted as his father's secretary and learned all the languages of Europe, but when he became Secretary of State and later President of the United States, he conducted all his official business in the language of America—the English language. He was not a Mason but he followed the Masonic custom.

The Tennessee General Assembly of 1919 passed an act which requires every public schoolteacher of this State to be an American citizen. The general assembly of 1851 passed an act requiring every high school in Tennessee to have not less than 1 year of American history and Government. Every Mason of the State and Nation has given his wholehearted support to both these acts. They tend to make sure of the safety and security of the Nation and that is what all loyal Americans want and demand.

The supreme council goes yet a step further in this attempt to safeguard the security of our Nation. It favors adequate provision in the American public schools for the education of the alien population in the principles of American institutions and ideals of citizenship. Every naturalized citizen should be able to speak the English language. He should have a knowledge of our great civic documents; the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. He should have a working knowledge of the liberty, freedoms, privileges, and safeguards he enjoys under our form of Government. If he fails or refuses to meet these requirements then he should be sent back to his former home. We do not want him or any of his kind.

The Scottish Rite is a strong and outspoken proponent of the principle of the entire separation of church and state, and opposition to every attempt to appropriate public money—Federal, State, or local—directly or indirectly, for the support of sectarian or private institutions. Public money

for private or sectarian schools would be on a par with public money for the support of churches—the church that could produce the greatest number of members and supporters. It should never be done.

The person who is opposed to the principle of separation of church and state could not by any manner of means be regarded as a loyal and devoted American. Our great country is founded on this basic principle. Just bear this in mind; where religion is free, Masonry is free and where Masonry is free religion is free. All loyal Americans believe in this motto and they are willing to sacrifice their lives in order to bequeath it to their children and their children's children.

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

State, Nation Seen in Fiscal Fight for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the *State Journal of Lansing-East Lansing, Mich.*, on Sunday, February 8, 1959. The writer of the article, Harold Thompson, is a Detroit businessman, who was deputy secretary of state in 1947 and 1948 in the State of Michigan.

There is much food for thought in Mr. Thompson's statements. Spending more than our income, whether it be ours as individuals, or that of local, State, or Federal Government can lead only to disaster.

The article follows:

STATE, NATION SEEN IN FISCAL FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

(By Harold Thompson)

It would seem that we, the people, are in a mess. Our National Government is in debt to the sum of \$300 billion, our State is bankrupt, our cities have serious financial problems and our schools are in jeopardy for lack of money. The only answer to date on the horizon is to borrow more money—that is, increase the national debt, borrow from the veterans' trust fund, and (in Detroit) put out a huge bond issue for the rehabilitation of our school buildings.

Very few of our elected representatives at any level are looking the cause squarely in the face. The effect is obvious but the cause is equally obvious and simply is that we are spending more than our income. This is true in our Federal Government, it is true in our State government, and it is true at local levels.

Any American housewife knows the answer when faced with this problem in her little domain. Sure, the family can borrow money and then borrow more money, which our governments are now doing. They call it refinancing. The average man and his wife, however, know that to keep piling debt on top of debt simply means that in the end they will be wiped out. They know they would lose their home, their car, and anything else they are buying on time.

FACE PROBLEM SQUARELY

Knowing this, the average man and his wife simply face squarely their problem and do the only thing they can do to save their little world. They simply cut down expenses, regardless of how deep they have to cut. They know no other way of survival, and indeed there isn't any.

If this sounds like oversimplification, it is only because the last 20 years have produced too many politicians who appeal to their voters by promising everything in sight. Promising something for nothing, under the illusion that in issuing new U.S. bonds and borrowing from the veterans' trust fund for example, we are borrowing merely from ourselves.

This is the great American lie and history will record of us that we were in fact dishonest.

Proof of this lies in the fact that nowhere do we find any elected representative talking about paying off our national debt, and at local levels we find our representatives talking only about how to raise more money. As far as the national debt is concerned, we, the present people, have no intention of paying any part of the \$300 billion, but are passing the buck to our great-grandchildren and indeed to our great-great-grandchildren, children as yet unborn, children being taxed without representation.

EXPENSES NEED HARD LOOK

It seems to this humble citizen that we first, therefore, should take a hard look at our expenses of government, and by this I do not mean the defense costs. I mean the tremendous number of new agencies that have cropped up during the past 25 years. Undoubtedly some of them are good, but many of them are luxuries. Are we being honest in having such luxuries and at the same time forcing future generations to pay for them? In short, are we not overgoverned? Do we not have far too many government employees?

This is particularly true at our State level, but yet no one seems to be seriously concerned.

One would like to know what was the total number of State employees 15 years ago and what is that number now?

One would like to know what new agencies have been created during these past 15 years.

One would also like to know how many employees are being carried by different departments in Lansing that have not been certified by civil service.

In other words, this humble citizen would like someone to really get at the facts toward the end of seeing how many functions could be abolished and how many people could be taken off the State payroll.

Such a suggestion will horrify those who use our money to buy votes, but then there are those among our representatives surely who must clearly see that the end is in sight, as indeed the average man and his wife see their end in sight when they embark on a program of borrowing and borrowing.

RUSSIAN PURPOSE NOTED

The question here is not how to preserve those new functions of the Government which are doing some good, but rather how to save the State and the Union from going under. The object of Russia in conducting the cold war is to deplete us financially; thus those among our representatives who continually subscribe to these everlasting borrowing and inflationary policies are aiding and abetting Russia in her economic attack on this country.

Russia's intent at this stage of the game is not important. The fact is she is bringing this beloved land of ours to its knees by everlastingly weakening its financial structure. We are way past such things as political

expediency, and are now in fact fighting for survival.

Thus I suggest that some legislative branch of our State government really get hard-boiled about this matter of being overgoverned. It is not a task for the administration. It is a task for all those of our elected representatives who have to do with spending money. Possibly the State senate is the best body.

Having done this and then followed through by pruning down to the ground, we can then discuss ways and means of raising more money with the least amount of overhead.

In this connection this humble citizen subscribes to the philosophy that all of us should pitch in and help just as all of our boys in the Armed Forces do their task regardless of individual or economic status.

This citizen does not believe most of our people want to steal from their great-grandchildren. This citizen believes that most of our people are good Americans and will help when the need is made clear.

We are past the day of soaking one group to gain favor with another group. We are almost in the position of passengers on the ship that is going down and we are in the lifeboats. We are now in the position of all being in danger if the lifeboat capsizes.

My prayer therefore is that the elected representatives of the people throw partisan politics out of the window and look this whole question right in the face, and, having done this, take such action as is necessary to get us back on the right track, regardless of the effect on such representatives or their political parties.

Arms and the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act which the House recently passed, the following editorial from the *New York Post* of February 18, 1959, deserves the thoughtful consideration of every Member of Congress. This editorial endorses the position which I took on this legislation—that a 2-year extension would be adequate while a thorough review is made of our military manpower needs and our military manpower procurement policies. I hope that every Senator will have the opportunity to read this editorial prior to taking a position on the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act when it comes up for Senate action:

ARMS AND THE MAN

One of the more dubious institutions of our time is the military conscription law. We are a democracy in the space age; our Army depends primarily on complicated scientific gadgets that require special technical skills instead of massive unskilled manpower; the democratic principle of universal service, understandable in time of war, is increasingly inapplicable because exemptions now are generous. Yet the House of Representatives has again bowed to the Pentagon's flag-waving man hunt and voted overwhelmingly to extend the law for another 4 years.

The action was dutiful obsequious to a sacred cow being rushed through the House with a red, white, and blue ribbon. A small group of dissenters with a strong sense of reality did put up a fight for a new look at the Pentagon's flim-flam. But when the vote came they were swamped. Even members who privately expressed doubts about the necessity for the draft timidly refrained from blocking the cow's passage.

The bill is now in the Senate. It deserves much more careful scrutiny there. Many thoughtful men believe that a 2-year extension will certainly suffice while a thorough review is made of the law's merits and our true military manpower needs in this strange new world. We agree.

Dedication of the New Supreme Court Building in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am glad to place in the RECORD the following remarks made by Justice Gerald Nolan and the address made by Francis M. Verrilli, esq., at the recent dedication ceremonies of the new Supreme Court building in New York:

ADDRESS BY JUSTICE GERALD NOLAN

As the one presiding over the ceremonies I am compelled to say, "Mr. Roscoe, we enjoyed your message very much." Later in the day I hope to have the pleasure of saying, "Andy, you did very well."

I can testify as presiding justice that in Brooklyn we have a very fine and a very active bar association. The officers, trustees, and members of that association are always mindful of the high ideals of an honored profession. They have always been most cooperative in every project initiated by the bench and by the bar, designed to promote, sustain, or to improve the administration of justice.

The leaders of that association have been men of great legal attainment, and the present incumbent of the office of president is no exception to that rule. He exemplifies in the full the spirit of the great association which he represents, and he is a fitting successor to the many distinguished men who have preceded him in that great office.

It is my privilege to present to you at this time the president of the Brooklyn Bar Association, Mr. Francis M. Verrilli. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY FRANCIS M. VERRILLI

Judge Nolan, honorable justices, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very touched by the very gracious introduction of Judge Nolan.

It is a very pleasant task that has been assigned to me today to say a few words on behalf of the Brooklyn Bar Association on the historic occasion of the dedication of its very beautiful edifice.

Every citizen is justly proud of this imposing building, for its simple beauty and practical usefulness, but we are not concerned with marble and gilt, but rather the purposes for which the building has been erected, that is, the full and efficient administration of justice.

It is entirely fitting, therefore, for us, the members of the bar and the able justices of this court, to rededicate ourselves to the

continued development of the law and the true administration of justice to all men without fear or favor and without regard to race, creed, or color.

While we have traveled far along this road, there is much to be done and we should continue to strive to give to all the litigants who will enter these halls not only the appearance of justice but the very essence of justice by courtesy, kindly consideration, and patient understanding of their problems.

The layman is often confused and bewildered at the law's delay, and the multiplicity of courts, which constitute our judicial system. The judicial conference, of which you will hear more this morning, I am sure, has set forth a plan for the reorganization of the courts which warrants our most careful and thoughtful consideration, and it is our duty as members of the bench and of the bar to help evolve a workable plan of court reorganization.

The public looks to us, the bench and bar, to solve these problems, and if we face up to them with courage and vision, then we will add honor and luster to the noble profession of the law.

The Brooklyn Bar Association adds its congratulations and felicitations to all those who have made this very historic occasion possible. Thank you. [Applause.]

Need for Flexibility in Cotton Acreage Allotments Cited by Alabama Gov. John Patterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, Alabama cotton farmers realize perhaps better than anyone the dire necessity of congressional modification of the laws regulating allocation of acreages.

A survey conducted in our State shows that unless flexibility in acreage allotments is provided whereby one farmer can transfer unwanted allotments to other farmers in the same county, Alabama will stand to lose the creation of new wealth on nearly 100,000 acres of good cotton land.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2428, to provide for lease and transfer of acreage allotments, which, I believe, will help to revitalize cotton production.

I have received from Alabama's new and able Governor, the Honorable John Patterson, a letter pointing up the pressing need for legislation such as I propose, and offering the support of the State of Alabama.

We are hopeful for early consideration of and approval of this legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the letter from Governor Patterson:

STATE OF ALABAMA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,

Montgomery, February 11, 1959.

HON. KENNETH ROBERTS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KENNETH: Farm leaders all over Alabama are concerned about the wholesale abandonment of cotton allotments due to the situation on many of our farms where small

allotments coupled with low prices have rendered cotton production unprofitable.

A survey conducted in each of Alabama's 67 counties indicates that unless the flexibility in acreage allotments which the leasing measure that you support provides is effected for 1959, that Alabama will stand to lose the creation of new wealth on nearly 100,000 acres of good cotton land. Even at present prices and yields the leasing of allotments within the counties as you propose has been estimated to prevent the loss of over \$15 million worth of new wealth for Alabama in 1959 alone.

Consequently, this cotton measure could well be one of the most important measures to come before the Congress in 1959 insofar as the economy of the State of Alabama is concerned.

I am sure that I do not need to call it to your attention that while the Nation has allotted to cotton 75.7 percent of its 1950 allotment, Alabama has been assigned only 60.8 percent of its 1950 allotment for 1959.

Therefore, I take this means to urge you to renew your efforts so that Alabama farmers who depend upon the production of cotton for their livelihood may be given the opportunity to plant any acreage not used by their neighbors, protecting the State's allotment whereby Alabama can from this day forward, at least maintain its relative position as a cotton-producing State.

In this connection I offer the full support of this administration and the State of Alabama.

Yours for a greater Alabama.

JOHN PATTERSON,
Governor.

Welfare State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, disciples of deficit spending should be observing what it has done to the State of Michigan, and maybe their hurry to put the United States in the same boat might be slowed up a bit.

I was glad to see that the Washington Evening Star of February 23 devoted a substantial editorial to a presentation of Michigan's current financial situation.

If my colleagues have not read this article, or do not know about what has happened in Michigan, they will find it most informative and helpful in their own decisions to spend or not to spend the public's money. I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

WELFARE STATE?

The State of Michigan leads the world in production of motor vehicles and parts. It ranks very high in other lines of manufacturing, in mining, and in agriculture. It is divided by Lake Michigan into two parts, adding immeasurably to its resort attractions and accounting for its official motto: "Si quaeris peninsulam amoenam circumspecte"—If you seek a pleasant peninsula, look about you. It is also broke, financially speaking, or so close to it that the disciples of deficit spending should be enjoying a happy holiday in their hearts.

That it was not literally broke on February 15, according to an Associated Press dispatch from the capital city of Lansing, was due entirely to the willingness of Michigan in-

dustry to hand over more than \$35 million in taxes from 2 to 4 months ahead of their due date. Without such prepayment, the State treasury would have been bare of money on February 15—"collapse day," as it had become known. The taxes, of varied types, were due between April 15 and June 15. Gov. Mennen Williams, sometimes mentioned as a Democratic Presidential hopeful, invited Michigan industry to help avert the crisis that Michigan politicians—Democrats and Republicans alike—had created. With the \$35 million plus, the State was able to make first payments since last November to the three State universities, to honor overdue obligations to townships and cities, and even to meet such welfare needs as aid to dependent children and the aged.

There is a possibility that "collapse day" may be rescheduled on April 15, but Mr. Williams has some ideas on how to cope with that. He has proposed a constitutional amendment referendum on April 6 to raise from \$250,000 to \$50 million the amount the State can borrow without express vote, and he has suggested that a veterans' trust fund of \$50 million be made available for collateral. He also has proposed bigger taxes—on industry profits and personal income. The news dispatch did not mention any recommendation for cutting down expenditures—now or ever.

Time To Repeal Telephone Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation designed to repeal the excise tax on telephone service. The 10-percent sales tax on telephone users was levied during World War II as a temporary measure to reduce the load on overburdened telephone facilities and to raise funds for financing the war effort. The original purposes of this tax have long since faded from the scene, and yet this burdensome tax remains.

It may be argued that all taxes are burdensome, but that they are necessary to finance the vital services provided by the Federal Government. However, the tax on communications facilities is particularly severe, and I believe unfair, because it is a regressive sales tax which is imposed on everyone alike without reference to ability to pay. I have always opposed the use of a sales tax where it was not designed to fulfill a specific need.

Now, Federal sales taxes are levied on luxury items such as jewelry, liquor, and nightclub entertainment, and these I believe are well justified. But certainly one cannot put telephone service in the same category as these luxury items. Telephone service is a public utility of the same nature as electricity, gas, and water on which there are no Federal excise taxes.

This tax is also illogical in view of the Federal Government's efforts to promote the extension of telephone coverage through the telephone program of the REA. This program has greatly benefited the rural people of our Nation. But one should note that over 40 percent of

our farm families today are still without the benefit, indeed, the vital necessity of telephone service. It is time to repeal this excise tax which runs directly counter to the stated aims of the Federal Government to promote telephone service.

Repeal of Excise Tax on Transportation of Passengers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of Resolution 1 of the 1959 Minnesota Legislature, which expresses the concern of the people and the legislature in Minnesota relative to the repeal of the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 1

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the repeal of the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers

Whereas the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers was adopted as a wartime tax to discourage the movement of civilian passengers during World War II; and

Whereas today, 13 years after the cessation of hostilities, there continues a 10-percent levy on the transportation of passengers (title VI, sec. 609 (a) United States Code), which tax while collected by the common carriers of transportation by rail, by highway, by water, and in the air, is imposed upon and collected from the users of such transportation; and

Whereas millions of dollars in revenues are paid to the State of Minnesota by those common carriers; and

Whereas the 10-percent tax on transportation of passengers discourages the use of public transportation systems and tends to decrease the revenue of the State and local government by reason of the lesser earnings or volume of business of said public system of transportation; and

Whereas there exists ample facilities for the public transportation of persons throughout the State of Minnesota and the Nation and the purpose for which said tax was imposed has long since ceased to exist; and

Whereas the decrease in revenue by reason of the small amount received for said excise tax on the transportation of passengers will largely be made up by the increased income taxes paid by the passengers of common carriers and other excise taxes paid on the facilities and equipment used by said common carriers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to repeal the Federal excise taxes upon the transportation of persons; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the

Minnesota delegation in the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

KARL F. ROYVAAG,
President of the Senate.
E. J. CHILDREN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Passed the senate the 6th day of February 1959.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 16th day of February 1959.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
Approved February 19, 1959.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.
Filed February 20, 1959.

JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State.

AMVETS 1959 Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Dr. Winston E. Burdine, national commander of AMVETS, appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and presented the 1959 legislative program of his organization. AMVETS deserves a great deal of credit for their well-thoughtout legislative program.

I was particularly impressed with the stand of the organization regarding non-service-connected pensions and find myself in complete agreement with the statements made regarding the relationships which should exist between non-service-connected pensions and service-connected disability and death compensation for veterans, widows, orphans, and dependent parents.

In its legislative program, AMVETS calls for first consideration for service-connected compensation programs and hospital and medical programs. AMVETS supports pensions based on need but have rejected pension demands which would result in non-service-connected payments for a few days service, which would be greater than payments being made to seriously disabled service-connected veterans, dependent parents, and dependent children.

I hope that every Member of the House will have an opportunity to read Dr. Burdine's statement:

STATEMENT OF WINSTON E. BURDINE, M.D., NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMVETS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON AMVETS' 1959 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, FEBRUARY 19, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I deeply appreciate your courtesy in granting me the opportunity to appear today for the purpose of presenting the highlights of AMVETS' legislative program for 1959. Having been engaged in the activities of organized veterans since the end of World War II, I am not entirely unfamiliar with the many accomplishments of this committee on behalf of the Nation's war veterans and their dependents. I can assure you that I am highly honored by this privilege today.

AMVETS, as you know, is an organization composed exclusively of World War II and Korean conflict veterans. During our brief existence a definite philosophy has gradually evolved. It is a philosophy that recognizes that the veteran has a vital stake in the economy of this Nation—that he has an obligation as a citizen as well as a veteran—that he will not overburden the economy with unreasonable demands that cannot be fully justified. We are motivated by a desire to perfect a sound enduring structure of benefits that will adequately and properly discharge the Nation's responsibility to its veterans and at the same time merit the respect of the American people. This philosophy has been reiterated in our current legislative program.

PENSIONS

Undoubtedly the most controversial subject in the field of veterans' legislation now facing this committee involves non-service-connected pensions. The administration, congressional leaders, and organized veterans all agree that the present non-service-connected pension system requires revision. Here the unanimity seems to end. Some would expand the program by adding persons to the rolls with no disability and little or no financial need. Others would increase monthly payments to those pensioners who are truly in need, while curtailing monthly payments for those having independent income.

AMVETS position with respect to the non-service-connected pension program was made crystal clear in a policy statement unanimously adopted at the 1957 national convention and reiterated at the most recent national convention in August 1958. This policy states that "AMVETS regard compensation for the service-connected disabled veteran and the surviving dependents of those who lost their lives from a service-connected cause as a paramount objective of the veterans' program. Nevertheless, AMVETS support the non-service connected pension program for veterans and their dependents so long as the program is based on realistic tests of need. The present non-service-connected pension program is deficient in some respects in that it fails to distinguish between various levels of need, thus resulting in thousands of veterans and widows being denied benefits or having to exist on a small pension with no other income when many other fortunate individuals have considerable income and resources and receive the same pension payment. AMVETS reject proposals which would further liberalize the pension program by adding persons to the rolls who are not actually in need. Instead, AMVETS would prefer to see any additional expenditure for non-service-connected pension directed to those most in need. Of particular concern are those unfortunate individuals who are so disabled as to require the aid and attendance of another person. The widows of World War II and Korean veterans are causing particular concern because widows and small children are not eligible for pension unless the veteran had a service-connected disability ratable at an ascertainable degree at the time of his death.

"We cannot disregard the precarious position of the Nation's finances at this time in that 7 percent of the Nation's annual income is being expended for veterans' benefits, yet it is inevitable that as unwarranted expenditures for non-service-connected pensions arise, it will be increasingly difficult to obtain and maintain adequate compensation for the service-connected disabled. We must assume adequate compensation programs, medical services, and adequate pensions for those truly in need rather than embark on pension programs which are actually in the nature of a service bonus."

This policy, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, was not formulated overnight at a national convention, but resulted

from mature deliberation and analysis of the present pension program and the many proposals offered in the 85th Congress to expand the program. Our study revealed some obvious but still rather startling facts. Most Americans know that there exists today a non-service-connected pension program for veterans of World Wars I and II and Korea, but few realize the scope of the program. There are approximately 800,000 pensioners on the rolls today. A great deal is being said about the inadequacy of the pension system, yet the fact remains that at age 65, a veteran may be working half time, have only 10-percent disability, and still qualify for a pension. If he is married, he may have personal income of \$2,700 per year. There is no limitation on income received by his wife, and there are no restrictions on liquid assets or net worth.

Your committee, Mr. Chairman, in the results of a survey recently released, reported details of cases of veterans on the pension rolls with liquid assets in excess of \$50,000. Numerous cases were reported where the veteran and his wife had more income than the average American family, yet he was receiving a pension and had been on the rolls for many years. The committee survey indicated that about 20,000 of the married pensioners now on the rolls have family income in excess of \$5,000. More than 13,000 pensioners have liquid assets of \$15,000.

On the other hand, the survey revealed that at the bottom of the scale there are about 46,000 married pensioners who have no income other than their pension and approximately 114,000 have incomes of less than \$500 exclusive of pension.

Yet each, irrespective of outside income, receives the same monthly rate of pension—\$66.15 or \$78.75, if he is 65 years of age or has been in receipt of pension for 10 years. The rate is \$135.45 if the veteran requires the aid and attendance of another person.

We of AMVETS are keenly aware of the fact that a seriously disabled veteran with no other source of income cannot live on this meager pension. It is essential that this unfortunate group be granted an adequate pension, yet it is equally important that we guard against providing a windfall or a bonanza for those with substantial independent means. The solution does not lie in increasing the income limits as some have suggested. This would only add more veterans with substantial means to the rolls. The seriously disabled, no-income veteran couldn't care less. Nor does an arbitrary across the board increase for all pensioners solve the problem. Not only would the cost be prohibitive, but inequities with respect to the service-connected compensation program would result.

For example, the highly publicized program of one group advocates a \$100 per month pension for all World War I veterans at age 60, irrespective of income or disability. The Veterans' Administration has estimated the cost of this proposal to be \$2.3 billion in its first year of operation, then a rapid rise in cost each year until in 1976, just 18 years from now, it will reach the fantastic cost of \$26 billion.

Aside from the cost, however, the inequities are apparent. You will be paying the nondisabled veteran with as little as 90 days' service the same monthly amount you pay the veteran who is 50 percent disabled from war wounds incurred in combat. Parents who lost a son in service receive only \$50 each provided they are able to meet the severe criteria of dependency that has been established. Two orphaned children whose father lost his life in service receive only \$50 each per month.

In other words, we would see veterans with relatively short service and no need actually receiving more consideration from their Government than thousands of war casualties, children orphaned by war and de-

pendent parents. The gross unfairness of this situation is readily apparent.

The solution to the problem confronting us lies in the capable hands of this committee and the Congress. It is the position of AMVETS that first consideration should go to the veteran and his family having little or no outside income and that pensions should not be paid in cases where little or no need exists. The only purpose served by paying a pension to a family with substantial income and net worth is the building of an estate to be passed on to their heirs.

We respectfully urge that you resist the pressures for a greatly expanded non-service-connected pension program of this nature. Instead we urge you to give serious consideration to the establishment of a greatly revised and realistic pension program. In the considered judgment of AMVETS, such legislation should provide that the amount of monthly pension payments be directly related to the amount of independent family income received. The veteran with little or no income should receive a substantial increase in pension payments. As the income increases, the pension payment should be lowered or conversely, the lower the income, the greater the pension payment. In this manner, persons with less than \$500 per year income would receive the maximum pension and persons with substantial income would receive the minimum or none.

Inasmuch as family income rather than the income of the veteran alone would be considered, it is suggested that additional payments be made and separate income tables be utilized when dependents such as wife and minor children are involved.

In the opinion of AMVETS, any consideration of pension legislation must necessarily include provisions for establishing the eligibility of World War II and Korean widows to pension on the same basis as is provided for widows of World War I veterans. As you know, widows of World War II and Korean conflict veterans to be eligible for pension must establish that the veteran upon whose death the application for pension is based was separated from service for medical reasons or that he had an ascertainable degree of service-connected disability at the time of death. The widows of World War I veterans applying for this benefit are spared this requirement and may qualify merely on the establishment of 90 days service and a discharge other than dishonorable. We can see no logical reason for the disparity and recommend its correction.

The sliding scale formula of income inversely related to monthly pension payments previously mentioned should be applied to the widow's pension program as well as to veterans. Provisions should be made, however, for the deduction of burial expenses from the proceeds of commercial life insurance in determining a widow's annual income for entitlement to non-service-connected death pension. In many instances, a widow is denied pension for a year because the proceeds from a small insurance policy, most of it consumed by the expense of burial, causes her to exceed the statutory income limit.

We do not propose to offer here a panacea for all deficiencies in the pension program. We do, however, believe that the implementation of AMVETS suggestions will result in a more sensible distribution of the pension dollar and at the same time remove certain inequities now existent.

SERVICE-CONNECTED NEEDS

In considering the service-connected compensation program we come to a matter of priority. Great demands are being made on the Congress to liberalize pensions. We presently have an income limit of \$2,700 for a married pensioner. He receives his pension in addition to this or, in other words, has a total income of about \$3,450 and yet be carried on the pension rolls on the basis of need.

There are demands from all sides to raise income limits or, in fact, abandon them altogether in favor of a general pension without a needs test.

Consider these demands in comparison to the income pattern of the service-connected disabled. In a survey conducted by the administration it was learned that the income of a 100-percent service-connected disabled veteran, without statutory awards, was only \$2,900 per year including compensation. The rate of compensation for this group is \$2,700 per year. Therefore, it is apparent that their ability to earn additional income is nil. In the face of this fact, some have the temerity to suggest that we should adopt a pension program which would carry hundreds of thousands of veterans, many with a few days service, to levels of income from \$3,500 to \$5,000.

The greatest need in the area of service connected compensation, in the judgment of AMVETS, is greater recognition of the limited or negligible earning capacity of the more seriously disabled veterans. This committee and the Congress recognized it in the 85th Congress by increasing the rates of compensation for certain categories of paraplegic and blinded veterans. There are, however, many seriously disabled veterans who are unable to work because of their disability and receive only \$225 per month.

The President in his recent budget message indicated that increases in compensation for some of the seriously disabled was warranted.

Consideration should be given to extending the benefits of the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 to the children of service connected totally disabled veterans. This group of veterans, for the most part, are unable to provide for their children's education because of their disability. In short, the special needs of the seriously disabled service connected veteran should receive first consideration.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

One of the most important programs administered by the Veterans' Administration is its hospital and medical program. This program, representing as it does, the greatest single Government medical program in the world, merits the continuing attention and scrutiny of this committee. We are grateful for the exhaustive study of this subject by your committee in the last session of Congress.

AMVETS position on VA hospitals, though spelled out in several resolutions, may be summed up clearly and concisely. We are seeking a policy that permits maximum utilization of available facilities and a dynamic and ambitious program of hospital modernization, renovation, and replacement. To accomplish the first objective, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should have authority to adjust the care and treatment program to the changing characteristics of the veteran population without unwarranted intervention by the Bureau of the Budget.

In this connection, we believe that existing facilities no longer required for certain types of treatment should be used wherever possible for the care and treatment of chronic, long-term patients, particularly selected mental cases. This would alleviate the acute problem now existing in this field of medicine.

In short, the program should be geared to present day requirements rather than budgetary limitations. We are encouraged by the 1960 VA budget for inpatient care which reflects an increase over the current budget. We are told that not only will this permit an increase in the average daily patient load, but the staffing ratios in hospitals will be improved. In other words, there will be more professional and skilled employees per thousand patients than the present budget permits.

We are extremely disappointed that the 1960 budget as presented failed to include funds for the construction of replacement

hospitals in Oakland, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, D.C. It is essential that sufficient funds for increasing the tempo of the replacement and modernization program be provided. As a doctor and a hospital administrator, I am well aware of the exorbitant and unnecessary cost involved in operating hospitals that are outmoded or badly in need of repair or renovation. Money saved by failure to appropriate funds for this purpose is false economy indeed. AMVETS are seeking an increase in the funds for this program and for medical research.

Before leaving this subject, I want to voice AMVETS continuing support of the policy that permits war veterans to receive treatment for non-service-connected disabilities in VA hospitals, provided a bed is available and they are unable to pay. If this humanitarian policy were ever discontinued, I am confident that the quality of VA medicine would deteriorate.

As you know, a good doctor makes a great financial sacrifice in practicing medicine in a Veterans' Administration hospital. This financial loss is offset by the wealth of knowledge and experience gained in treating practically every ailment known to man. If the care and treatment program were limited to service connected there would be little incentive to practice VA medicine.

The result would be the inability to recruit doctors. Obviously, the service-connected veteran would suffer from the inability to staff hospitals and the resultant inadequate medical care.

Here again I must comment upon the relative merits of the needs in the VA hospital program and the demands for pensions. Certainly there can be no question in anyone's mind that the providing of hospital care to needy veterans and the repair and replacement of older hospitals merits a higher priority and fills a far greater need than adding persons who are financially independent to the pension rolls.

Notwithstanding our support of non-service-connected hospitalization, however, I want to make it crystal clear that AMVETS will not condone abuses in this program. If a veteran can afford to pay for his non-service-connected hospitalization, he should not occupy a bed at the Federal Government's expense. We believe that admitting procedures now in effect have held abuses of this nature to a minimum.

PEACETIME BENEFITS

The question of benefits for persons who served after January 31, 1955, has long been a matter of concern to AMVETS. The President's proclamation of January 1, 1955, established January 31, 1955, as the terminal date for entitlement to wartime veterans' benefits. Consequently, persons entering service after that date are not entitled to education and training, housing-loan guarantee and other benefits offered war veterans.

These men do not qualify as war veterans because their service is limited to time of peace. They certainly should not be placed in the straight peacetime service category because, for the most part, they were drafted or entered service under the compulsion of the draft. In many instances the service was even more hazardous than that experienced by some war veterans. So they represent a new category for whom no precedent with respect to veterans benefits has been set. In the 85th Congress, extensive hearings on peacetime benefits were held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. A bill making this group eligible for unemployment compensation was the only legislation enacted.

It is the considered view of AMVETS that one of the most pressing needs of this group is an educational benefit. The results obtained from World War II and the Korean GI bills is dramatic proof of the value to the Nation of such a program. Not only do we have a better educated citizenry but the ability of these people to earn higher in-

comes has resulted in more taxes for the Federal Government.

I believe my own case will illustrate this. I received \$3,200 worth of education under the World War II GI bill. In the 5 years following the receipt of this education, I paid the Federal Government \$30,000 more in income taxes than I had paid in the 5 years preceding it. I would like to have a return of this nature on some of my investments.

Developments in science and engineering have pointed up the alarming shortage of persons educated and qualified for careers in these important fields. Statistics will reveal that more than 25 percent of those who attended colleges and universities under the World War II GI bill became scientists and engineers. There is every reason to believe that the same ratio would prevail today.

Even the Bradley Commission, not particularly noted for its praise of veterans' benefits, had these kind words to say about the World War II GI bill, "the veterans' educational program was a major contribution to the national welfare, and the country would be weaker educationally, economically, and in terms of national defense, if educators, veterans' organizations, the President, and the Congress had not seen fit to embark upon this new and momentous educational enterprise."

We of AMVETS are confident that a program of education and training for the post-Korean group would be equally productive of results. The distinguished chairman of this committee has introduced at the request of AMVETS, H.R. 2259, a bill creating a program of education and training for persons with service after January 31, 1955. We urge this committee to give early consideration to this measure and other pending bills on this important subject.

JUDICIAL REVIEW AND FORFEITURE

Two long-standing procedures in the Veterans' Administration adjudication process in our judgment are in need of further study and revision. The first involves the so-called judicial review or review by an independent court or board of Veterans' Administration decisions in claims for disability and death compensation.

Under the present system, these claims are first adjudicated by a board in the local Veterans' Administration regional office. In the event of an adverse decision, the veteran may appeal. The appeal is handled by the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration in Washington. It is the view of AMVETS that there should be a further avenue of appeal outside the Veterans' Administration.

The second procedure requiring revision is the system of forfeiture. In a study released in the 2d session of the 85th Congress this committee pointed up the inequities existing in the archaic forfeiture laws. These laws provide that any veteran who makes a false statement to the Veterans' Administration in connection with any claim is subject to losing all his rights and privileges as a veteran.

Your study revealed that a veteran could forge or alter a VA check and forfeit all his rights, while the same action with respect to a social security check or a postal money order would not affect his VA benefits. Two veterans, one of them disabled and in receipt of compensation, commit the same offense. Both forfeit their rights to VA benefits. The disabled veteran is, in effect, receiving a life sentence in the loss of his compensation, while the other veteran, by comparison, escapes punishment.

These are but a few of the inequities brought to light by your study. We urge you to consider corrective legislation during this session of Congress.

CONCLUSION

The matters that we have discussed this morning merely touch upon some of the highlights of AMVETS legislative program. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would

like to submit for the record the complete digest of our legislative program as adopted by our most recent national convention. Our legislative director will present more detailed testimony on many of these subjects as the session progresses.

In this, my first public appearance before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I desire to reaffirm that AMVETS is dedicated to promoting the welfare of the veteran, particularly those who are disabled, and their dependents. We know that this committee and its capable staff are similarly dedicated. We pledge to you our cooperation and objective thinking in arriving at our mutual objectives.

The Value of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of Congress will be interested in reading an address delivered by Circuit Judge W. D. Debardeleben, of Anniston, Ala., at a recent meeting of the Helping Hand Club of Anniston.

The address follows:

THE VALUE OF FREEDOM

Mr. President and my friends, your organization's gracious invitation to take part in this meeting accorded to me a rare honor, distinction, and pleasure, for here I find an outstanding leadership in our community.

In casting about for a subject for discussion with which I have some limited familiarity and appropriate, as I believe, to fit this occasion, I have chosen for presentation a matter which I have named "The Value of Freedom." Although this matter to be laid before you has often been stated in varying forms, nevertheless, I subscribe to the thought that repetition is justified to remind you and me of the luxury of freedom wrapped about us as American citizens under the law of this land. Constant consciousness and jealousy of its rewards are indispensable in the perpetuation and defense of our liberties.

From the beginning of time man has been in constant quest of a perfect and just freedom. God, in His infinite wisdom, wove through His sacrifice and example the righteous pattern of life threaded with the divine pronouncement of a just freedom for all of us, should we obey His commandments and support His cause.

American justice and its counterpart, liberty, were guaranteed and made secure by the people themselves upon the adoption of the Constitution and its amendments of the United States. Our Constitution, bought with the lives, blood, and sacrifices of our forebears, and kept inviolate by succeeding generations, which Constitution claims the distinction in the annals of literature as the shining masterpiece of composition and superb importance to all Americans, out-ranked and superseded in importance by only the Holy Bible, itself. This instrument of ours, I say, must at all costs be preserved, and it will be, provided we all do our full share to this end. It protects us, comforts us, and inspires us, and sets the true course to be followed in the relationship of men, with the full and complete recognition of the existence of a supreme being. We, its beneficiaries, must ever be vigilant and alert to defend it against all enemies from within and from without our country and to keep it in our service.

The first 10 amendments, known as the Bill of Rights, to the Constitution of the United States rings out in clear and unmistakable terms freedom for all people who come under the influence of its protection. I feel sure that all of us at one time or another have read the Bill of Rights, but even so, I hold to the proposition that we should, from time to time, refresh our recollection of its contents and to appreciate anew its provisions. With this idea in view, and with your indulgence, I now present to you the Bill of Rights:

"ARTICLE I

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"ARTICLE II

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

"ARTICLE III

"No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

"ARTICLE IV

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

"ARTICLE V

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger, nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

"ARTICLE VI

"In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

"ARTICLE VII

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

"ARTICLE IX

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"ARTICLE X

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

There you find inspiration for all of us.

Throughout the length and breadth of this land thousands of our boys have borne arms from time to time in defense of our country, enduring the brunt of sacrifice with courage and bravery and earning for themselves the eternal respect and gratitude of all free men. Yes, many of them in the cause of liberty, gave the last full measure of their devotion and now rest in eternal sleep. Let us always keep in our memory an honored place for those who gave so much for us.

As is well known by us, our system of democratic laws consists of three branches of government: the legislative, executive, and judicial, each with its peculiar sphere of limited authority. Thus established we find a time honored form of government by checks and balances so designed that no branch thereof is permitted to usurp and encroach upon the rightful powers of the other branches. All of this is provided for in the name and interest of freedom and justice. No manmade government insures more freedom for the people. This is so for the governed enacted the laws through their chosen representatives for limited terms of office, and they cannot continue therein after the expiration of their tenure of office, although legally eligible to succeed themselves, except at the pleasure of a majority vote of the people. This is democracy in its truest form. Democracy says that those who govern must derive this right from the consent of the governed.

We Americans are all stockholders in the government we have set up for ourselves and the value of the share of stock we hold therein is dependent upon our individual efforts to sustain, maintain, and improve it. No organization, by whatever name it may be called, can prosper to its fullest extent without the constant cooperation of its officers and membership. To function properly each must put his hand to the task, for then and only then will there be a full realization of the benefits desired.

The riches and abundance of America were made possible through the freedom of the individual to manufacture his goods, till his soil, and harvest his crops, ply his trade, and follow his profession in a competitive economy and to sell his talents and products in an open market. Thus we see the real incentive—freedom—stimulating the American citizen to use his capabilities to the fullest degree in the economic field, for he has the certain assurance that he shall reap such reward as his efforts produce and nothing more. Herein lies the financial prosperity of America basking in the sunshine of democracy and guided to its present destiny by the divine authority.

To continue our journey on the road of freedom and to enjoy the happiness that it gives at every milestone along its way, we must be ever mindful and have an abiding conviction of the value of our privileges as American citizens and be ever sensitive to the challenge of all antidemocratic movements acting to destroy our precious heritage.

Peace in our times, as well as for those who come after us, is the uppermost thought of all right-thinking people everywhere. To achieve this there must be a reawakening of the spirit of fellowship all over the world and the unceasing practice of the divine doctrine "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Unfortunately, this spirit of fellowship does not prevail in some places on this earth, consequently, in the interests of self-preservation, we must keep and maintain a mighty Army, Navy, and Air Corps, equipped with the latest sinews and armaments, and bear the heavy burden of taxation for this purpose. Let us all bear in mind that whatever may be the cost in taking these protective measures, the cause of freedom warrants it. We shall and must assess the value, as American citizens, of our greatest

assets which are, in general: freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of religious worship and freedom of speech and freedom of the press we enjoy from day to day, which you and I are prone to consider as commonplace. We should give our thanks from day to day to almighty God for the many blessings He has bestowed upon us in this free land—constantly reminding ourselves that in many other countries such freedoms do not abound.

Freedom in all her glorious aspects finds the true symbol in the flag of our country, bearing in majesty, in beauty, and dignity the visual message, the import, and significance of her calling.

This flag of ours embraces the hopes, the aspirations, and the inspirations of all Americans, wherever they may be, for the continuation and survival of the democratic process and the liberties we claim as our own.

With God's help and the faithful allegiance of all true Americans to her indispensable cause, she, Old Glory, will forever wave in proud supremacy and with victory won against all enemies who may challenge her eminence in the sun.

Poverty in economic advantages; poverty in educational advancements; and poverty in health are all to be deplored, but the worst poverty of them all is the poverty in freedom.

Freedom, as we all agree, is the firm foundation upon which is rested and built our American fortress of democratic privileges. Without this bedrock foundation, the structure of Americanism established thereon would collapse, and thus we would find ourselves committed to the tyranny of blackness, despair, and oppression. Freedom, I believe therefore, is the most honored and respected word in any language, with the exception of the revered word "God," for God is the supreme being of the universe and the ruler of all mankind, unto whom we, His followers, offer our petitions, supplications, and prayers from time to time for His divine guidance and direction in the preservation of our freedoms and well-being.

The darkness of tyranny covers many areas of the world today, spread and controlled by the godless ideology of communism. One such area is Budapest upon which recently the eyes of the world were focused on the struggle of its people for liberation from enslavement. These brave freedom warriors fought with their sacrifices, daring and even death a short-lived freedom. This, their love of freedom, transcended all other considerations and their acts and deeds warrant the plaudits of everyone who believe in right and justice.

I believe that freedom for the downtrodden people of Budapest will not long be denied, for their will for victory is everlasting and determined. No power can long endure without justice supporting it.

The Budapest incident is a concrete illustration of what it means to be deprived of liberty and freedom.

Let it, therefore, be always remembered by we Americans that freedom may in piecemeal or all at once be denied us, even by forces operating from within our country, if we do not remain alert and ready at all times to combat with all we have the antidemocratic forces which seek to conquer and subdue us by various guises and means and destroy the true meaning of our Bill of Rights as it is clearly written.

What is America? God built a continent with glory and filled it with treasures untold. He bedecked it with soft, rolling prairies and pillared it with thundering mountains. He studded it with sweetly flowing fountains and encompassed it with long, winding streams. He graced it with deep shadowed forests and filled them with song. These treasures would have meant little if myriads of people, the bravest of the races, had not come, each bearing a gift and a hope. They

had the glow of adventure in their eyes and the glory of hope in their souls, and out of them was fashioned a nation blessed with a purpose sublime. They called it America.

Freedom has been woven into the fabric of our lives as Americans. There are those who would confuse with high-sounding phrases; others who would swap it for the tasteless pottage of security; yet others who would encompass and limit it with their definitions.

But freedom is not a thing to be pinned down and defined or to barter away. It is many things. It is everything. It is, in fact, all that we have.

Freedom is the light shining in the window of a church house. It is the call of school bells on the frosty air. It is the pride of a man who says, "This is mine." Freedom is the whistle of a train in the night and the knowing that you might be aboard.

Freedom is the vagabond who sleeps by the tracks, the clerk who decides to go in business for himself, the dreamer who works on a new machine, or the sign that says, "Gone fishing. Back tomorrow." Freedom is the key to the front door, the pencil in your pocket. It is the postcard you send your Congressman, the letters you write, the paper you print, the words you speak. It is your right to agree or disagree, and it is that hushed, fateful moment behind the drawn curtains when you are alone with your ballot. It is your right to go to church or to stay home and sleep.

It is the radio by the window with the knob that sends long pointed fingers searching across the world for voices. Many voices. Any voices.

Freedom is the gun in the top drawer, your top drawer in your home. It is the rifle on the rack above the kitchen door. It is the hardware store where you can buy a box of shells and no questions asked.

Freedom is the luxury of rest, the sound soul-building sleep of one who goes to bed at night afraid of no man. It is the right to grow; to be more of a person this year than last; to become learned if you can, or rich if you are able.

Freedom is the bounty of the harvest, the foods you buy as you please, and use as liberally as you like.

Freedom is the gladness of a little boy running home for supper, and the bright new day that is tomorrow, yours to use and to treasure.

Freedom is the right to hold and to use whatever inventions the future may bring us; but it also is the tear you brush away as the parade goes by, and the bugles cry, and the drums roll out their stirring notes of a patriotic air. It is some of the sorrow and glory in your heart.

It is the dawn wind on a high mountain peak, the innate respect for the human form, the love of man, the fear of God.

But freedom isn't free. It is the dearest thing we have. It was bought for us and handed down to us at the cost of life, of loneliness, and of torture.

The value of freedom can be no better voiced than in the inspired and immortal words of the patriot, Patrick Henry, of historical fame, when he said for all ages to hear: "I do not know what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

The 56 American patriots, who signed the Declaration of Independence, our honored and cherished document of freedom from tyranny, knowingly accepted the risk inherent in winning liberty and in so doing they on freedom's altar pledged our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

You and I, as individuals are responsible for the successes and failures of America. What we do, or fail to do, as citizens, will add up to the strength or the weakness of our Nation.

How To Encourage American Investment Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address which I presented before the international section of the New York Board of Trade on February 10, 1959:

HOW TO ENCOURAGE AMERICAN INVESTMENT ABROAD

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to join you today to discuss the subject, "How To Encourage American Investment Abroad." This very important problem engages your interest as American businessmen and my interest as a Member of the U.S. Congress. We appreciate the critical importance of this subject and of the need for developing public policy and programs that are adequate.

The London Economist, a week or so ago, put the problem very well. It said that "Provided there is no thermonuclear war, the whole future balance of international manpower is likely to depend on one factor: On whether the poorer nations can be offered the prospect of getting richer within the free world's economic and political system than they would within the Communist one."

When we talk about foreign economic policy as a whole and foreign investment policy in particular, we are talking about policy for national survival. There is no question about it. We are engaged in a life-and-death struggle to save and promote the kind of social, political, and economic system—in short, the kind of world order—that is the heritage of Western democracy. We are trying to do this, challenged by the most artful and persistent foe that we have ever faced. The conflict is all the more trying because we are waging it at this stage without adequate weapons. We have, in fact, an excessive preoccupation with the military side of any prospective conflict. I do not say that military preparedness is not absolutely essential—it is, but by being in the soundest military posture we are assuming hopefully that the Russians will not begin a war with us. Thus, military preparedness only buys time and prevents the conflict from breaking out into a shooting war. The outcome of the long-run competition will not depend on military weapons. The battlefield where the conflict is really joined today and for the future is in the competition for men's minds and allegiances and hence it is where our foreign economic policy, as the economist pointed out, is of such critical importance.

I am afraid that in this department of our strategy for survival we are not well stocked with weapons. In fact, not only have we not devised and put into use the kinds of policies and programs that are essential but we have had a bad habit of stumbling and falling back. One example has come to me very graphically. I am sure that you have all read about the Turbine case under the Buy-American Act which led to a Government contract being awarded a domestic manufacturer despite the fact that the British bidder was \$300,000 below the American bid. There are many wrinkles to this case, but what is most striking to me is that the contract was awarded to the domestic firm, despite all the rules and regulations of the Buy-American Act and the Executive or-

der that was proclaimed to implement it, on the grounds of national security. That is, we are asked to believe that letting the contract in England would have jeopardized the national security of the United States. The reason that was given—national security—was just an excuse because it was the only excuse available. What is appalling is the use of such an excuse.

Not only is it ridiculous to think that our national security would be impaired if the two turbines were produced by the British firm in a country that is perhaps our staunchest ally, but what is even more significant is the narrow parochial meaning that this action gives to the concept of national security.

Our national security is not impaired by a liberal trade policy. Quite the contrary. It is through the expansion of trade and investment that we can, in a very real sense, assure our national security. The concept of national security has meaning, of course, only in the context of the threats and dangers that beset us. It is World War I thinking at its worst that defines national security as the maintenance of economic isolationism. In a world where the military threat is one posed by thermonuclear weapons delivered by intercontinental ballistic missiles, if a full-scale war ever gets started, it will be decided in a matter of days. The target of our enemies will be Continental United States. We enjoy no military isolation. How can we bemuse ourselves with economic isolation? No, even on purely military grounds, this kind of national security thinking is a phony, at best, and dangerous, at worst. The danger stems from the fact that this attitude shows no comprehension of what the real issues are and what we must do to wage the cold, nonshooting, war that we are already in.

What we must do and I think, if we apply ourselves, can do very well indeed is to give our kind of economic system a chance to work its wonders throughout the world. We must realize that unlike the Soviet Union that can mobilize all its resources through the State by engaging in State trade and aid activities, because we believe in free enterprise, the role of Government in our society is necessarily limited. That makes it all the more important that we use governmental policy properly to produce the results we want to achieve. We want to see the growth of international trade in an increasingly free environment. In this way, we can stimulate productivity throughout the world and thus increase standards of living. By avoiding conflicts over trade through restrictionist policies, we would avoid some of the most damaging blows to amity and cooperation among the free world countries.

We seek the expansion of private investment. Private investment through the capital and techniques that it employs is the engine of economic growth. Through its growth we look to the expanded use of economic resources throughout the world and that is the essential base for economic progress.

I want to concentrate today on private investment policy since this seems to me to be a critical area from the point of view of Government policy today. That is not to say that trade policy is not significant or that there is not an intimate relationship between trade and investment policy. I think there is, but we have an established trade policy. Last year the trade agreements legislation was renewed for an unprecedented 4-year period. We are, however, deficient as far as investment policy is concerned. This is a subject that has been under intensive study and discussion for a decade but as yet we have not broken out of the chains of uncertainty and come forward with a meaningful policy.

From what we know about private investment and the incentives and obstacles that promote and deter it, I think we can fairly conclude that it is in the field of tax reform that the most effective incentives to private foreign investment can be found. To be sure, the Government can moderate the non-business risks of doing business abroad through such things as the investment guaranty program and through the consummation of treaties and conventions for the protection of private property and to assure equal rights for American citizens and corporations. But when we talk about private investment, we talk about economic decisions by American corporations that are made on the basis of a calculated profit. Foreign investment, by and large, does not assure the investor that he will earn sufficiently higher returns than he can on domestic investment. Through tax policy, the take-home profit for foreign investment can be enhanced and, in addition, the investor can be encouraged to commit his earnings from foreign operations to new investment.

I know that there is a view held in some quarters that the tax system is not an appropriate instrument to use to achieve public policy objectives. I regard that as an unduly sterile approach to tax policy. It is clear to begin with that our system of taxation does, in fact, impart willy-nilly incentives and disincentives to certain types of economic activity and business pursuits. Any system of taxation is bound to.

Moreover, there have been consciously built into the tax system incentives of one sort or another. The real question is whether any particular change in tax policy that is proposed will be successful in accomplishing a legitimate and desired goal. I think that in the case of private investment, because we want such investment to continue to be private, tax reform is in many respects the only good and effective instrument we have. Now, even aside from the question of providing tax incentives to private foreign investment, it would seem to me that our tax system as it applies to foreign source income could stand reform on equity grounds alone. The operation of the foreign tax credit limitation is an example of this. It is a happy coincidence that in suggesting intelligent tax reform we can accomplish both the objectives of bringing greater equity into the tax picture as well as adapting the tax system so as to provide proper incentives to private foreign investment.

As you know, I introduced a bill on the first day of this Congress, known as H.R. 5, which I believe will help accomplish the objective we have in mind. I want to say at the start that while I believe H.R. 5 to be a good bill, soundly conceived, and one that will bring important benefits, it is by no means perfect in every detail. Some changes have already been brought to my attention that may well deserve incorporation in the bill. Most of these have been of a complicated technical nature and have to be given careful scrutiny. The essential thing to my mind is to strike a balance by including, as I believe I did in H.R. 5, provisions that are realistic and effective. I am sure that not everyone in the business community would feel that H.R. 5 does everything that he feels is necessary, but I would suggest to such people that they realize that we may be in danger of accomplishing nothing if we seek to accomplish everything. That would be as foolish as throwing out the baby with the bath water.

The principal provision of H.R. 5 is that establishing a special class of domestic corporation known as a foreign business corporation to conduct the foreign operations of American firms. The foreign business corporation would enjoy the privilege of deferral of U.S. taxes on its income.

This proposal would, therefore, permit the domestication of foreign base corporations

established in tax haven countries and would accord the same tax benefits that are enjoyed by such corporations to the foreign business corporation. The question may well be raised as to what advantage the foreign business corporation form offers American business in view of the fact that they can already avail themselves of the tax advantages of this form through the incorporation of holding companies in foreign tax havens. The answer, I think, is that there are significant advantages and the best test of this is that the American business community has, in the hearings which our subcommittee held, expressed its vigorous interest and support for the proposal.

This support reflects several factors. Foreign incorporation may be a cumbersome and expensive proposition. It may mean committing personnel to a foreign country; it means putting your foreign operations under the sometimes uncertain tax policies of a foreign sovereignty. It also means some uncertainty as to whether the United States tax benefits will continue to be enjoyed. As you know, some of the advantages of a foreign base corporation depend on regulations of the Treasury Department.

These could presumably be revised at some time in the future. Moreover, some commentators have been casting sidewise glances at foreign base corporations and suggesting that these are nothing more than tax evasion propositions. By providing explicitly in U.S. statute for the foreign business corporation and by according status and permanency to the privilege of tax deferral and the other collateral tax advantages, a great deal of the uncertainty that presently exists would be dispelled as would a good deal of the inconvenience and expense of foreign incorporation.

Thus, there are, it seems to me, tangible advantages to the American business engaged in foreign operations to be found in the foreign business corporation proposal. I think that it is as well an important and effective stimulus to expand private foreign investment. Recent Department of Commerce studies have shown that something in excess of 50 percent of the earnings from foreign operations are retained for reinvestment purposes.

Tax deferral recognizes this practice and encourages it by, in effect, giving the foreign investor an interest-free loan equal to the amount of income that would have had to be paid to the U.S. Treasury.

The provision of the bill contained in section 3 relating to transfers and reorganizations should be read in the context of the foreign business corporation provisions. This provision would permit the transfer of property from a U.S. corporation to a foreign corporation without any tax penalties resulting from the transfer. Thus, foreign operations presently organized in the branch form can move into a foreign corporation and enjoy the advantages that that form of enterprise may afford. I would expect that in many instances the foreign branch activities would be shipped into the foreign business corporation. Since these are transfers entirely between domestic corporations, no tax consequences would, of course, arise and, therefore, no special legislation is required.

There is one respect in which section 3 of the bill that I have been referring to might very well be changed. As it presently stands, it does not permit the liquidation, say, of a Panamanian corporation and the tax-free transfer of the assets of such corporation to the foreign business corporation. To the extent that we wish to have the foreign business corporation form used instead of a foreign holding company, where the investor decides to liquidate his foreign base corporation and reorganize his foreign activities under the foreign business corpora-

tion, he should be permitted to do so without incurring tax liabilities.

Section 4 of the bill extends, with very minor modifications, the present Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions and the consequent tax advantages to foreign source income without regard to the geographic source of such income. The extension of Western Hemisphere trade corporation treatment to the Eastern Hemisphere seems to me to be entirely reasonable. In 1942 when the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provision was first enacted, there may have been special considerations of foreign economic policy favoring special treatment to Western Hemisphere trade and investment.

Today, the Western Hemisphere does not stand in a unique position with respect to the rest of the world. Increasingly, our foreign economic policy objectives have come to comprehend the entire free world. To implement these broader objectives, it is appropriate to generalize what has hitherto been very special treatment.

Tax reduction, of course, has a very direct effect on increasing the profitability of foreign operations, and it is for this reason that it is perhaps the most potent tool in the tax arsenal. It must be recognized, however, that the revenue consequences of across-the-board tax reduction are more serious than of other proposals, and for this reason, this provision of my bill is likely to occasion the most opposition.

What I think is not sufficiently appreciated about section 4 is that any tax reduction is not, in effect, an across-the-board reduction. A 14-point reduction will not yield 14 points of tax abatement on all foreign source income. In those cases where the foreign tax rate is above 38 percent, the amount of the abatement will be commensurately less. What is significant, however, is that, by and large, the lower tax rates are found in the less developed countries.

Hence, the maximum benefits from the 14-point tax reduction will be enjoyed on income earned in such countries. The 14-point proposal, therefore, has in practice a selective effect, and it is a selective effect which coincides with the high priority objectives of public policy in the field of private investment; namely, the stimulation of private investment in the less developed areas of the world.

Skipping section 5 for a moment and turning to section 6, the section relating to tax sparing, this provision takes account of the fact that even in many underdeveloped countries tax rates are high and present a barrier to the expansion of investment. If underdeveloped countries wish to enact incentive tax legislation in order to foster private investment, they should be encouraged to do so. The operation of our foreign tax credit system, however, at present frustrates the achievement of such an objective. To the extent that foreign tax rates are lowered, the U.S. tax liability of the U.S. taxpayer is generally increased. The Treasury and State Departments have been much interested in this problem and have recommended the use of tax treaties containing tax-sparing provisions as the appropriate solution.

H.R. 5 suggests, as an alternative, that there be a legislative mandate to recognize incentive tax sparing by foreign countries as taxes paid for the purpose of the U.S. foreign tax credit. Embodying this policy in legislation seems to me to have many virtues. The principal one, of course, is that it avoids the very important criticism that can be directed at tax sparing through treaties, namely, the circumvention of con-

gressional authority in the field of taxation. In addition, under a general legislative mandate, the Secretary of State would not have to negotiate complicated and time-consuming tax treaties. He could, if he wished merely certify unilaterally which foreign tax sparing legislation would be accorded the treatment provided for. Alternatively, he could use this general authority to negotiate executive agreements in order to obtain reciprocal benefits. Such agreements are simpler to negotiate and do not require the advice and consent of the Senate. Thus, the tax sparing provision of section 6 continues the principle of selectivity inherent in section 4 and gives it broader scope.

Sections 5 and 6 of the bill are provisions that can be supported on equity grounds, pure and simple. Affording the taxpayer the option to choose between the country by country limitation and an overall limitation on the amount of tax credit he can take against his U.S. tax liability, would give effect to the principle of equality of treatment on which the foreign tax credit provisions are based. At present, under the existing country by country limitation, foreign source income can be subject to a higher rate of taxation than domestic source income of an equal amount. By permitting the option of an overall limitation, this inequity would be removed in those instances where the taxpayer derives foreign source income from other countries where he has unused tax credits. Section 7 similarly rectifies an inequity in present law relating to the question of gain or involuntary conversion of property of foreign subsidiaries. There does not seem to me to be any good reason why a domestic parent corporation that has insured the property of its wholly-owned foreign subsidiary must pay a tax on the insurance proceeds if the property of that subsidiary is involuntarily destroyed or converted. This contingent tax penalty that may arise against the domestic parent deters investment in those countries in which it is either impossible or difficult to secure adequate insurance coverage and where, as a result, the domestic parent must insure the property involved.

H.R. 5 in itself represents, I firmly believe, a balanced and moderate proposal for tax reform in the field of foreign source income that I am confident would go a long way in providing the kinds of incentives that are necessary in order to promote the expansion of private foreign investment. There really is nothing startling new or revolutionary about these proposals. In fact, they have been under consideration for some years. I am persuaded of one thing, however: The time has come to do something about the subject. We can no longer afford the vacillation and delay that has characterized discussions of public policy in this critical area. I am encouraged to learn that the public advisory groups established to advise the President in this field will come forward with constructive recommendations in the tax field. We, of course, have to wait for the publication of these reports and findings in order to ascertain what these specific proposals are. But I am encouraged by the initial evidence, at least, that the administration in Washington is bestirring itself, and I hope that a good conclusion will come out of these efforts.

Meanwhile, it is up to the business community, alert businessmen such as yourselves, who are concerned with private enterprise and our foreign economic policy, who are acutely aware of the challenges that confront us, to work unstintingly for the development of sound and constructive policy in this area. In the final analysis, you are the people who will decide what our country will do.

Alabama Delegation Urges Consideration of Coosa-Alabama River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the development of the Coosa-Alabama River system has been authorized for some 14 years. An item in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956, 84th Congress, called for a comprehensive investigation of the entire river system. An interim report has been submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. However, the Board has not scheduled this report for its next meeting in March of this year. Inasmuch as this project has been authorized and a favorable report submitted to the Board and since this project has been inserted as a Senate amendment to the Public Works Appropriation Act for the past 3 years, the Members of Congress affected by this project have submitted a letter to the Chairman of the Board, Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., requesting the Board to schedule this project for the March meeting. Under unanimous consent I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD:

Maj. Gen. WALTER K. WILSON, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Office, Chief of Engineers, T-7, Gravelly Point, Va.

DEAR GENERAL WILSON: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, respectfully urge that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors consider the report on navigation plans for the Coosa-Alabama River system at their meeting early in March of this year.

It is realized that the agenda for this meeting has been established. However, due to the importance of the development of the Coosa-Alabama River system and in conformance with the remarks of President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message in 1955 indicating that the plan for the development of this waterway is the kind of partnership he would like to see, we urgently request that this report be placed on the agenda for consideration at the March meeting of the Board.

As you undoubtedly know, the development of the Coosa-Alabama was authorized in the 79th Congress in 1945, including construction of a multipurpose dam at Miller's Ferry and two other dams on the Alabama River. Since that time a private concern, the Alabama Power Co., has begun a multimillion-dollar series of dams on the upper stretches of the waterway. The Federal Government has not kept pace, and the work on the Alabama River remains unstarted.

An item in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956, Public Law 163, 84th Congress, called for a comprehensive investigation of the entire Alabama-Coosa River. In partial response to this act, an interim report was prepared by the division engineer, South Atlantic Division, and was forwarded to the Chief of Engineers early last fall. This report indicates that the reporting officers have found that the estimated benefits exceed the estimated cost and early construction of the project is warranted.

We realize that, while there is only a short time prior to the Board meeting in March to consider and analyze the data submitted, we believe that the importance of this project makes it imperative that action be taken which will permit the start of construction at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator; JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senator; ERWIN MITCHELL, FRANK BOYKIN, GEORGE GRANT, ALBERT RAINS, KENNETH A. ROBERTS, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, GEORGE ANDREWS, ROBERT E. JONES, CARL ELLIOTT, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Members of Congress.

Salute to the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, National Guard units of my State, South Dakota, observed Muster Day. I should like to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for the service to all of us provided by the men of the guard. The valiant role played by South Dakota guardsmen during World War II is a vivid memory of mine going back to the early 1940's when many of my college classmates were mobilized as guard units to defend our national interest in the critical opening months of that great struggle. National Guardsmen have served us well in other conflicts and have conducted themselves with great credit during peacetime.

A fitting tribute to the National Guard is the editorial which appeared in the Rapid City Journal for Saturday, February 21, which follows:

GUARDSMEN HANDY TO HAVE

The National Guard Sunday celebrates Muster Day. It is the birthday of Gen. George Washington who was a member of the Virginia Militia, and it is a time to honor the guardsmen, as we call them now.

In its founding years, this Nation had to depend on its civilian soldiers—Washington's militia—and we still must plan on our guardsmen who rate as the Nation's oldest fighting organization.

We tend to forget our National Guard during years of peace.

It seems strange that this should be; that after 300 years of fighting Indians, invaders and dictators, floods, fires, and tornadoes, the National Guard should have to prove itself. But prove itself it did, and in 1945, after the smoke of 4 years of battle had cleared away, National Guardsmen had won 14 Medals of Honor and 88 Presidential unit citations. Eighteen National Guard Infantry Divisions had fought throughout Europe and the Pacific, compiling one of the proudest combat records in our history.

The guard's participation in World War II is a perfect example of the unyielding spirit of free citizens who take up arms in the defense of their Nation. And there were dark hours during the war when it was that spirit alone which turned the tide of battle.

Week in and week out, while most of us are enjoying the leisure of hours after work and of weekends, 470,000 Army and Air National Guardsmen are giving of their time

in the most vigorous training program of their organization's history. They know that in modern warfare a citizen must be not only willing, but prepared to fight as well.

We are much safer for having them.

Boyhood Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. FOLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the problems facing the growth of America are natural subjects of concern for all of us as parents, public officials, and citizens. Great publicity is given to individual delinquent acts involving a very small percentage of our young people. Very little or no recognition is given to the many acts of heroism which daily are performed by a much larger percentage of our young citizens. Because of this general omission, I am proud to bring the attention of the Members of the House to a recent act of boyhood heroism by Jimmy Lewis of Eckhart, Md. I feel it will warm your hearts and stir your pride as it did mine. There are many unsung Jimmy Lewises who daily show kindness toward their fellow man and devotion to the welfare of dumb creatures.

In their honor and to the honor of Jimmy Lewis, I have inserted the true story of the saving of the lives of Rex, Bing, and Sam, three beagles:

PLAQUE WILL BE GIVEN TO ECKHART BOY

A plaque will be presented to Jimmy Lewis, 17, of Eckhart, by the Animal Welfare Society for his heroism and kindness in rescuing three beagle dogs which were trapped in an abandoned coal mine last fall.

According to Mrs. W. Earle Cobey, president of the Animal Society, the organization's executive committee took note of Jimmy's action after a news account of the rescue was published. Immediate steps were taken to show him some recognition.

The plaque is to be presented at the meeting of the society January 26 at 7:30 p.m., in the Cumberland Free Public Library. At this meeting, the annual report for 1958 will be given and officers will be elected for 1959.

Mrs. Cobey, commenting upon the award to Jimmy Lewis, recounted the report of the rescue of the three beagle hounds, Rex, Bing, and Sam, as it was first recorded by Herbert L. Knepp, president of the Western Maryland Wildlife Federation. The report shows that:

George W. Lewis, Jimmy's father, was hunting with the dogs when they sighted a huge cat—the kind that goes wild and feeds on game—and chased it into the mouth of the abandoned mine. Fallen timbers and rock had so clogged the mine tunnel that the dogs were able to squeeze through, but were unable to find their way out again.

The elder Lewis had almost given the dogs up for lost when Jimmy remembered an old air shaft that descended to the mine. Checking at this point next day, the dogs were heard whining below, where, it is presumed, they went to get fresh air.

Jimmy prevailed upon his father and two of his friends, William Pilsinger and Noah Shroyer, to lower him into the air shaft on a rope—a distance of some 50 feet from the surface—to try to save the dogs. Reluc-

tantly, the men acceded to the wishes of the boy, and he went down into the abandoned pit, where weakened timbers could have sent tons of rock and earth tumbling in upon him. Jimmy put the joyous pups in burlap bags and the men pulled them to the surface.

Jimmy lives at Eckhart with his parents, and is student manager of the Beall High football team. He is advisor to the Eckhart Square Circle Boys Club.

THE ANIMAL WELFARE SOCIETY
OF ALLEGANY COUNTY, INC.,

Cumberland, Md.

Mr. JAMES LEWIS,
Eckhart, Md.

DEAR JIMMY: It is with a great deal of pleasure that we, the Animal Welfare Society of Allegany County, Inc., present to you this special award of 1958 in recognition of your courageous act in saving the lives of three beagle hounds on November 23, 1958.

We feel that you are a very worthy recipient of this award, the first we have ever presented anyone.

Presented January 26, 1959.

VIRGINIA B. COBEY,
WINIFRED A. BIGLER,
HELEN POWELL WISE,
DOROTHY BORDEN,
LOUIS B. YOUNG,
Executive Committee.

JANUARY 26, 1959.

JIMMY LEWIS,
Animal Welfare Society, Cumberland Free
Public Library, Cumberland, Md.:

My congratulations for the recognition being so deservedly given you this evening by the Animal Welfare Society. Your heroism and kindness in rescuing Rex, Bing, and Sam is an exemplification of the best qualities of true American boyhood.

My commendations also to the individuals and organizations which have taken due note of your noble action.

With sincere best wishes to you for all future success.

JOHN R. FOLEY,
Member of Congress.

Rev. Ralph A. Weatherly, Pastor of Grace
Episcopal Church in Kingston, Pa.,
Announces Plans for Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of Saturday, February 14, 1959:

GRACE RECTOR'S RETIREMENT

The community and the diocese of Bethlehem will share the mixed emotions of Grace Episcopal Church, Kingston, in the wake of the announcement that the Reverend Ralph A. Weatherly will leave the westside charge on October 1. After 41 years in the priesthood of the Episcopal Church, 31 of which were in the service of Grace Church, there will be general agreement he has earned a measure of leisure. The fact that two sons have followed in his footsteps, thus paying him a high compliment, also will have a tendency to modify the normal distress, resulting from the knowledge a notable career is approaching its close.

A North Carolinian by birth and the son of an educator, the Reverend Mr. Weatherly has been at home here for three decades. The community has respected him as a good neighbor and citizen as well as an outstanding churchman. It has been grateful for interest in its welfare, as manifested in many organizations as well as in his church. One who possesses the courage of his convictions, he has never hesitated to make his position clear on issues, in which the public interest was involved. A sense of humor has not been the least of his assets.

The diocese of Bethlehem will miss his counsel and leadership. As chairman of its standing committee, he has occupied a key post, thus making his influence felt far beyond the confines of his congregation.

Greater Wilkes-Barre will wish him well in his future endeavors.

Right on Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am cheered by the fact that certain responsible editors in our country have refused to be buffeted into the jitters by the current war of nerves.

I am glad to see that the editor of the Evening Star in Washington has commended Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, on his recent statements regarding the stupidity of trying to play a missile-by-missile game with the Russians, and the necessity rather for maintaining enough strength to retaliate after the first blow, and in such force that no one will risk making the initial strike.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the article in the February 23 copy of the Star:

RIGHT ON TARGET

Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has scored a direct verbal hit on the heart of the missile controversy.

Addressing a South Carolina audience, the admiral decried any numbers game approach to appraising our missile strength in relation to Russia's. The important thing, he said, is not whether Russia has half as many or twice as many ICBM's as the United States. What is important, so far as discouraging an attack on this country is concerned, is that we maintain enough strength to retaliate after the first blow has been struck, and to retaliate in such force that no one will risk making the initial strike.

Admiral Burke believes we have this retaliatory capacity today and that the Russians know we have it. Furthermore, he says, we can and will retain this retaliatory capability. In his judgment, we should not engage in "an endless arms race with the Soviets in ballistic missiles, any more than we have attempted to race them in numbers of submarines or Army divisions."

The reassuring thing here is Admiral Burke's belief that we have and will retain the capacity to destroy Russia if we are attacked. It is on this point that the current controversy hinges, the administration's critics contending that we lack or will soon lose the essential retaliatory capacity. At bottom, of course, this is a matter of judgment. Admiral Burke could be wrong. But

so could the critics. Admiral Burke is thoroughly competent to judge a matter of this kind, and, despite insinuations that the Chiefs of Staff have been pressured into making soothing statements, we do not believe for a moment that he would make a public speech of this nature unless he fully believed his own words.

Fast-Thinking Sheriff Miller Shows Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in this telephone, radar, and automobile age we constantly think in terms of law enforcement as the FBI, the city police, and the State police.

There are still left some really good law-enforcement people at the sheriff's level. In downstate Illinois we ordinarily look to the sheriff for all of our rural protection.

One of these fine sheriffs in my congressional district is Sheriff Eugene Miller in Douglas County, Tuscola, Ill. He recently pulled off an arrest that would have done credit to Wyatt Earp, Matt Dillon, or any other of the famous old sheriffs that show up on Saturday night's TV. For this fine piece of work the Campaign-Urbana (Ill.) News-Gazette wrote an editorial on last Friday, February 20, 1959, and I herewith append it:

[From the News-Gazette, Feb. 20, 1959]

FAST-THINKING SHERIFF MILLER SHOWS COURAGE

Fast-thinking, quick-acting Douglas County Sheriff Eugene Miller thwarted a wild, dangerous escapee from an Indiana reformatory in what might have ended in a trail of tragedy.

The Douglas sheriff, using his auto as well as his head, interrupted the fleeing desperado's flight at a Decatur intersection by a split-second act of good timing and heroism.

As a result, the crime spree of an Ohio youth, perpetrated at Tuscola and resulting in the terrorizing of three persons and the kidnaping of two men, came to an abrupt end—and a much more fortunate one than might have been, were it not for the fast action and fortitude of an alert law-enforcement officer.

Sheriffs, elected officials, aren't always expert police officers. Their role usually is more that of an administrator than one of an apprehender.

But in the case of this bizarre nighttime chase, starting as a varied chain of events after a young stranger attempted to burglarize a Tuscola store, Sheriff Miller proved himself capable in the best tradition of a public law officer doing his duty when he faced a tough situation, regardless of the personal danger involved.

No sheriff out of the old West, not even on TV, could have performed with more bravery and success in getting his man—and saving possible death or injury to others in the desperado's grasp.

Congratulations, Sheriff Miller, for your competence and your courage.

A Laboring Man Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard and read of labor's influence on its members, both with respect to candidates for political office and recommendations for the enactment of certain legislation.

Few men are willing or are fearful to speak their reactions to such suggestions or pressures. I am submitting, with the writer's permission, a letter which cogently expresses his reaction to the Committee on Political Education directing union members to write to their Congressmen in support of their recommendations. The letter follows:

NAPERVILLE, ILL., February 16, 1959.

Representative ELMER J. HOFFMAN,
Wheaton, Ill.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOFFMAN: Two weeks ago I received the latest issue of the IBEW's Newsletter. Several pages were used to expound COPE's political position, and directing union members to write to their Congressmen in support of their recommendations. I took this newsletter to work and it was discussed over lunch boxes for several days. There were members of various construction trades involved; and not one man was in favor of COPE's recommendations.

The greater majority of the opinion was in complete accord with mine, some of which is as follows:

1. Cut unnecessary expense in the Federal Government by stopping the airport and housing bills that just recently passed the Senate. Follow the ideas presented last year by the Byrd committee report and by Representative GWINN's bill, House Joint Resolution 355.

2. Help smaller corporations and increase tax receipts by cutting corporate tax to around 40 percent from 52 percent. Special consideration to new equipment would help modernize, reducing the many present repair expenses used to circumvent the high tax rate.

3. Collect from those getting facilities and loans for little or nothing. Barge lines get channels and the use of locks at the expense of the taxpayer; truck lines pay only a small share of the extra initial cost and repairs they cause to highways. They should both pay their way, and this would probably help solve the railroad problem as well.

4. Cut unnecessary subsidies. Some few are necessary but the majority are actually harmful to the economy. Farm supports are a glaring example, being inflationary in both Federal and consumer levels, reduces gross national product, and costs billions to maintain.

5. Increase pay of officers and skilled members of our Armed Forces. The reduction in waste and training would more than pay the bill. The increased combat efficiency resulting from some better men staying in would be a pleasant bonus to the taxpayer.

6. Increase appropriations for use in research and development, especially in the fields of nuclear and space equipment. Properly applied, the propaganda and industrial applications would greatly reduce the effective cost. The armed services should all be made stronger but the Titan, Polaris, and Minuteman missiles, atomic missile submarines should be pushed to cut the 1960-63

missile gap, propagandize, and learn what we can to build better in the future.

7. Get the "hard sell" into diplomacy. Let the world know that most of the cold war emergencies are due to the failure of the Russians to keep agreements.

8. Protect the workers, public, and the union movement by adequate legislation. The good unions would not be hurt by the correct laws but the controls applied could limit the racketeers in the unions, keep them from using the money and power of unions for themselves, and in general protect the workers and public. A point of interest: The IBEW claims to spend no money in politics in spite of directing us to write in favor of certain legislation, especially the Kennedy bill, which is too weak to help the workers, and if passed would probably hold up adequate legislation for many years.

Please consider the above in your new position of public trust.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD D. HOLLE.

The Pressing Need for a Community Facilities Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include for the RECORD a talk entitled "The Pressing Need for a Community Facilities Loan Program," made by the Honorable J. F. Crawford, mayor of Abbeville, Ala., during the recent annual meeting of the Alabama League of Municipalities with the Alabama congressional delegation in Washington:

THE PRESSING NEED FOR A COMMUNITY FACILITIES LOAN PROGRAM

(By J. F. Crawford)

In my opinion the community facilities problem is one of the most serious problems facing our communities. Even now the blunt truth is that we are falling behind in our constant efforts to provide the public works and community facilities which our expanding community needs require.

The community facilities problem did not appear overnight—it is a problem which has been brewing for years, and unfortunately it is a problem which will greatly intensify in magnitude in the decade of the 1960's when family formation will skyrocket.

WE DESPERATELY NEED LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS

Our communities desperately need sewer facilities, water facilities, roads, parks, public buildings, hospitals—in other words all of the facilities essential to a growing community.

The mass exodus to the suburbs of our central cities is no temporary phenomenon—it will continue to be with us and will approach a truly sensational rush in the next decade. This, of course, will aggravate the community facilities program still further.

We recognize that these facilities must be paid for and nothing would please us greater than to finance all the facilities we need from local resources. But the plain truth is that our cities are already in difficult financial straits. It is an open fact of life that the Federal Government through the income tax has staked a claim upon the great bulk of tax revenue. There is just nothing new left for us to tax locally.

Put simply, we need these additional facilities and yet we cannot pay for all we need

from current revenue. And another hard fact of life is that we cannot borrow funds to finance our community facilities at a reasonable interest rate and on reasonable terms in the private capital market.

LAST YEAR'S BILL WOULD PROVIDE SOLUTION

We believe that community facilities legislation along the lines of last year's legislation will provide the solution.

If our communities can obtain long-term loans up to 50 years at an interest rate of approximately 3 or 3½ percent I can think of no greater helping hand in assisting us to cope with the community facilities problem. I think also that the very existence of legislation of this kind would help bring down interest rates in the private capital market.

WE HOPE FOR FAVORABLE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

We were most favorably impressed by the forceful and persuasive speech in favor of community facilities legislation recently made by Congressman ALBERT RAINS, one of our great Alabama legislators, before the Annual Convention of the National Association of Home Builders. I understand that he is going to introduce the bill again this year and I am hopeful that the Congress will see the wisdom of his proposed legislation and adopt it. Let's review last year's Rains bill.

In expanding the present community facilities loan program (authorized in the Housing Amendments of 1955) of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, this bill Mr. RAINS introduced last year would provide a fund of \$2 billion for loans to eligible projects. Of this sum \$400 million would constitute a revolving fund, with a provision which would permit proceeds of loans made under the "old program" (the 1955 act) to go into this revolving fund.

The interest rate agreed on by the House Banking and Currency Committee would amount to 2½ percent—the lowest rate practicable to cover the cost of the money to the U.S. Government.

Under the bill a borrowing municipality can specify a loan maturity of 50 years or, if it chooses, a term of shorter duration.

ALL CITIES COULD PARTICIPATE

Who is eligible to borrow this money? While smaller communities will be among the principal beneficiaries of the program, the bill removes priorities in existing law and extends eligibility without regard to population size. The unemployment problem is general throughout the country, affecting cities of all population ranges, and it is our belief that the economic stimulant of this loan program should be available to all entities of local government, from the smallest to the largest. At the same time we recognize the crying need for such projects as last year's bill would permit—from the town square to the largest metropolitan municipal center.

TYPE OF PROJECTS ELIGIBLE

What kind of projects could be undertaken? Under existing law, priority is given to applications involving the construction of basic public works, such as water works and sewer systems. Realizing that this priority system excluded many worthwhile and important community projects which could be started at once if liberal loans were available, the Rains bill spelled out the eligible projects.

It would permit loans for:

- (1) The construction, repair and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports and other public transportation facilities.
- (2) Public parks and other public recreational facilities.
- (3) Public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers, public nursing homes and public convalescent homes.
- (4) Public refuse and garbage disposal facilities, water, sewage and sanitary facilities as well as other public utility facilities.

POLICE AND FIRE FACILITIES

(5) Public police and fire protection facilities; civil defense needs; public wholesale farm produce markets, public libraries and offices and other public buildings (other than schools), and public land, water and timber conservation facilities.

(6) In addition the bill would allow loans to nonprofit hospitals to finance specific projects for hospital construction, repair or improvement.

I hope this review of the importance of a community facilities loan program will serve to point up its importance to Alabama cities and towns—small and large.

Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell at Lincoln Day Banquet, Middlesex Republican Club, Boston, Mass., February 12, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Middlesex Republican Club of Massachusetts, the oldest Republican organization in the United States, was honored to have Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell deliver the principal address at its Lincoln Day banquet in Boston on February 12, 1959. He spoke, in part, as follows:

Lincoln Day has always been a challenging one for Republicans, for it brings vividly to mind the first principles of that great President, and commands us to measure our actions against them.

This day is one for frank talk.

And I am going to talk frankly to you this evening.

We must face facts in the same way that Mr. Catton's brilliant oration has told us that Lincoln faced them.

Lincoln knew that victory, to be meaningful, had to be of the people—by a party that showed clearly that it was for the people—all of the people.

In the same way, if we are to win in 1960—and we can win in 1960—it must also be a triumph by the people and in their interest.

There is no greater issue upon which Republicanism stands more solidly with all Americans than that of personal freedom—in the field of personal rights, in the field of labor-management practices, in the field of sympathetic social legislation that recognizes the need for local initiative and responsibility, in the field of fiscal management, in the harmony and balance of big and small governments.

The President who wrote the Emancipation Proclamation and signed the Homestead Act did leave behind him, alive and enduring in this party, a veneration for personal rights, and a determination that they shall be protected.

The dignity of the free human being and the majesty of the free human will exercising its own decisions—whether in the person of a Negro voter in Atlanta, a labor union member in Detroit, a small businessman in Los Angeles, a farmer in Iowa—is the central cause of Republicanism. It always has been, since Lincoln, it still is under President Eisenhower, and it will continue to be under the next Republican President in 1960.

It is because of our philosophy of personal rights that Republicans often find themselves at variance with the political philosophy

phies that cluster together under the expandable label of Democratic.

Obviously, the most direct application of the principles of Abraham Lincoln is in the area of civil rights, the rights proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitution.

Some Americans are now being denied these personal rights. Reason and moderation demand that this denial be brought to an end with all deliberate speed.

This is the law of the land, and the requirement of a regard to human dignity.

We seek the support of all Americans who agree with us that none of us is secure in our rights while a single American is denied his rights.

They either exist for all or they do not exist for any, for long. Lincoln reminded us that no nation can endure that is only partly free. This job is not yet finished; it is ours to complete his work.

But, first, we must make certain that our meaning is clear to all the people. This means straightforward and honest campaigns not obscured with issues secondary to that of personal freedom. And it means good candidates.

Good candidates are essential.

Also essential are the precinct workers behind them. The recruit-now-for-'60 program, aimed at enlisting 2 million more precinct workers for the 1960 campaign, is underway.

This party is already on the move to victory.

In this undertaking, too, Lincoln sets the example.

His was defeated in 1858. We were defeated in 1958. He achieved victory in 1860. What can he tell us?

He offered affirmative programs.

Looking over an America gripped in the most terrible dilemma it has ever faced, he affirmed the fact that personal rights precede comfort or expediency.

He stood up, and against the counsel of fear, he asserted the fact that right makes might.

And we, how do we look to America?

Lincoln, in defeat, got his strength to go forward from a belief in personal rights. We can do the same.

How does a respect for personal rights, for human dignity, affect our decisions of today?

First, it requires a courageous determination to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar. Holding the line against inflation means holding the line against governmental extravagance. It means refusing to give way before political pressures. It means creating a stable value in the wages and salaries we earn, so Americans can plan ahead. Insurance policies, pension funds, savings must be protected against those who would drive down the value of the dollar by driving up the rate of Federal expenditure. This takes courage. Pressure groups won't like it. But the growth of our economy must have a firm foundation, a foundation which assures that the American wage earner will be able to plan for a secure future.

Second, it requires that we help the labor movement rid itself of the gangsters and hoodlums who stamp down the personal rights of union members.

Third, it requires that we help all our citizens to equal opportunity for employment and advancement.

Fourth, it requires protecting equally and fairly all persons at work in an industrial economy.

Fifth, it requires helping all our citizens to make use of their right to vote.

Sixth, it requires support for President Eisenhower's policy of encouraging the States and local communities to take full responsibility for protecting those rights of all citizens which are not national concern.

Ours is not a narrow objective—we do not seek to build a fence of favors around the undue influence of some parts of our society. Rights are universal, and our approach to them is also as wide as American opportunity.

It was this approach that extended unemployment insurance to 4 million additional workers, and social security to 10 million more men and women—and began the largest public improvement ever undertaken, the highway program.

It was this approach that granted the largest tax cut in our history in 1954 and created the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

This approach raised the standard of living in this country to an all-time high, fostered an economy that has brought personal income, wages and profits to new and expansive levels.

This approach has established a new agency for aviation, and a new agency for outer space.

Republicanism has been a positive and virile force in this country but sometimes I think we are trying to keep it a secret.

There are new and grave problems ahead of us in the fields of education, of defense, of international strength, of labor-management relations.

These things are the concern of most Americans, and they are seeking the right answers.

We have a proud record and we have a proud opportunity ahead. In looking toward 1960, and beyond, we must remember that as Republicans, our tradition demands that veneration for the personal rights of all the people—high or low, white or black, urban or rural, rich or poor—that inspired Lincoln and has animated all our party in its finest hours.

That veneration determines our approach to the solution of any national problem, whether in education, politics, business or anywhere else.

We have the positive program.

We have the best way to a new and better America.

Let our opponents, grouped haphazardly together for mutual self-advantage, paint the distorted pictures and use the distorted facts and plaster us with distorted labels—this fact will stand out.

When it comes to personal rights for all Americans, no Republican owes a debt—political, financial, or moral—to any one group, any one faction, any one system or organization. The compromises are all on their side. The implied promise and the part performance is all theirs.

In this respect, we are the majority. We are America. And in 1960 our triumph, like Lincoln's, will be a victory for personal rights, and for the popular confidence of Americans in the party that respects these rights as inalienable.

But keep this in mind—to win, we must deserve to win.

Thank you.

Lithuania's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the

Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Evening News of February 16, 1959:

LITHUANIA'S CHALLENGE

The free world today observed Lithuanian Independence Day, although this Baltic country has been absorbed by the Soviet Union and freedom has disappeared there. Be that as it may, today's celebration is fully justified as a reminder that, so far as the United States is concerned officially and all who love liberty above life are concerned, Lithuania still exists and the hope is one day it will throw off the yoke of Communist oppression and take its rightful place in the family of nations.

It was on February 16, 1918, that Lithuania emerged from the bondage of czarist Russia after 123 years. There followed 22 precious years of independence. Then in 1940, the hapless country, with its neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, was overwhelmed by Red Russia and 19 years of slavery and tyranny ensued with thousands in exile and unspeakable hardships visited on the survivors.

But the struggle for freedom goes on in the name of Lithuania. Much to the chagrin of the gang in Moscow, Lithuanian Independence Day is observed annually without fail to remind the Kremlin that it has not succeeded in its purpose although it dominates the scene by force and also to remind the world of Soviet perfidy as well as Lithuania's legitimate aspirations.

An enslaved Lithuania points an accusing finger at Nikita Khrushchev as it did at Joseph Stalin. And it will at Khrushchev's successor if Lithuania does not attain its aspirations in the meantime. For this struggle can have only one ending—the liberation of Lithuania.

Freedom always wins the last battle and it will in the case of Lithuania. Sometimes, the conflict is long and costly, but the outcome is inevitable. It took 123 years before freedom triumphed in Lithuania over czarist Russia; the hope will be that the waiting period will be reduced considerably in the case of dethroning the Reds. In view of the developing crisis, the climax may come sooner than generally anticipated.

Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Several of the major features of this bill include: An increase in retirement and survivor annuities and pensions by 10 percent; an increase in unemployment benefits rates, and an extension of unemployment benefits periods beyond the 130 days allowed by present laws; and a reduction from 65 to 62 in the age at which spouses and women employees may receive annuities at a reduced rate.

The Railroad Retirement Act has been a great boon to the railroad people of this country, providing well deserved security in the years after they have left active railroad service. However, this legislation is now in need of amendment to keep it in tune with the times.

It is well known that in periods of rising prices such as we have had over the past few years, that persons on fixed incomes are most severely hurt. The increases granted to retired railroad employees have not kept pace with the increases in the cost of living.

I believe that this bill will provide the necessary liberalization in railroad retirement provisions and railroad unemployment insurance while, at the same time, by alterations in the financing of these benefits, insure the continuance of the program on a sound financial basis.

Two Senators Put Berlin Focus Where It Should Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the main issue in Berlin is not a city, but whether the West will hold its correct moral and legal position, or will yield to intimidation and thereby start the collapse of world collective security.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release on this vital subject: [Release from General Features Corp., Feb. 23, 1959]

TWO SENATORS PUT BERLIN FOCUS WHERE IT SHOULD BE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Two U.S. Senators have skillfully brought the Berlin debate back to the central issue and cut short the efforts of other Senators who, in the name of flexibility, have confused it.

The two are JACOB JAVITS, of New York, Republican, and THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, Democrat. The issue is whether the United States, Britain, and France, with West Germany's backing, are going to be bluffed into yielding something by Nikita Khrushchev's Berlin threat or are going resolutely to call the bluff—and seek to benefit by it.

Specifically, the two Senators have introduced separate resolutions calling upon the Allies to stand firm at Berlin and to negotiate the future of Germany with the Russians, rather than bringing the two Germans together in separate negotiations. For the latter would mean, as Senator JAVITS correctly insisted, that West Germany would be lost. In an inspired burst, the Republican also suggested that the U.S. Senate delegate seven of its Members to be present in West Berlin on May 27, the day when the Soviet ultimatum expires, to dare the Russians to come and take it.

Whether the Senate acts on either resolution is dubious. Neither sponsor is a member of the exclusive Senate Committee on Foreign Relations whose members generally succeed in keeping these all-important matters strictly within the family. But the committee is now pretty well dominated by such champions of flexibility as Democrats FULBRIGHT and MANFIELD (whose recent plan for a German settlement shocked our firm friend Chancellor Adenauer) and Republican WILEY.

Now none of the Senators mentioned opposes more negotiations as such. During the last few years, partisans of flexibility have

persuaded the free peoples that peace through negotiations with the Russians should be possible in the near future since neither side wants war. Even those who believe that each negotiation inevitably strengthens the Communists and weakens the West feel obliged to go along.

But Senators JAVITS and DODD, backed by KEATING, of New York, and MORTON, of Kentucky, want to be sure that any coming negotiations do not undercut the Allies' right to keep West Berlin independent and accessible and that the West does not start by giving Khrushchev any of the things he wants.

For the debate in the United States on German policy is being held against the background of two things—Khrushchev's reiterated threat of war if the Allies insist on maintaining their rights and Prime Minister Macmillan's visit to Moscow.

Khrushchev has obviously been encouraged by the readiness of such Americans and Britishers to negotiate in the name of peace. The more the Allies hurry to get a meeting with Moscow before the expiration of Khrushchev's ultimatum, the more the Russian must believe that his intimidation is succeeding.

To be sure, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have so far stood firm on the central issue—no concessions on Berlin—and the President has warned that Khrushchev will have to shoot first. If they had simply said "nuts" to Khrushchev and waited for him to ask for a four-power meeting, there would have been no confusion. But their desire also to appear flexible, has apparently reassured Nikita that by threat he can at least obtain something.

Macmillan's quick offer to visit Russia must further have convinced the Kremlin that it has nothing to fear and something to gain by intransigence and more big talk.

In short, this Berlin sparring is just another revelation of the situation of the West ever since President Eisenhower at the summit meeting in 1955 assured the Soviets that far from seeking to regain what it has lost, the United States will act only in self-defense. That permanently leaves the initiative with the Russians for they have nothing to fear so long as they do not actually start shooting. (And the lack of American reaction to their cold-blooded destruction of the unarmed American plane may have fathered the thought that minor shooting on their part will be permitted.)

It is hard to see how, if the Soviets persist in aggression, they can fail to gain by it. For pure defense never yet won any kind of a struggle.

A Giant Among Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JESSICA WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, to a man, the great leaders of this Congress have already risen to pay their final respects to the memory of Dan Reed, and there is nothing that I, as a newcomer to Congress, can hope to add to what they have already said. The men and women who knew him longest and best have eloquently attested to his greatness, and to their everlasting respect and affection for him, and no greater tribute could be paid any man.

He has made his indelible mark upon all of us, and nothing could be said which

would add to the stature of Dan Reed, but I do want his wife and family to know that all of us share with them the deepest kind of regret.

Dan Reed was, very simply, a great and good man—strong, courageous, dedicated, kind. Men of his mettle do not come our way in every generation, and his place here will be exceedingly hard to fill.

Programs and Actions of Congress Vitrally Affect Towns and Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include for the RECORD a talk entitled "Programs and Actions of Congress Vitrally Affect Towns and Cities," made by the Honorable M. N. Brown, mayor of Enterprise, Ala., who is president of the Alabama League of Municipalities, during that organization's recent annual meeting in Washington with the Alabama congressional delegation: PROGRAMS AND ACTIONS OF CONGRESS VITALLY AFFECT TOWNS AND CITIES

(By M. N. (Jug) Brown)

On behalf of the full membership of the Alabama League of Municipalities—the 255 towns and cities it represents—I want to express grateful appreciation to the congressional delegation for granting us this opportunity to appear before you to discuss the municipal interest in 20-odd areas of congressional activity.

There has never been a time when a close and effective relationship between the Federal Government and the communities of the Nation was more important than at the present. There are many reasons for this, not the least being the failure of the States to move in and extend a helping hand to the municipalities as they struggle to meet the challenge of the times by providing adequate community services and facilities for the major part of the Nation's population. The cities and towns have been practically deserted by their parent governments—the States. They have been left alone as far as the States are concerned and in effect told to "root hog or die." But, the Federal Government has been much more aware of municipal needs and the Congress has stepped in and provided programs that have literally saved our towns and cities from utter and complete decay. We are grateful to the Alabama congressional delegation for the very important role it has played in this development.

FACTORS THAT CAUSE FEDERAL-MUNICIPAL PROGRAMS TO BE NECESSARY

One may inquire as to why the States have neglected the needs of the cities and towns—the places where an overwhelming part of the country's population lives. Continued rural domination of State legislatures is the chief though not the sole reason. Unequal representation in State legislatures has held back municipal progress. Opposition from large and powerful business groups to progressive legislative measures needed to enable our towns and cities to progress and grow is another handicap we

have faced. The same groups that bombard Congress week after week in an effort to defeat sound Federal-local programs are the ones that hang around the State legislatures in clusters to lobby against public interest programs considered there. Their influence, in controlling legislative policy in the States is considerably greater than their ability to prevent Congress from enacting sound and workable programs designed to help our local communities to grow and become stronger.

They shout "return government back to the States" but at the State level they would bring every possible pressure to bear to see that programs now operated jointly by the Federal and municipal governments never get the State assistance they would have to have were the Federal Government to drop out of the picture as far as financial support is concerned.

The inadequacy of the revenue-raising powers of the municipalities is so great that without outside assistance few, if any, towns and cities could carry on decent services and programs so much needed today by local citizens and businesses.

The competition between the States and their municipalities for revenues to support their services is much greater than would ever be the case between the Federal and the State governments. The overwhelming share of the cost of the State of Alabama's five major publicly supported programs comes from the Federal Government. Not one dime of State assistance goes into the operation and maintenance of the five major services and programs of the city and town governments of our State.

SUMMARY OF OUR INTEREST IN FEDERAL-LOCAL PROGRAMS

We hope you'll bear in mind, as the mayors who follow me to this witness table testify, that the partnership between the Federal Government, on one hand, and the municipal governments, on the other, is enabling our Nation to become stronger and better able to serve the daily governmental needs of all our people. The continuation of these 20-odd Federal-municipal programs are much more important than pleasing the propagandists of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Let me also remind you that if Congress had listened through the years to these big-business groups, our country would not today have thousands of federally supported National Guard armories, public hospitals, the social security program, the great Tennessee Valley Authority. No, and we would not have the Federal-aid airport program, the water-pollution control program, public housing, or urban renewal. We would still be in the horse-and-buggy days as far as effective and serviceable government is concerned.

My colleagues here will summarize our interest in—

- (1) The airport-construction program; (2) the urban interest in the Federal-aid highway program; (3) a strong civil defense program; (4) the need for continued regulation of natural-gas wellhead prices; (5) traffic safety measures before the Congress; (6) the need for continuing the water-pollution control program; (7) low-rent public housing; (8) need for an expanded urban-renewal program; (9) need for assistance to depressed areas; (10) the value of Federal planning assistance to our cities and towns; (11) the urgency of enacting legislation to make possible a community facilities' loan program; (12) proposed laws affecting municipal bonds; (13) the TVA self-financing legislation; (14) assistance to public libraries; (15) waterways development; (16) legislation affecting school programs; (17) legislation affecting intergovernmental relationships; (18) hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act; (19) the social secu-

rity program and its coverage of municipal employees; (20) miscellaneous bills now pending before the Congress.

Let me again thank you for the interest and time that you give us as we present some municipal viewpoints on the several Federal-municipal programs I have listed. I know my fellow mayors will be glad to answer any questions about these programs as we submit testimony during the time we spend here with you.

Speaking as president of the League of Municipalities, I want to generously praise you for the great job you do for Alabama and her people, and especially for the support and help you give the municipal governments and their officials from day to day. I am proud of the reputation you have across the country as being the greatest urban-minded delegation in the entire Congress of the United States.

Remarks by Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson, to the Grand Masters of Masonry, Hotel Statler, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, February 24, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address made by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, to the Grand Masters of Masonry, in Washington on February 24, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, there is no member of the President's Cabinet who is more highly respected, admired, or in whom the Congress and the public have more confidence than Mr. Robert B. Anderson. Those of us who have worked with Mr. Anderson throughout his years of service as the Secretary of the Navy, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and now Secretary of the Treasury, regard him as a dedicated American. In his present position of world service, freedom-loving people look to him for leadership. He is fulfilling their hopes and aspirations.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ROBERT B. ANDERSON

Over 300 years ago, Francis Bacon made this statement: "The true and lawful goal of the sciences is simply this, that human life be enriched by new discoveries and powers."

Bacon was pleading with the scientists of his day to use their skills in improving the ordinary conditions of living. This was a radical suggestion for his time. The new world was just opening up; the compass and the printing press were just beginning to have their incalculable influence in enlarging not only man's physical surroundings but the larger creative environment in which new discoveries can take place.

Yet how cramped a world this seems compared with our own.

We live in a period of great international tension—yet it is a period also of unparalleled inventiveness and achievement. The scientists of today have made it possible for us to believe that sources of energy are avail-

able which can in time replace most human toil. For the first time in history, there is a possibility that conditions permitting the full exercise of man's creative abilities can be realized for the many, not just for the few.

A great deal has been said about the need to accomplish greater brotherhood of mankind. Our own order is dedicated to this principle. But translated into real terms, brotherhood begins with improvement in the conditions of living. It begins with getting help to people where they need it.

For help of this sort to be effective it must be adapted to differences in cultural backgrounds as well as in the material conditions of living. We must give frank and honest recognition to dissimilarities in customs, history, philosophy, and religion. We must think in terms of minimizing differences—however sharp they may seem on the surface—and maximizing common interests.

I believe it is a little easier to do this if we remember that our own culture is to a very large extent a borrowed one. The mathematics we use today to send a satellite into space had its beginning long ago in Egypt, in Persia, in Greece. Our art, our music, the body of science we build on, all came initially from others.

We have also been givers. Not only our great proponents of freedom and democracy, but Edison, Morse, Kettering, Einstein, Salk, and many other but less well-known Americans have helped change the conditions of life throughout the world. With all that we have given in the past, however, our greatest opportunity may be now, when the aspirations of millions of people to live better are finding tangible expression in many areas for the first time.

During the past 15 years 700 million people in 20 countries have won political independence. But this is not enough. Brotherhood among men is laudable as an ideal. To be meaningful it must be translated into terms of understandable reality. Though much remains to be done the record of our Government and our people has been a commendable one. I should like to illustrate this first by telling you a story—a true story about a little village in India which I visited last fall, in connection with my participation in the international monetary conferences being held in New Delhi.

This village was the site of a foreign assistance project, sponsored and financed by an American nonprofit institution. There were no impressive structures in the village. There were two Americans giving technical assistance. A team of bullocks was slowly moving around in a circle turning a large arm. Each turn produced 1,600 revolutions in the apparatus which generated electricity—sufficient for one light in each house at night, and for power during the day to run a small woodworking plant employing 50 people.

The same bullock-powered equipment pumped water into pipes which ran along the streets of the village with a tap in front of each house. For thousands of years, the villagers had traveled long distances for water. Now, they could step outside the door and draw water whenever they needed it. Moreover, the excess water went into a reservoir and was sufficient to irrigate 50 acres of land. By means of a simple mechanism thought up by an American agricultural specialist, the village had taken its first steps toward the twentieth century. Here surely is the place where emphasis should be put—at the point where people can be given the means of helping themselves through bettering actual living conditions in their own communities.

The technical assistance programs now in progress are, of course, of many different kinds and are carried on under many different national and international auspices.

In every case, the projects are joint operations with the countries concerned. The United States and U.S. technicians, however, have been in the forefront of all of the efforts during the postwar period to help people lift themselves above the level of a bare struggle for existence and into a situation where backbreaking toil does not constitute the whole of living. While there are honest differences of opinion as to scope and detail, I would like to mention a few efforts of our Nation in helping other nations of the world.

Closely allied to the technical assistance programs have been the programs for cultural exchange. These are performing the immensely important service of making possible person-to-person contacts between people of different countries. Through scholarships and exchange of personnel, through on-the-job help when it is most needed, technical assistance and cultural exchange together are probably achieving the most practical results which up to now have been devised for promoting greater well-being among the nations of the free world.

For long-range stability and improvement in standards of living in the less developed countries, however, there must be substantial capital investment extending over a period of years. There must be transportation facilities, powerplants, harbor installations, and industrial equipment of many varieties. Our Government has been a leader throughout the postwar period in the establishment and support of financial institutions providing long-term developmental funds of this type.

The Export-Import Bank, set up by this country in the thirties, has continued since the war to provide financing for the export of American equipment for industrial purposes of many different kinds. In recent years its loans have been largely concentrated in Latin America and Asia.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, formed at the end of the war by the allied countries under our leadership, provides financing for long-run investment programs of various types when private investment is not available on reasonable terms. Recently, the Bank has devoted its funds primarily to assisting economic development in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, contributing enormously to economic development in these areas. The International Bank has had no losses on its loans.

We are hoping that the Congress will promptly authorize the increased subscription to the International Bank proposed in the President's message of February 12. These subscriptions require no cash outlays. The subscriptions to the capital stock of the Banks constitute a contingent liability of all the member governments to meet the obligations of the Bank. In this way the Bank is able to secure adequate loan funds at reasonable rates of interest in the open market.

The President's message of February 12 also proposed to increase our quota in the International Monetary Fund, a companion organization of the International Bank. This institution makes short-term advances to its members in order to facilitate the exchange stability which is an essential condition of healthy international trade.

Unlike the International Bank, the Fund requires outlays on the part of the member countries on a quota basis—one-fourth payable in gold, and the remainder payable in non-interest-bearing securities of the member country. The Fund's activities have grown and have become increasingly effective. To fulfill its obligations properly under conditions of expanding world trade, an increase in the quotas of member countries is imperative. We hope for prompt action on this request also.

The Development Loan Fund, established by the United States, has further assisted economic development by making loans to

both governments and private business when a given project cannot obtain financing from the other institutions or from private capital sources. In some cases, the loans granted by this Fund are repayable in the borrower's own currency.

Discussion is now going on within our Government and with foreign countries exploring the desirability of establishing an International Development Association which would be an affiliate of the International Bank. This institution would supplement the functions of the bank by providing loans for development which could not be financed on hard currency repayment terms. It would also permit members with accumulations of nonconvertible currencies, to use their accumulations for constructive loan purposes.

In addition to the programs already mentioned, we are engaged at the present time in negotiations with the countries of Latin America, looking toward the establishment of an inter-American banking institution which would assist economic development in the countries of this hemisphere.

There have been other important governmental programs which could be mentioned. One which was of immense importance to the free world was the Marshall plan for aid to the devastated countries of Western Europe, shortly after the close of World War II.

Through our timely assistance and through their own efforts, the Western European countries were not only able to get back on their feet, they have since come to enjoy a higher standard of living and a better level of production than ever before. Likewise, countries in Asia—many of them newly established as independent nations—have been assisted in their efforts to improve living conditions, to put their economies on a going basis, and to resist aggression.

Still another program which has paid large dividends in human terms has been our plan for exporting part of our agricultural surplus. Under this program, payment for the goods we send overseas can be made in local currencies, thus permitting countries in need of food and certain other agricultural products to benefit from our abundance, even though they may lack dollar exchange.

The story of America's assistance to other countries has and should continue to emphasize the tremendously important role played by American private capital during the past 15 years and in the years ahead. This capital has aided resources for economic growth in other countries. It has brought to these countries a high degree of technical and managerial skill which they lacked. It has contributed to the development of export industries which provide the means for purchasing needed goods from our own country and from elsewhere.

American business today has investments abroad valued at about \$40 billion. Each year there has been a movement of capital from the United States to other countries. For the last 3 years, this annual outflow has been at the rate of about \$4 billion a year.

Under present world conditions, private investment faces real difficulties. These stem from frequent political instability, the threat of aggression, and subversion in some foreign countries, and the obstacles to capital investment in areas where economic conditions are unstable and relatively less advanced. For these reasons our Government has tried to assist the expansion of private investment through such devices as tax treaties and guarantees against the inconvertibility of earnings and the risk of confiscation or possible loss from war.

Private capital is a stern analyst. Even with the encouragement of our Government, private investment is made principally in those countries which are willing to compete for it by the establishment of sound fiscal policies, adequate protection, and the recognition of the right of capital to earn. Both the Government and private organizations are continuing to have a major role in pro-

moting the spread of capital and thus insuring better economic conditions in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Our Government has also had to provide military assistance. This is in our own interest, as well as in the interest of friendly nations threatened with aggression. Without help, the Soviets would have had a clear road for the pursuit of their program of world domination. I need mention only the Near East and you will understand what I mean.

One of the favorite themes of Communist propaganda is the supposed concern of Communist dictatorships for human beings and their welfare. The Western nations who are leaders of the free world must continue to bring out the true facts with respect to these claims.

To do this we have only to note what has actually happened when a country has fallen under Communist control.

In Soviet Russia, the aristocracy of the Communist Party has been substituted for the aristocracy of the czar. There are some 200 million people in the U.S.S.R. Out of this number there are something like 5 or 6 million Communist Party members. These 5 or 6 million are ruled by a bare handful of dictatorial leaders, and these leaders are subject essentially to the orders of one man.

From China, we are told that the Communist regime has devoted itself to furthering the advancement of man. But what has it done in fact?

Families have been ruthlessly torn apart. Vast numbers of people have been herded into communes, without the slightest effort to obtain their consent.

We hear the Communists speak of the people's rights under their form of government. But there are no free elections, in any meaningful sense of the term. There is no free press. There is no freedom of belief. There is no freedom of choice to work. Human resources are regimented for production as if they were so many tons of steel or coal.

The Communists also like to refer in their propaganda to their respect for the rights of other nations. But we cannot erase from our minds the tragic fate of the Baltic Republics, of Bulgaria, of Hungary, of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of East Germany. All of these peoples have lost the right to direct their own destinies. When they have tried to reassert that right, they have been cruelly suppressed. We cannot ignore the threats of subversion in other countries.

In contrast, our country has moved steadily forward since the close of World War II to further the brotherhood of man. Our most valued export is still, as it has been throughout our history, the concept of freedom and humanity for which our Nation stands. We can be rightly proud that the first postage stamps issued by the Republic of Indonesia turned out to bear the portraits of Washington, Lincoln, Franklin, and Hamilton, side by side with the founders of the new Republic. But we can also be proud of the countless ways in which our sharing of know-how, capital, and just plain friendliness during recent years has helped strengthen the basis of fellowship and understanding throughout the free world. This is brotherhood in action.

Poison in Your Water—No. 15

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Winston-Salem, N.C.,

Twin City Sentinel on February 18, 1958, describing pollution in Rockingham County of that lovely State.

Those who doubt the evils of pollution should contemplate this situation which is repeated in State and county after State and county all across the United States.

This is the water we drink.

One of the real things which this Congress and the United States has done to clean up this horrible situation has been the enactment of Public Law 660 in the 84th Congress. Under that law grants were made to municipalities across this country of up to \$45 million a year on a matching basis.

The progress made because of this legislation has enabled us for the first time to keep pace with the population growth in this country and to actually catch up very slightly on the filth and pollution which we dump into our streams.

During this Congress the President cut the amount of grants under this program by reducing the budget request from the full \$45 million to only \$20 million. This strikes a tremendous blow at the program.

It is my hope that the House will consider this article and use it and others which I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the basis for appropriating the full \$45 million authorized under Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress.

TWELVE TOWNS, FIRMS POLLUTE STREAMS (By Gene Whitman)

The State stream sanitation committee listed a dozen Rockingham County towns and industrial firms today as significant pollution sources in the Roanoke River Basin.

It identified Draper, Leaksville, Madison, Mayodan, Reidsville, Spray, and Stoneville in Rockingham, and Walnut Cove across the line in Stokes, as communities which have insufficient sewage treatment, or none at all.

It listed Fieldcrest Mills at Draper, Leaksville, and Spray, Leaksville Woolen Mills, Inc., at Spray, and Washington Mills Co. at Mayodan as industrial polluters. Other towns and firms further east were listed.

The cities and industrial firms are expected to advise the division of water pollution control of the State board of health within 60 days whether they contemplate voluntary action to abate the pollution and apply for a temporary permit.

COULD CONTINUE

Under the temporary permit, they would be allowed to continue discharging wastes into the streams under a satisfactory time schedule for building adequate treatment facilities.

The North Carolina policy is not to start enforcement action if satisfactory compliance from the towns and industries is obtained voluntarily.

There was no estimate of the money which will be required to treat the sewage and industrial wastes. The committee suggested that towns and their industries get together on treatment plans, if possible.

Committee conclusions on the pollution and the steps needed to abate it included:

Draper: A system expected to serve 3,500 persons discharges sewage without treatment. A treatment plant should be built as soon as possible.

Leaksville: A system collecting sewage from an estimated 5,000 provides no treatment. A plant should be built as soon as possible.

TWO SEPTIC TANKS

Madison: Sewage from approximately 1,200 flows through two septic tanks that are grossly overloaded. A secondary treatment plant should be built as soon as possible.

Mayodan: A municipal sewage system serves an estimated 2,000 and receives domestic sewage from Washington Mills. A small intermediate treatment plant is overloaded and not properly operated and maintained. It should be either enlarged or replaced.

Reidsville: Sewage from a plant serving about 4,000 is discharged into the Roanoke basin, increasing the coliform bacteria. No further physical improvements are indicated at present, but the city should begin planning to enlarge its facilities or pump the wastes into its new plant for treatment.

Spray: The sewage system collecting wastes from an estimated 5,000 provides no treatment. Proper treatment facilities should be built as soon as possible.

Stoneville: A sewage system serves an estimated 530 and gives both primary and secondary treatment, but needed repairs and alterations should be provided.

Walnut Cove: The sewage system serves only about 566 people—a small portion of the town. A primary treatment plant is overloaded and some sewage is discharged without treatment. The town should consider extending its sewer lines into areas not now served and providing treatment in a single plant.

Fieldcrest Mills, Draper: Sewage from each mill is given partial treatment in a septic tank, then discharged into the river; treatment equal to secondary treatment should be provided.

Fieldcrest Mills, Leaksville: Sanitary sewage, dye house and finishing wastes are discharged without treatment. Facilities should be built, providing the equivalent of secondary treatment.

Fieldcrest Mills, Spray: Sanitary sewage, dye house and finishing wastes are discharged without treatment. Facilities should be built, providing the equivalent of secondary treatment.

Leaksville Woolen Mills, Spray: Sanitary sewage and a small amount of industrial waste are discharged without treatment. If the town of Spray will not accept waste, the company should determine the most practical method of treatment.

Washington Mills Co., Mayodan: Overflow sanitary bleach and dye wastes are discharged without treatment. They should be treated prior to discharge.

Rev. Joseph J. Losieniecki, New Pastor of St. Hedwig's Church, Kingston, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Evening News of February 12, 1959:

ST. HEDWIG'S NEW PASTOR

The Reverend Joseph J. Losieniecki, new pastor of St. Hedwig's Church, Kingston, one of the leading charges in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Scranton for Americans of Polish extraction, is no stranger to the community.

A brother of the Right Reverend Monsignor W. A. Losieniecki, pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Maternity, Wilkes-Barre, the Reverend Father Losieniecki devoted 26 of his 43 years in the priesthood to the Park Avenue Parish his brother now serves and to St. Joseph's Church, Wyoming. He has labored at Greenwood in Lackawanna County the past 17 years.

A reputation as a devout churchman and excellent administrator precedes him to the West Side parish where he succeeds the late Reverend Paul Kopicki and the late Reverend James E. Gryczka, whose name was identified with St. Hedwig's for four decades.

In all the parishes in which he served and in local Polish circles, the Reverend Father Losieniecki has been known for his warm personality and even disposition. His ready smile, unfailing cheerfulness, and infinite patience have won for him a legion of friends.

Members of St. Hedwig's Parish are fortunate to have a clergyman of his qualifications as their spiritual guide. He will be an asset to Greater Wilkes-Barre as well.

Juvenile Delinquency Control

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill H.R. 3464, entitled the "Juvenile Delinquency Control Projects Act."

Every year the problem of youthful lawbreakers grows more serious. Every year we are confronted by a barrage of articles in popular and scholarly magazines about what should be done to stop juvenile delinquency. Every year a large number of bills is introduced suggesting action by the Federal Government to help States and communities solve this appalling problem.

During the last Congress, the subcommittee on special education of the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I have the honor to be chairman, held extended hearings on the general subject of juvenile delinquency.

Many of the Nation's outstanding leaders in the field of youth work testified before our committee. They strongly agreed that we need to know far more than we do at present about the causes of delinquency, the effectiveness of present methods of treatment and control, and development of new ways of handling juveniles who go against society.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Mr. Speaker, my bill provides for this. It provides \$5 million a year for 5 years to pay part of the cost of projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Projects may be proposed by States or other public or nonprofit private organizations.

Such projects would be evaluated by a National Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency consisting of 12 recognized authorities in professional or technical

fields related to juvenile delinquency and members of the general public.

The Advisory Committee will make recommendations on the projects to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This bill provides for demonstration projects. We expect that projects approved under the bill will be of an action-research nature—that is, actual field trials of methods and techniques in controlling delinquency.

The bill requires complete reporting of results. The Secretary is directed to disseminate any significant findings on juvenile delinquency control as soon as they occur. He is also directed, at the end of the 5-year period, to make a complete evaluation of how knowledge about juvenile delinquency has been advanced by all the projects taken together. In the interim, the Secretary is to make annual reports of his actions on the recommendations of the National Advisory Council, and to submit to Congress recommendations about the administration of the act or further legislation he thinks desirable.

PROPOSED PROJECTS

Mr. Speaker, as an illustration of the results we might expect from this bill, let me recount a few examples of projects suggested by witnesses before our committee:

A former Commissioner of Social Security would like to prove what one or more good, well-trained probation officers can do with juvenile offenders.

The chief of a State child welfare bureau wants to demonstrate what could be done by working thoroughly through the schools, where early truancy and misbehavior often spell future trouble but where understaffed faculties can do little about it.

The director of a private welfare agency thinks they could learn how to perform their present services more efficiently.

A prominent psychiatrist favors a detailed study of one segment of a city to identify pre-delinquent children.

A former Chief of the U.S. Children's Bureau would like to see cities of different sizes experiment on different methods of how to train police for work with juveniles and different methods of organizing police bureaus.

A training school superintendent thinks the ingredients of the personality of adults who are able to influence youths to go straight could be identified.

A State youth control official wants to change one of his training schools to a therapeutic community with high grade social workers to try to work changes in attitudes among those committed.

A correctional official hopes to perfect techniques to identify the few truly dangerous psychotic personalities among the thousands of juveniles he screens for probation, because he is scared to death he may miss one.

EXPECTED RESULTS

Mr. Speaker, I think we can expect significant results from a bill such as this. We have learned the value of demonstrations and research in many fields of endeavor. Not only in scientific fields does it pay off. Our Nation has realized won-

derful results from similar demonstration and research projects in the fields of public health, vocational rehabilitation, and education. What could be a more practical step at this time than to assemble and spread what knowledge we now have about juvenile delinquency control, and to launch a broad, coordinated plan of demonstration projects to uncover and test new ways of dealing with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill will go far in finding more effective ways to prevent and treat juvenile delinquency. I think this will begin a coordinated effort that will assure that all promising avenues of development are followed in the most efficient manner. Even more important, perhaps, I think that we can assure that what is known and discovered through projects begun under this bill will be made available to the States and communities, schools and churches, of this country. Only then can they deal with this difficult and growing problem in the soundest possible ways. Many of the ideas so readily advanced today about what should be done about delinquency may be sound. We will not know which are sound and under which conditions they will work until we go about testing these ideas in actual situations.

This bill is an example of the best kind of role for the Federal Government to play in solving our major social problems. The States and local units of government, the private voluntary organizations and individual families must ultimately do the job of eradicating juvenile delinquency. But we here at this level can help to provide them with the leadership, the coordination, and some of the knowledge and tools to do their job better.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will receive early, favorable consideration.

Rev. Robert Graham, Late Pastor of Ashley (Pa.) Presbyterian Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of February 13, 1959:

REV. ROBERT GRAHAM

After he had served Ashley Presbyterian Church as pastor for 35 years, the announcement in 1956 that Rev. Robert Graham would resign caused widespread regret. He was persuaded by his congregation to remain in the pastorate several months beyond the date he had fixed for leaving. This was to give time to consider the selection of a successor. The request was a measure of the esteem in which he was held in his own church.

In October 1951 members of the Ashley church and officers of Lackawanna Presbytery gathered to observe his 30th anniversary as pastor. Many from other faiths,

clergymen and laymen alike, were present to pay tribute. This was likewise true when a dinner was given Mr. Graham on the eve of his retirement. He was admired in his calling and as a citizen for many good qualities not the least of which were his kindness and his neighborly spirit.

His was the longest tenure of any of the six pastors of the Ashley Presbyterian Church from the time it was formally organized in 1866. Lackawanna Presbytery which knew him as a dedicated member honored him with many calls for service, several terms as moderator. He had been a delegate to both the senate and the general assembly and had long service as State clerk.

Upon his retirement Rev. Mr. Graham became pastor emeritus of the Ashley church and was frequently called upon to officiate or to assist at special ceremonies. For several months last year he served as the acting pastor of a Presbyterian church in Washington, D.C.

In his death this community has lost a clergyman who reflected great credit on his calling, an earnest citizen and an unfailing friend.

Deficiencies in Headquarters, USAF, Manpower and Personnel Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, 1959, I inserted in the RECORD a report made by the Council of Defense Lodges—American Federation of Government Employees—concerning the conflict of military and civilian personnel in the Pentagon.

I am also submitting herewith a copy of a letter written to the Secretary of the Air Force by Mr. John Mann, president, Lodge 1092, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, Headquarters, USAF, outlining key deficiencies in headquarters USAF manpower and personnel policies:

AMERICAN FEDERATION

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,

February 6, 1959.

The Honorable JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In Report No. 2512 dated August 7, 1958, the House Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization outlined the following problem:

"The Hoover Commission in 1955 recommended 'that civilians with broad management and accounting experience and competency be appointed as comptrollers.' Three years later, in 1958, the Department of Defense has 970 comptrollers, of whom only 24 percent are civilians. In fact, as recently as July 1, 1958, the Air Force issued an order requiring that all comptrollers in that service must be military except as designated by the Secretary of the Air Force. April 24, 1957, the Secretary of Defense issued a Department of Defense directive—No. 1100.9, Military-Civilian Staffing in Management Positions and Support Activities—which called for the gradual replacement of military in such civilian-type positions as comptrollerships. Present personnel data do not indicate any widespread implementation. Actually, there might be a trend in the opposite direction.

"With the built-in rotation cycle of the military officers, there are generally civilian

deputies in the 740 military comptrollers. The exception is the Air Force where only 11 percent of the comptrollers or deputy comptrollers are civilians."

An interesting question arises from this data: Could the Headquarters, USAF, by increasing the proportion of civilians in the key jobs, improve its fiscal management operations and to what degree of dual staffing exists in the fiscal management?

While this report deals primarily with the comptroller function (accounting, finance, budget, statistical services, and management analysis), we feel that this same situation prevails in many other functional areas throughout Headquarters, USAF. Malutilization of military manpower exists in many other support functions such as administrative services, supply, transportation, maintenance-engineering, procurement, installations, manpower, and management.

Staffing of civilian-type support positions with military personnel has approached a point which, we feel, actually jeopardizes economic completion of the Air Force combat mission. Recent military and civilian pay raises have a direct bearing upon this problem. The assignment of military personnel to civilian or administrative-type duties has become prohibitively expensive. Pay fringe benefits have increased costs to where today's enlisted man can earn over \$10,000 per year. In the officer category, the career cost amortization of one full colonel may involve as much as \$33,000 per year. This includes base pay, quarters' allowance, longevity pay, flying pay, responsibility pay, PCS costs, dislocation allowances, training costs, retirement, medicare, and other fringe benefits not inherent in civilian manpower costs.

In terms of overall manpower implications, the problem involves much more than simple comparisons of take-home pay between military and civilian personnel. An Air Force major and a GS-12 civilian, for example, may have similar take-home pay in terms of dollars. However, in terms of true cost to the taxpayer, a military man involves many costs, benefits, and investments (education, training, facilities, housing, retirement, etc.) not accorded a GS-12, or other comparable career civilian.

In many areas in Headquarters, USAF, commissioned officers spend their entire tour of duty in nonmilitary, nondefense, noncombat, functional assignments. This is unnecessarily expensive. More importantly, it is creating a misleading manpower picture in terms of defense readiness and combat capability. Manpower totals are padded with thousands of uniformed personnel who are not engaged in, or even prepared for, defense or military-type duties. We feel that this is neither the spirit nor intent of Congress in putting a man in uniform. The assignment of military personnel to administrative and support-type activities may well constitute the most expensive form of bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Compounding this situation is the fact that the military man often does not have the motivation, aptitude, background, or training for support-type duties. He knows he will probably be rotated in 3 years into an entirely different career category. He also realizes that interim civilian-type assignments tend to jeopardize his long-range military advancement potential. In the support areas, particularly, this has created officer and civilian morale problems, poor management leadership, lost continuity, and inadequate technical specialization. In many cases, important projects or programs are canceled prematurely or reorganizations undertaken at considerable loss in Air Force funds and resources, simply to coincide with an individual officer's rotation. In others, costly or ill-considered decisions are made as a result of disinterest, lack of training, or

personnel instability. We feel that this type of transient management is costing the American taxpayer millions of dollars in excess defense costs. During recent Senate appropriations hearings, considerable discussion was centered upon the high cost of personnel instability within Headquarters, USAF.

The problem, as we see it, involves much more than simple mismanagement or labor relations as such. The entire concept of civilian-military relationships, roles, and teamwork must be reexamined within Headquarters, USAF. By comparison the Navy and Army have relatively progressive policies and concepts in the area of military-civilian teamwork. The Navy, for example, has a full-time Industrial Relations Office and has civilianized many of its support functions for purposes of continuity and technical specialization. It also makes greater use of civilian comptrollers. The Army has assigned civilian deputies in many of its support activities. For some reason, Headquarters, USAF, continues to pursue a costly and illogical manpower policy concerning the utilization of civilians. The impact of this policy upon defense capability and costs should be obvious.

We also feel that the proposed 2-percent reduction in DOD civilian manpower will actually increase overall defense payroll costs. Reductions in civilian manpower, in many instances, simply mean that military personnel will be assigned to perform civilian duties. Direct and indirect payroll costs will actually be increased in many areas. This process will then be compounded by a secondary manpower cycle wherein Headquarters USAF will demonstrate a need for additional military manpower. In contrast to this, it is accepted knowledge that advancing weapon systems, technology, and airpower concepts (missiles and spacecraft) will require progressively greater concentration of stabilized civilian manpower in the direct and indirect support areas.

We could cite many more arguments and examples of why greater utilization should be made of civilian manpower in support type activities in headquarters USAF. However, numerous studies by outside consultants and citizen groups (Hoover Commission, Sarnoff Commission, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller report) have indicated similar conclusions. We feel that corrective action is long overdue.

As a point of departure, the following proposals are submitted:

1. Establishment of civilian deputies at headquarters USAF, at all levels, in such functional areas as procurement, manpower, supply, transportation, information services, accounting and finance, and maintenance-engineering.
2. Establishment of civilian comptrollers, and deputies, within Headquarters USAF.
3. Review of Headquarters USAF civilian-military manning ratios in all direct and indirect support functions. Progressive civilianization of appropriate broad functional areas and activities, throughout headquarters USAF, as outlined in DOD 1100.9.
4. Require absolute compliance with existing directives concerning utilization of civilian manpower as outlined in AFR 40-3, AFR 30-22, and DOD directive 1100.9.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN MANN,
President, AFGE Lodge 1092 (AFL-
CIO), Headquarters USAF.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the deficiencies pointed out in the above letter to the Secretary of the Air Force is further substantive proof that the interests of our Nation would be best served by removing military jurisdiction from civilian employees in the Government service.

Jazz: A Means of Direct Intercultural Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, evidence of the importance of the special international program for cultural presentation has recently come to my attention, and I wish, in turn, to place it before all Members of Congress.

Engaged as we are in efforts to communicate on diplomatic, legislative and political levels, we may overlook the fact that certain kinds of immediate and direct experience are much more meaningful to most citizens of other countries. Friendship comes from interests held in common, but more particularly from enjoyments shared.

In August of 1958 the Woody Herman band toured 19 countries of South America and the results of that tour are to the point. The following comments are excerpted from articles in the December 14, 1958, and December 21, 1958, editions of the San Francisco Chronicle by Mr. Ralph J. Gleason, the able editor of that newspaper's Rhythm section:

Just back from a 30,000-mile, 3-month tour of Central and South America for the U.S. State Department, Bandleader Woody Herman has a simple recommendation on how to make friends south of the border.

"Send them more jazz groups," he said last week in Hollywood.

One of the most amazing things was the reaction of the members of the band. "Week after week," he said, "those New York hippies were personal ambassadors. Every man a diplomat. It was beautiful. And the reception we got everywhere was almost frightening. We couldn't lose."

In Montevideo, for instance, the Herman band outdrew the Russian Ballet which was playing opposite them, and in several halls the band set attendance records.

One of the surprise features of this tour was a series of free concerts which Herman gave at schools and universities.

The first took place in Caracas, Venezuela, in August. Local representatives of the State Department were dubious as to the possible reaction, but Herman felt that if the students had a chance to hear jazz, they would appreciate it. Thousands jammed the beautiful Caracas University hall and thousands more tried vainly to get in. "It was wonderful," Herman said. Then, convinced of the practicality of the free school concerts, they were repeated.

Throughout the tour, South American musicians swarmed around the band and set up friendships that will likely last for years. Members of the Herman band are now involved in sending back music and recordings to musicians all over South America.

Our diplomacy in South America in recent years has not been notable for its success and there has been a growing feeling that if we concentrate more on something, such as jazz, which communicates directly and less on formal diplomacy, we may make more friends more quickly.

One of the main obstacles to the sending of more cultural missions to South America, Herman said, is the difficulty in obtaining funds for this purpose from Congress.

"There has been no publicity here about the success of these tours, therefore Congress doesn't feel the necessity of spending the money," he said.

As proof of the success of the tour, Herman proudly displays an editorial from the Daily Journal of Caracas following the band's appearance there.

"During the course of recent history," the editorial says, "we have seen several excellent ways of how not to win friends and influence people abroad."

"White-tie diplomacy, as Vice President Nixon called it, is on the way out."

"Just how many friends . . . have been made with a round of formal cocktail parties we never did find out. But we have a pretty good idea of how many friends musical ambassadors such as Louis Armstrong, Leonard Bernstein, and now Woody Herman have made for the United States."

"Keep up the good work, Uncle Sam, and send us more of these 'cats'."

Poison in Your Water—No. 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the New York Journal-American on January 10, 1958. That article entitled "Water Pollution Perils Upstate City" sets forth more reasons why the full \$45 million authorized under Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress should be appropriated for grants to cities and municipalities to clean up their sewage disposal.

This article sets forth how the county health board president announced he would issue a "boiled water" order on Monday unless the supplies of water in Rensselaer County are cleaned up. He said:

City water in Rensselaer is so polluted it is dangerous for home consumption.

Dr. Quinlan said:

I will prohibit its use next Monday unless something is done.

His grim statement continued:

A disastrously widespread outbreak of hepatitis and allied liver diseases is to be greatly feared.

The water of this area is drawn from the Hudson, one of our great waterways, just above the city of Albany.

This is just another danger to our people which stems from foul, filthy, dirty water full of municipal sewage and industrial waste. This situation goes on in hundreds of cities and communities throughout the United States and lives and health of millions of Americans are endangered thereby:

WATER POLLUTION PERILS UPSTATE CITY—
HEPATITIS EPIDEMIC FEARED

RENSSELAER, N.Y., January 10.—An epidemic of infectious hepatitis, a serious liver disease, from polluted water supplies threatened the entire 11,000 population of this city today.

The threat was defined by the Rensselaer County Board of Health in a survey rushed to completion in less than 4 days.

Dr. John J. Quinlan, county health board president, said he would issue a "boiled water" order to public on Monday unless the supplies are cleaned up.

"City water in Rensselaer is so polluted it is dangerous for human consumption," Dr. Quinlan said. "I will prohibit its use next Monday unless something is done."

"Our survey revealed that the supplies, drawn from the Hudson just above Albany, are inadequately filtered and chlorinated . . . and have a soaring bacterial count in the water mains."

"A disastrously widespread outbreak of hepatitis and allied liver diseases is to be greatly feared."

Dr. Quinlan said the condition had worsened steadily during the past several months.

He said a copy of the country report had been forwarded to State Health Commissioner Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe with a request for his urgent attention.

A Virginian Sparks the Drive To Strengthen Small Business in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the Small Business Administration which was created by Congress in 1953 and made into a permanent Federal agency by action of the 85th Congress.

Under the able direction of its Administrator, Wendell B. Barnes, the Small Business Administration has been of immeasurable help to the entire national economy. SBA has done this through its program of helping to rehabilitate, to expand and generally revitalize thousands of small business enterprises throughout the land.

Through efforts of SBA, many millions of dollars of Government defense contracts have been diverted to small business enterprises, thereby enabling them to maintain steady employment and healthy business conditions in countless communities.

Last year the Congress created the Small Business Investment Act, the objective of which is to furnish long-term and equity-type financing to small business enterprises—a kind of financing not easily to be found through commercial banks. The interest in this plan has been widespread in all parts of the country.

Sensing that the Investment Division was to become one of the most effective segments of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Barnes sought a highly-qualified banker and financial expert to take charge of the division. He found Mr. Duncan H. Read of Middleburg, Va., president of the Middleburg bank, a former partner in the nationally known firm of Dillon, Read & Co., and favorably known in American financial circles. As

a Deputy SBA Director in control of the Investment Division, Mr. Read now is rapidly bringing the Division to a level of high operational efficiency.

Mr. Read addressed a meeting in Washington February 20, of the SBA's Region Four Advisory Board embracing Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Because of a widespread interest in the Small Business Investment Division on the part of Members of Congress, as well as by bankers, investment people and small business throughout the country, I herewith offer the text of Mr. Read's remarks for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF DUNCAN H. READ, SBA DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, INVESTMENT DIVISION, BEFORE SBA'S REGION 4 ADVISORY BOARD

The activities of the Investment Division of the Small Business Administration, created by the Small Business Investment Act last summer, are twofold:

- (1) To make loans to State and local development companies, and
- (2) To license, regulate and give financial assistance to privately organized, privately financed companies, called small business investment companies.

The provision for loans to local development companies has aroused considerable interest because of the opportunities under title 5 of the act, which permits loans up to \$250,000 for assistance to an identifiable small business. Loans can be obtained under section 502 of this portion of the act to help a small business purchase needed equipment, build additional facilities, and even to acquire property deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of small business expansion.

While the law limits to \$250,000 the amount we can lend for a single small business, it should be remembered that the number of loans to a local development company for additional small businesses is not necessarily limited. Thus, for example, four loans for as many small businesses may be negotiated if their getting established in the community will carry out the aims and purposes of the act.

Local development companies in Virginia and North Carolina, as well as several further south, already have availed themselves of the opportunity to obtain Federal funds to carry out such aims.

The Small Business Investment Act aims to keep the Government out of business, and to assist and encourage private organizations to provide a source of long-term loans and equity capital for small business, hitherto difficult to obtain. The assistance to the small business investment company provided by the act, is twofold:

First, there are tax advantages for the SBICs and the investors who form them. These advantages may be found in section 57 of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958, and may be summarized as follows:

- (1) The investment companies are allowed an ordinary loss deduction, rather than a capital loss deduction, or losses realized on the convertible debentures of small business concerns (including stock received pursuant to the conversion privilege);

(2) Taxpayers investing in the stock of the investment companies also are allowed an ordinary loss deduction, rather than a capital loss allowance, on losses arising from the worthlessness, or sale of such stock;

- (3) The companies are allowed a deduction for 100 percent of the dividends received from a taxable domestic corporation rather than the 85 percent deduction generally allowed corporate taxpayers.

I think you regional advisers might be interested in a brief résumé of our analysis of what kind of people and organizations are applying for licensing as a small business investment company; and what they apparently expect in the way of results by forming such companies.

First, for the first time in 25 years, banks are permitted to engage (directly, if you will) in equity and long-term financing. Today, this is their only opportunity to do so. Investment companies are being formed by banks, with and without the participation of private individuals or investment underwriting firms. Such companies would be expected to operate at a profit to all stockholders, but would also create satisfactory relationships of various kinds for the banks and underwriting firms involved.

Second, several investment companies are in the formation stage at the instigation of groups of small business concerns themselves for the purpose of providing these concerns with a source of equity and long-term capital. Such investment companies would be operated at a profit, but primarily for the benefit of the borrowers, and would confine their activities probably to long-term loans not involving the equity of the borrowers. Manufacturers supplying small business concerns would be logical stockholders of such investment companies.

Third, another category of investment companies would be those formed principally as venture capital undertakings, where the incentive is to finance enterprises that have a promising growth potential. Private individuals in high tax brackets who see advantages of putting their capital to work through the formation of an investment company, rather than directly, should be the main source of establishing investment companies in this category.

Now, the profit potentialities of SBIC's will naturally vary with the nature of the business. For instance, certain profit potentialities are available to investment companies in all three categories. First is the differential between the interest paid on borrowings and interest charged on loans; and a second is the income received for services of all kinds rendered to the small business concerns. These two sources of profit might be expected to keep solvent an investment company that wishes to operate primarily pro bono publico, without sharing in the growth of the borrowing companies.

For SBIC's not operating pro bono publico, the third and main source of profit, of course, is in sharing in the growth of successful small businesses through acquisition of their convertible debentures. I think this needs no elaboration.

There are also supplemental or incidental advantages to certain types of stockholders of an SBIC, depending upon the nature of their businesses. Banks, for instance, which form SBIC's might expect to expand their banking business because of the investment company's activities; investment underwriting companies owning stock in SBIC's might expect to develop opportunities for public security offerings; insurance companies interested in SBIC's lending, for example, to real estate developers, might expect to handle considerable insurance in the field of title search and insurance, fidelity bonding, and other types of insurance that the construction industry needs.

But whatever the source of profit might be, there can be no substitute for able management experienced in the lending and investment field.

In reviewing the applications received to date, we have found that applications received from people with previous experience in banking and investments, and in the preparation of financial statements and documents, have required a minimum of implementation and correction.

It will not be surprising to you, therefore,

to know that of the 10 proposals for which the applicants have been told to proceed, 5 of these proposals have been submitted with a bank as either sole stockholder or at least one of the stockholders.

One or two applications have been prepared by people with little or no experience in complying with statutory requirements or in the preparation of financial statements. These have been returned to the applicants for corrections of all kinds.

We are constantly being asked when the first SBIC group will be licensed.

We cannot set such a date right now. We can say only that out of 43 applications, we have told 10 that they may proceed to organize as described in their proposals.

We have told another eight applicants that final consideration of their proposals cannot be given until they have furnished further information or amended their proposals.

We advised one applicant that his proposal, as submitted, was not satisfactory for a variety of reasons.

You will see from this chart that there has been a steady stream of proposals coming into Washington, and I hope that the next time we meet I can tell you that most of them have been licensed and that their investment companies are in business.

I think you all may know that SBA organized three briefing sessions in Los Angeles, Kansas City, and as recently as January 30, in Philadelphia. Mr. Barnes was accompanied by several people from SBA's Washington office, as well as two representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission. We expect to issue very soon copies of the remarks made by Mr. Barnes and the others at the Philadelphia briefing session, with typical questions and answers received at all three meetings.

Judge Bernard C. Brominski Honored by His Hometown of Swoyerville, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of February 11, 1959:

HOMETOWN HONORS JURIST

It was interesting to note that more than 500 persons turned out for a community testimonial dinner in Swoyerville in honor of Judge Bernard C. Brominski. That was an impressive tribute to a native son.

It has been written that no man is a hero to his valet. By the same token, an individual, no matter what eminence he may attain elsewhere, too often does not impress his neighbors when success knocks at his door. Judge Brominski is a refreshing exception to the rule as the gathering in the auditorium of Holy Trinity Church demonstrated.

There are several contributing factors. He is a member of a family that has played a prominent role in Swoyerville, his father, the late Dr. John Brominski, having been a civic leader and burgess. The young jurist himself, endowed with a warm personality, has been a popular figure in the West Side borough. And the people are understandably proud of the contribution he has made to the prestige of his hometown by his elevation to the bench, a distinction Swoyerville shares with him.

In recent years, Swoyerville has developed an esprit de corps through the success of its high school teams and the recognition that has come to other local residents, including its clergymen. The newly developed pride is reflected also in the development of its residential districts. The addition of a jurist to the role of citizens has just about filled its cup of joy to overflowing, if the response to the testimonial is any criterion.

Lincoln as an Extremist on Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 12, 1959]

LINCOLN AS AN EXTREMIST ON COURT—CIVIL WAR PRESIDENT CALLED OUTSPOKEN IN VIEWS ON DRED SCOTT DECISION

(By David Lawrence)

The Nation is celebrating this week the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Eloquent eulogies are being spoken—and he deserves them all. But if what Abraham Lincoln said just 100 years ago were attributed today to anyone else in public life, the same utterances would be denounced as coming from a racist, or a person who defies the Constitution.

Few persons realize how outspoken Abraham Lincoln was against a Supreme Court decision and how he insisted that a mere overturning of precedent in a ruling was not settled law. It was just 100 years ago when Abraham Lincoln was debating with Stephen Douglas in the State of Illinois. Only a few months ago the Library of Congress published a book containing facsimiles of the printers' copy of the stenographic record of the Lincoln-Douglas debates as edited and prepared for the press by Abraham Lincoln.

Following is a quotation from Mr. Lincoln's speech delivered on July 13, 1858, at Chicago:

"The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision (of the Supreme Court of the United States) is a degree of sacredness that has never been before thrown around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why, decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very Court before. It is the first of its kind; it is an astonisher in legal history—it is a new wonder of the world."

In speaking further of the Dred Scott decision, Mr. Lincoln said at Quincy, Ill., on October 13, 1858:

"But we nevertheless do oppose that decision as a political rule which shall be binding on the voter to vote for nobody who thinks it wrong, which shall be binding on the Members of Congress or the President to favor no measure that does not actually concur with the principles of that decision. We do not propose to be bound by it as a political rule in that way. * * * We propose so resisting it as to have it reversed if we can, and a new judicial rule established upon this subject."

In another speech delivered in Chicago on July 17, 1858, Mr. Lincoln quoted with approval a letter from Thomas Jefferson, written in 1820, which declared that if the

Judges of the Supreme Court are to be considered as "the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions," this could be a "very dangerous doctrine indeed and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

In a speech delivered at Ottawa, Ill., on August 21, 1858, Mr. Lincoln took up the race question. He denounced slavery, but then added:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which in my judgment will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas, he is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man. . . ."

"What next? Free them and make them politically and socially our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of white people will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if, indeed it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill founded, cannot be safely disregarded. We cannot, then, make them equals."

With further reference to the equality or inequality of the races, Mr. Lincoln said, on September 18, 1858, at Charleston, Ill.:

"I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race. I will add to this that I have never seen to my knowledge a man, woman, or child who was in favor of producing a perfect equality, social and political, between Negroes and white men."

Poison in Your Water—No. 17

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, another area of our country became closed to water sports and to recreation because of health danger. An article describ-

ing the situation appeared in the San Francisco, Calif., Call-Bulletin on December 17, 1957. The article pointed out how the Redwood City harbor had become so polluted that it was a health danger. Raw sewage drifts into the bay and surrounding areas from improper operation of nearby sewage disposal plants. The result is that citizens who could play and recreate in once pure and beautiful waters are denied that enjoyment because of the health danger from sewage and pollution in the area:

WATER SPORTS HELD POLLUTION DANGER

(By Stuart W. Welch, Call-Bulletin peninsula reporter)

REDWOOD CITY, December 17.—Water contact sports should not be allowed in Redwood City's harbor or connecting slough because of the health danger, according to the county health department.

A letter to this effect was read last night to the city council here by Dr. Harold D. Chope, county health director.

Any type of swimming, water skiing, or skin diving would be dangerous, Dr. Chope wrote, because of water pollution.

The health director pointed out that sewage drifts into the bay and sloughs from improper operation of nearby sewage disposal plants.

It is expected the council will pass an ordinance banning all water sports except boating by next spring.

Protest Against Electrical Equipment From Foreign Concerns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith for the attention of the Congress a resolution passed by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania. The resolution is self-explanatory and is a protest against the purchase of certain electrical equipment from foreign concerns by American agencies. You will note that this is a bipartisan resolution. I sincerely pray that the Members of this body will take cognizance of the seriousness of the effects of the continuation of this policy by Government agencies:

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) is seriously jeopardizing American recovery from the recession by awarding sizable contracts to foreign concerns; and

Whereas our immediate concern is the loss of a multi-million dollar turbo-generator contract to the C. A. Parsons Company of England while the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, East Pittsburgh, Pa., was the lowest domestic bidder; and

Whereas the importation of this electrical apparatus will result in the loss of more than one million man-hours of work for the Westinghouse Electric Corporation employees which is comparable to work for 700 employees for one (1) year or 350 employees for two (2) years; and

Whereas there will also result a loss of direct and indirect taxes in the amount of \$3,255,500 Federal and \$363,300 State; and

Whereas during 11 months of 1958 the Federal Government awarded \$30,530,114 in heavy electrical apparatus contracts and for-

eign manufacturers were awarded 35 percent or \$10,711,070; and

Whereas we believe that in addition to the effect this policy has on our economy, it is a reckless and hazardous policy for the security of our Nation, as this equipment will now be dependent on a foreign company, from across the ocean, for maintenance and repair; and

Whereas the Government of England stands steadfast in its policy that no equipment as referred to herein shall be purchased by English concerns from a foreign country because of national security; and

Whereas we believe the Government should look beyond the price alone and evaluate the health of our own economy and the soundness of our national defense; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to establish a congressional committee to investigate the policies of the Tennessee Valley Authority so that further loss of employment in the United States, at a time when employment is now of grave concern, will be avoided; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each House of Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the House of Representatives.

HIRAM G. ANDREWS,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

JAS. MINSKY,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the fourth of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia is inserted at this point in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1959]

EMPLOYERS DENOUNCE GARNISHMENT AS DISRUPTING FUNCTION OF PERSONNEL

(By Morton Mintz)

"I object to the fact that three or four firms in the city of Washington are causing this hearing. It (garnishment of wages) is causing my firm to use one clerk's time some 3 hours a week, and it is expensive. My time is also involved."

This was Richard D. Gibbs, secretary of Peoples Drug Stores, testifying before the House District Judiciary Subcommittee on May 27, 1957. He continued:

"Most of the people think that Peoples Drug Stores are doing something to them by holding their salaries, and they think we influence these garnishments, whereas, we do everything to discourage them."

The grief caused easy-credit customers and the public under the District's bad debt or garnishment law has been set out in preceding articles. But employers have a host of complaints, too. More of these were placed before the House subcommittee by Victor Ottenstein, representing the District News Co.

He spoke of the many times easy-credit stores and small-loan companies phone his

firm, learn that an employee who wants to buy from them is being garnished—and sell to him anyway.

"I feel," he testified, "that it is a promiscuous extension of credit when they know that the employee will probably default, and it is a nuisance to the employer."

"We train our employees and it takes a while before they catch onto the work, and then they get a garnishment and they might leave the job and go somewhere else, which means we have to go to the trouble of employing someone else to replace them."

"A new person makes mistakes which cause us annoyance. Some employees who might have their salaries attached this week will have them attached next week by another firm. A person with a family has to pay rent and has to buy food and they cannot exist without some sort of income, and in some cases it makes thieves out of these employees * * *."

"Now, it is not only a nuisance at our place of business, because it takes executive time out to handle these matters, or to see the employee about these situations, and to train new employees, but when we have to appear in court to say that the employee earns only so much and should get an exemption, it takes the whole day, and we just cannot afford to spend that time."

Ottenslein then went into the effects of the bar on attaching wages of Federal and District Government employees. He said it is "unfair to non-Government commercial establishments * * * to have employees threatened with garnishment because it is difficult to hire employees. There is a scarcity in the labor market, and these employees figure, 'Well, I'll get a job with the Government, and they cannot attach me.'"

Here are illustrations, based on interviews with employers, of points made by Ottenslein and others:

One large employer, Government Services, Inc., had to handle 531 attachments last year. The source of more than 100 of these was two easy-credit stores, which stresses once again that a huge share of the garnishments originates with a very few firms.

This employer, at the request of the Washington Post, made a detailed study of its cost of handling these attachments. The estimate: \$10 each.

The pay of one valued GSI employee was attached for 2 consecutive months. "It just doesn't make any sense working here and not getting a paycheck," he said. He quit.

Another major employer, Washington Terminal Co., had to process 623 garnishments last year. The estimated average amount: \$150. This company estimated a smaller cost of handling, \$4 each.

One employer of fewer than 150 persons made a study for the Washington Post of the cost of training replacements for five employees who, heavily in debt, began to steal, were caught and were fired. His estimate: \$460 in direct payroll costs.

From a letter to Municipal Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr., from Nicholas Costin, a restaurant operator: "Some of these garnishments are granted against people who have never been in my employ, or who have left my employ many months ago. This only proves that sales are made without any check upon the purchaser's credit. We who are employers are obliged to answer a garnishment and often find ourselves obligated to these unscrupulous creditors when such an answer has gone astray."

Many employers end up making loans, often out of their own pockets, to garnished employees. If an employer advances wages to an employee whose pay has been attached, he can be sued by the creditor.

The creditor's right to sue is effective under the garnishment law for a 6-month period or until the debt is paid, even if the garnishment itself expires. Such a suit was filed against a real estate firm in 1957 by

Hollywood Credit Clothing Co., Inc., 703 7th Street, NW. Municipal Court Judge Milton S. Kronheim Jr. dismissed the case, ruling the realty firm, in advancing wages to a \$50-a-month janitor after it received a Hollywood attachment, was not trying to help the janitor evade the judgment, but only to help him exist.

John Crosby States the Case for Pay Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I present below a most provocative article written by the respected television critic, John Crosby, which appeared today in the New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Crosby's article follows:

IS PAY TV THE ANSWER?

Costs are becoming an awful problem on television. Gad, I remember way back when the Milton Berle show—the whole hour, including musicians, writers, chorus girls, guest stars, and Berle—came to \$17,000 a week. Today you can hardly get the dog act for that. You can hardly get anything for \$17,000 except prolonged commercials on daytime television.

Sure, television is graced by an occasional Hamlet or For Whom the Bell Tolls. But, increasingly, the specials and even the regulars, such as Palyhouse 90, are falling behind their budgets. Television more and more is in an era of deficit financing, like Government. Sometimes the deficits are fairly formidable, too. Eventually, they will be downright frightening.

Already See It Now has vanished, mostly, though not solely, because it was too expensive. The other serious operations on television—many of them anyway—are sustained by deficit financing that cannot go on forever. However, even apart from the shows that have disappeared altogether, as See It Now, the rising problem of cost has cut the quality of television in less spectacular ways.

Already, a good many writers, including several who started in television, say they won't write for TV because TV can't afford them. That applies also to actors. To get a cast like that in For Whom the Bell Tolls you have to go way over your budget. If the best writers are unobtainable you must take lesser writers and get a lesser script.

All of which leads me to ask the question aloud that I have been asking myself for a long time: Can the advertiser afford television much longer? Or, to put it another way, can it afford good television, which is what we are primarily concerned with here? Sure, the advertiser can afford to turn on the network and fill it almost uninterruptedly with commercials, as is being done on daytime television. Or, it could fill the nighttime air with garbage—westerns and parlor games.

But is this enough? It's not enough for me. I am increasingly in favor of pay television, because I think it is the only solution to the interesting problems. I have never been naive enough to suppose that pay TV would automatically open the floodgates to operas, symphonies, and really worthwhile things. Let's not delude ourselves with great expectations. There will be plenty of junk on pay TV, too.

But at least there will be plenty of money to put on decent dramas. Actors we got;

writers we got; directors we got; and the creative energy of this country is at white heat. All we haven't got is money, at least on television we haven't. I would dearly love to see a top producer like Fred Coe given enough money to pull together all the elements he needs in writing and acting and then thrown into competition with the junk merchants at the box office.

Television should be restored to the hands of the showmen instead of the advertisers. Again, this will not necessarily lead to Nirvana. There have been some awfully shoddy, sensational, cheap-jack showmen. But at least the aim of any showman is to entertain, not simply to sell goods. Just the absence of commercials would add so much to some shows. Already good directors are driven out of their wits by inserting underarm deodorant advertisements in the middle of tender, dramatic scenes. When such commercials become the price of survival, then your serious writer and director leave the medium altogether.

Why not pay TV? Well, the chief cry against it is that it is un-American. Free broadcasting is the American tradition. But is any television really free? They add the cost of "As the World Turns" to the soap chips. And I don't even like "As the World Turns." I'm forced to pay for a program I don't want—and so are you. This isn't free TV; it is pay TV, and you don't have any control over what you're paying for.

I don't think sponsored television will disappear altogether, either. If you wanted to play "Concentration" or to watch Dick Clark's teenagers dancing to rock and roll music, or to see "Secret Storm," it would have to be on free television because no one in his right mind would pay to see those things.

A concert by the Philharmonic would not attract an audience big enough to interest Procter & Gamble, but it would sure attract a big enough one to interest Sol Hurok, whereas no one would pay 10 cents to see "Name That Tune"—the rating notwithstanding.

Besides, all the arguments are going to pale eventually before the single overriding argument of economics. If costs continue to mount, the advertisers won't be able to pay the bills and it will have to be pay TV.

Addresses at Ceremonies Dedicating New Supreme Court Building, Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include herewith the following remarks of the Honorable Gerald Nolan, presiding justice of the appellate division, second department, Supreme Court of the State of New York, and the address made by Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, at the ceremonies dedicating the new Supreme Court Building, in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959:

PRESIDING JUSTICE NOLAN. When we think of courthouses, this type of building, I suppose we all think of judges, lawyers, jurors, and litigants. If we stop to consider the matter I think we will all agree that what

goes on in courthouses, the administration of justice, affects directly or indirectly every segment of our community. This program would not be balanced nor would it be complete if we did not hear from a representative of commerce, industry, banking.

We are very happy that we have with us today on this occasion one who has been for many years a friend of the court, a dynamic booster for everything that Brooklyn stands for, a keen student of political science, and a leader in the banking circles of the borough.

It is a privilege at this time to present to you the president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY MR. ANDREW S. ROSCOE

Our distinguished presiding officer, so well equipped for his duties, since he is also the presiding justice of the appellate division, Right Reverend Bishop DeWolfe, Right Reverend Monsignor Rev. Dr. Steinbach, Mr. Borough President, distinguished justices, not only of this great court but of all other courts, distinguished guests, my ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor to be here. No one could wish for a more eloquent background to a speaker's platform than this supreme courthouse, which stands as an integral part of a civic center unmatched in any other community. This striking and imposing structure represents a very tangible achievement—the result of skills of labor, architects, and engineers, of planning and financing. It represents a happy conclusion to years of effort. This is sufficient reason for pride.

But I, for one, find this a time and an occasion for humble gratitude.

It is said if we hold any object close enough to our eyes, the object, however small, is big enough to blot out the sun.

This very wonderful supreme court building is very close to all of us, but being this close, it could blot out something larger, stronger and, if you please, more beautiful. This "something"—for it has no convenient and all inclusive label—is the spirit, the drive and the inherent hopes of a free community which recognizes justice as the keystone and the pillar of good government.

As an individual I am grateful to those before my time, to the symbolic body politic which has continuously fought for the rights of a free citizenry against external enemies and those enemies within ourselves such as doubt, timidity, and the instincts of inordinate self-aggrandizement.

A combination of geography and a unique community spirit have given to Brooklyn its deserved reputation as a frontier town or, if you will, an "open port" to our America. For 300 years Brooklyn has been a gateway and a sanctuary, an experimental area for people of different backgrounds and cultures to work and to live together with consequent inestimable benefit to themselves and their neighbors. That has been no simple, automatic accomplishment.

Just as a man cannot be called truly honest if he has never faced and rejected the temptation to steal, he cannot be called a true citizen unless and until he has firmly adopted the rigorous principles that demand political, religious, and racial tolerance for all others as well as for himself. Brooklyn has served and is serving as a "melting pot"—I think I would rather call it a crucible, a testing place of the American spirit. From this crucible prejudice has been sifted and human understanding has been nurtured. Ours is a divine and human faith, a vital philosophy. Such faith inspires progress.

In 1861, when the old Supreme Court Building opened, Brooklyn had a population of 279,000. Today its citizens number about 3 million. The borough has become a world-recognized center of commerce, industry,

education, and the arts. Aggregate family income in Brooklyn has leaped in 25 years from \$1½ billion to over \$5 billion.

But let us recognize an essential of civil progress. In this growth the people have relied upon the law—its administration and just interpretation. Different points of view demand interpretation. The rapid and just disposition of litigation has played a vital role in the borough's tremendous progress over the years.

The ideal concept of absolute justice for all enables us to plan for a future community, secure in the hopes of all our citizenry who come to recognize equality before the law, integrity in the administration of justice. It is rightful that the Supreme Court Building be part of a civic center, for it gives stern recognition that without the law and respect for it we have no society, no commerce, no industry—and most important, no hope for an even better future.

This building will enable the distinguished members of the supreme court of the second judicial district to function in improved physical facilities. However, the strength of our judicial system does not lie principally in physical facilities. The source of strength lies in the knowledge, the character and the heart of the men who serve on the bench and thus serve their community.

I noted before my gratitude to the body politic. I note now the deepest kind of gratitude to the members of the supreme court who are continuing with distinction and greatness the brilliant traditions of justice, justice humanly administered.

I thank God we live in a society where justice can not be dispensed by electronic machines, for only the creatures of the Lord are endowed to judge, to understand their fellow mortals.

I sometimes wonder if we adequately conceive the tremendous burdens that have been placed upon the distinguished jurists to whom we owe so great a debt.

More than a quarter of a century has gone by without any addition to the number of justices of the Supreme Court of the Second Judicial District. In 1932, this body of jurists handled 3,342 cases. In 1958, still with 15 justices exclusive of the appellate division, over 5,000 cases have been adjudicated. It has been a stupendous task and a magnificent accomplishment. In 1932, automobile registration was modest, commercial aviation was in its infancy, labor legislation was just beginning to become a part of our legal system, sociology and psychology were tenuous, timid studies. Today our judges must treat with and properly administer infinitely vaster areas of legislation, and dispense justice in the administration of a progressively increasing caseload. They accept new theories of dynamic justice and are required to employ new, infinitely broader areas of social science in the expanding role of justice.

The assignment to this district of 3 city court judges and a justice of the 10th district is recognition that too much is being asked of too few.

The action on studies of modernization of judicial procedures I leave to legal authorities.

But I know I am voicing the sentiments of businessmen whom I am honored to represent as president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association when I say that even further steps should be taken to lighten the heavy burdens which the members of the Supreme Court in this district have shouldered without complaint and with such dedication to the service of the people of Brooklyn.

As a businessman, I know the volume of business can not be increased beyond a given point without proportionately increasing the manpower. Because the borough faces a future of economic and social growth, the

Court too faces additional tasks. The issue of more justices is urgent; time itself can be an element of justice or injustice. "The law's delays" of Hamlet's grim soliloquy may well constitute a form of tyranny itself.

I voice my congratulations, and a hope that the Governor of New York, the Mayor of New York and the members of the Board of Directors of the State, the members of the legislature, in the best public interest will give favorable attention to easing the burdens of the dedicated and devoted men whom the people are proud to know as the Supreme Court of the great State of New York.

What Would It Prove?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Mesa Tribune, Mesa, Ariz., under date of February 16, 1959, entitled "What Would It Prove?"

WHAT WOULD IT PROVE?

Throughout Soviet history the Communists have sought to tantalize the world's gullible millions with false lures. Not the least of the frauds is that they do more for humanity, economically, than do their capitalist rivals.

The truth on this score, of course, is that most Russians have been living for decades in a planned depression. As recently as half a dozen years ago, their housing was worse, on the average, than under the hated czars.

Obviously it won't always be this way. Living standards have risen in some parts of Soviet life and will continue to climb. The day may come when ordinary Russians really are provided for adequately, though that time probably is not as near as Premier Khrushchev forecasts.

Just for argument's sake, however, let's say the Russians will at some future point match or even surpass the economic output of the United States.

Khrushchev assumes—and this is one place where the Reds probably believe their own stuff—that this will "prove" the superiority of the Communist system.

He assumes, too, that whether this particular economic lure has worked up to that time or not, it will surely attract the millions thereafter.

The questions for us are: Will it lure the uncommitted peoples and will it prove the superiority of Soviet communism?

We have to fear that the lure will work on some. It even works to some extent in this day and age, when we know it to be a fraud.

But it is not likely to work on men who have tasted genuine freedom.

Nor will it demonstrate the superiority of the Russians' way of life over our own.

Man is not just a machine to be stoked. As a human being, he has a crowning spirit. This spirit comes to fullest, truest flower only when he is free.

Even in the fanciful prospect that the Russians should some day outproduce us 4 to 1, they will not be superior. They will not begin to match us until they are free men living in individual dignity, enjoying the fruits of the mind and heart—not just of the factory and farm.

New Supreme Court Building Dedicated in Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the remarks by Justice Gerald Nolan and the address by Hon. Charles W. Froessel at the dedication ceremonies of the new supreme court building in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959:

PRESIDING JUSTICE NOLAN. To those of us who are from Brooklyn—and I say that advisedly because I speak of the sons of Brooklyn who are sons by birth and those who are sons by inclination—to those of us who brag that we come from Brooklyn, which might be more accurate, it seems to me when we think of the court of appeals we think of it as a strictly Brooklyn institution because of our distinguished friend and neighbor, the chief judge of the court of appeals, the Honorable Albert Conway, who is unfortunately unable to be here today, but we have, of course, other judges in that court, and I am about to present to you one of them.

No one, I think, is better able than he is to appreciate this beautiful building because he knew the problems that faced the judges who sat in the old courthouse which this magnificent building has replaced, and for many years he served with great honor and distinction as a justice of the supreme court and held court in that old courthouse.

I am sure that he is very, very happy to be here on this occasion, and we are happy to have him. It is my pleasure to present at this time associate judge of the court of appeals, one of our neighbors from the county of Queens, the Honorable Charles W. Froessel.

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES W. FROESSEL

Mr. Justice Nolan, Judge Keogh, Reverend Clergy, my brethren of the bench and of the bar, ladies and gentlemen, may I add to that introduction of Judge Nolan's that I was born in Brooklyn. I think he meant to imply that, but I wanted to make that certain. Secondly, the very gentle yet incisive suggestion that the speakers be brief will not go unheeded, I am sure, provided, of course, that we agree upon the definition of the word brevity. But let me assure you that that last clause should not alarm you.

At the outset I should like to bring to you the greetings of my chief judge, Albert Conway, and all of the associate judges of the court of appeals. I know that every one would have been delighted to be with you this morning and to join with you, excepting for the fact that this is the opening of our January term. We meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon, and since lawyers travel from great distances to be at that court, we could not very well suspend operations.

As we lift the curtain upon this very delightful event that is being unfolded here this morning, we witness the opening of another chapter in the long history of the supreme court of the State of New York. It was originally established 268 years ago on May 6, 1691 by the colonial legislature of our then State.

Some 86 years later the framers of our first constitution, the constitution of 1777, not only recognized this court but continued its existence. Some 70 years thereafter, and in 1847, the powers and jurisdiction of the court of chancery were transferred to this

court. It was in that setting in the closing days of the Civil War that the late home of the supreme court in Kings County was established, thus manifesting that even in those very critical days, when the Nation was plagued with problems that they wondered whether they would ever solve, our forebears recognized that no matter what the time, no matter what the crisis, justice must be served. Thus the supreme court has functioned there ever since.

Meanwhile, other courts have had their jurisdiction transferred to this court. It acquired appellate jurisdiction, first in general term, then in the appellate division, and the appellate term. So that now the supreme court of the State of New York is the highest court of original general jurisdiction, in law and in equity, in matters civil and matters criminal, with appellate jurisdiction, subject only to that jurisdiction which the constitution has laid down for the court of appeals of the State of New York.

The supreme court is one of the great courts of the world, and we are delighted that they have found this new home which has long been overdue. Today as you move into your new home, this very beautiful new building, we find it fittingly set upon the site where freedom of speech was exercised by two great newspapers published in this county and the city of New York.

It is also appropriate, is it not, that these exercises this morning should be held in the part in which you will select juries which Magna Charta insisted on as the principal bulwark of their liberties.

When I think of some of the courthouses that I have seen all over the world—and I am thinking now of one in particular in the bush of African Uganda, and others in other places—this certainly is a dream.

Judge Conway and I the other day were talking about your dedication, for we both served on this court and in this county over a long period of years. We talked then of the new courthouse, I mean when we served on the court, for plans for this new building were conceived many years ago, and we both looked forward to the day when we might be privileged to sit here as part of the circuit that all supreme court judges traveled in those days from St. George to Riverhead and sometimes upstate.

But after all is said and done, limestone and granite, and all the other accessories of this delightful modern building, while affording comfort to those who serve here, certainly will not in themselves render justice, will they? That can come only from dedicated judges, jurors, and court staffs who recognize that they are not merely dealing with cases but have in their hands the lives and the liberties and the treasures of our people, who recognize that to perform their duty they must appreciate that the art of doing justice is doing what you have to do better than you have to do it.

The psalmist said that justice is the insurance we have on our lives and our property, and obedience is the premium that we pay for it. As judges, we must insure justice by giving our very best, by competence, industry, patience, and integrity. At best, justice is a very frail thing, is it not, as all things human. But we do our best, and even when we do our best, we are not always sure that we are always right. That applies to the court of appeals as well as to every other court in the State.

It is particularly difficult in this tremendously complex civilization in which we live, when the contest for power and for the control of men's minds, and now for the control of outer space, is in high gear, when the law of the sea is undergoing debate in the United Nations for radical changes, and lawyers are pondering already about the laws of outer space. With all that we still have our congested calendars, so-called court reform, and

the countless other problems to perplex and challenge us.

You will recall Judge Cardozo's reference in his "Nature of the Judicial Process" to the concern that he felt, and the troubled spirit that he had in the early days on the bench when he looked for certainty in the law and found that it was a trackless ocean, and the search was futile, for the haven was always beyond. Our problem is to find it as nearly as we can, whenever we are called upon to do so.

A genius has been said to be a common man doing common things uncommonly well. I would like to be that sort of a common man in my work as a judge, and I am sure that every judge present in this courtroom feels likewise. Perhaps we can approach the goal if we try hard enough.

So, my friends, this morning let us not merely dedicate a building which in all its beauty is a quiet yet forceful symbol of justice, and all that justice implies, let us rededicate ourselves to see to it so far as we are concerned and so far as we possibly can, each one of us, that we shall do our best to make that noble symbol a reality.

Statement of Hon. Lymon Goolsby, Mayor of Winfield, Ala., on the Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 members of the legislative committee of the Alabama League of Municipalities met with the Alabama congressional delegation to discuss municipal problems. It was a great day of exchange of views on many problems.

Among the statements made on the occasion was a very fine statement by the Honorable Lymon Goolsby, mayor of Winfield, Ala., entitled "What the Library Services Act Has Done for Alabama."

I include Mayor Goolsby's statement as part of my remarks and commend its reading to interested Members of the U.S. House of Representatives:

WHAT THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT HAS DONE FOR ALABAMA

(By Lymon Goolsby)

Tremendous stimulus has been given to the development and improvement of library service in Alabama by the grants from the Library Services Act (Public Law 597, 84th Cong.), passed in June 1956. The first allotment of \$40,000 was received in March 1957. In the second year of the act, fiscal 1958-59, Alabama received \$139,644, and in the current or third year, fiscal 1959-60, Alabama is receiving \$161,369. During the 3 years Alabama has received a total of \$341,013 of Library Services Act aid. Largely because of the interest aroused and the needs shown by the State plan for the use of the Library Service Act grants, the State legislature increased the State appropriation for the public library service division for the biennium 1957-59 by almost 40 percent. This increase in funds has made possible the extension of service to 188,572 people who had no library service prior to 1956 and greatly improved and strengthened service to 519,153 people who had quite inadequate service prior to the act.

The number of counties in Alabama with no free library service has been reduced from 11 to 6. In addition to these direct improvements in local library service, the State agency, the public library service division, has been greatly strengthened so that it can give more service more efficiently to all areas of the State; both in developing new libraries where there are none now and in giving its various services, such as book loans, reference and information help, and professional advice to established libraries. Although not included in the areas receiving direct help from Library Services Act grants, one county which was without any library service prior to 1956 now has a library with a bookmobile serving the entire county, and we feel that much of the impetus for the founding of this library came from the interest generated by the act, and we know that much help was given by the field representatives of the division which before the act would have been impossible. Action of a similar nature, though not on a countywide scale, has occurred in other communities.

INCREASED LIBRARY SERVICE SINCE 1956

In 1956 it was estimated that 38 percent of the State's population had no access to free library service; in 1959 this percentage has dropped to approximately 31 percent, as a direct or indirect result of the Library Services Act. In addition to this, greatly improved service is available to people living in the areas where regional libraries have been established, and to the whole population of the State through the strengthening of the Public Library Service Division and its field services.

The Library Services Act funds have provided almost \$25,000 worth of books, including periodicals, filmstrips, and recordings, over \$86,000 worth of equipment, including six new bookmobiles (five now operating and one on order), two automobiles for the field staff, two station wagons for regional libraries, library furniture and equipment both for the new regions and the division, office machines and duplicating equipment including such major purchases as a multi-lith and an addressograph machine. These funds have also purchased the necessary supplies for processing the new books. They have provided for the addition of seven professional librarians, five subprofessional assistants, eight bookmobile clerks and drivers, and clerical help for the new regional libraries and the division's staff. They have made possible the operation of the bookmobiles purchased and much necessary travel both by field staff and attendance at workshops for in-service training by library personnel over the State.

EXTENDING THE REGIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAM

In addition to all this, the increased State appropriation made possible the purchase of \$44,000 worth of books for the regions established under the Library Services Act through 1958; in fiscal 1959 the new regions will receive \$56,000 worth of books from State appropriations as part of the Alabama State plan under the Library Services Act.

Five new regional libraries have been developed, and two regional libraries have been greatly strengthened with the addition of one or more counties. In these libraries it has been found that use increased dramatically with the new books and equipment and professional guidance. For instance, in the Horseshoe Bend Regional Library, almost 4 percent more books were circulated in the two counties which had formed the region before the addition of a third county, in the first 9 months of operation than had been circulated in those two counties in the entire previous year; and the number of books circulated in the entire region had doubled, going from an average of over 11,000 volumes per month to more than 22,000 volumes per month. The same kind of increase is seen in the circula-

tion figures of the other regions where there are old figures for comparison.

THERE IS STILL MUCH TO BE DONE

There is still much to be done, even though we are proud of the accomplishments so far. In addition to the 133,280 people in the 6 counties still without public library service of any kind, there are also 21 counties without library service in the rural areas outside of municipal or town libraries, and 12 counties in which the county library, though willing and anxious to serve the residents of the whole county, has no effective means of giving service beyond the town in which the library is located. In these 33 counties almost 831,000 people have no access to library service near where they live. It is these areas which will be disappointed if the present program in the State is curtailed.

The President's budget recommended the appropriation of \$5,150,000 for the coming year, but it is hoped by us that Congress will appropriate the full authorized amount of \$7,500,000 under the Library Services Act. If the State continues to appropriate funds for library service as it has in the current biennium, Alabama can easily qualify for the full \$209,495, which would be its allotment under the full amount authorized. The progress made during the first 2½ years of the effective period of the act, each year with less than the authorized amount having been granted, is a sure indication of the ability of the State to use the money wisely and of demonstrated needs met.

Coal Research Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks in the RECORD, I want to announce that I am introducing tomorrow a new Coal Research Commission bill.

This bill takes into consideration the criticism aimed in the creation of this Commission by those who say that it is an unwarranted raid on the Treasury. I am including in my new legislation a proviso that the coal industry receive a larger percentage as a depletion allowance, and that from this increased depletion allowance the coal producers will pay on a per ton pro rata share the entire cost of the operation of the Research Commission. There are those who may argue that the inclusion of this provision in the enabling act creating the Commission is a contradiction in that two distinct subjects are covered by the same legislation. I know of no other method by which we could pursue the ends we have in mind, except to make both provisions part of one act, namely, the creation of the Commission, detailing its functions, and establishing the revenue for its operation.

In this legislation, I propose that the Federal Treasury advance \$5 million for the initial expenses of creating the Commission, and to start it functioning. This money, however, under the terms of my act will be repayable to the Federal Treasury after the act is enforced. At this time I would also like to present the

following statements and information heralding the greatest advancement yet made by this important industry in its fight to keep its share of the American economy for the future. The Congress of the United States should take cognizance of the fact that the bituminous coal industry is neither subsidized, nor in any way, receives any public moneys from the U.S. Treasury. It is therefore important that all of us keep abreast of the actions and the thinking of this great segment of our industrial strength.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following releases from the National Coal Policy Conference:

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 25.—Management and labor in the bituminous coal industry and related groups have formed an over-all organization designed to advance and promote the interests of the industry on the broadest possible front.

Formation of the National Coal Policy Conference, organized and supported by the United Mine Workers, the bituminous coal operators, the coal-carrying railroads, coal-using electric utilities, and some industry equipment suppliers, was announced today by George H. Love, chairman of the conference, and chairman of the board of Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

"We, of course, are concerned with the immediate future of bituminous coal, but our thinking goes far beyond that," Mr. Love said. "We are concerned with the adequacy and availability of our total energy resources and the assurance that such resources, including coal, have their proper place in the national economy in the decades to come."

Joseph E. Moody, president of Southern Coal Producers' Association, will serve as executive director of the conference. Headquarters will be in Washington, D.C.

Creation of an organization similar to the one now established was suggested by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, in an address in Cincinnati last May.

In making the announcement, Chairman Love said:

"I think the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference is unprecedented. I know of no other instance where management and labor in a major industry, and related major industries have agreed to work together to advance common interests as they have in this particular case."

"The step we have taken is a most heartening indication for the future of the bituminous coal industry."

Mr. Lewis hailed the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference as follows:

"Formation of the National Coal Policy Conference can only be considered as among the most gigantic forward strides taken by the American coal industry in its long and proud history. Assuredly, the industry and its workers have long needed a common voice to focus the attention of the Government and the American people upon the efficiency of this Nation's basic industry."

"The most valuable natural resource in the United States has far too long been the object of legislative apathy and public ignorance."

"This new effort with its able leadership will be able to speak for our industry with confidence and in a positive manner. Within itself it will be a forum where all segments of the industry can meet to resolve their various problems."

"To the general public it will demonstrate the truth: America's basic resource—coal—its proper utilization and its future must be the concern of all Americans. The National Coal Policy Conference promises to insure that coal will be recognized for what it is—America's primary source of power."

Howard E. Simpson, president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., said:

"The railroad industry welcomes the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference as a major step toward the economic recovery of America's coal and railroad industries.

"The Nation's railroads have long been concerned by the steady decline in the production, consumption, and transportation of coal.

"The health of the coal industry is essential to the economic well-being of the railroads. Coal depends on efficient rail transportation to market its product."

Philip Sporn, president of American Electric Power Service Corp., said:

"The organization of the National Coal Policy Conference is not only a significant event for the coal industry, but is, I believe, of even much greater significance for the country as a whole. Coal has an indispensable role to play in the coming growth and development of the country over the next 30 to 40 years and a great responsibility in assuring that our dynamic industrial system can continue to have available to it the large share of its total huge energy requirements which cannot be supplied by anything else but coal during that long period."

Among the objectives of the Conference are the following:

1. The development and execution of an intensive nationwide educational campaign to acquaint the public with the vital importance of the coal industry to the national welfare.
2. The broadening of domestic and export markets for bituminous coal.
3. The encouragement and promotion of research into the production, marketing, and utilization of coal.
4. Creation of positive and constructive Government policies toward the bituminous coal industry.
5. Steps to increase coal's depletion allowance in order to meet rapidly rising costs of operation, and to accumulate the capital needed for future expansion.
6. A program to place bituminous coal in a position where the industry can meet the demands for increased production which would be placed upon it in case of war.
7. Action to stop the dumping of residual oil at coal's expense and to put an end to the practice of dumping natural gas for industrial uses to the detriment of the coal market.
8. Action to end extravagance and waste in the program to develop civilian atomic energy here and abroad.
9. The formulation of broad policies for the coal industry in matters agreed upon by the Conference groups.

Coal technology has advanced steadily in recent years. Production efficiency has increased until the current average output is approximately 11 tons per man per day. Labor peace has been maintained in the coal industry over a full decade. Prices at the mine are approximately what they were 13 years ago, an amazing record during an inflationary period. But national consumption of coal has declined since World War II. Compared with the all-time peak for bituminous coal production—631 million tons in 1947—production was down to approximately 400 million tons in 1958.

Coal profits have remained too low for the economic health of the industry as a whole. The cost of opening a new coal mine is more than three times what it was in 1946. Meanwhile, the industry has lost markets; some markets because of legitimate competition, others from what it regards as unfair competition.

Today, residual oil is being imported into the United States at a rate equivalent to 41 million tons of coal annually. Simultaneously, natural gas is being sold at unrealistically low prices to displace coal as boiler

fuel, a wasteful use of an extremely valuable and diminishing resource.

Coal is the one industry on which the United States must rely, and will continue to have to rely, for the bulk of its power requirements in time of peace as well as in time of emergency. Without subsidies, the American coal industry speedily expanded production to meet the power crises of two world wars.

However, the coal industry and coal-carrying railroads cannot meet the demands of a national emergency if they continue to operate under existing conditions.

It is vital to national security and well-being that the capacity to mine and transport adequate supplies of bituminous coal is maintained.

The National Coal Policy Conference will take the most vigorous action possible to increase the production and consumption of coal and see to it that the transportation system which will be expected to deliver this coal in an efficient and orderly fashion is in a position to do so.

"The long-term interest of the Nation in this case," Mr. Love said, "clearly coincides with its short-term interest. Our industry contributes \$5 billion annually to the national economy and supports, directly or indirectly two million people. Shipments from mine to market add \$2 billion to the revenues of the carriers. Twenty-one States out of the forty-nine produce substantial quantities of coal and have a major interest in the industry's prosperity."

Officers of the conference and the executive committee are as follows:

Chairman: George H. Love, chairman of the board, Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Executive director: Joseph E. Moody, president, Southern Coal Producers' Association, Washington, D.C.

Members of the executive committee:

Coal operators: George H. Love; F. S. Elfred, chairman of the board of Peabody Coal Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; Harry LaViers, president, South-East Coal Co. of Paintsville, Ky.; C. J. Potter, president of Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co., of Indiana, Pa.; Raymond E. Salvati, president of Island Creek Coal Co., of Huntington, W. Va.; and Kenneth A. Spencer, president of Pittsburgh & Midway Coal Mining Co., of Pittsburgh, Kans.

United Mine Workers: John L. Lewis, president; Thomas Kennedy, vice president; and Michael Widman, Jr., assistant to the president.

Railroads: H. C. Murphy, president and chairman, executive committee of Burlington Lines; Howard E. Simpson, president of Baltimore & Ohio Railway Co.; and John Tilford, president of Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

Utilities: Philip Sporn, president of American Electric Power Service Corp., of New York.

Coal industry equipment suppliers: J. H. Fulford, president of Jeffrey Manufacturing Co., of Columbus, Ohio; and W. L. Wearly, president of Joy Manufacturing Co., of Pittsburgh.

JOSEPH E. MOODY

Joseph E. Moody, executive director of the National Coal Policy Conference, was born in Hartford, Conn.

After graduating from Cornell, he entered the brokerage business, leaving it in 1929 to become secretary of the Manufacturers' Association of Hartford County, Conn. This association was composed mostly of the manufacturing plants in Hartford County.

In 1937, Mr. Moody became director of personnel for the Hat Corp. of America in Norwalk, Conn.

He did work with war agencies in Washington during 1941 and part of 1942, and in 1942 he entered the employ of the York Corp. of York, Pa.

Mr. Moody became president of Southern Coal Producers' Association in November 1947.

As spokesman for the southern producers' group, which has mines in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, Mr. Moody has been a vigorous advocate of policies aimed at maintaining the industry's competitive position.

In 1956 he aided in forming American Coal Shipping, Inc., an inter-industry effort intended to stimulate coal exports. He also helped in the organization of the High Volatile Coals Export Association and Low Volatile Coal Exports, operators' groups concerned with stabilizing exports.

Mr. Moody's efforts were instrumental in the opening of the Florida utility market for the bituminous coal industry, and he has also been a vigorous and frank critic of Government policies which he considers injurious to the industry.

His work in promoting the interests of the southern producers and of the entire bituminous coal industry has attracted national attention.

He will keep his post as president of Southern Coal Producers' Association.

Mr. Moody married Laura Russell of Friendship, N.Y. They have four children: Mrs. Donald L. Cates of San Anselmo, Calif.; Mrs. Robert H. Sowers of Cincinnati, 1st Lt. Bryce Moody, and Margaret Moody.

THE BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY IN BRIEF

1. Where located: The principal bituminous coal-producing States are: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

2. Production: In 1957—the last year for which official figures are available at this time—total production was 492,703,916 tons. The Bureau of Mines has issued a preliminary estimate of 400 million tons for 1958. Peak production was 631 million tons in 1947.

3. Mines: In 1957 there were 8,539 mines in operation; in 1958 there were 7,588 mines producing.

4. Jobs: Average daily employment in 1957 in the industry was 228,000; the estimated daily average employment for 1958 was 190,000.

5. Of the total production about 83 percent is hauled as revenue producing freight by railroads. In 1957 the railroads hauled 382 million tons. The estimated total for 1958 is 332 million tons. (The balance of production is moved by trucks and waterways.)

6. Principal consumers of bituminous coal in 1958 were:

	In millions of tons
Electric Power Public Utilities.....	153
Steel.....	84
Other industries, including railroads and chemicals.....	90
Overseas and Canada.....	52
Retail sales.....	36

(Tonnage consumed in excess of the estimated 400 million 1958 production was drawn from previous production.)

STATEMENT BY HOWARD E. SIMPSON, PRESIDENT, BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.

The railroad industry welcomes the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference as a major step toward the economic recovery of America's coal and railroad industries.

The Nation's railroads have long been concerned over the steady decline in the production, consumption, and transportation of coal.

The health of the coal industry is essential to the economic well-being of the rail-

roads. Coal depends on efficient rail transportation to market its product.

In 1957, 422 million tons of coal and coke were transported by rail. The gross revenue received from this transportation was approximately \$1¼ billion, representing more than 15 percent of the entire freight revenue of the railroads.

The Baltimore & Ohio, for example, depends upon the transportation of coal and coal byproducts for 30 percent of its gross freight revenues. Certain other railroads look to coal for an even greater proportion of their income.

The decline in coal production, from 631 million tons produced in 1947 to approximately 400 million tons in 1958, has, therefore, had a serious effect on the economy of the railroad industry. It has meant a reduction of personnel. It has meant a loss, through inactivity and deterioration, of valuable rail equipment used in the transportation of coal. It has meant the loss of vitally needed revenue.

With this background, the railroad industry is happy to participate in forming the National Coal Policy Conference. We believe that this conference will be in a position to make an important contribution to the Nation's economy, and will constitute an important example in good labor-management relations.

The aims of the conference deserve the support, not only of those in the coal, railroad, and power businesses, but of every American citizen.

STATEMENT BY GEORGE H. LOVE, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE

The future of the bituminous coal industry is of vital importance to the welfare of the entire country.

This being the case, it is time that the industry and other industries heavily dependent upon coal take affirmative action to protect their interests and the Nation's interests.

We, of course, are concerned with the immediate future of bituminous coal, but our thinking goes far beyond that. We are concerned with the adequacy and availability of our total energy resources and the assurance that such resources, including coal, have their proper place in the national economy in the decades to come.

Our group intends to start the campaign to enlarge coal's markets immediately and to continue as long as is necessary.

Another primary aim of the National Coal Policy Conference is to acquaint the public with the pertinent facts about coal.

It is as modern as any source of energy on earth and is an indispensable national asset.

Among the most important of all our objectives is to make certain that the industry will be in a position to make the contribution which would be required of it in the event of a major war. This is necessary for our national security.

The bituminous coal industry has made tremendous strides in efficiency and productivity since World War II, particularly with regard to productivity per mineworker employed. Prices also have been remarkably stable during a period of national inflation. At the mine today they are approximately what they were in 1946.

Unfortunately, the coal industry has not expanded as have other major industries within recent years.

Coal's earnings also have been very low by comparison with other industries. With mining highly mechanized, the situation is such that the ability to expand rapidly in times of emergency is called into question. This is true regardless of the fact that all informed persons agree that coal is our basic energy resource and will be called upon to supply a large part of the rising demand for energy in the future.

The National Coal Policy Conference is not an organization intended to attack other industries or Government. Coal does not seek or expect favoritism. All we ask is fair play and fair competition. These requests are not unreasonable.

It is no secret, however, that we feel that the Federal Government has permitted, and is permitting, discriminatory practices which hurt coal. Among these are heavy importations of residual oil which have displaced coal along the east coast, the dumping of natural gas for industrial uses at coal's expense, and wasteful spending on the civilian atomic energy program.

While we have lots of coal, the industry cannot be expected to remain on a standby basis. It takes from 2 to 3 years to develop a new mine; it takes a lot of capital to buy the machinery and other supplies needed to extract the product. In my opinion, any further reduction in coal output could threaten our national security. A substantial rise in output in the near future would be in the nature of defense insurance.

I think the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference is unprecedented. I know of no other instance where management and labor have agreed to work together to advance common interests as they have in this particular case.

The step we have taken is a most heartening indication for the future of the bituminous coal industry.

The long-term interest of the Nation in this case clearly coincides with its short-term interest. Our industry contributes \$5 billion annually to the national economy and supports, directly or indirectly, 2 million people. Shipments from mine to market add \$2 billion to the revenues of the carriers. Twenty-one States out of the 49 produce substantial quantities of coal and have a major interest in coal's prosperity.

Statement of Hon. V. H. Albright, Mayor of Haleyville, Ala., on Traffic Safety Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, members of the legislative committee of the Alabama League of Municipalities met with the Alabama congressional delegation to discuss municipal problems. It was a great day of exchange of views on many problems.

Among the statements made on the occasion was a very fine statement by the Honorable V. H. Albright, mayor of Haleyville, Ala., entitled "Reviewing Traffic Safety Measures Before Congress."

I include Mayor Albright's statement as a part of my remarks and commend its reading to interested Members of the U.S. House of Representatives:

REVIEWING TRAFFIC SAFETY MEASURES BEFORE CONGRESS

(By V. H. Albright)

We still have with us the tremendous problem of traffic safety. While last year the national fatality toll dropped slightly to 37,000 killed, I think we can take little comfort in that fact and that any optimism we exhibit be of a very cautious nature.

I am proud that Alabama was one of those States showing a decrease in traffic deaths, dropping from 910 killed in 1957 to 792 killed in 1958.

But it is still a tragic thing that 792 good citizens of Alabama and nearly 37,000 others throughout the country lost their lives on our highways and that traffic accidents caused billions of dollars in property damage and millions of crippling injuries.

Legislation on this subject will be handled by our good Fourth District Congressman Kenneth Roberts, who is chairman of the newly formed Subcommittee on Health and Safety.

REVIEWING TRAFFIC SAFETY MEASURES SO FAR INTRODUCED

I would like to review with you briefly some of the traffic safety measures which he had introduced and which will come before his subcommittee.

First, and I think most important, are two bills concerned with safety standards of automobiles as they are manufactured.

Experts have repeatedly said that much could be done which is not now being done to manufacture safer automobiles.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated, for example, that when a crash happens, the driver or passenger who is wearing a seat belt has a far better chance of escaping death or injury than a person who is not wearing a seat belt.

Yet there has been no move to make seat belts standard equipment on new cars.

One of the bills I just mentioned would require the Department of Commerce to determine exactly what safety standards new cars should meet, and then make it unlawful to ship these new cars in interstate commerce unless they meet the required safety standards.

This measure is certain to meet strong opposition from the automobile manufacturing industry, which appears to be more concerned with sales than with safety. And this industry has the money, people and experience to put up a tremendous battle.

The other of the two measures we are talking about may be a back door method of accomplishing the same objective.

This bill would require that all automobiles purchased by the Federal Government would have to meet safety standards prescribed by the Department of Commerce.

The Government is one of Detroit's best customers, and it is believed that if the manufacturers have to provide certain safety equipment for Government-purchased automobiles, that safety equipment will soon become standard equipment on all automobiles.

Another bill which will be considered by this subcommittee is one which would provide some Federal funds for research into driver training programs.

PROPERLY TRAINED DRIVERS NEEDED

This is another area where it has been proven time and again that properly trained drivers have fewer accidents, fewer fatalities, fewer injuries, and fewer traffic law violations.

The Federal funds provided by this act would have to be matched dollar for dollar by the States applying for them. They would not be used for teachers' salaries but for research and study to develop the best possible type of driver training program. And control of these funds would be at the State level.

Still another important piece of legislation is one which would determine how much damage to our health automobile exhaust fumes are causing and require some control of the amount of pollution being discharged into our atmosphere.

At a recent air pollution conference right here in Washington the Public Health Service said there is some ground for belief that

automobile exhaust fumes are a source of lung cancer.

There is expected to be introduced in the near future, if it has not already been introduced, a bill which would set up a central record system of traffic law violations.

CHECKING ON DRIVER'S PREVIOUS RECORD

As the situation is at present, a driver in Alabama can have his license revoked for a traffic law violation, and then skip right across the State line into Tennessee or some other State, complete the necessary residence requirements and get himself a new license which will serve him until he gets into another scrape with the law.

The State issuing the license has no way of checking to see what his previous driving record has been, or even checking to see whether he has been previously licensed in Alabama.

With a central records section reporting on all license revocations and traffic law violations, the examining officer could check any applicant's previous driving record in much the same manner that a law enforcement officer can check a suspect's criminal record with the FBI.

These are but a few of the many bills concerned with the safety of all of us which will be referred to the Health and Safety Subcommittee, but certainly these are some of the most important.

I feel sure that all of us will want to give the chairman all the help we can in getting as many as possible of these bills enacted into law.

Educational Television—Advertising's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently had occasion to attend the midwinter conference of the Advertising Federation of America. Because the advertising industry is often the subject of misunderstanding and adverse criticism, I was particularly impressed and pleased by a speech on the topic of educational TV delivered by Mr. John P. Cunningham, chairman of the board, Cunningham & Walsh, Inc.

Educational TV has in the last 10 years mushroomed from 1 established station to 36 stations now broadcasting with at least 12 applications pending for additional broadcasting permits. Because business must take the lead in putting educational television stations on a sound financial footing, it is commendable and noteworthy, I believe, that the advertising industry has put its best foot forward in recognizing its responsibility to stimulate the expansion and use of educational television. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to insert the full text of Mr. Cunningham's remarks in the RECORD:

I am not going to use this platform to brag about the power and glory of advertising.

I would rather use it to face up to a responsibility that I believe we have that is not yet recognized by very many of us. Yet, in my opinion, it is the most important unsolved problem that has confronted us in this generation—the problem of properly harnessing television in the educational area.

It is the problem of releasing to the country the tremendous latent forces of television to the task of upgrading our national mind. In importance, it ranks with the problem of releasing the forces of nuclear energy to the task of upgrading our national industrial vigor.

Until this television force is released, I don't see how any one of us can be completely comfortable about the tremendous commercial franchise we hold in this medium.

Hardly more than 10 years ago, this amazing new instrument was thrust by the precise fingers of science into our somewhat clumsy hands—willing and energetic though they may be.

As the 10 years have rolled by, television has proved itself to have two great powers beyond any other means of communication.

First, it has an exposure-power hitherto unknown in communications. The average American citizen sits before that little square screen for over 3 hours a day—for over 22 hours a week. More than at any other occupation except working and sleeping.

Secondly, unlike any other means of communication, it has immediacy.

Now, a man can sit by his own hearth and look around the curve of the earth. He can see his own destiny being shaped. At the moment. Live. On stage. He can peer into the parliaments of man. Sitting in his own armchair, he can view the eternal conflicts taking place that will mold his future and that of his children.

All the stored-up knowledge of the ages—science, music, art, culture—can be spilled into his living room. Soon he will be able to roam the entire world from his own armchair.

But so far it is little more than a highly magnetic new plaything.

Its editorial content was almost wholly turned over to American business. I make no excuses. We have done astonishingly well with it in the field of entertainment. We are delivering the world's most talented artists to your living room every night—6 feet away from your own personal box seat—a couple of hundred dollars' worth of free theater tickets each week.

But we are being widely criticized by a highly vocal, highly intelligent and responsible minority.

Too many commercials, too silly, too repetitive. Too many westerns, giveaways, etc. Too much pallid programing. Not enough cultural fare.

I will not dwell on the criticisms. We are all well aware of them.

All of us in business, I'm sure, recognize the great unused educational power of television and would like to see it exercised.

But we tend to walk away from this problem and say it is not ours. We tend to say that it is the responsibility of the educators, the legislators, the broadcasters.

I say let us walk away from it no longer. As custodians of so large a share of the airwaves, it is our problem. As responsible citizens of the United States, it is our problem.

Let us face it.

Well, what is the character of the problem? What should be our objectives? What are we after?

First, let me explore with you what it is possible to get out of television—what television can contribute to the forward march of the mind—project headway—if I may call it that.

For one thing, it can give us a much better informed and intelligent electorate. For instance, sessions of Congress should be televised on a regular schedule—dull though they may be. Let us see our representatives in action—or in inaction. Let us see the empty seats. The filibustering. The logrolling. The pork-barrellism. Let us also see the wisdom, the patience, the vision of

the men opposed to these undemocratic forces.

Let us send Congress into the classrooms of the country—to bring life to the tomes and the teachings. Let our children examine first-hand what we hopefully expect them to improve.

Let our school children also look into sessions of the Supreme Court—not the trials perhaps—but certainly the majestic simplicity of this ultimate Court on the days of decision—those famous Mondays.

The United Nations, too, is worthy of a wider theater.

International broadcasting is very near. That was the portent of our recently launched Atlas satellite which tossed President Eisenhower's Christmas words back to earth.

International television will enable the nations of the earth to exchange their cultures—and their national aspirations—from fireside to fireside. It holds promise of being the greatest force yet in the promotion of permanent peace.

Television can cultivate new interests in young rock-and-roll brainpans. Our cold war with communism is no longer a conflict between two classes of thought. It is a conflict between 2 million classrooms of thought—and we must throw the greatest cross-country classroom of all into it—the TV set.

Television is the one instrument through which sleeping interest in science, chemistry, and the arts can best be aroused.

It reaches homes where books are seldom read.

It reaches homes where beauty is absent. Television can teach foreign languages more quickly and coherently than any book ever written.

Locked in that mess of tubes and wires behind the screen is the capacity to raise the intellectual and scientific attainments of our whole people to new levels.

It has often been said that there are many good teachers—but few great teachers. Television can bring those few great teachers into every man's living room. It can be used in teacher-training. It can upgrade the entire teaching staff of the Nation.

The great immediate thing that television can do is to make a college degree available to every single American. The only action required of the television student would be to go to a central place in his city four times a year to take an examination. It might take the TV student 5 to 10 years to acquire the credits for a degree now piled up in our 4 bright college years—but what is that to a hungry mind?

Our collegiate admissions system, as compared with Russia's, seems to have one very serious mechanical defect. The intake valve is corroded—corroded with privilege. It admits many youngsters to a college education who sometimes don't want it very much—but who are persuaded to go to college by family tradition, ease of money, and social status—a sort of self-perpetuating collegiate class—while college is denied to many minds potentially more valuable to the Nation—that are forced into work.

Television today alone can correct this dreadful inequity—with some sort of countrywide televarsity.

How does Russia look at this opportunity?

Let me give you the words of Dmitry Chesnokov, who is No. 1 of the Soviet airwaves.

In an interview in Moscow with our Mike Wallace recently, he said:

"Each television program should improve the human being. Our main purpose is to raise the culture of the people."

"What about laughter?" Wallace asked him. "What do you do for comedy, for humor?"

Chesnokov replied, "When a program of so-called humor is deprived of meaning and sense, it is not humor. It must have a purpose. It must point out a shortcoming in

society, a social deformity. We do not believe in laughter, just for the sake of laughter."

Which means that there are no Milton Berlovitch on the two Russian networks—first and second service, they call them.

Well, what do we need to do?

We need made available to every single farm and apartment, tenement and garret in this country a full-time 24-hour-a-day TV educational channel. That's all, and that isn't much.

What is the situation now?

There are some inspiring early morning educational efforts now on the networks, such as "Continental Classroom" on NBC, sponsored by A.T. & T., General Foods, and others. There is "Sunrise Semester" on CBS. The networks now are willingly contributing much free time to Project Headway.

Thirty-six cities have educational TV. But two-thirds of the Nation's population has no access to these channels.

There are only 60,000 TV sets in America's 1,520,000 individual classrooms, about 4 percent.

Many colleges—299 to be exact—allow credits for TV courses toward their regular college degree. But they can't easily reach the great mass of our working populace, because in very few cities is prime evening time or weekend time available, and that is the time obviously most essential, since 85 to 90 percent of our workers are on the job all day.

The Metropolitan Educational Television Association in New York City operates its staff, its studio, its live programing, and its educational kinescopes on an annual budget of \$400,000—\$400,000 a year, I said—which is less than the cost of two Dinah Shore Chevy shows.

Television can even do some things better than the college classroom. It can give students front-row closeup seats for important demonstrations. It can bring the finest laboratory facilities to remote schools which could not otherwise afford them. It can provide postgraduate courses to college graduates—while they work.

To give all our people equal opportunity will require a nationwide 24-hour-a-day clearance that will reach every television set in the United States, either on a single channel or multichannel basis.

Some people have felt that opening up the ultra high frequency channels, of which there are 70, as opposed to VHF's 12 channels, was the answer. But today, UHF seems to be slowly passing away. UHF stations are closing and UHF set production has declined to around 8 percent of total sets.

There is no question in my mind but that American business would like to see this Project Headway on the airtracks—including advertisers, broadcasters, and advertising people.

American industry very much wants a pool of scientific-minded youngsters available. It spends millions a year in employee recruitment programs now to get them—Western Electric, General Electric, Sperry, Westinghouse, etc.

American industry today not only supports many educational programs directly—but many more indirectly.

Last week alone in New York in addition to the regular educational channel WPIX there were 37 programs that could be conceded as educational, put on by the broadcasters—sustaining. No sponsor. But who paid for them? As far as I know, the networks have no source of income except from advertisers. So the producing costs, studio, and camera costs for these daytime programs all were paid for by the sponsors of "The Nervous Guns" and "Joe Revolvers" at night.

No complaints.

The problem is manifold.

How can prime time be fairly secured?

How can channels be isolated?

Who's going to pay for it?

Who's going to direct it?

I did not come here with the answer. I came here to take this problem out of the back corridors of our concern and to deposit it out here in the open—and to acknowledge our obligation as advertising people to help solve it.

The whole lumpy and contorted problem, however, is shot through with reassuring rays of light.

Federal and State educational funds can be wooed and won. Legislatures are listening. The big foundations are dabbling—seriously. Many high-minded men are working with the problem—men who recognize the investment that broadcasters have put into their franchises and know these investments must be respected in the solution. Many men who draw their salaries from commercial TV or are involved in the frothiest of TV entertainment are desirous of solving it.

They need our help.

How can we give it to them?

It is a task worthy perhaps of an important spotlight committee, consisting of leading advertisers, broadcasters, and educators, similar in stature to the Hoover Commission, to explore and recommend.

It is a task perhaps worthy of a joint committee formed by our own trade associations—the AFA, the 4-A's, the ANA—and the broadcasting associations—to face it and come to grips with it.

In my own small way, I hope to make a continuing nuisance of myself among advertising people until it is solved.

Even if and when we should get a country-wide educational clearance setup, it will still have need for our advertising and publicity skills.

It must be marketed well to the American citizenry. Its values to the individual and the Nation must be defined and publicized—at least as effectively as the 1960 Buick.

It will be solved someday. But as a nation we cannot afford to allow this great cultural force to lie around unused on into the years.

Only when television is finally well harnessed to the march of the national mind can we in advertising relax comfortably among our ratings, our westerns, our quizzes and our job of entertaining the masses.

To Be Young and a Southerner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, those who would understand the mind of the South give heed to its quiet as well as strident voices. One of the eloquent quiet voices of the South is Ralph McGill, the editor of the Atlanta Constitution. I present below the Blazer lecture which Mr. McGill delivered at the University of Kentucky this month:

TO BE YOUNG AND A SOUTHERNER

There are many times in these great and testing days, when I think of the opening paragraph of "A Tale of Two Cities":

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the

age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct the other way—in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only."

That is as true today as when Charles Dickens wrote it long ago. But then, as now, there are days when it is a wonderful and a fearful thing to be alive. One wakes each morning wondering what new crisis or convulsion news will greet him. And one greets each night a bit weary with confronting all that day has brought.

What will Russia do? What is Prime Minister Nasser plotting in the Middle East? Will General de Gaulle be able to halt the war in Algeria, or will it blind him and France to such weakness that the general and his government will fall, pulling him, and perhaps Europe, into chaos? What is the fate of West Germany and Berlin? Will we awaken one morning to know that war flames about the distant Isles of Matsuo, Quemoy, and perhaps Formosa?

These are but the main acts in the big drama of our time.

All this daily adds a jigger of adrenalin, the bourbon of the hormone world, to our bloodstream. I am at the age when I think just to be alive is a great and wonderful thing. But to be alive, and also to be a southerner, is the finest luck of all.

It is we who are made, whether we like it or not, participants in one of the most tremendous sociological processes of all time. Try as we will, we cannot be merely spectators. In one degree or another we must participate as the Nation remakes itself, with great travail, and some agony strongly to be a part of the future—and not to slip backward into the hand-wringing apathy of the frustrated and the impotent nations which chose to rest on the old ways and to cry the old shibboleths.

The processes of change are accelerated—all over the world they are quickening. Ideas are as powerful as missiles. New nations appear and still more are clamoring to be born. And we of the United States have chosen to make the American dream bright enough and wide enough to give light to our path as we move to keep pace with events.

And we, in this varied and complex South which we love and serve, have had grievous burdens put upon us. Tremendous opportunities knock at our door. We are a part of history and it is all the more good to be alive and a part of it.

And to be young southerners—that, of course, is the most delightful, mystical and wonderful agony of all.

One of the phrases most familiar to our ears is that of "the new South." Many prophets have proclaimed a new South. The truth is there is always a new South in the making. Sometimes it slows down to a slow pace of a weary man on a tired horse traveling a quiet road. And then again, it speeds up like a square-dance tune or the mad, giddy whirl of a carousel with our leadership trying to catch the brass ring—good for another ride.

This South is new to me. It is not the one I knew as a boy. It certainly is not the one my father knew. My grandfather—like yours, would never have imagined the South of today. And certainly when you are a grandfather you will dwell in a South that will not much resemble that of today.

Valor, courage, integrity and the mighty mysteries and values of God and man remain constant. So do weaknesses, mean-

ness and vanities. But the world changes—and we are a part of the world.

It would be very interesting, indeed, if one could peer into the minds of the young southerners today—and, for that matter, into the heads of all our young citizens.

But none has so great a regional stage show, and so good an opportunity to decide, as the young southerners in college and those just coming into their teens and becoming aware of the forces in their lives. Their leaders are before them and are on trial. They are watching their political representatives in the spotlight of the great drama of human rights and public education.

Since their political leaders are before them so plainly, the young southerners cannot help but think about these men and about those who speak from pulpit, podium, or press on the same subject.

Not since the period 1855-61 have the young southerners had so stark a contrast or so vivid a drama to watch. Somebody is wrong. That at least is obvious. The Deep South direction is exactly contrary to that of the rest of the country. The debate is joined.

It is a great time and sometimes a dismaying time, to be alive and sensitive to the tremendous issues of our day. They are complex. The young southerner knows even better than his political leaders that the problem which in time will close the doors of his schools is by no means local.

The young southerner also is a product of what cynics call the Bible belt. He is, by and large, a church-going, Sunday school attendant. And this, too, worries him. He understands that what the preacher and the church school teacher say on Sunday runs contrary to what his Governor says on Monday. He keeps trying to rationalize the Sermon on the Mount and the last press conference at his State capitol.

In a way, this is a very lucky thing for the young men and women in their teens, coming with a rush toward maturity. No generation since that of 1855-61 has had so good a chance to compare and contrast what it hears and what it reads.

Even the most blind today can sense that we are caught up in a great convulsion of history. We all know that our lives unalterably are committed to a future which somehow frightens us. None of us has ever been able, of course, to see into that inevitable tomorrow. But this one seems to be making so much noise. And the old wrestlers in the international cockpit of history are not as strong as they once were. The big new giants are Russia and China. And they don't go by the old rules.

All this is plain to all the young persons of America. They know that history is on the march. Missiles are more understandable to them than to their parents. It is no exaggeration to say that, in spirit at least, the young American is closer to the future than his father and mother.

Prophets are never well regarded. But one may venture a prophecy about the future with some assurance of being vindicated by the swiftly moving years. Out of the South's great travail and agony of soul in time will come a new political leadership. It will be more in tune with the industrial South and the future which such a civilization produces. It will open new and better schools, not close them. How long it will take none may say for sure. Years will pass. Perhaps a few. Perhaps many. But that leadership in a time of intercontinental missiles, of machines which think, and of great concentrations of populations, will not consider the greatest issue to be where a colored man shall sit in a streetcar or where his child will go to school. Almost any prophet will see that new political leadership is an inevitable part of that future of which every tomorrow is the opening of a new door.

The story of the Republic is one of frequent struggles with the past, with old cultures and traditions.

This one of our time is nothing new. But it is a great and significant one. And perhaps the luckiest person of all, when all is said and done, is the young southerner. His leadership is on trial. He can see it plainly and he can follow or reject.

Some of you will do the job of recreating the domestic equilibrium of our region and our country. I hope we do not leave you too much to do.

We must agree with Sophocles that the day can be evaluated only after dusk, that it is through death that one judges life.

There is quite a job to do—

In education, for example, we have come a long, hard path. Public education is relatively new in the South.

The report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education for the year 1900-01 showed southern schools to be wholly inadequate, poorly attended, and poorly taught.

The amount spent on public education was about a third of the national average. Then, as now, there was a greater proportion of the children to adults than in the North. In addition to this, about 80 percent of the southern population was rural and sparsely settled. School terms in agricultural areas were confined to a few winter months.

In 1901 Charles W. Dabney of the University of Tennessee said in a report:

"In the Southern States, in schoolhouses costing an average of \$276 each, under teachers receiving the average salary of \$25 a month, we are giving the children in actual attendance 5 cents' worth of education a day for 87 days only in the year—such means will never educate the people."

In 1900-01, for example, Alabama's Legislature gave the university a mere \$10,000. Until 1904 Louisiana had a limit of \$15,000 on annual appropriations for Louisiana State University. The total yearly income for the 63 colleges and universities of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas was \$65,843. This is less than the average southern State now spends per year on its schools.

We know, looking at history, that the damage done by the Civil War in property losses was great. The poverty which followed was harsh, often brutal. But the corrosive damage done the spirit and soul of the South was through lack of education. The children, the grandchildren, and the great-grandchildren of the adults of those post-war years did not have a fair chance. I have known many fine men and women who were deprived of any chance at adequate education in those years. My own father was one. These persons had almost a passion for educational opportunity for their children.

By 1901 the situation was so desperately hopeless that it attracted the attention of northern philanthropists. George Foster Peabody was first to help. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his father poured \$53 million into their general education board between 1902 and 1909 to help the South toward education.

The crusade for public schools fervently was preached at barbecues, picnics, in churches, courthouses, schools, fairs, and camp meetings. There was strenuous opposition. Some persons of influence and learning did not believe in free public education. Others did not want the Negro to have it.

Poverty lay heavily on the South. But nowhere was it as burdensome as on the farms—especially the many small ones. The wan man in the faded denim, his sunbonneted wife, and his pinched but eager children, had already shown their resentment in the Populist revolution.

Walter Hines Page described them in a great speech for free education as the forgotten man. Franklin Roosevelt, years later,

was to take that phrase and make it a part of our political vocabulary.

By 1913 a certain momentum was attained. Standards of admission and graduation, which were widely debased, were tightened. Public education came to the South.

Teachers and parents have sacrificed and toiled for it. The despair of the first years of the century are but memories for the old or stories to be read in books.

What of education in 1959?

The compulsive determination of politicians and many of the people to destroy public education in four or five States is almost incredible even when one lives with it.

To speak the phrase, "close the schools," means a previous process of closing the mind has been completed. The mind must be shut before doors to schools may even be thought of as closed.

In early January of this year the Census Bureau released some figures on education. A part of that report, as sent out by the United Press International, was as follows:

"Arkansas spends less per pupil to educate its children than any of the 31 other States that finance schools through school districts, the Census Bureau reported today. "Arkansas provided \$69,636.000 for its 388,000 schoolchildren, or \$154 per child, according to the report covering 1957.

"The next five low rankings all went to southern or border States, South Carolina, \$185 per pupil; Alabama, \$77; Kentucky, \$185; Georgia, \$192; and West Virginia, \$205."

The obvious question growing out of these school figures for 1957 is, What about the rest of the picture?

Southern schools are still among the lowest in expenditure per pupil. But it must be noted that the amount spent in 1957 was a tremendous increase over that of 20 years ago—and is a moonshot away from the educational totals of the bygone era.

A study of the South's position today reveals a national story of change and shifts, economic, population, and also a pattern of growth and process.

The South has grown, changed, and progressed.

But so have the other regions. It is important, therefore, to know what the picture is. Otherwise, we will not know what the job is.

The progress story, as revealed by Department of Commerce figures, is a spectacular one in Texas and Florida. But because the South started in the industrial revolution without any real manufacturing base, certain paradoxes emerge. In personal income Percentage retail sales gains in the South advance since 1940 is higher than the rest of the Nation. Yet, we are still last in income per capita. There is another paradox. Percentage retail sales gains in the South are the second highest—despite our lowest per capita income. Apparently, our wives spend more of our income dollar.

According to the Department of Commerce, the per capita income for the continental United States for the 4 years from 1954 through 1957 was \$2,027, a gain of 14 percent for the 4 years. The per capita income of the 12 Southeastern States in that period was \$1,427, exactly \$600 a year, or \$50 a month below the national average. Yet, this was a gain of 16 percent, second highest in the Nation.

Not even Florida, with all her spectacular growth, reached the national per capita income average. Hers was \$1,836. Georgia was second, with \$1,431. Mississippi was lowest with \$958.

Continuing with the Department of Commerce figures for the past 10 years through 1956, we find these results.

In employment the South is fifth in percentage increase with 24 percent.

If the employment is an indication of industrial development we have here a clear

and interesting picture. Where is the greatest growth in America?

The Pacific States have an employment percentage gain of 67 percent.

The Midwest is up 41 percent.

New England has declined, showing but a 1-percent gain. The Mid-Atlantic States of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York, long heavily industrialized, are just about holding their own.

The West Central States are up 41 percent. But it is the astonishing State of Texas, where employment is up 78 percent, which brings up their average.

And in the South our average is up 24 percent, largely because of Florida which has outdone even Texas in percentage employment gain—a whopping 81 percent in 10 years.

So, we have an answer to the question—Where is the really great growth? It is in the Far West, in Texas, and Florida. We are all familiar with the fact all our cities are growing. The shift is from the fields to factories.

For example, only 1 out of every 10 Negroes now is a farm hand; the rest are in the cities, not just southern cities, but in northern and western cities, too. Migration from the South has not really been slowed down. In the decade from 1910 to 1920, almost 10 percent of the population of the South migrated. In the decade from 1920 to 1930, it was almost 15 percent; in the last decade, ending in 1950, 18.9 percent of the South's population left.

The Negro problem of population annually grows less.

In the years since 1950 through October 1958, there has been a growth in the United States of 15 percent in population. Only two Southern States have reached the national average; Florida with 51.9 percent and Virginia with 15.4 percent. Most of this latter population is a spillover from Washington's great force of Government workers.

Three Southern States lost population, keeping company with Vermont in this category. They are West Virginia, Arkansas, and Mississippi. The Bureau of the Census estimated that after the 1960 census, when Congress by law proceeds with reapportionment, the 17 States of the West will gain 11 House seats, the North will lose 7 and the South 4. With Alaska in the Union the 17 States of the West have 36 of the 98 Senators. This is 14 more Senators than our 12 Southern States. When Hawaii comes in during this session the western count will rise to a majority of 16 more.

What does this cause us to know? It is that population shifts have rather profound economic and political effects.

This is, in brief, some of the background of the changes which have touched us all, stopping at every door, passing over none.

For all the South's struggle and progress, her needs and lacks in education have remained unmet. She is not alone in this, but to be willing to destroy the advances made is almost too fantastic to be believed at a time when the need for more and better education has been violently thrust upon us.

There are already minds and schools closed in the South. There will be more. But I firmly believe those who take this action are trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored. I mean no irreverence when I say that while public education may be crucified on a cross of willful destruction of it, it will rise again out of the wreckage.

Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia have somehow escaped this ugly compulsion to close schools.

One naturally asks: "Why?"

There is one immediate answer. It is leadership. That leadership, seen by an outsider, is broad in scope. It includes elected officials, educators, students, the churches, newspapers, and the citizen himself. I know it was not easy. I am sure there is still reluctance and resistance.

But, nonetheless, civilization, the best quality of Americanism, and the best southern tradition have managed to exert the most influence here. I am aware that the percentage of Negro population is less in the States noted than those in the old cotton South. That is, of course, a factor. More of the plantation-type economy exists in the Deep South.

But, let us be candid. The real explanation is leadership.

You did not have so many closed minds. Your resistance, when confronted with law, accepted law.

It puzzles me, looking at the South. Our beginnings were made by those determined persons who came through the mountain passes and spread out into the Southeast. We are, basically, the same sort of people. But the hands of that great potter, economics, was on us all and we are not all shaped the same emotionally or spiritually. It should be plain that a first loyalty must be to one's country. But not all see that.

Kentucky, North Carolina, and Tennessee can go forward toward the job of progress that we must do here in the South. North Carolina has announced, for example, that because her universities are to remain open, she will build a great research center in the triangle between her three largest institutions. A State whose colleges and universities are to remain open can plan and progress. Virginia has accepted a course of law.

Those States which live in frustration, fear, and uncertainty, will pay a price which may not be calculated if they do indeed destroy, even for a time, public education. That it will be severe in terms of education, business, and things of the spirit, is undoubted.

The voices of those States fully committed to processes of law and democracy must continually be raised in support of both.

Our population burgeons. One hears already not the patter of little feet, but the thunder of them. No system of private or parochial schools can do the job. These schools have a real function. But the almost 200 million Americans and their children increasingly crowded into urban areas can be served only by an efficient public school system.

Ignorance, prejudice, and shabiness of mind and values always are careless leaks in the dikes of civilization in which man is a free individual. These forces must always be recognized for what they are and their presence and purpose publicly proclaimed and opposed.

There are many paragraphs in Boris Pasternak's "Dr. Zhivago" which seem to me to apply in our region, and in the Nation as well.

One of them is this:

"If the beast who sleeps in man could be held down by threats—any kind of threats, whether of jail or of retribution after death—then the highest emblem of humanity would be the lion tamer in the circus with his whip, not the prophet who sacrificed himself. But don't you see, that is just the point—what for centuries raised man above the beast is not the cudgel but an inward music: The irresistible power of unarmed truth, the powerful attraction of its example."

If the South loses, or betrays public education into inadequacy, we will lose, too, this inward music, and the ability to offer the example of unarmed truth.

Reuther Wants More of the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reuther Wants More of the Same," which appeared on February 18, 1959, in the Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz.:

REUTHER WANTS MORE OF THE SAME

Walter Reuther is seeking to extend his kind of financial and political ruin from the State of Michigan to the United States. He proposes that the entire labor union movement sponsor a march on Washington for jobs to dramatize his personal program for socializing employment.

The kind of policies Reuther demands have bankrupted Michigan, lost his United Auto Workers half a million members and killed Michigan Gov. G. Mennen Williams' fond hopes for a Democratic presidential nomination. Reuther cannot escape responsibility for Michigan, since his UAW virtually controls the State. We shall discuss Michigan's dilemma more in detail at a later date; for now, Reuther's effort to compound his failure deserves a close look.

He proposes vastly greater Federal subsidies for unemployment, including federally financed housing and medical and legal care. He demands a shorter workweek and authority for the President to suspend Federal withholding taxes from wages and salaries. The withholding provision is the craziest item of all, since it would merely delay payment of taxes, not forgive them. It would not apply to the unemployed since they have no current income, but to those who are earning. Reuther says it would provide quick injections of consumer purchasing power.

This infatuation with governmentally manipulated consumer purchasing power is at the root of all Reuther's cockeyed philosophies. Even in the shorter workweek, he would bitterly resist any status quo in hourly wage rates, insisting that they be raised to give each worker the same take-home pay for a shorter week as for a longer one. His idea is that the Government, by legislating the same pay for less work, would force industry to hire more people and thus increase consumer purchasing power.

What Reuther is saying is that more Government domination of the country's economic life would increase the gross national product by making more money available to everyone, thereby boosting demand. It is not a new idea. It is as old as socialism. And it is as false.

The National Tax Foundation has been taking a look at gross national product (GNP) in relation to Government control-through-spending. In 1913, when pump priming as a routine thing was unheard of, GNP amounted to \$13 for every \$1 of Government spending. Now there is only about \$4 of private enterprise production for every Government dollar. Or, to put it another way, GNP today is only 11 times greater than in 1913, but Government expenditures have risen 50 times.

Obviously, increased Government spending has not increased private production in ratio. In fact, the opposite would seem to be true. When we get the bill for today's skyrocketing

welfare state expenditures, the lesson may be driven home even more drastically.

Reuther remains stubbornly blind to the quietly insistent lesson of history. Even Michigan has not opened his eyes by smacking him in the face far more dramatically. He wants Federal domination of the Nation's economy at all costs, and he intends to use his union as a weapon to achieve it.

We hope the people have more sense than to fall for the Reuther panacea.

National Civil Service League Announces Winners of 1959 Career Service Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe Members of the House will be interested in a statement of the National Service League identifying the names of career employees who are recipients of career service awards this year:

The National Civil Service League today named the winners of its fifth annual career service awards, the most prized awards conferred upon public employees by a citizen organization. Each year, the league, a non-partisan organization of citizens for good Government, recognizes and focuses national attention on 10 outstanding Federal employees who exemplify the highest characteristics of public service. A special committee of the league selected the 1959 award winners on the basis of competence, efficiency, character, and continuity of service.

The recipients of the awards will be honored at a dinner on Monday, March 2, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington. Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., president of General Dynamics Corp., will be the principal speaker. Mr. Pace formerly served as Secretary of the Army and Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The banquet will also feature music of the U.S. Air Force Band and a star performer. Master of ceremonies for the evening will be Mr. Theodore F. Koop, Washington director of news and public affairs for CBS. A scroll and personal memento will be presented to each winner.

The 1959 winners, who represent the best traditions of the career service, are:

Lyle T. Alexander, Chief of the Soil Survey Laboratories, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture. For three decades Dr. Alexander has been rendering great service to his country in a Government career. A world leader in soil science, he has made outstanding contributions in the fields of soil management, soil genesis, clay minerals, and radioactive materials. He is a top expert on the use of radioactive materials in agricultural research, and especially on the effects of radioactive fallout on soils. He has been highly effective as Chief of the Soil Survey Laboratories.

John B. Barnwell, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education, Veterans' Administration. An inspiring and humble humanitarian, Dr. Barnwell organized a cooperative study of the chemotherapy of tuberculosis that served as a model for other cooperative studies, improved the treatment of tuberculosis, and saved many lives and millions of dollars. A 16-year veteran in Government service, he is now directing a tremendous medical research program that is favorably affecting a very large segment of the total medical care of the United States.

James C. Evans, civilian assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve. The chief adviser on racial and related matters in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and a principal consultant to other Government agencies on such matters, Mr. Evans has greatly aided our national security in more than 15 years of Federal service. Due to his foresight, ability, and integrity, the Department of Defense has made remarkable strides in integrating military personnel in the armed services and improving the equality of opportunity for both military and civilian personnel.

William F. Finan, Assistant Director for Management and Organization, Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Finan is the key assistant to the Budget Director for the improvement of organization and management in the entire executive establishment. He is widely recognized for his notable contributions to improved administrative performance. There is perhaps no one in the Federal Government who knows as much as he does of the intricacies of its administrative system, and who has done more to find solutions to difficult problems. He has been in the public service for almost a score of years.

Lyle S. Garlock, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management. Mr. Garlock administers almost one-quarter of the entire Federal budget. For the fiscal year 1959 he is exercising fiscal control of sums in excess of \$18.6 billion, the largest single peacetime appropriation ever given to any single organization in the executive department. His expeditious financial handling of the B-52, B-58, B-70, and the advanced missile programs has produced outstanding results. In his 25 years of service he has wisely and successfully borne heavy loads of responsibility matched by few men.

Paul M. McDaniel, Deputy Director, Division of Research, Atomic Energy Commission. Having been in the service of the Nation for more than 16 years, Dr. McDaniel has long been associated with the atomic energy program. His efforts have contributed much to the proper organization and operation of the Atomic Energy Commission to meet the challenges of new discoveries. He was instrumental in establishing the Division of Research study of controlled thermonuclear energy. He also has filled many special assignments for the United States in connection with atomic energy.

Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For almost 24 years Mr. Myers has rendered distinguished service to the social security programs of the Nation. He has also been prominent in conducting numerous international actuarial surveys and reviews for foreign governments. His eminence in his profession is internationally recognized, and key personnel in government, here and abroad, have confidence in him and seek his services. His vast knowledge and long experience make him extremely valuable to the public service.

Richard A. Weiss, Scientific Director, Army Research Office, Office of the Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army. Dr. Weiss has played a progressively important role in the evolution of scientific research and development as a basic factor in the national defense effort. He has significantly advanced our defense capabilities through his administrative and personal contributions in such fields as optics, nucleonics, and electronics. Since 1941, this dedicated scientist has devoted himself to the service of the United States, has rejected non-governmental positions offering higher salaries, and has encouraged the youth of the Nation to develop scientific talent.

Joseph E. Winslow, assistant to the Special Assistant to the President for Personnel.

The top career official concerned with the personnel policies affecting all departments and agencies of the Government, Mr. Winslow is a dedicated and highly competent civil servant who has materially helped improve Federal personnel management. In his 24-year career, he has participated in drafting significant personnel legislation, and has had a principal role in the development of the recent training authorization legislation, the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service, and many other important administrative measures. He is frequently consulted by top officials for assistance in Federal personnel matters.

Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Having devoted 30 years of public service to the conservation of the Nation's human, cultural, and natural resources, Mr. Wirth has given new vitality to the whole program of the National Park Service. He is one of the best known and most popular bureau administrators in the Federal Government. While preserving the areas of the National Park System inviolate as a priceless heritage for future generations, Mr. Wirth has given inspired leadership and provided common-sense judgment to programs designed to make these areas more meaningful and enjoyable to the cultural and recreational pursuits of their millions of visitors.

Statement of Hon. J. W. Arnold, Mayor of Cullman, Ala., on Bills Relating to Issuance and Sale of Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, members of the legislative committee of the Alabama League of Municipalities met with the Alabama congressional delegation to discuss municipal problems. It was a great day of exchange of views on many problems.

Among the statements made on the occasion was a very fine statement by the Honorable J. W. Arnold, mayor of Cullman, Ala., entitled "Bills Relating to Issuance and Sale of Municipal Bonds."

I include Mayor Arnold's statement as a part of my remarks and commend its reading to interested Members of the U.S. House of Representatives:

BILLS RELATING TO ISSUANCE AND SALE OF
MUNICIPAL BONDS

(By J. W. Arnold)

In each session of Congress numerous bills are offered which relate to and affect the issuance and sale of municipal bonds. Some of them usually are calculated to be of assistance to the issuing bodies. But, sometimes there are bills whose passage would adversely affect the best interests of our local communities. I would like to discuss types of proposed bond legislation falling into those categories so that our delegation in Congress will know our interest and point of view regarding such proposals.

Ever since the spread of industrialization in the South, our cities and towns have been able to secure passage of State legislation to do these things:

1. To finance construction and equipping of industrial plants for lease to industrial

tenants. This is done through issues of revenue bonds.

2. To finance construction of various types of municipal utilities—waterworks, sewers, natural gas and electric systems—through the issuance of revenue (non-general-obligation) bonds.

3. To finance the municipality's share of hospital construction, development of local public housing authority projects and urban connecting link highways.

TAX EXEMPTION HAS STIMULATED INVESTMENT IN MUNICIPAL BONDS

The policy of the Congress to not tax income earned from municipal securities has stimulated a good market for such bonds or other evidences of debt. Many attempts have been made to repeal this exemption, but always Congress has voted on the side of the municipalities. This we hope will continue to be your policy. Without the exemption feature the interest rate on municipal bonds and other evidences of indebtedness would run so high that we would not be able to undertake many of the municipal programs that we currently sponsor.

A determined drive is always put forth by the Treasury to remove this tax exemption from our statute books. We hope you will hold the lines against any such attempt that may again be made by the Treasury in the 86th Congress.

One bill has already been introduced by Representative ABRAHAM MULDER, of New York, to eliminate the tax exemption on bonds issued by communities to finance the construction of industrial plants by public bodies. We hope you will help us either kill it or hold it indefinitely in the House Ways and Means Committee.

ESTABLISHING A BROADER MARKET FOR MUNICIPAL BONDS

To lower interest costs to municipalities in financing their operations and public works programs, we suggest:

1. That Congress amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to authorize commercial banks to underwrite revenue types of public securities and allow commercial banks to compete freely with other financial institutions for these issues.

Cities and towns are turning increasingly to revenue bonds in financing municipal public works. Experts in the public finance field now estimate that one-half of all municipal borrowing is done through the issuance of revenue bonds. Interest charges cities and towns pay on revenue financing is determined to a very important extent by the competition between financial institutions for these issues. Commercial banks may deal in general obligation (full faith and credit) bonds, but are prohibited by law from underwriting revenue bonds of cities and towns. This restriction in competition has the effect of increasing interest costs and as a result, the cost of many municipal improvement programs is unnecessarily high.

2. It has been suggested—as another means of improving the municipal bond market—that Congress enact legislation which will broaden the market for municipal bonds by permitting regulated and unregulated investment companies to distribute interest on such bonds to their shareholders without loss of tax exemption. Legislation is pending now to accomplish this.

Many companies have large sums of money that can be invested in municipal securities if the interest earnings are tax exempt. The interest is now tax exempt as far as the companies are concerned, but when it is passed along to shareholders it becomes taxable as income of individuals. It has been estimated that the cost to the U.S. Treasury would not be heavy. If this is true, the proposed legislation would seem to be in the municipal interest and worthy of your consideration.

Back for a moment to the whole subject of municipal tax exemption, let me say that it

is the feeling of municipal governments and their officials that the constitutional immunity of the States and the municipalities and their agencies from Federal taxation is necessary to the preservation of the Federal form of dual sovereignty in American government upon which depends the integrity of local self-government in the United States and with it the firmest possible assurance of democracy and the preservation of human liberties.

I thank you.

Farewell Appearance of J. J. Singh, "Mr. India," Before the Far East Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee To Give His Views on United States-Indian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. J. Singh, the president of the India League, is leaving the United States and returning to his native India. Mr. Singh, or "J. J." as he is called, has made many good friends here. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include some of the many personal tributes, news articles, and editorials that have appeared in the newspapers and those that were received on the occasion of the farewell public meeting of the India League of America, held on Wednesday, February 11, 1959, at the Community Church of New York, New York City:

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., member of the executive committee of the league:

"INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,

"New York, N.Y.

"DEAR FRIENDS: I cannot tell you how much I regret not being able to be with you at this farewell meeting of the India League of America. I feel as if I were saying goodbye to old friends by proxy, and that I know is no way of revealing the depth of friendship and regard I have felt for the members of the India League. I wish I could be with you to tell you of the personal satisfaction I have gained from my association and participation in the work of the India League.

"I want to single out from among the many friends in the India League the one with whom I have worked closest and who has given me so much of his time and thought when there was work I could do as a friend of India in the Halls of Congress. J. J. Singh has been a source of strength and inspiration to all of us; a man of dedication to his principles; a sturdy ambassador of good will for India. I remember the work we did together in accomplishing the passage of legislation that removed the obnoxious India Exclusion Act from our statute books and prepared the way for the naturalization of Indians resident in the United States.

"Though he is leaving our midst, I know that our paths will cross again.

"We who are the friends of India will not forget for one moment that a crucial role in world history is now being played by the people of India. India must be given every opportunity to prove to the world that free-

dom and economic opportunity can exist side by side and that it is not mandatory that freedom of a people must necessarily exclude its economic well being, or that economic progress can only be made at the expense of freedom. This is the test mankind faces in these troubled times and one of the most significant of all testing foregrounds is the subcontinent. It is not a choice, it is a must that we, in the United States, give economic aid to India, help to increase her trade, and help to finance her new industries. That we have so far failed to recognize the importance of India to the development of a free society everywhere is borne out by the fact that of the \$20 billion of trade that the United States carries on, only \$500 million relates to India. Yet India gives us the mica, the jute, the manganese, the spices that we ourselves must have in the development of our own economic and scientific progress. To India we look for the attributes of charity and compassion, steeped as she is in spiritual strength. We in the United States cannot afford to take our eyes away from the Indian scene. I have witnessed for myself in my visit to India the heartbreaking problems that face her. I have seen, too, the tremendous work that is being done in the villages. The intelligence and sensitivity of her leadership, her men and women of dedication and sacrifice have left a deep impression on me. The world watches the struggles of a free people of India and the progress made under that freedom as against the brutal totalitarianism of Communist China. In a sense then I say—and I repeat—that herein lies the test tube of whence our civilization shall go.

"I shall miss you all, but I must leave you with the assurance that my work and friendship for India shall continue unabated.

"Sincerely and hopefully,

"EMANUEL CELLER."

Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C., member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: It was with deep regret that I received the news of the dissolution of the India League in your letter of January 29.

"The work done by the organization, and particularly yourself, has made a significant contribution to the better understanding of India by people in the United States. Through your efforts, many Americans have seen the close kinship between the people of your country and ours as we both struggle toward our common goals of freedom and peace.

"My sorrow at your departure from our shores is tempered by my admiration for your accomplishments. I wish you Godspeed in whatever you put your many talents to in your native land.

"Yours faithfully,

"W. O. DOUGLAS."

Mr. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: I read with interest and regret the article in the January 18 edition of the New York Times relative to your decision to return to your home in India after 33 years in the United States.

"I can well understand yours and your wife's desire to get back to India again not only for your own, but for your children's sake. You have been a very worthwhile resident of our city and have won the admiration and respect of all who came in contact with you. I want you to know that I have had the opportunity to see and visit with you and like all of your friends, hate to see you leave.

"May I extend to you every good wish for success, health and happiness in your home country.

"Sincerely yours,

"JAMES A. FARLEY."

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate, Washington, D.C.:

"Thank you so much for your letter of the 31st. I regret that you are retiring and returning to India, but you can rest assured that you have made a great contribution to a better understanding of your country in America during these past years.

"Sincerely yours,

"J. W. FULBRIGHT."

Representative JAMES G. FULTON, member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C., member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR J. J.: As a personal friend, it is a pleasure to add my comments on your valued contribution to the growing friendship between India and the United States, which I believe will be one of the decisive factors in world affairs in the next generation. I do hope that you will keep me advised as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, when there are matters which you think should be brought to my attention in order to maintain this friendship which has been growing steadily through such a difficult period.

"With personal regards and best wishes,

"Sincerely,

"JIM FULTON."

Dr. Frank P. Graham, U.N. representative in India and Pakistan, member national advisory committee of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: I regret your leaving us and wish you, Mrs. Singh and your family every happiness in your return to your native land. You have been a real unofficial but effective ambassador to the people of the United States. We will deeply miss you here.

"With high esteem and warm regards to you and Mrs. Singh from Mrs. Graham and me,

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANK GRAHAM."

Dr. John Haynes Holmes, minister emeritus of the Community Church of New York, member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: This is melancholy news you send me in your letter of the 29th—melancholy for us who lose, by your return to India, and are deprived of your presence and work here in the hour of India's continuing need in the vast struggle for independence, but happy for you and your wife who return to your beloved country to serve the great cause there, as, for so many years, you served it here in America.

"Your work here on behalf of India's liberty has been truly remarkable. You have functioned in various capacities as scholar, teacher, propagandist, orator, and advocate, of a nation's cause, and all of these upon the highest level of integrity, honor, and resourceful leadership. You have been like the watchman on the towers, always alert, always fearless, militant, and courageous. It's easy to see why we shall miss you, for India is still in critical times, and where shall we look for the guidance and tireless service which constituted always so large a measure of our own strength? But, as I have said, what America loses here is straightway gained by India, and thus made a continuing labor on behalf of your heroic people.

"I am deeply sorry that, because of illness, I shall be unable to participate in, or even be present at, the farewell meeting arranged for February 11 next. I take pleasure, therefore, in accepting your invitation to send you a message of farewell which, in due course, I shall forward to you. It has been my privilege to know you and to admire you, and to share with joy in your work. I should count it my great fortune that, thanks to your courtesy, I may send you this message of farewell, for which you ask.

"With renewed greetings, and all best wishes, I remain,

"Very sincerely yours,

"JOHN HAYNES HOLMES."

Mr. Henry R. Luce, publisher, Time-Life-Fortune, member national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR J. J.: As I prepare to leave for Arizona, for a period of concentrated reading, thinking, and writing, I learn that in my absence there will occur the valedictory meeting of the India League of America. I learn, too, that you are soon to leave us and return to India. The two facts add up to a tautology, for it is impossible to imagine an India League with J. J. and vice versa.

"While I may not have been a regular participant in the work of the league, I am proud of my association with it as a member of the advisory board, and I am specifically proud of certain of the league's achievements. Two examples come to mind. One is the securing of UNRRA relief for the victims of the Bengal famine in 1943. The other is the act of Congress enabling Indians to become American citizens. It will always be a cause for gratification to me that my wife, as a Member of Congress, was a sponsor of that law.

"Of course, when one speaks of the India League's activities in these and other good causes, one speaks mostly of J. J. Singh, who brought the organization to life exactly 20 years ago. You have been good for us Americans. You learned our democratic processes better than most of us and employed them wisely and constructively. You have been a good friend and, particularly since your marriage to the enchanting Malti, an ornament to our society.

"I know that my colleagues in Time, Inc., are toasting you and Mrs. Singh at a party in our offices in mid-February. I deeply regret that I shall be absent. In case I am not back in New York in time to speak directly with you, here are my regretful farewells to the J. J. Singhs, and my hopes that you, as an incorrigible ambassador, will visit us soon again.

"Sincerely yours,

"HENRY R. LUCE."

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, the Senate, Washington, D.C., member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: It is with deep regret, because of conflicting dates out in South Dakota in connection with the observance of the 150th birthday of Abraham Lincoln, that I cannot be with you for the farewell public meeting being sponsored by the India League of America in New York City on February 11.

"It is with even greater regret that I learned that the Indian League of America is being dissolved and it is with a genuine sense of personal loss that I learned of your decision to return to your native country of India. You have served both India and America well for a long period of time in your self-assigned responsibility as 'Indian Ambassador without portfolio.'

"Knowing you as I do, I am sure that once you are back in India your service to both countries will continue to be significant and that you will do much to bring about in India better understanding of America and the free way of life which it exemplifies and symbolizes. The future of India is with the free world and I know that you will bring to the attention of the leaders of India the continuing importance of cooperation with the free world in the development of policies and programs designed to prevent the further spread of communism, and the dangers to peace which the expansion of communism necessarily provides.

"With every best wish, I am,

"Cordially yours,

"KARL E. MUNDT,

"U.S. Senator."

Hon. William M. Rountree, Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D.C.:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: Thank you for your letter of January 31, 1959. I share your regret that the India League of America has decided to end its long service for the cause of Indian-American friendship. I am happy to enclose a message on the work done by the league which you may wish to use at the final meeting.

"Your own efforts will be long remembered and your presence in the United States will be missed. Even though you are ending your work here, I am glad that we will have in your person in India a firm friend of the United States who will continue to work to strengthen the bond of friendship between our two countries.

"Sincerely,

"WILLIAM M. ROUNTREE,

"Assistant Secretary."

"To the India League of America:

"It is with a sense of regret that I send these farewell greetings to the India League of America on the occasion of its last meeting. The league can be proud of its contribution to the close and friendly relations which exist between India and the United States. I am confident that, even though the league itself will no longer exist, its work will be continued by the individuals who were members of the organization. My colleagues and I assure you that we will do our utmost to strive for an ever larger measure of friendship and understanding between our two countries.

"WILLIAM M. ROUNTREE,

"Assistant Secretary."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1959]

The city bade a fond farewell yesterday to Sirdar Jagjit Singh, Indian's unofficial ambassador, who has been supporting the cause of his homeland in New York for the last 33 years.

Mr. Singh—"sirdar" is a Sikh honorific roughly equivalent to "captain"—was the guest of honor at a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel sponsored by Mayor Wagner and paid for by the Indian League of America. Mr. Singh is its president. He is leaving for retirement in New Delhi on March 8.

Mr. Singh, or "J. J." as he is known, received a scroll from Mayor Wagner citing him for distinguished and exceptional service to the city.

The citation noted that Mr. Singh "has accomplished so much in furthering mutual friendship and understanding between the people of India, his native land, and the people of the United States, his adopted land for 33 years."

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Brooklyn Democrat and chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, praised his old friend for his efforts at United States-Indian understanding even during dark periods.

Mr. Singh, who said that he considered himself a New Yorker, promised that he would tell his people "about the greatness, kindness and decency of the American people."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 17, 1959]

THE UNOFFICIAL AMBASSADOR

Many friends of India will be saddened by the news that, after 22 years of promoting friendship and understanding between our two countries, the India League of America is being disbanded and its president, J. J. Singh, is taking his family back to India.

The league's membership has never been large, but its work, largely carried on through Mr. Singh's personal diplomacy and his tireless lobbying and letterwriting, has, in a quiet way, helped considerably to bring about a greater American understanding of the

vastly important but long mysterious giant of the East.

The fact that Mr. Singh's departure has signaled the dissolution of the league is an eloquent measure of his personal contribution to it. The league hopes that another organization (Mr. Singh suggests the Asia Society) will carry on its work. As for unofficial ambassador Singh himself, whose return to India after 33 years here is prompted by family considerations, his enthusiasm remains undimmed, and it perhaps is not too much to hope that he will be as effective an interpreter of the United States to his countrymen as he has been an interpreter of India to Americans.

[From the New York Times, February 18, 1959]

AN UNOFFICIAL ENVOY

In giving a farewell luncheon for J. J. Singh, Mayor Wagner has recognized the distinguished part that this unofficial envoy from India has played in the life of our community. We hope that it is not farewell but merely au revoir, and that J. J.—as he is affectionately known to thousands of Americans—will come back to visit soon and often.

After 33 years in this country Mr. Singh has decided to take his charming family back to his native India and to retire there. No one who knows him can accept the idea of his retiring without the broadest reservation. He will continue to work on behalf of his country and on behalf of better understanding between India and the United States. Perhaps he may even form an American League in India, since he was the life and soul of the India League here for 20 years and as he leaves the India League has disbanded, saying "mission accomplished."

He has been singularly successful in presenting the cause of his people to this country. One reason is that he has understood and liked Americans and made them like him. His urbanity, good humor, common sense, and patriotic devotion have endeared him to everyone who had reason to know him.

J. J. Singh has been an honor to India and a most pleasant visitor here. More like him would do us all good.

Popular Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when the national defense education bill was before the Congress last year considerable opposition was voiced to the student loan program provision. Many thought that it would not be used. The following editorial from the New Republic of February 23, 1959, gives some interesting statistics concerning the widespread popularity of the program.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4220, which would provide for a college scholarship program. I cannot too strongly urge upon our colleagues the necessity for enactment of this measure, to supplement the loan program:

POPULAR EDUCATION

A largely ignored report from the U.S. Office of Education shows that the student loan program authorized in last year's Na-

tional Defense Education Act is 10 times more popular than Congress anticipated. Under the program, college students can borrow up to \$1,000 a year for academic expenses. They do not have to begin repaying the loan until 1 year after they graduate, and then the terms are reasonable: 10 years to pay at 3 percent on the unpaid balance.

Congress last fall appropriated \$6 million to get this program started. The colleges have to put \$1 of their own into their loan funds for every nine Federal dollars received. By the end of 1959, more than 1,200 colleges and universities had asked for \$62 million—466 of them never had a student loan program before.

The administration has responded by proposing that Congress meet the students' demand about half way: the President has requested that another \$24 million be appropriated for fiscal 1959 and another \$30 million for fiscal 1960.

Addresses of John Cashmore, President of the Borough of Brooklyn, and Frederick Zurmuhlen, Commissioner of the Department of Public Works of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses of Hon. John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, and the Honorable Frederick Zurmuhlen, commissioner of the department of public works of the city of New York, at the ceremonies on January 5, 1959, dedicating the new Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, N.Y.:

ADDRESS OF JOHN CASHMORE, PRESIDENT OF THE BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN

Mr. Justice Nolan, reverend clergy, distinguished members of the bench and bar, ladies and gentlemen, today we dedicate the building which will stand for the next century, at least, as the symbol of justice in Brooklyn. It is a magnificent structure, indeed, and well it should be in keeping with its noble purpose. Constructed at a tremendous cost, it represents no small sacrifice on the part of the people of the great community it is to serve.

But sacrifice in the name of justice is nothing new to this community of Brooklyn, because the very ground on which this structure stands reverberated nearly 200 years ago to the tramp of Washington's soldiers, and the land nearby was literally soaked with the blood of those who gave their lives to throw off tyranny and oppression so that freedom and justice might be the symbols of the American way of life.

And let us not lose sight of the fact that the historic Supreme Court Building across the street, which now gives way to the needs of a new era, was also constructed at equally great financial sacrifice during the War of 1861, when men of the old city of Brooklyn were dying by the thousands to prove the truth of their conviction that no race of people could be kept in bondage and slavery under the American system of justice.

Today, one short century later, the members of the race that was enslaved live side by side in this community with the mem-

bers of the race that were their tormentors. In this courthouse they will both stand equal before the law.

To be sure, this great structure does represent sacrifice, but the very principle of justice itself has always required sacrifice, constant, never-ending sacrifice, by those who would serve its cause and reap its benefits.

Although the spirit of justice and the self-discipline that are entailed in its preservation seem native and natural to the character of our people, it is also true that some leadership is necessary in undertaking a project so great as this.

Many of our citizens have given much to make this a day of accomplishment, but there is one man who has provided the leadership and the courage to overcome the obstacles that arose during the past 5 years. I am happy to salute him, for when others were fainthearted he pushed on. He is the great mayor of the city of New York, Robert F. Wagner. To him and to Commissioner Zurmuhlen, who have done so much to make this great courthouse a reality, I extend the thanks and appreciation of the Borough of Brooklyn.

And now we, the administrators of the city who have supervised the erection of this structure, which is but stone and mortar, deliver it to you, the justices of the court, to infuse in it the spirit and the soul of justice. Yours is an awesome responsibility indeed. To find the truth, to render exact justice between man and man, to preserve the heritage of liberty and justice that our people of Brooklyn have fought for and died for—these are burdens to try even the strongest and most learned of men.

That Almighty God will give each of you, and those who come after you, the strength, the courage, and the wisdom to face these great tasks is the fervent prayer of all the people of Brooklyn, who have so often proved their complete and unselfish devotion to the cause of justice.

Thank you. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF FREDERICK ZURMUHLEN, COMMISSIONER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, NEW YORK CITY

Justice Nolan, reverend clergy, the resident justices and many judges of many courts that are here today, distinguished guests, and not to forget the borough in which this building lives or is, the Honorable John Cashmore, Mr. Borough President, ladies and gentlemen, as you have been told, we have gathered here today for a formal dedication of what is probably the newest and largest landmark in the Borough of Brooklyn. It is the largest component of this borough's civic center, which has been developed over a long period of time and is based upon a vision and ability to see into the future of many borough planners and many city planners, in addition to the department of public works.

Much of what we see nearby today in arriving or leaving, or which we come in contact with in our day to day pursuits as officials, judges, attorneys, businessmen, or civil service personnel, may be taken for granted among the many facilities this city must afford its citizens, without appreciating or even considering the years and the nights, the days, the hours, the headaches that go into the evolution of the plans and designs that are conceived and then finally consummated by architects, engineers, and then interpreted into actual physical being by skilled and semi-skilled workmen.

The skill of the surgeon, the logic of the advocate, the dedication of the clergyman may be found around us here in counterpart in terms of architecture and engineering. Professional careers may be saved, an innocent suspect may be exonerated, a weighted soul may be redeemed. A lasting facility has been constructed to afford comfort, conven-

ience and protection of our rights in an atmosphere synonymous with the prestige of our democratic way of life, our respect for the Constitution and the constitutional law of our land.

There has already been a whisper of criticism of this building by chronic complainers. An official may falter, the attorney may err, even a clergyman may be remiss on occasion. This is no more or less true of the architect and the engineer. There are those who would scoff when a case is tried and decided, a delicate operation performed or a building built. But to paraphrase a well-known saying, "Let him who is perfect cast the first aspersions."

The department of public works, and I am well into my 12th year as its commissioner, is justly proud and almost smugly happy today to have been responsible for this building. It has been a long time coming. This building was in the budget in 1948 originally, and is only being dedicated in 1959.

Our nonprofessional as well as our registered architects and professional engineers whose efforts are coordinated with those of the outside consultants who were in this case, Shreve, Lamb & Harmon, well-known architects, and Sisco & Hennessey, well-known engineers, the contractors, a co-venture of Castagna & Son, and R. H. Construction—all of these have filled their tasks with the degree of dedication that enabled us to complete this project in time and with some degree of completion.

I mean by that, that we do not feel particularly good about opening or dedicating a building that has no landscaping around it. However, that was due to a lack of money. The landscaping, I am positive, will be in the next capital budget, and will take place during the coming year. However, I think, Judge Keogh, we did provide you with at least an entrance to each one of the courts, and an entrance from each one of the streets on which the court faces.

In my time as commissioner we have completed some \$600 million worth of work. That is a lot of money. And the men who have the headache of finding where it comes from are represented here today by the borough president of Brooklyn, not only in his own capacity as borough president, but I understand he is going to represent the mayor also, the members of the board of estimate—without them none of this work would be possible. Almost needless to say, the \$600 million included some \$200 million worth of hospitals as well as an impressive number of health and welfare stations, firehouses, police stations, new library construction, and rehabilitation, pollution control projects, together with miles and miles of interceptor sewers, bridge repairs, and new bridges.

Simultaneously we have maintained and operated 68 public buildings assigned to our jurisdiction, with more than 7 million square feet of space, larger than Radio City and the Empire State Building. And that makes us one of the largest landlords in this city.

Now some of our tenants have large families. We are going to have a large family in this building. We get along very well. There is never any question about the rent at least, though at times there may be complaints about the services. But then all big landlords have some headaches.

We do our best with limited budgets. And if you read our reports, you will find that we maintain these buildings at less cost per square foot than is done in private industry.

We, in the department of public works, will give the best for the dollars assigned to our department, and all we ask is an appreciation for the things so many take for granted, the incomparable services and protection that the department and other departments afford on a day-to-day basis.

We offer you today, Judge Keogh, and your entire staff of judges, this temple of justice

as a monument to democracy, to our way of life and our firm conviction that we know what we want, because we know it is best for us, and not because we have been told that it is best for us; because we have the absolute right to enjoy our use of reason and decide for ourselves as individuals, not in classes, on the best individual interest.

To that simple, honest principle this magnificent building is dedicated. Not with our words, not with our flags, but with our oath of allegiance, with our hearts, with our inbred respect for the law and order which regulates our land, our rights and privileges, and our responsibilities.

It has been a privilege as an engineer and as an architect to have supervised the construction of this landmark. It will stand for generations and command the respect of those whose rights will be protected here.

And may it serve well the present and those future generations for whom we have planned and built here the Brooklyn Civic Center in the greatest city in the world. [Applause.]

National Guard Muster Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, February 22 some 470,000 National Guardsmen honored George Washington by mustering at their respective armories throughout the United States.

The Altoona (Pa.) Mirror recognized the occasion by the following editorial entitled "Let Us Remember," which appeared in the February 21 edition. This editorial is a great tribute to the citizen-soldiers that make up our National Guard and which have contributed greatly to the preservation of our Nation.

The editorial follows:

LET US REMEMBER

Tomorrow is the birthday of Gen. George Washington.

Tomorrow is also National Guard Muster Day—an occasion for more than 470,000 of our citizen-soldiers to honor this same George Washington, an early comrade-in-arms of the Virginia Militia.

This newspaper believes that Muster Day should be more than a day set aside by National Guardsmen. We believe that it should be an occasion for citizens everywhere to honor the National Guardsmen themselves; to acknowledge the great debt they owe to the men of their oldest fighting organization.

We tend to forget our National Guard during the years of peace. Even now many of us have forgotten what World War II should have proved once and for all: That National Guardsmen are capable of meeting any challenge that faces them.

It seems strange that this should be; that after 300 years of fighting Indians, invaders, and dictators, floods, fires, and tornadoes, the National Guard should have to prove itself. But prove itself it did, and in 1945, after the smoke of 4 years of battle had cleared away, National Guardsmen had won 14 Medals of Honor and 88 Presidential Unit Citations. Eighteen National Guard Infantry divisions had fought throughout Europe and the Pacific, compiling one of the proudest combat records in our history.

The guard's participation in World War II is a perfect example of the unyielding spirit

of free citizens who take up arms in the defense of their Nation. And there were dark hours during the war when it was that spirit alone which turned the tide of battle.

Tomorrow—on Muster Day, 1959—the spirit remains. Week in and week out, while most of us are enjoying the leisure of hours after work and of weekends, 470,000 Army and Air National Guardsmen are giving unselfishly of their time in the most vigorous training program of their organization's history. They know that in modern warfare a citizen must be not only willing, but prepared to fight as well.

They go about their tasks quietly and unobtrusively and we seldom know they are there. Every once in a while disaster will strike locally and they will go into action again, saving lives, guarding property, and restoring order, and we read about their deeds and we praise them. And then we forget; we take them for granted.

Let us remember. Let us honor the past contributions of our National Guardsmen and acknowledge their present-day efforts.

We are much safer for having them.

American Bar Association Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the American Bar Association, at its midwinter meeting in Chicago, overwhelmingly adopted the report of its special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. This excellent report, resulting from an exhaustive study by this most competent committee, calls for legislative action by the Congress. It should be read and its recommendations carefully considered by every Member of the House and the Senate:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

FOREWORD

International communism continues its worldwide conquest with the same vigor which has enabled it to bring 900 million people under its control while covering one-quarter of the earth's surface. In these United States its threat increases as far too many of us fail to comprehend its sinister purpose. The objective of worldwide communism has never changed—only do its tactics change in order to more effectively infiltrate life in America, to lower resistance to its propaganda, and to cripple our defenses against this tyrannical and deadly way of life.

There is not one home in our land which is not affected by communism in some manner. Above all, our national economic security has been undermined by the necessity of building our defenses against the threat of Soviet aggression and through the Red impact on world trade. The U.S. gold reserves are becoming alarmingly low. Our country is the lone nation in the civilized world which admits foreign capital from undisclosed owners.

Our internal security has been weakened by a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the public and technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind have had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and

free the subversive to go forth and further undermine our Nation. Lenin once stated as a prerequisite for a revolutionary situation which the Communists could exploit, the fact that the ruling classes can no longer govern. Must we admit that we have reached that point?

The Soviet advances in seeking superiority in the control of space have doubtless been aided by the theft of secrets from American scientists in the same manner in which the Soviets gained the know-how to develop nuclear weapons. Should the United States come under attack, it will then be too late to allocate responsibility. Corrective action must be taken now. Time is running out on us.

It is now an established fact that every institution, every force, and every person actively engaged in the forefront of the defense of our country against the rising menace of communism becomes the target of attack and vilification by Communists, Crypto-Communists, fellow travelers, their stooges, and innocent but beguiled persons.

The agencies of Government charged with protecting our internal security have demonstrated by past performance their ability to protect our Nation. We take pride that a lawyer, Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and his staff, composed largely of lawyers and others with legal training, have been in the forefront most often under very difficult circumstances. In war and peace the FBI has demonstrated the ability to carry out its responsibilities to the American people in a truly American manner avoiding the excesses of both the NKVD and the Gestapo. It, therefore, merits the wholehearted support and continued confidence of the bar and of the American public.

The fight to keep America free and secure must be strengthened by providing those agencies of our Government which are responsible for our internal security with the means to maintain the security of our shores, the fight for a free America cries out for a furthering of the educational program to combat the evil ideas of communism with truth, and the American bar's responsibility has never been so great as at the present time to assume leadership in the preservation of the freedoms so gallantly won by our forefathers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States and an independent judiciary created by the Constitution have been and are the ultimate guardians of the Bill of Rights and the protectors of our freedom, and as such it is the duty of the members of the bar to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks; and

Whereas this association recognizes that sharp differences have been expressed as to the soundness of some of the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court affecting the national and State security, with particular reference to the activities of domestic and foreign Communists within our country; and

Whereas such differences have given rise not only to severe criticisms of the decisions, but unfortunately to condemnation of the Court itself, and to omnibus proposals for limiting its appellate jurisdiction; and

Whereas while members of this association view some of the decisions to be unsound and incorrect, they deem such broad omnibus proposals at this time unwise and likely to create more problems than they will solve; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association disapprove proposals to limit any jurisdiction vested in the U.S. Supreme Court; be it further

Resolved, That wherever there are reasonable grounds to believe that as a result of court decisions, weaknesses in internal secu-

rity have been disclosed, remedial legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States, including a specific pronouncement of congressional intention that State statutes proscribing sedition against the United States shall have concurrent enforceability.

II

Whereas recent declarations by the U.S. Supreme Court (notably in *Watkins v. U.S.*, 354 U.S. 178) have been construed as holding that the House of Representatives has not spelled out with sufficient clarity or detail the authority granted to the Committee on Un-American Activities and queries whether the said committee has been carrying out properly its congressional mandate, which interpretation has resulted in the reversal of trial court convictions for contempt of Congress; and

Whereas it has been deemed by many Members of the Congress, the bar, and the public that such declarations and interpretations thereof tend to impede the work of the Congress through its committees and thereby create a problem, the solution to which must be found; and

Whereas it is the view of this association that the quickest and best solution is for the House of Representatives to rewrite its resolution of authority to its congressional committee investigating internal security and Communist activities in terms so thoroughly, carefully, and precisely worded as to leave no area for reasonable misunderstanding or evasion; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommend to the Congress that the House of Representatives rewrite and adopt its basic resolution of authority for the Committee on Un-American Activities under the same name or such name as such legislative body shall designate setting forth that the purpose in creating said committee is to study the operation of existing laws and the requirements of further legislation, in addition to defining clearly and adequately the powers of such committees.

III

Whereas your committee deems it advisable that the precise terms of the basic authority of the congressional committee which subpoenas the witness to appear and testify should be made available to each witness subpoenaed, for his enlightenment in advance of the hearing; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommends to the Congress that whenever any of its committees subpoena a witness to appear and testify or to give evidence, such committee should furnish the witness at the time he is subpoenaed with a copy in writing of the precise terms of the basic authority of the committee.

IV

Whereas recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, in cases involving National and State security and with particular reference to Communist activities, have been severely criticized and deemed unsound by many responsible authorities; and

Whereas problems of safeguarding National and State security have been exposed or created thereby which this association feels would be best solved by the careful study of each decision, and the prompt enactment of sound amendments to existing laws within the constitutional powers of the Congress; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommend to the Congress the prompt and careful consideration and study of recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and the preparation and passage of separate amendments to the laws involved so as to remove any doubt as to the intent of the Congress, and to remedy any defect in the existing law revealed by the decisions; be it further

Resolved, That legislation be promptly enacted to eliminate obstacles to the preservation of our internal security in the following areas:

(a) Amend the Smith Act to define the word "organize" to include the recruitment of new party members, the formation of new party units, and the regrouping, expansion, or other activities of an organizational nature performed by members of existing clubs, cells, classes and other units so as to insure the applicability of this section of the act to Communist actionists, agents, organizers, colonists, or members currently performing organizational work;

(b) Amend the Smith Act to make it a crime intentionally to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States or to teach the necessity, desirability, or duty of seeking to bring about such overthrow; in order that (1) this Nation might take protective steps to prevent acts which, if not prevented, could result in bloodshed and treachery; and (2) this Nation need not be forced to delay the invoking of the judicial process until such time as the resulting damage has already been wrought. (See *Yates v. U.S.*);

(c) Establish the right of each branch of government to require as a condition of employment that each employee thereof shall not refuse to answer a query before a duly constituted committee of the Congress or before duly authorized officers of either the executive or judicial branches of the Government with respect to Communist, Communist front or other subversive activities or any other matter bearing upon his loyalty to the United States, as the Government has a right to know his record;

(d) Invest in the executive branch of the Government the right to protect our internal security against the activities of aliens who were or became Communists at any time subsequent to their entry into the United States by providing for their deportation without any deprivation of due process; and the right to make and enforce reasonable restrictions on aliens awaiting deportation to prohibit them from engaging in any activities identical or similar to those upon which the aliens' deportation order was based, with the further right fully to interrogate aliens awaiting deportation concerning their subversive associates or activities;

(e) Strengthen the effectiveness of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1948 by a requirement that political propaganda by agents of foreign principals be labeled for what it is where such agents are situated outside the limits of the United States, but nevertheless directly or indirectly disseminate such propaganda within the United States.

V

Whereas, the respective records of the Subcommittees on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee and of the House Un-American Activities Committee both charged with the duty of investigating internal security and Communist activities are records of accomplishment and great service to the Nation; and

Whereas the continuation of the work of these committees is essential to the enactment of sound and adequate legislation to safeguard the national and State security; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association recommends that the House of Representatives continue to maintain a committee to investigate matters relating to national security with particular emphasis on Communist activities invested with adequate jurisdiction to accomplish its purpose, and that the Senate continue to maintain and support its Subcommittee on Internal Security; and be it further

Resolved, That such committees maintain close liaison with the Intelligence and Se-

curity Agencies, as well as with the Attorney General of the United States, to the end that they may be kept advised as to legislative needs of the executive branch of the Government required to carry out its responsibilities for internal security.

REPORT

Inasmuch as the house of delegates of the association referred back to the committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives, to study the recommendation that the association endorse H.R. 12949 and the recommendation that the association endorse S. 1411 in cooperation with the special committee on individual rights as affected by national security, this committee submits its recommendations with the body of the report. Such a procedure is followed because the two committees to which the recommendations were referred for further study have not had a sufficient opportunity to jointly discuss their findings. The recommendations are submitted herewith.

Be it resolved, That this committee recommends that legislation be promptly enacted to eliminate obstacles to the preservation of our internal security in the following areas:

1. Restore to the executive branch of our Government the right to determine and to dismiss, if required, those who are security risks in both sensitive and nonsensitive positions in the Government service.

2. Restore to the executive branch of government the right to deny passports to persons knowingly engaged in subversive activities, or activities designed or intended to further international communism by the establishment of criteria and standards to be applied in the issuance of denial of passports. These criteria and standards should be clear and unequivocal, and in addition contain a specific authorization to the Secretary of State empowering him or the Acting Secretary to withhold a passport in the national interest based upon confidential information and upon which he shall certify that it is contrary to the interests of this Nation that a passport be issued to the applicant; and further, to prevent foreign espionage agents from departing this country for the purpose of carrying out their espionage pursuits or to escape disclosure or prosecution; and that such legislation establish adequate appeal procedures which would insure due process of law so as to provide recourse to the individuals concerned in the event of any arbitrary and capricious exercise of discretion not properly founded.

It is with a profound sense of high privilege and grave responsibility that your committee submits the following report to the house of delegates and, through it, to the bar and to the public.

UNLESS

International communism will enslave the peoples of every nation of the free world—including the United States—unless they—

Awaken from their apathy and their indifference to the dangers that exist and threaten.

Learn and appreciate the freedom and the human rights they enjoy—and are determined and prepared to fight to preserve them for themselves and for their children.

Learn and appreciate the meaning of enslavement of the individual as it exists under communism.

Learn and appreciate the difference between the idealistic pretensions of communism and its inhuman reality.

Learn that the Communist ultimate goal of dominating and controlling every nation and every human being, never changes—though its tactics vary from day to day.

Understand that wishes and prayers alone will not suffice to overcome communism or to avoid its menace.

Know that only by unity, determination, strength—moral, scientific, and military—and a willingness to state their position in

advance, and to be ready to fight for it, can they best safeguard the free world and its institutions.

Remember that Communists respect only those with equal or greater strength.

Know that the plea for peaceful coexistence is a fraudulent tactic of international communism seeking to blind the American people to the Soviet record of broken promises and aggression and intended to paralyze and disarm the free world in advance of the coming Soviet onslaught.

Never forget that international communism—particularly the Soviet—has the worst record for broken treaties in all history.

Remember that communism has never sold itself on its merits nor has it ever been adopted by a free vote of a free people.

Realize that free industry and free labor unions in any country are free only so long as communism does not dominate there—and that both industry and labor carry grave responsibilities in the defense of their nations against communism.

Realize and warn that partisan politics by those occupying or seeking public office may be a great aid to international communism and a serious handicap to one's own country.

Remember that subversion—aided by treason and treachery of domestic citizens—has been the most successful tool and tactic of international communism in gaining control of new enslaved nations or in weakening or dulling the resistance by those nations which remain free.

Never forget that international communism still maintains as one of its fundamental tenets—where and when necessary—the overthrow by force and violence of any free nation when such overthrow can be successfully accomplished.

Know that one of the Communists' chief tactics is to keep the free world on the defensive by prodding and creating problem spots in every area of the globe.

Know that without sacrifice free nations cannot be protected or prepare themselves for defense from communism's constant assaults or against outright war.

Realize that the process of weakening the free nations is constantly carried out in many ways through subtle and persistent propaganda, and that the weapon of counter-propaganda by truth has not as yet been adequately or affirmatively used against the Communists.

Never forget that while from time to time we may have to confer and negotiate with Communist Russia or other Communist enslaved nations, their agreements have no sacred or serious meaning to them, will be breached when it is expedient for them to do so, and that such negotiations should be carried on by duly constituted officials of government and not by self-appointed apologists.

Remember that international Communists continue to talk peace but relentlessly wage war in its many forms at the same time.

Never confuse Communists with the freedom-loving peoples of the nations they dominate and control, or fail to appreciate that these peoples crave freedom and a better way of life, peace, and understanding with other nations. But, if the peoples of the free world are alert to what communism is and how it operates and what it costs in determination, dedication, toll, and sacrifice to protect our freedoms and our way of life, then the free world will survive and communism will ultimately dissipate or destroy itself and its devoted followers.

Most persons who are informed on communism think our country now faces its greatest danger. The thesis of J. Edgar Hoover's new book, "Masters of Deceit," is: "Communism is the major menace of our time. Today it threatens the very existence of our Western civilization."

Footnotes at end of speech.

In his speech to the 1957 national convention of the American Legion, Mr. Hoover warned:

"To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that."

And on December 22, 1958, Mr. Hoover added:

"Sensing a more favorable atmosphere, the Communist Party, USA, and its dupes and sympathizers gained further courage and became more vocal in their attacks upon law enforcement and other professions which are dedicated to preserving our freedoms."

The lawyer-author of the Gaither report to the President on national security recently told our association:

"Our security is in unprecedented peril. . . . The ultimate objection of international communism is world domination, and the Soviet Union will pursue this objective ruthlessly and relentlessly employing every possible political, economic, subversive, and military stratagem and tactic."

COURT DECISIONS RELATED TO COMMUNISM

Mr. Justice Jackson in *American Communications Association v. Douds*¹ concluded that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not a political party but "is a conspiratorial and revolutionary junta organized to reach ends and to use methods which are incompatible with our constitutional system." Likewise, former Chief Justice Stone reached a similar conclusion several years earlier in *Schneiderman v. United States*.² So, too did former Chief Justice Hughes when, as Secretary of State, he refused to recognize the Communist Government of Russia, and former Chief Justice Vinson in *Dennis v. United States*³ which decision upheld the convictions under the Smith Act of the American Communist leaders.

Similar pronouncements are contained in the preambles to many State sedition laws as well as in the preamble to the Communist Control Act of 1954, where Congress stated specifically that "the Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States, although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States." Likewise, the Subversive Activities Control Board has, after protracted hearings, found the Communist Party to be a Communist-action organization required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950.

In spite of this, much dicta has appeared in recent decisions of the Supreme Court to the effect that the Communist Party is a political organization of a lawful nature similar to the Republican, Democratic, or Socialist Parties, hinting that disclosure of membership therein or association therewith is entitled to the protection of the first amendment. While this view has not been actually held in any known case, language contained in many of the decisions has invited confusion.

Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States through invalidation of State sedition statutes, and limitation of State and Federal investigating powers in the field of subversion although these cases might readily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting National and State security efforts. The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet, use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objectives. This trend was treated fully in the conference of State chief justices last year when they called upon the U.S. Supreme Court to exercise the power of judicial self-restraint. The dissenting opin-

ions of certain Supreme Court Justices have been crystal clear in charting the effect of the failure of the majority to recognize the underground forces that are at work and to appreciate how these decisions affect our internal security.

It has frequently been said that "justice delayed is justice denied." The delays in arriving at final determinations in criminal proceedings have invited criticism of the American judicial process. In no area has this been more tragically illustrated than in cases dealing with Communists. The proceeding against the Communist Party before the Subversive Activities Control Board is a case in point which makes a mockery of justice. Eight years have now elapsed since the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950. The status of the Communist Party continues to remain unadjudicated. The constitutionality of the act remains to be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Communists have used every tactic to delay the determination of this case and subsequent enforcement of this act.

Your committee wishes to make clear that this delay is not the fault of the Subversive Activities Control Board itself which is composed of men and women of great talent who have diligently and courageously maintained a rare judicial attitude and composure despite the Communist vilification which has been heaped upon the Board and the members personally. They have endured frustrations imposed upon them by judicial delays and failures to meet the issues in a decisive manner so that justice might inure to the American people as well as to the accused.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, under the mandate of the Internal Security Act of 1950, issued its order on April 20, 1953.* That order, issued after exhaustive hearings and documented in a scholarly manner on a legal basis, found that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was a Communist-action organization and directed that it must comply with the act. This order remains to be enforced. We reassert the views stated in the brief which the American Bar Association filed in the U.S. Supreme Court in support of the Internal Security Act of 1950. If any part of the said act violates the Constitution, the courts should so hold. Congress should then enact new legislation or amend the present act to conform to any constitutional requirements as determined by the courts. If the act is constitutional, the Communist Party should not continue to enjoy immunity from its security provisions during many years of protracted legislation.

The importance of the Communist Party proceeding before the Subversive Activities Control Board justifies a brief résumé of this matter:

1. The Supreme Court did not determine the constitutionality of the act but rather remanded the case to the Board for exploration of charges supported by affidavit made by the party in the court of appeals concerning the credibility of three Government witnesses, namely, Crouch, Johnson, and Matusew. The charges made by the Communist Party in the court of appeals were not controverted by counteraffidavit of the Department of Justice for the reason that there was other overwhelming evidence to sustain the Board's order. The Supreme Court stated that since the assertions were not challenged by the Department it must remand the case to the Board for exploration.

2. When the case was returned to the Board the Department of Justice did not undertake to challenge the veracity of the charges made against these three witnesses. Accordingly under the Supreme Court's opinion the Board had no alternative but to expunge their testimony in its entirety

from the record, and on the basis of the remainder of the evidence—testimony and documentary—the Board entered a new order.

3. The case again was argued before the Court of Appeals. After oral argument there and prior to decision by the Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court handed down its opinion in the Jencks case (noted later in this report). The party thereupon filed motions invoking the Jencks doctrine. The Court of Appeals then remanded the case to the Board for production of documents in relation to witness Mary Markward. The Communist Party then filed a petition for rehearing and a motion to adduce additional evidence in relation to witness Budenz. In the course of preparing a reply to the petition for rehearing and the motion the Department discovered the existence of a recording of the initial interviews with Budenz after he left the party, the substance of which had been previously reported. This discovery was made known to the appellate court and it thereupon remanded the Budenz question also for production of documents.

4. All documents ordered by the court to be produced have been furnished by the Department to the Subversive Activities Control Board in relation to the two witnesses. It developed, however, that Budenz was unavailable for further cross-examination due to a grave heart condition. The party now has a motion pending to reopen the case for cross-examination of all FBI agents who interviewed Budenz, claiming among other items that there are inconsistencies between the documents produced and the testimony of Budenz before the Board.

5. On February 9, 1959, the SACB in an order for the third time after months of additional study, required the CPUSA to register in accordance with the Internal Security Act of 1950. In its most recent order, the Board rejected the Communist Party claim that false testimony had been given by a witness in another proceeding. Another round of appeals no doubt will be sought by the Communist Party to further delay a final adjudication of this case.

The following are the principal cases that have been criticized by the public, public officials, and the bar in varying degrees as illustrative of how our security has been weakened:

1. *Pennsylvania v. Steve Nelson* (350 U.S. 497 (Apr. 2, 1956)): The Court held 6 to 3 that the Federal Smith Act which prohibits the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence, suspends the enforceability of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act in certain respects— which act proscribes the same conduct—on the grounds that Congress has preempted the field of sedition against the United States to the exclusion of parallel State legislation that the dominant interest of the Federal Government precludes State intervention, and that the administration of the State act would conflict with the operations of the Federal plan. Three Justices dissented in every respect and pointed out that the Court should not void State legislation without a clear mandate from Congress.

2. *Communist Party U.S.A. v. Subversive Activities Control Board* (351 U.S. 115 (Apr. 30, 1956)): The Board found the Communist Party to be a Communist-action organization subject to the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The Communist Party appealed to the U.S. court of appeals and filed a motion for leave to introduce additional evidence before the Board alleging that three Government witnesses had committed perjury in other similar cases which motion was denied. The Government did not challenge

the allegations in the motion, but simply contended that the Board's order was amply supported by evidence other than the testimony of the witnesses in question. The Supreme Court held 6 to 3 that the court of appeals had erred in denying the motion and remanded to the Board to permit the evidence to be introduced. Three Justices dissented on the grounds that denial of the motion was within the lower court's discretion and that there had been no abuse of discretion. The dissent criticized the refusal of the majority to deal with the constitutional issues presented.

3. *Watkins v. U.S.*, 354 U.S. 178 (June 17, 1957): A union officer appearing as a witness before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities refused to answer questions as to past Communist Party membership of certain persons, objecting on grounds of lack of pertinency to the subject under inquiry by the subcommittee. The Supreme Court held 6 to 1 (two Justices not participating) that under the applicable statute a congressional investigating committee must upon objection of a witness on the grounds of pertinency, state for the record under inquiry at that time and the manner in which the propounded questions are pertinent thereto. The Court stated that the phrase "un-American activities" was vague and that the evidence failed to show that the question under investigative inquiry was ever made specifically known to the witness. The dissent declared that the pertinency of the questions asked to the matter under investigation had been sufficiently shown. (This decision has led to a continuing discussion and challenge by witnesses as to the "pertinency" of questions. No court could function smoothly under such an impediment.)

4. *Cole v. Young*, 351 U.S. 536 (June 11, 1956): An employee in the U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Department, who was charged with "sympathetic association" with individuals reliably reported to be Communist and making contribution to an allegedly subversive organization, was summarily dismissed by the agency head under the authority of the Summary Suspension Act of 1950, which authorizes heads of specified agencies to summarily dismiss employees "in the interests of the national security of the United States." The act provides that the determination of the agency head is conclusive and final. The Supreme Court in a 6 to 1 decision overturned the dismissal on the ground that the Summary Suspension Act has reference only to those activities directly concerned with the Nation's safety, and that the employee in question did not occupy a "sensitive position." Three Justices dissented, holding that the clear purpose of Congress was being frustrated in that the statute had been intended to authorize summary dismissal of employees whose retention would be inimical to the national interests regardless of the sensitivity of their positions.

5. *Leedom v. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers*, 352 U.S. 145 (December 10, 1956): The National Labor Relations Board after an administrative investigation and hearing found that an officer of the plaintiff union had filed a false non-Communist affidavit. The Board, in accordance with the National Labor Relations Act which denies the benefit of the act to unions whose officers have not filed such affidavits and makes union officers who have filed false affidavits subject to criminal penalties, issued a decompellance order barring the union from the benefits of the act until it complied. The U.S. Supreme Court held that this order was beyond the Board's authority and that the only remedy which the act permits in the case of false affidavits is the criminal penalty.

* Footnotes at end of speech.

6. *Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workmen of North America v. National Labor Relations Board*, 352 U.S. 153 (December 10, 1956): An officer of plaintiff union had been convicted of filing a false non-Communist affidavit. The Board issued an order directing the employer to correct an unfair labor practice. The court of appeal refused to enforce this order on the ground that the union was not in compliance with the act and thus not entitled to its benefits. The Supreme Court reversed, reiterating the view stated in the *Leedom* case that the sole penalty for false filing of a non-Communist affidavit is the criminal penalty.

7. *Gold v. U.S.*, 350 U.S. 985 (January 28, 1957): Defendant president of a labor union was convicted of having filed a false non-Communist affidavit with the N.L.R.B. On defendant's appeal to the U.S. court of appeals the conviction was affirmed. It appeared that an FBI agent investigating another similar case telephoned or visited three members of the jury during defendant's trial and inquired whether they had received any propaganda literature. The issue reaching the Supreme Court was whether the impact of these contacts on the jurors was so prejudicial as to require reversal. The Court so held in a per curiam opinion. Four justices dissented on the ground that no effect upon the jurors adverse to the defendant could reasonably be anticipated by virtue of the accidental intrusion on their privacy.

8. *U.S. v. Witkovich*, 353 U.S. 194 (April 29, 1957): The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 requires that an alien against whom a deportation order has been outstanding for more than 6 months shall be required "to give information under oath as to his nationality, circumstances, habits, associations, and activities, and such other information, whether or not related to the foregoing, as the Attorney General may deem fit and proper." Appellee being an alien against whom a deportation order had been outstanding for more than 6 months refused to answer questions put to him by the appropriate immigration authorities regarding his present Communist relationships. He was indicted under the criminal provisions of the act. The Supreme Court held, 6 to 2, that the statute authorized only questions reasonably calculated to keep the Attorney General advised regarding the continued availability for departure of aliens whose deportation is overdue and ruled for dismissal of the indictment. Two justices dissented expressing the view that under the statute an alien could properly be questioned as to activities indicated by past conduct and that the statute raised no constitutional question.

9. *Schwartz v. Board of Examiners of New Mexico*, 353 U.S. 232 (May 6, 1957): Schwartz's application to take the New Mexico bar examination was denied on the ground that petitioner had not shown good moral character in view of his past membership in the Communist Party, his use of aliases and his record of arrests. Schwartz, unlike other individuals, did not invoke the fifth amendment and was frank and candid with regard to his past Communist activities. While the petitioner made out a good case on his conversion from Communist ideology, nevertheless the decision casts grave doubt on the propriety of the Supreme Court to substitute its standard of fitness for the bar of New Mexico in place of the standard established by the bar and the courts of New Mexico. The Supreme Court reversed the State Supreme Court of New Mexico holding that Schwartz's exclusion violated due process, stating that the record did not support the State court's conclusion that petitioner had not shown good moral character.

10. *Konigsberg v. State Bar of California*, 353 U.S. 252 (May 6, 1957): Petitioner refused to answer questions as to present and

past membership in the Communist Party put to him by the California State bar examiners. He was thereupon refused admission to the bar on the grounds that he had failed to prove that he was of good moral character and did not advocate the overthrow of the Federal or State governments by unconstitutional means. Five Justices of the Supreme Court overruled the California Supreme Court holding that petitioner's right of due process had been violated since the evidence did not rationally support the finding that he had failed to prove that he was of good moral character and that he did not advocate the overthrow of the Federal or State government by force and violence. Two Justices dissented on the ground that refusal to answer questions relevant to fitness without constitutional justification justified the committee's refusal to certify petitioner for admission to the bar. One Justice dissented on procedural grounds. (This decision is the greatest inroad on the traditional right of each State to establish its standard of fitness for its own bar and was severely criticized by former President David F. Maxwell in his annual address to this association.)

11. *Jencks v. U.S.*, 353 U.S. 657 (June 3, 1957): An officer of a labor union was indicted for filing a false non-Communist affidavit with the NLRB. At his trial he filed a motion requesting an inspection of reports made to the FBI by Government witnesses as to event and activities to which they had testified at the trial. His motion was denied and he was convicted. The U.S. Supreme Court overturned this conviction, five Justices concurring, stating that the defendant was entitled to examine these reports. The former practice of submitting Government documents to the trial judge for his determination of relevancy and materiality was disapproved and the Court held that if the Government wished to exercise its privilege to withhold the reports in the public interest then the criminal action must be dismissed. Three Justices dissented in part, holding that the documents should be produced for the examination of the trial court in camera to determine their relevancy as well as the applicability of the Government's claim of privilege in the public interest. One Justice dissented en toto.

12. *Service v. Dulles*, 354 U.S. 363 (June 17, 1957): Plaintiff, a foreign service officer, was on numerous occasions investigated as to loyalty and standing as a security risk. These investigations involved extensive hearings. In the most recent one the State Department gave him clearance and this action was approved by the Deputy Under Secretary. However, on a post audit the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission made unfavorable findings and recommended his discharge. The Secretary of State accepted these findings without making an independent review of the evidence. The U.S. Supreme Court reversed the action of the Secretary of State and of two Federal courts holding that Dulles' action was in violation of the loyalty and security regulations under which the Secretary of State was bound to make an independent determination after a review of the evidence.

13. *Yates v. U.S.*, 354 U.S. 298 (June 17, 1957): Defendants were charged with conspiring to advocate and teach the forcible overthrow of the Government of the United States and to organize as the Communist Party of the United States, a society of persons who so advocate and teach, all in violation of the Federal Smith Act. The Supreme Court reversed convictions in two lower Federal courts and held that teaching and advocating the abstract doctrine of the forcible overthrow of the U.S. Government was not punishable under the Smith Act as long as it was "divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end." The Court further held that the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act referred only to acts entering into the creation of a new organization and stated

that since the Communist Party was organized in 1945 and the indictment not returned until 1951, that the prosecution on this charge was barred by the 3-year statute of limitations. This decision is characterized by numerous partial dissents and partial concurrences on the part of the various justices. Two justices in dissent stated that overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy could be proved from the record.

14. *Raley, Stern & Brown v. Ohio* (354 U.S. 929): The Supreme Court vacated the judgment of the Ohio Supreme Court and remanded for consideration in the light of *Sweezy v. N.H.*, a case concerning the conviction of three men who had refused to answer questions about Communist activities put to them by the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission. One justice dissented for the reasons stated in his dissenting opinions in *Sweezy* and *Watkins* and another justice dissented indicating his desire to note probable jurisdiction and set the case for argument. On remand the Ohio Supreme Court reiterated its earlier conviction and the case is once more pending appeal.

15. *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (354 U.S. 234 (June 17, 1957)): In the course of an investigation of subversive activities in New Hampshire a witness refused to answer questions concerning a lecture given by him at the State university and questions concerning the Progressive Party and its adherents asked by the New Hampshire attorney general acting as a one-man legislative committee. The Supreme Court reversed the contempt conviction by the State court, four justices basing their decision on the ground that the State legislature had not made clear in the authorizing legislation that it desired the information sought by the attorney general and deemed the lack of authorization to be a lack of authority on the part of the attorney general. Two justices dissented from this reasoning saying that the distribution of powers on the State level is not a matter of Federal concern, but concurred in the result on the ground that the State had failed to show that the protection of State interests justified the invasion of the witness' constitutionally protected academic and political freedoms. Two justices dissented from the result in its entirety.

16. *Slochower v. Board of Education of the City of New York* (350 U.S. 551 (April 9, 1956)): Under the terms of a New York City charter provision which had been long in effect a City College professor was discharged without notice or hearing for claiming his privilege against self-incrimination when asked about Communist Party membership by a congressional committee investigating matters of national security. It seemed that the professor had answered similar questions put by a State investigating body and that this information was in the hands of city authorities at the time of his discharge. The Supreme Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and held that this automatic discharge was unconstitutional because of alleged lack of due process. Four justices dissented.

17. *United Mine Workers v. Arkansas Oak Flooring Co.*, 351 U.S. 62 (Apr. 23, 1956): Louisiana State courts had enjoined picketing by a union which had failed to file the non-Communist affidavits and other data required by the National Labor Relations Act. The Supreme Court held that the State courts had no power to enjoin the picketing on the ground that while the union could not resort to the N.L.R.B. because of its failure to comply with the filing requirements, it could nevertheless take other lawful action, e.g. peaceful picketing. One justice dissented on the ground that the said act contained no implied limitation on the State power exercised under these facts.

18. *Sacher v. U.S.*, 78 S. Ct. 842 (May 19, 1958): Sacher refused to answer three questions put to him by a subcommittee of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate

Committee on the Judiciary. His contempt conviction was upheld by the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court remanded the case for reconsideration in the light of *Watkins v. U.S.* The case was reargued before the Court of Appeals and the conviction reaffirmed. The Supreme Court again reversed the order of conviction and found that questions relating to proposed legislation barring Communists from practice at the Federal bar constituted an excursion outside the committee's authorized scope of inquiry. The grant of certiorari and reversal order were made at the same time and in the same per curiam decision. Two justices dissented on the grounds that the questions were pertinent to the authorized inquiry and that the court had refused to hear argument from Government attorneys.

19. *Kent & Briehl v. Dulles*, 78 S. Ct. 1113 (June 16, 1958): The Secretary of State turned down passport applications of Kent and Briehl on the grounds that they were Communists and that they had had constant and prolonged adherence to the Communist Party line. The Supreme Court reversed two lower Federal courts and held that since statutes provided that it is unlawful for a citizen to enter or leave the United States without a valid passport, the Secretary of State did not have authority to promulgate regulations denying passports to Communists or to persons whom evidence showed were going abroad to further Communist causes, or regulations demanding non-Communist affidavits from citizens applying for passports. Three justices dissented in all regards stating that the Secretary of State's passport power permitted the regulations in question.

20. *Dayton v. Dulles*, 78 S. Ct. 1127 (June 16, 1958): Dayton, a native born citizen, is a physicist who has been connected with various Federal projects. He applied for a passport to enable him to travel to India in order to accept a position as a research physicist there. This application was turned down by the Secretary of State for three reasons: (1) His alleged association with various Communists, (2) associations with persons suspected of being part of the Rosenberg espionage ring, (3) his alleged presence in an apartment in New York which was allegedly used for microfilming material obtained for the use of a foreign government. Basing its reasoning on *Kent v. Dulles*, the Supreme Court overruled two lower Federal courts and held that the passport could not be denied to a U.S. citizen on the ground that it was believed he was going abroad to engage in activities which would advance the Communist movement. Four justices dissented on the same grounds as the dissent in *Kent v. Dulles*.

21. *Yates v. U.S.*, 78 S. Ct. 128 (November 25, 1957): Yates and 13 others were indicted and convicted of conspiring to violate the Smith Act. In the course of the trial Yates refused to answer 11 questions relating to whether other persons were members of the Communist Party. The trial court held her in contempt for each refusal and imposed 11 concurrent sentences of 1 year each. Supreme Court reversed two lower Federal courts holding that this action constituted an improper multiplication of contempt proceedings against the witness when first inquiry was made stated that she would not identify any Communist Party members. The Supreme Court reversed all but the first conviction which was vacated and remanded for resentencing "in the cool reflection of subsequent events." Three justices dissented to the remand of the first conviction holding that all the convictions should be thrown out.

22. *Bonetti v. Rogers*, 78 S.C. 976 (June 2, 1958): Bonetti was an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence in 1923 who joined the Communist Party in 1932 and left it in 1936. In 1937 he

went to Spain to fight the Spanish Civil War. In 1938 he returned and was admitted for permanent residence as a quota immigrant and thereafter continued to reside in the United States, except for a 1-day visit to Mexico in 1939. The Internal Security Act of 1950 provides for deportation of any alien who was at the time of entry into the United States, or has been "at any time" thereafter a member of the Communist Party. The Supreme Court reversed two lower Federal courts and held that plaintiff's time of entry for purposes of the act was 1938 not 1923, and not having been a party member then or subsequently, was not deportable. Three justices dissented stating that this construction deletes the phrase "at any time" out of the act and reads the word "last" into the statute and thereby "cripples the effectiveness of the act."

23. *Flaxer v. U.S.*, 79 S. Ct. 191 (December 15, 1958): Flaxer was convicted of contempt of Congress and failing to produce pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum issued by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee records of his union showing names and addresses of members employed by the Federal, State, or local government. The Supreme Court remanded the case for reconsideration in the light of *Watkins*. Upon reaffirmation of Flaxer's conviction the Supreme Court reversed on the ground that the indictment named October 5, 1951, as the date of contempt when actually the subcommittee had given him 10 days from that date in which to comply. The Court states "Yet for all we know, a witness who was adamant and defiant on October 5 might be meek and submissive on October 15."

24. *Uphaus v. Wyman*, 355 U.S. 16 (1957) (pending): Appellant Uphaus appealed from affirmation by the New Hampshire Supreme Court of his conviction of contempt of court for refusing on grounds of the first amendment to produce in response to subpoena duces tecum, a guest list and certain correspondence with speakers at World Fellowship, Inc., a summer camp in Albany, N.H., of which appellant was executive director. The documents were subpoenaed by a State legislative committee in the course of a State investigation of subversive activities. The U.S. Supreme Court without hearing argument on October 14, 1957, vacated the judgment of the New Hampshire Supreme Court and remanded the case for further consideration in light of *Sweezy v. N.H.*, whereupon the New Hampshire Supreme Court reaffirmed its former decision and appellant again appealed. This case was argued before the U.S. Supreme Court on November 15, 1958, and a further decision is now pending.

The Shelner case (Florida). In accordance with the resolution of the house of delegates and authorization of the board of governors, our committee—on the request of the State attorney for cooperation—applied for and obtained permission to appear as amicus curiae in the appeal pending in the Supreme Court of Florida from the order of dismissal of the disciplinary proceedings against Leo Shelner. Leo Shelner had twice previously been ordered disbarred by the Circuit Court of Florida.

Our committee prepared and submitted a brief to the supreme court of Florida in which its views were set forth with relation to the duty of the bar and of the courts concerning the responsibilities in maintaining the high standards of fitness required of lawyers. The committee further defined its concept of an acceptable standard for attorneys. Any member of the bar who, in appropriate proceedings persists in refusal to answer pertinent questions concerning his activities in the Communist Party or Communist-dominated fronts on the ground that his answers to such questions concerning his activities might tend to incriminate him is unfit. It is inconceiv-

able to us that an attorney and officer of the court may continue in good standing while he pleads self-incrimination in refusing to answer questions relating to subversive activities.

The brief pointed out that labor union officials, teachers, Government employees, and employees of private industry, have been safeguarded in invoking the fifth amendment to inquiries which might tend to incriminate them. However, in so doing, they demonstrate lack of candor required of attorneys and forfeit their positions of trust and responsibility. The Shelner case is most important to the bar. Other States having such problems await the final decision.

The appeal was argued before the supreme court of Florida on February 8, 1958. Julius Applebaum, a member of our committee, argued as amicus curiae for this association. On July 24, 1958, the court ordered further argument on September 5, 1958, and requested supplemental briefs as to the application of three decisions, *Mar Lerner v. Hugh J. Casey, et al.*; *Herman A. Beilan v. Board of Public Education, School District of Philadelphia*; and *Milton Knapp v. Mitchell D. Schweitzer, et al.*, rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court on June 30, 1958. Our committee prepared a supplemental brief on behalf of the association and participated in the supplemental argument. As of this writing, the supreme court of Florida has not yet rendered its decision. The committee is willing to appear in similar cases upon direction of the house of delegates or board of governors.

In sharp contrast to the due process afforded Shelner is the Associated Press dispatch of September 16, 1958. By decree of the Communist regime in Hungary, 3,500 lawyers were disbarred. They were deemed to lack approved political qualifications.

COMMUNIST TACTICS

The Communists have set forth their master plan of world conquest even more forthrightly than did Hitler in "Mein Kampf." The Communist Manifesto is specific: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions." Communists have never deviated from the theory enunciated by Marx and the strategy devised by Lenin.

The Communist master plan for world conquest has been outlined by both Lenin and Stalin as entailing the violent smashing and overthrow of all non-Soviet governments, including those of Great Britain and the United States. Prior to this overthrow and to prepare for it in each instance, the Communist Party is to make "transmission belts" of all possible nonparty agencies for the diffusion of the Communist line, weakening the country to be overthrown. Already this has become a historical fact to which once free peoples, now enslaved, can testify. Need we have more evidence of Soviet intent?

During the last 25 years, the United States has participated in hundreds of meetings with the Communists, including those held at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. All this talk has led to many major agreements and Soviet Russia has broken almost all of them. The Communists have followed Lenin's dictum about treaties and agreements: "Promises are like pie crusts—made to be broken."

The United States has met on countless occasions with the Chinese Reds to negotiate the release of American prisoners. The record is a dismal one. In June 1954 a total of 76 Americans were held in Red China. On August 1, 1955, 35 were released. An additional 28 were released at the end of 1955. Since then nine more have been released.

On January 9, 1958, the Reds in China were holding four Americans and in October 1958, had arrested a fifth American, a Roman Catholic priest. The Communists have followed Stalin's principle of diplomatic intercourse:

"Words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."¹⁰

HINDSIGHT OR SOUND APPRAISAL

On June 17, 1958, when the Soviet news agency, Tass, announced the executions of former Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy, Gen. Pal Maleter, and two other leaders of the anti-Communist rebellion of 1956, Western leaders expressed shock and dismay. General Maleter, the hero of the rebellion, had been seized by the Soviets when he met with them under a flag of truce to negotiate the withdrawal of the Red army from Budapest. Nagy and his associates were executed, although they had received in advance a written guarantee of safe conduct when they left their asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy.

In March 1945, 16 top leaders of the Polish Government were invited to Moscow to participate in the conduct of negotiations. They were promised on the word of honor of the Soviet Government that they would be afforded safe conduct. All 16 were arrested and then vanished. Nothing further was heard of any of them until 10 years later, when the wife of Gen. Leopold Okulicki was notified of his death 9 years before in a Soviet prison.¹¹ Since the Katyn Forest massacre, which came to light in 1943 (where thousands of Polish officers who were prisoners of the Soviets were shot and buried in a trench), it has been obvious that coexistence with communism is a contradiction in terms.

Marx and Engels stated this objective in the Communist Manifesto: "The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."¹²

Lenin gave this command to Communists: "It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even, if need be—to resort to all sorts of stratagems, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge."¹³

On another occasion, Lenin added: "As long as capitalism remains we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."¹⁴

On September 17, 1955, Nikita Khrushchev warned us: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."¹⁵

Khrushchev made this statement to Western diplomats at a Moscow reception on November 18, 1956: "If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you. Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."¹⁶

Khrushchev appeared on our American television screens on June 2, 1957, and confidently told us: "Your grandchildren will live under socialism."

William Z. Foster dedicated his book "The Twilight of World Capitalism," to his grandson, "who will live in a Communist United States."

The key to Communist tactics is the dialectic, expressed through what is known as historical materialism. By constant examination of the directive documents which flow from Moscow to the Communist Parties of the world, and adapted in turn by them to the conditions of each country, we see

the dialectic at work through the Communist line.

Under the theory of the dialectic, as it allegedly works in society and history, the triumph of the world Soviet dictatorship or socialism, leading to world communism, is inevitable. No action of any human agency can halt this fatalistic process. But it is not a progress that is made on a straight line or even on a curve; it is a zigzag movement due to the struggle of contending forces and their relative strengths from time to time, a course which, however, leads ever onward toward world dictatorship. This results at times in Communist advances, at times in retreats. Each development must be taken advantage of by Red tactics and strategy to forward the course of world dictatorship to the maximum under the prevailing conditions.

Stalin has stated clearly the object of the strategy of retreat or apparent retreat when he says: "The object of this strategy is to gain time, to demoralize the enemy, and to accumulate forces in order later to assume the offensive."¹⁷ This follows Lenin's tactics which have been described in his work "One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward."¹⁸

The result of the strategy and tactics thus devised, to take into account the relationship of forces at any particular time, is the appearance of forward and backward movements, which are all designed by their zigzag course to lead to furthering Soviet advances. Because of the general lack of knowledge in the United States of these tactics and strategy, as laid down by Lenin and Stalin and summed up in the latter's Foundations of Leninism, the Soviet advance made during the past 25 years has been little less than amazing.

History now records the facts of Communist dialectics at work. Under Stalin the change from hostility to apparent friendship and back to hostility were changes by periods. There was the Hitler-Stalin pact period (time of hostility), the World War II period (time of apparent friendship), and the postwar period (time of hostility again). Under Khrushchev, Stalin was damned, Lenin exalted, and then at a 1957 diplomatic reception Khrushchev switched and said, "God grant that every Communist should fight for the interest of the working class as Stalin did." The Communist strategy under Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev is to use both hot and cold methods at once. Thus in the past few months we have witnessed the shelling of Quemoy and threats to Berlin coupled with cultural exchanges and the trip of Soviet Deputy Premier A. I. Mikoyan. We saw his smiles and snarls. The Communists aim to keep us complacent until the choice is annihilation or surrender, at which time they confidently expect us to submit to a negotiated surrender.

Also during the past year, the Communists went forward with the rocks and garbage thrown at Vice President Nixon in South America; backward with the smiles of Menchikov; forward with the executions of Nagy and Maleter; backward by allowing Tito to make a few anti-Soviet statements; forward with the defeats of anti-Communists in Syria and Indonesia—all with the same unity of purpose that makes everything contribute to their plan of world conquest.

Current Communist tactics include the following:

1. Nullification of the Smith Act and other anti-Communist legislation: FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified January 16, 1958, at a House hearing made public in May, that 49 of the 108 Communist leaders convicted by Federal juries under the Smith Act have been set free by Supreme Court decisions.¹⁹ As of January 25, 1959, only 33 convictions of Communists remain as such while of the 108 convicted, 75 have been released. Judge Richard H. Chambers, of the

U.S. Court of Appeals, in a decision releasing 11 of these convicted Communists, said that Supreme Court decisions have left the Smith Act, as to any further prosecution under its provisions, a virtual shambles.

J. Edgar Hoover has testified that a top Communist functionary described the Supreme Court decision in the Smith Act case of June 17, 1957, as the greatest victory the Communist Party in America has ever received.²⁰ The Daily Worker summed up the Yates, Watkins, and other cases of that same day in these words: "The curtain is closing on one of our worst periods."²¹ The Sunday Worker of May 11, 1958, contains strong opposition to any legislation to overcome the Supreme Court's rulings on internal security.

Other anti-Communist laws which have been targets of the Communist Party and which are now nullified or weakened by the judicial decisions are the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, the anti-sedition laws of 43 States, and Hawaii, key security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and the Summary Suspension Act of 1950.

2. Muzzling the FBI and congressional investigations: For years the Communist Party has poured out its most hysterical language against that which the Reds call the Gestapoke FBI, and congressional inquisitions and witch hunts. This tactic has been so successful that it is now said that the Communists don't have to tell congressional committees anything. The effectiveness of the Communist propaganda machine is attested to by the frequency of attacks from sources of presumed respectability. It is significant to note the similarity of these so-called respectable verbal and written brickbats with Communist poisoned darts. As the world Communist onslaught continues, an intensification of attacks on the FBI, congressional committees and indeed all other effective anti-Communist forces can be expected. In fact an excellent criteria of the effectiveness of any group which labors to preserve the American way of life is the intensity of Communist and radical attacks directed at them.

Judge Robert Morris, chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee for 6 years, said: "The power of the Congress to learn the underlying facts of the [Communist] conspiracy has been hamstringed since the decision in the Watkins case."

There appears to us to be little question that the dicta in such cases as Watkins and Sweezy have compounded the difficulties of investigating committees in the security field. Witnesses, dominated by the Communist Party, have used the dicta to impede the function of Congress in its legislative responsibility. On this basis Communists have adopted the tactic of invoking the first amendment rather than the fifth amendment in refusing to answer obviously pertinent and important questions.

In the first session of Congress subsequent to the Watkins decision, hearings by the House Un-American Activities Committee was practically brought to a halt and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee suffered a similar plight. On July 5, 1958, the press reported that congressional investigations into the Communist conspiracy have reached an all-time low for the last two decades. However, committee files are bulging with data on the conspiracy which are crying for exploration to form the basis for corrective legislation.

The experience of France, and more particularly Germany, show the danger of restricting legislative investigations.²² Bismarck so feared the power of parliamentary investigation that he dissolved the Prussian Parliament when it attempted to assert its right of investigation. Historians agree that the lack of legislative investigation was the greatest single cause for the authorization of Imperial Germany.

Footnotes at end of speech.

When the Weimar Republic was created, article 34 of the Constitution granted the Reichstag the power "to appoint investigating committees." When the Reichstag attempted to exercise its constitutional right, the German Constitutional Court, in two key cases, narrowed the scope of parliamentary inquiry so considerably that the investigating powers of the Reichstag were inadequate to its tasks. As a result, the Reichstag never exposed the Nazi, purges by Hitler, concentration camps, and secret police. The success of the Nazi conspiracy taught the German Supreme Court a lesson. On August 17, 1956, it handed down a scholarly 375-page opinion which outlawed all activities of the Communist conspiracy in West Germany.

Notwithstanding some mistakes—fewer than generally charged—the service to our country by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee has been incalculable and worthy of far greater praise than has been accorded to them. The Communist and radical propaganda against these committees has never subsided. Our committee, therefore, recommends the adoption of Resolution V.

This committee has been astonished to read the proposal to the Congress that one of its committees charged with investigating National and State security and Communist activities be discontinued. We regard any attempt to terminate or to curtail the work of the committee of each House charged with this vital duty as a distinct disservice to the Nation.

3. Ultimate elimination of Federal and State security programs: This tactic has been successful with regard to nonsensitive positions in Government and evidence is abundant that the Communist conspiracy considers nonsensitive positions vitally important. Government employment is not a right but a privilege.

4. Communism is worldwide in its scope of operations which require travel on the part of its propaganda and espionage agents: For this reason Communists and their dupes aided by innocents have long been carrying on a vigorous campaign to break down, or weaken, passport control in the United States. Meanwhile, they maintain strict controls in the Soviet Union, Red China, and other satellite countries.

5. The peace offensive: On April 1, 1951, the House Un-American Activities Committee issued a report called "The Communist Peace Offensive: A Campaign To Disarm and Defeat the United States." This document showed in detail how intellectuals, professors, writers, and others who influence public opinion, were attracted to various Communist peace fronts. This report said: "The most dangerous hoax ever devised by the international Communist conspiracy is the current worldwide peace offensive."

Today, under the slogans "peace" and "peaceful coexistence," we are witnessing an intensification of this Communist peace offensive. The Czechs and Hungarians found that coexistence with communism is enslavement. Peaceful coexistence means Communist conquest without war. In his February 1956 report to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Khrushchev asserted in Aesopian language that peaceful coexistence would lead to the victory of world communism.

Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, in his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, has accurately described what the Communists mean by peace. "Every act that contributed to the Communist conquest is a peaceful act. If they take a gun, they take a peaceful gun, containing a peaceful bullet, and kill you peacefully and put you in a peaceful grave. When the Chinese Commu-

nists murder millions, it is an act of peace. When the Russian tanks rolled into Budapest to butcher and destroy, it was glorious peace." This is what J. Edgar Hoover calls semantic sabotage.

In describing the recent case involving the Communist spy Rudolph Ivanovich Abel, J. Edgar Hoover testified: "I mention this case particularly, Mr. Chairman, because there are some people who think that the matter of Soviet espionage is a thing of the past and no longer exists in view of the theme of peaceful coexistence the Soviets continue to expound. Many of the incidents in the Abel case occurred in 1957."²⁴

We must realize that Communist governments resort to blackmail, counterfeiting, forgery, kidnapping, lying, mass murder, slavery, subversion, theft, and treaty-breaking as part of their official state policy. It is a matter of historical record that the Kremlin blackmailed the Allies into concessions during World War II by threatening to sign a separate peace with Hitler; that Communist governments have counterfeited American money and forged American passports; kidnapped American citizens and held them for ransom; kidnapped 28,000 Greek children in the most cruel mass abduction in modern history; murdered thousands of Polish officers at Katyn Forest;²⁵ 6,112 American soldiers whom they captured in Korea;²⁶ and thousands of boys and girls in Hungary; forced millions of Polish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Czech, Hungarian, and Ukrainian citizens to work as slave laborers in Siberia; stole 600 tons of gold bars worth \$600 million from the Government in Spain in 1936;²⁷ destroyed by subversion the post-war Republics of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland; and violated 50 of their last 52 treaties.

6. Summit conference: Pressures exercised to influence the President of the United States to arrange for a summit conference with Khrushchev are unfortunate. Such pressures have been applied by friendly nations and by some inexperienced but well-meaning citizens. Communists have the most deplorable record in all history for violation of sacred treaties. It is the policy of Communists to promise anything and to perform nothing unless it serves their immediate needs. Communists should first demonstrate by concrete actions their good faith in their stated desire for peace. Without such evidence of good faith any conference becomes merely a Communist vehicle for their propaganda purposes. It is hopeless and futile to rely upon voluntary compliance with treaties by Communists. The Communists, through Khrushchev can free East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other enslaved nations and thus demonstrate in 24 hours their good faith and a true desire for peaceful coexistence.

Experts on communism testified before the U.S. House Un-American Activities Committee on April 30, 1958, that the Kremlin looks upon a summit conference solely as another weapon in its program for global conquest. Time will tell us the influence which the Soviet Deputy Premier A. I. Mikoyan, in his open sesame tour of the United States last January has exerted to entrap the United States into another summit conference.

7. Cultural exchanges: Nikita Khrushchev's famous report of 1956 lists cultural and business exchanges as one of these developments which will bring about the growing weakness of the United States and advance world socialism. On June 2, 1957, Khrushchev appeared on American television screens and called for a wider exchange of cultural delegations.

On December 22, 1957, the Communist Daily Worker desecrated the greatest religious holiday in Christendom by declaring that perhaps the best Christmas present Santa Clause will bestow on America will be the widespread cultural exchange of certain

Americans with Soviet agents coming to this country.

On January 27, 1958, the United States signed a 2-year agreement with the Soviet Union for the exchange of persons in the cultural, scientific, technical, and educational fields. The primary activity of every one of Moscow's cultural delegates while in this country is to promote the Communist world revolution. E. H. Cookridge, former British Secret Service agent and an authority on Soviet espionage, had this to say: "Every Soviet football team, every athlete competing at an international sport event, Soviet scientists attending a congress abroad, the Moscow Ballet performing in a western capital or a group of Soviet artists at a film festival are invariably accompanied by special agents of the Soviet secret police. Judge Robert Morris, who has spent the last 17 years intensively studying and exposing the Communist conspiracy, said: 'In past years of the exchange, secret police have passed as farmers, ice skaters, clergymen, and scientists, for the purpose of conducting espionage operation in this country.'" Prof. Seymour Melman, of Columbia University, at a disarmament conference held in Washington, D.C., on January 23, 1959, stated (as reported in the Washington Daily News of that date) that: "Owing to the possibility of moving nuclear warheads in small containers, it is not excluded that the principal cities of the world may already be mined with atomic warheads and their appropriate firing devices." Under these circumstances, what guarantee do we have that Soviet visitors may not engage in such destructive practices? AFL-CIO President George Meany said, on cultural exchanges: "No believer in the basic principles of free trade unionism could today conceivably desecrate these principles by undertaking to visit a country whose tyrannical leadership has for the 40 years of its existence been the avowed and uncompromising enemy of all human rights."

Cultural exchange with Soviet Russia should not be a one-way street. There can be no doubt that understanding could come from an honest two-way cultural exchange program where there is a full disclosure of the identities of visitors to any country. So when a Mikoyan visits the United States, those who fete him should know who he is and that for which he stands.

The responsible Newsweek magazine has this to say about Mikoyan in its issue of January 12, 1959: "Mikoyan is one of the butchers of Budapest. It was he who helped engineer the great double-cross that crushed the Hungarian revolt in October 1956. To lure the leaders of the revolt Mikoyan endorsed Imre Nagy as the new premier; at the same time, he made plans for the Communist puppet János Kádár to take over. His promise to withdraw the Russian forces from Hungary lured Nagy's Defense Minister to a meeting where Soviet troops could arrest him."

Henry A. Wallace, in a frank article published in 1952, related that he did not realize during his tour of Soviet Russia how the Communists were making feverish efforts to hoodwink him. Wallace said that it was only much later that he learned how a Communist slave labor camp had been transformed into a show city, with prisoners herded out of sight and watchtowers torn down, merely to deceive the American Vice President. Elinor Lipper verifies this in her book "Eleven Years in Soviet Prison Camps." As a prisoner in a slave camp visited by Wallace, she gives an inside account of how American tourists in Russia are deceived.

8. Recognition of Red China: Much of the propaganda in this country which supports recognition of Red China is Communist-inspired or encouraged. Diplomatic recognition is helpful to Communist subversion. The Communist espionage apparatus uses

Footnotes at end of speech.

the diplomatic immunity of its embassies and consulates to establish spy centers. It requires the unbroken seal of the diplomatic pouch to transmit orders to its spies and to receive in turn their reports and micro-filmed documents.

The Red diplomatic apparatus functions are described in detail in the report of the Canadian Royal Commission²⁸ which investigated code clerk Igor Gouzenko's revelations. They may be found, too, in the Report of the Australian Royal Commission²⁹ which investigated Embassy Secretary Vladimir Petrov's confession. They are told as well in the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee investigation of U.S. Communists working for the U.N.³⁰ conducted by Senator Herbert O'Connor, immediate past chairman of this committee:

That Red China will model her tactics after the tactics of Soviet Russia is made clear by the statement of Premier Chou En-lai in the Communist magazine *International Affairs*:

"The great Communist Party of China, organized by progressive elements of the Chinese people, was founded and developed under the influence of the October revolution, and was modeled on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."³¹

The most important loss that would be sustained by our recognition of Red China would be (1) the prestige that the Communist Regime would attain therefrom and (2) the demoralization of and hurt to the free nations—particularly in Asia. Moreover, can we give recognition to a government that is presently destroying the very fabric of human relations—the family—and enslaving its people in the manner that even the Communist rulers in Russia have not dared attempt? Responsible governments of free nations still have some responsibility to mankind and civilization. History has shown the recognition of the Soviet Union to have been a grievous error. We should not repeat that error with Red China.

9. Halt nuclear tests: The Communist tactic to obtain an agreement with the West halting nuclear tests is similar to Soviet exploitation of the agreement made at Panmunjom, namely not to rearm the North and South Koreans with jet planes and other modern weapons. The Soviets promptly violated this agreement. Then they violated its inspection clause by refusing to permit the neutral inspection team to inspect North Korean airfields.

The suspension of nuclear tests without complete inspection would result in the U.S. termination of testing. However, within the vast, isolated Soviet land mass, there would be a circumvention of this ban on testing.

10. East-West trade: Khrushchev's report of February 14, 1956, before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union calls for East-West trade;³² and this has been a part of the Communist line for many years. Foreign trade, to a Communist country is a political weapon to be turned on and off in accordance with its military strategy as a means of waging cold war. It is a means of obtaining from the outside world the strategic materials with which it can arm itself for world conquest. Trading with the Communist bloc would be a psychological as well as a military defeat for the United States. The goods we might sell to the Communist bloc will be used against us just as the superb Rolls-Royce jet engines sold to Russia were used to power the Mig 15's against us in Korea.

In May 1958, Khrushchev sent an 8-page letter to President Eisenhower in which he brazenly suggested that the United States grant Soviet Russia long-term dollar credits in order to finance trade with the United States. We would not gain by trading our

machinery for Soviet IOU's or even Russia's raw materials. The Senate report on the "Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials" issued July 9, 1954, shows that the Western Hemisphere contains all the 77 critical and strategic materials needed for military security. The bait of foreign trade is held out with the objective of developing pro-Soviet sympathy within the United States and thus undermining our national unity.³³

11. Propaganda: Communists are spending billions annually on propaganda around the world and it is reaching every city and hamlet in our Nation. This propaganda comes not only from the Soviet Union but also from Red China, from Iron Curtain countries, and from Western Europe. Much additional Red propaganda is published in the United States by Communist publishers.

12. Humiliation: The Communists use the tactic of humiliation. This tactic had already been used by the Communists on American prisoners in Korea. Communists have been active in supporting insulting demonstrations all over South America. On July 18, 1958, a mob of 100,000 Communists gathered in front of the American Embassy in Moscow and threw ink bottles and stones which shattered many of the windows on the first five floors. There has been a wave of demonstrations against the American information agencies in various parts of the world, accompanied by burnings of the American libraries. A number of Americans are being held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

13. The Communist tactic of vilification: One of the most constantly used tactics and tools of the Communists—and those deliberately aiding them, or misled by them—is the effort to defame, destroy or belittle the reputation of anyone—whatever his position or standing—who exposes or fights communism. No regard for truth is ever permitted to halt such campaign. Lies and half-truths are effective with the unthinking of the indifferent.

Example after example can be cited. Every member of congressional investigating committees has been the victim of this tactic. The FBI and its dedicated Director have been a prime target—and will continue to be so long as they are effective in combating communism. Every judge who did not respond to their arguments became a subject for this tactic.

The irony of fate has frequently decreed that this tactic be used by ruling Communists—temporarily in power—against their Comrade-rulers of yesterday when the simple struggle for power makes their comradeships a threat within the ruling clique. The guillotine of office or rank—followed by the routine, groveling, demoralizing confession is frequently not enough. The campaign of vilification and defamation must still be pursued. The degradation of Communists knows no bottom.

We plead with the bar—its leaders and members and the American people to understand this prime tactic of Communists and not to be misled by it. When the bar thinks and American agency or public official on Communist tactics, strategy, and objective way by going first to the public official or responsible administrator and call the facts to his attention. Perhaps there is another side to the issue. Those who charge violation of due process can strengthen their position by first practicing the principles of due process. When the enforcement machinery of our State, county, municipal, or Federal Government comes under unjust attack it is the duty of members of the bar as community leaders to come to their defense.

With each succeeding act of Soviet bad faith many western spokesmen express surprise. When anti-Communists reply "You should have expected this," the politically naive make a common rejoinder: "That is

mere hindsight; no one could have predicted that the Communists could be that bad." It is appropriate to point out that informed anti-Communists have always known and publicly stated that it is impossible to negotiate with international communism.

It was not hindsight, it was sound appraisal when Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby said on August 10, 1920:

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith. . . . The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements. . . . Upon numerous occasions the responsible spokesmen of this power, and its official agencies, have declared that it is their understanding that the very existence of bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule, depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other great civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their governments and set up Bolshevik rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries. . . . We cannot recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them."³⁴

It was not hindsight, but sound appraisal when Secretary of States Charles Evans Hughes stated on March 21, 1923:

"We are just as anxious in this Department and in every branch of the administration as you can possibly be, to promote peace in the world, to get rid of hatred, to have a spirit of mutual understanding, but the world we desire is a world not threatened with the destructive propaganda of the Soviet authorities, and one in which there will be good faith and the recognition of obligations and a sound basis of international intercourse."³⁵

It was not hindsight, it was sound appraisal when Robert F. Kelley, Chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs in the Department of State, wrote in a memorandum dated July 27, 1933:

"The fundamental obstacle in the way of the establishment with Russia of the relations usual between nations in diplomatic intercourse is the world revolutionary aims and practices of the rulers of that country."

"It is obvious that, so long as the Communist regime continues to carry on in other countries activities designed to bring about ultimately the overthrow of the government and institutions of these countries, the establishment of genuine friendly relations between Russia and those countries is out of the question."³⁶

It was not hindsight, it was sound appraisal when U.S. Ambassador to Moscow Laurence Steinhardt reported, on June 17, 1941:

"My observation of the psychology of the individuals who are conducting Soviet foreign policy has long since convinced me that they do not and cannot be induced to reopen to the customary amenities, that it is not possible to create 'international good will' with them, that they will always sacrifice the future in favor of an immediate gain, and that they are not affected by ethical or moral considerations nor guided by the relationships which are customary between individuals of culture and breeding. Their psychology recognizes only firmness, power and force, and reflects primitive instincts and reactions entirely devoid of the restraints

Footnotes at end of speech.

of civilization. I am of the opinion that they must be dealt with on this basis and on this basis alone."

CURRENT FALLACIES ABOUT COMMUNISM

So much misinformation is current about communism that it is appropriate to expose some of the major fallacies.

1. "Communism in the United States is dwindling in power because the party is dwindling in numbers."

This popular belief shows a complete misunderstanding of Leninism. Lenin's great contribution to communism was his principle of the dedicated few. He coined the expression "the fewer, the better." He originated the party of professional revolutionaries subject to military discipline. He rejected the idea of a popular party, and enunciated the principle that no one should be given party membership unless he was under discipline. This is how Lenin was able to establish communism in Russia with only a handful of supporters and later to take over Russia with only 40,000 followers.

It is just as false to measure the strength of communism in the United States by comparing the small number of party members with the large number of non-Communists, as it would be to measure the seaworthiness of a ship by comparing the area of its holes with the area of its hull. A few strategically placed holes can sink the largest ship.

A substantial strength of communism in the United States is the number of non-Communist organizations and individuals who will collaborate with the Communists. For every Communist Party member, there may be 10 non-Communists who will do the work of the Communists.

The Communists have had hundreds of fronts. In addition, they have fronts in front of the fronts. Making use of their fellow travelers and dupes, plus their united front tactic, the Communists boast they can have 50,000 letters on any issue sent to Capitol Hill or the White House inside of 72 hours.

The strength of the Communist Party was succinctly dealt with by J. Edgar Hoover in his book "Masters of Deceit" where on page 5 he states:

"The party's membership in this country reached a low in 1930 when it had 7,500 members, and a peak of 80,000 in 1944: Its membership at 5-year intervals since 1930 has been as follows: 1935, 30,000; 1940, 55,000 (a drop of 15,000 from 1939); 1945, 64,600 (a drop of 15,400 from 1944); 1950, 43,200; 1955, 22,600; and by the summer of 1957 membership had further declined.

"Fluctuations in the American Party parallel those in foreign countries. The record clearly establishes that Communist Parties have the power of swift and solid growth when the opportunity arises. The following figures reflect how party membership can dwindle and then spurt.

"In Italy, party membership went from 6,000 in 1943 to 2,500,000 in 1951; in France, from 20,000 in 1929 to 400,000 in 1956; in Syria, from 250 in 1931 to 10,000 in 1956; in Brazil, from 25,000 in late 1947 to 100,000 in 1956; and in Indonesia, from 30,000 in 1953 to 500,000 in 1956.

"When the Communist Party was at its peak in the United States it was stronger in numbers than the Soviet Party was at the time it seized power in Russia.

"The size of the party in various Soviet satellites at the time each came under Soviet control discloses how a well-organized band of revolutionaries can impose its rule over the majority population."

2. "The Communist Party is just another political party."

It has been established by the hearings of the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1951 and 1952, by 20 years of investigation

by congressional committees, and by the prior decisions of the Supreme Court in *Dennis v. United States*²⁸ and in *American Communications Association v. Douds*,²⁹ that the Communist Party, U.S.A. is not just a minor political party like the Prohibition Party. In the *Dennis* case, Chief Justice Vinson rightly described the Communist Party as "a highly organized conspiracy, with rigidly disciplined members subject to call when the leaders, these petitioners, felt that the time had come for action."

	Date of Communist takeover	Communist Party membership on that date	Population on that date
Bulgaria.....	September 1945.....	20,000	7,020,000
Rumania.....	March 1945.....	800,000	16,400,000
Poland.....	January 1949.....	1,000,000	25,225,000
Czechoslovakia.....	May 1948.....	1,329,000	12,338,000
Hungary.....	August 1947.....	750,000	9,383,000
Albania.....	December 1945.....	12,000	1,120,000
Yugoslavia.....	Mid-1945.....	141,000	14,500,000

Like an iceberg, eight-ninths of the Communist Party has always been underground. The crypto-Communists who carry no cards, and whose names appear on no party records, are the most dangerous Communists. Top Communist agents such as Klaus Fuchs, Guy Burgess, and Donald MacLean never marched in a May day parade, never carried a hammer and sickle banner, never raised a clenched fist at a Red rally. They were effective agents because they were always underground conspirators, and never aboveground. Communism will never win or gain followers on the basis of merit of its ideology or of truth. Ironically there are also those who have been infected with the Communist propaganda of inevitability. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles dealt with this matter in a speech before the National Council of Churches in Cleveland, Ohio, last November when he said:

"There are some who seem to feel that because international communism is a powerful and stubborn force, we should give way before it.

"Nothing could be more dangerous than to operate on the theory that if hostile and evil forces do not readily change, it is always we who must change to accommodate them.

"But let us make our opposition not just a barren negative, but a positive alternative."

3. "Poverty breeds communism." This is the false stomach theory of communism. Communism is not a disease caused by an empty stomach; it is a disease of the mind and soul. Communism does not always originate with the poor, the uneducated, the exploited or the working class. These groups are the victims of exploitation by the Communists. On the other hand, the world's roster of Communists contains the names of many who were well educated and came from families of immense wealth. The list of important Communist agents who were once known as student intellectuals is an endless one. All that is needed is to call the roll of important Communist leaders and secret agents and among them will be found once well-fed ingrates who were traitors to their society, in their quest for personal power.

4. "The only alternative to peaceful co-existence is world war III with nuclear destruction of our cities."

The Communists do not want to destroy us or our cities if they can take our cities intact as they captured Prague and the giant Skoda munitions works. They plan to capture America with native Communists, just as they took Czechoslovakia with Czechs, China with Chinese, Indochina with Indochinese, North Korea with Koreans, and almost took Spain with Spaniards. Why should they want to destroy our productive might if they

can win it by subversion and convert it to furthering the Communist world?

Sir Winston Churchill, whose ability to look ahead has been established as a historical fact said, more than 20 years ago:

"Communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the Communist faith as the doctrine itself.

"At first the time-honored principles of liberalism and democracy are invoked to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement toward the left.

"The creation of a mild liberal or Socialist regime in some period of convulsion is the first milestone. But no sooner has this been created than it is to be overthrown. Woes and scarcity resulting from confusion must be exploited. Collisions, if possible attended with bloodshed, are to be arranged between the agents of the new government and the working people. Martyrs are to be manufactured. . . .

"Pacific propaganda may be made the mask of hatreds never before manifested among men.

"No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists.

"Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin.

"Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions must be extinguished by death.

"Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterwards broken; liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician.

"The absolute rule of a self-chosen oligarchy, according to the dogmas it has learned by rote, is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigations progressively forever.

"All this, set out in prosy textbooks—written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations—is the Communists' faith and purpose."

The need for all Americans is to know the Communist objectives and what they stand for. In 1937 Pope Pius XI asked a searching question about communism:

"How is it possible that such a system, long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?"

He answered his own question in these words: "The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of communism."

Twenty-one years later, an additional 750 million human beings have been swept behind the Iron Curtain. But it is unfortunately still true that all too few people understand what communism is. Two years ago our committee reported:

"The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but world ignorance of their tactics, strategy, and objectives."

When our enemy was Nazi Germany, our Government and military leaders studied

Footnotes at end of speech.

every detail of the enemy and his strategy. George S. Patton was one of the truly great generals of the European campaign. Early in World War II, when the Germans were advancing, General Patton was asked one day if he wasn't discouraged. His answer was precise:

"I have studied the German for 40 years. I have read the memoirs of his great men. I have studied every detail of all his military campaigns. I have attended some of his staff courses. I know exactly how he will react under any given set of circumstances. He does not know what I will do. For this reason, when the time comes, I shall beat the hell out of him."

And this he did. The tragedy is found in the fact that there are too few George Pattons.

We can no more save our Republic from communism merely by saying we are against communism, than parents can save their children from polio by fervently being against polio. To conquer any disease requires intelligent study to isolate the germ and discover the vaccine. As the No. 1 killer in the world today, communism is a disease which merits our urgent study.

REPORT ON COMMUNIST LEGAL SUBVERSION

On Monday, February 16, 1959, the House Un-American Activities Committee made public its report on "Communist Legal Subversion"—the role of the Communist lawyer.

We shall not attempt in this already long report to summarize this congressional report. The report should be read not only by every member of this association, but particularly by the officers of the various State and local bar associations of which some of the attorneys mentioned in the report are members. The report does not name every attorney who is a Communist or a member of the Communist Party, but sufficient of them are named to constitute a challenge to the bar. The ABA, while ready to assist, nevertheless, has deemed it more properly to be within the jurisdiction of the State and local associations to take action of investigation and where warranted disciplinary proceedings concerning and against members on their rolls. Our committee feels that no new resolution need be passed by the house of delegates as it has already recommended proper action by the State and local associations against attorneys unworthy of membership by reason of their activities and their disloyalty to our form of government and to their oaths of office.

On this serious problem, the duty of cleansing our ranks of unworthy or questionable members is that of the bar, and the entire bar will suffer until the stigma on its rolls is removed. With sincere regret our committee must publicly state that the State and local bar associations have not fulfilled their duty to the public, the courts, or the bar.

CONCLUSION

Upon the bar of each nation primarily falls the duty to protect and defend its constitutional form of government and courageously to lead and soundly to advise the peoples and their governments. By their very training and experience, none more than lawyers should be aware of the dangers and the menace of international communism—and, therefore, none is more responsible for the protection of the free world.

Remember, there is no bar worthy of the name in Communist enslaved countries.

Only by alertness and dedication can the organized bar and each of its members perform their duty.

The danger and the menace of communism are worse than ever. Precious time is running out.

Wishes and prayers are not enough.

Respectfully submitted.

Peter Campbell Brown, Chairman; Julius Applebaum, James S. Cremins, Egbert L. Haywood, Ray Murphy, Louis B. Nichols, Kendrick Smith, Henry J. TePaske, Jackson A. Wright, Louis C. Wyman.

APPENDIX—RECOMMENDED READING

Books play a vitally important part in the history of government and economics. One need only mention "Das Kapital," "The Wealth of Nations," "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and the "Federalist Papers" to be reminded that books have started wars, changed the economy of great nations, and established new governments.

A number of books published in the past by some of the world's top experts on communism testify to the overriding importance of the Communist issue, and to the unhappy reality that the United States is losing the battle against international communism. A study of the following books and reports could halt the rising tide of world communism.

1. Congressional committee hearings and reports: For 20 years the House Un-American Activities Committee has been patiently investigating the Communist conspiracy. The reports of its hearings, and those of its Senate counterpart, the Internal Security Subcommittee, are an encyclopedia of information on this continuing conspiracy. The abuse which has been heaped upon these committees by the Communists and their fronts is itself an attestation of the value of these reports.

2. "Masters of Deceit: The Story of Communism in America and How To Fight It," by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover (Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1958, \$5). Mr. Hoover's preeminence as an authority on communism is unchallenged. This book provides us with a valuable primer on communism in the United States; its history, strategy, membership, and future. He describes the day-to-day operations of the Communist Party, what goes on underground, and how discipline is enforced. He shatters many anti-anti-Communist arguments and shows why this is no time for complacency regarding internal subversion.

3. "What We Must Know About Communism," by Dr. Harry and Bonaro Overstreet (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1958, \$3.95). These well known educators and foremost authorities in adult education examine communism and report from an educator's viewpoint in a clear factual manner. Many authorities on communism regard this book as one of the great contributions to anti-Communist literature.

4. "No Wonder We Are Losing" by Judge Robert Morris (The Bookmiller, New York, 1958, \$2.50). Judge Morris has put into this book his personal record of 17 years' investigation of communism on behalf of the New York State Legislature, Naval Intelligence, and as chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Particularly important chapters concern the famous hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations, communism's reach into education, and methods and rules of congressional committees.

5. "I Was a Slave in Russia," by John H. Noble (Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1958, \$3.75). The author, an American citizen, was captured by the Russians just after V-E Day in 1945 and held prisoner for 9 years. In this book, he tells of his shocking experiences as a slave laborer in Siberia; of other Americans who are still there; and of the millions of political prisoners and how they are treated. This book is especially

useful for those who believe in summit conferences and cultural exchanges with the Communists.

6. "Communist Psychological Warfare: Consultation With Edward Hunter," by the U.S. House Un-American Activities Committee (U.S. Government Printing Office, March 13, 1958). In 25 pages of testimony under questioning by Staff Director Richard Arens, Edward Hunter gives a brilliant analysis of current Communist strategy and how it follows here the pattern so successful in Asia. A distinguished journalist, author, and expert on communism in the Far East, Mr. Hunter first translated the term "brainwashing" from the Chinese. In this report he warns that Communist psychological warfare is now winning such extensive victories in the United States that the Red bloc will not need to employ direct military force against us in order to win the total war which they are waging.

7. "International Communism: Consultation With Dr. Fred C. Schwarz," by the U.S. Un-American Activities Committee (U.S. Government Printing Office, May 29, 1957). Dr. Schwarz is an Australian physician who is one of the world's top authorities on communism, particularly on the Communist mind. In this testimony, Dr. Schwarz gives his expert diagnosis, prognosis, and recommended treatment for the disease of communism. He shows how the first step in the Communist conquest of every country is the ideological conquest of the student mind.

8. "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," by Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1958, \$4). Dr. Bouscaren is the author of a number of authoritative works in the field of international Communist operations. He is a professor of political science at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., and is currently teaching at the National War College, in Washington, D.C. This book provides specific answers to the question of how individual Americans can combat communism with knowledge and facts.

9. "The Naked Communist," by W. Cleon Skousen (The Ensign Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, 1958). The author was formerly with the FBI and on the faculty of Brigham Young University and now chief of police, Salt Lake City, Utah; has been a student of communism for the better part of his adult life. His book is a painstaking account of the rise of communism, its philosophy, methods and tactics. The book is well indexed and documented and belongs on the bookshelves of any one who has a desire to learn of communism and its worldwide objectives.

¹ P. vi.

² American Bar Association Journal, May 1958, pp. 425-426.

³ 339 U.S. 382, 424.

⁴ 320 U.S. 118, 170.

⁵ 341 U.S. 494.

⁶ "Subversive Activities Control Board Report," S. Doc. No. 41, 83d Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 23, 1953.

⁷ The frequency of dissents in the Supreme Court decisions on matters relating to Communists reflects how the Court is divided and supports the thesis of this committee that corrective action is called for by the enactment of legislation.

⁸ "Manifesto of the Communist Party," by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (International Publishers, New York, 1932), p. 44.

⁹ "Collected Works of Lenin," vol. 9, Russian, 4th edition, pp. 290, 291; "Proletarian No. 20, 1905," address of Secretary of State Dulles before Atomic Power Institute, Durham, N. H., May 2, 1958.

¹⁰ Stalin: "Elections in Petersburg" (Jan.

12, 1913. Sochineniya (Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1946), vol. II, p. 277).

¹¹ Mikolajczyk, Stanislaw, "The Rape of Poland," New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948, pp. 111-112.

¹² Ibid., footnote 8, sec. II.

¹³ "V. I. Lenin Selected Works" (International Publishers, New York, 1943, pp. 95, 96).

¹⁴ Lenin, "Speech to Moscow Part Nuclear Secretaries" (Nov. 26, 1920); "Selected Works" (International Publishers, New York, 1943, vol. III, p. 297).

¹⁵ St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 16, 1955.

¹⁶ U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 27, 1957, p. 32.

¹⁷ "Foundations of Leninism," Little Lenin Library edition, p. 98.

¹⁸ House Un-American Activities Committee, "Marxist Classics," op. cit. p. 187.

¹⁹ "U.S. House Appropriations Subcommittee Hearings on the Department of Justice," Jan. 16, 1958, p. 173.

²⁰ Ibid. p. 174.

²¹ Editorial, June 19, 1957.

²² Ehrmann, Henry W., "The Duty of Disclosures in Parliamentary Investigations: A Comparative Study," 11 University of Chicago Law Review, pp. 117-153, Feb. 1944.

²³ House Un-American Activities Committee, "Marxist Classics," op. cit. pp. 24-25.

²⁴ Hearings on the Department of Justice, op. cit., p. 178.

²⁵ "U.S. House Katyn Forest Committee Final Report," Dec. 22, 1952.

²⁶ U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, "Korean War Atrocities," Jan. 11, 1954.

²⁷ "Scope of Soviet Activity," pt. 51, pp. 3434, 3435.

²⁸ June 27, 1946.

²⁹ Aug. 22, 1955.

³⁰ Jan. 2, 1953.

³¹ November 1957, p. 20.

³² House Un-American Activities Committee, "Marxist Classics," op. cit., pp. 23-24.

³³ The U.S.S.R. still owes vast sums to the United States that are overdue and unpaid.

³⁴ "U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 2d Report," Mar. 22, 1954, p. 41.

³⁵ U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 17, 1954, p. 128.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 130.

³⁷ Ibid., July 4, 1958, p. 72.

³⁸ 341 U.S. 494.

³⁹ 339 U.S. 382.

⁴⁰ New York Times, Nov. 19, 1958, p. 6.

⁴¹ "Great Contemporaries," by Winston Churchill (G. P. Putnam & Sons, New York, 1937), p. 168.

I have known Mr. Costerella since my boyhood days and have had the privilege of working with him in the interests of various charitable, civic, and humanitarian causes. In 1936, he was a charter organizer with me of the Italian Board of Guardians, which is now affiliated with the Catholic Charities in Brooklyn, to help curb juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Costerella knows the problems of juvenile delinquency as well, if not better, than any other public official of New York, and for this reason his views and thoughts on the subject, as expressed in the article, should prove of considerable interest to all who are concerned with this problem.

The article reads as follows:

CHARGES YOUTH NEEDS UNMET

(By Neal Ashby)

The settlement house is just as rollicking, appealing and dependable a deterrent to juvenile delinquency as it was the day the first one came into being a century or more ago, and Queens needs a lot of them, believes one prominent borough neighbor, Assistant State Attorney General Flavius N. Costerella. "The settlement house is the anchor around which families are helped in welfare, citizenship and community problems," declares Costerella, longtime Forest Hills dweller.

"Our present-day boys clubs are extremely effective, too, in meeting the basic needs of youth for physical exertion and a friendly social aggregation with which to become identified. But they don't serve the whole family."

And Costerella believes the whole family needs serving in a sobering number of cases. He charges:

"Parents spend their time watching television and don't pay attention to what their children are doing outside the home. These basic needs of youth are going unmet."

"Queens is seriously lacking in settlements and clubs, just as the whole city is. Every community should have one. The rate of juvenile delinquency is mounting every year. I think the emergency is so acute that the State should bear the expense."

He's in public life and active in politics and it's not surprising to find this energetic and ambitious attorney with native judicial bearing in the swim of community affairs. But settlement houses are a cause and a conviction to Costerella.

His near-religious belief in them carries all the way back to his own boyhood in cluttered Greenwich Village some 35 years ago. The capital of the forbidding world outside his modest home was for Bert Costerella the Greenwich House, still a citadel of good citizenship.

In the seven-story building on Barrow Street the Greenwich Village neighbors were provided medical and psychological services, a nursery for the toddlers, arts and crafts classes, athletics, clubs, entertainments and study groups—and they still are.

"I loved it," the attorney says fondly. But, foreshadowing the course his adult life was to follow, it wasn't the games, parties, boxing matches or talent shows for which Costerella had the greatest affection but the workings of Greenwich House's self-government bodies in which he was always a leader.

He remembers business meetings, policy conferences and fundraising instead of handmade pottery, game-winning baskets or vocal solos.

"It's been proven that juvenile delinquency occurs least in areas where settlement houses are located," Costerella asserts, "even in the worst slums."

The attorney commends the Boys Club of Queens in Astoria for its effective program and points out that a similar club is being organized in South Jamaica. But he comes back to the fact that—

"Queens doesn't have a single settlement house. Just off hand, they're needed in Corona, Rosedale, Jamaica, and right in my own community of Forest Hills."

Costerella, assigned by the State attorney general to represent the mentally ill in the guardianship of their property and civil rights, lives with his wife, Theresa, and their daughter, Mary Anne, 9, at 68-49 Manse Street.

He remains an active alumnus of Greenwich House and further pursues youth work through the Italian Board of Guardians, Ferrini Welfare League, 112th Precinct Youth Council and the Italian Charities of America, Elmhurst. He is a director of the National Society for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency.

"Kids need a place where they belong," he concludes, "where they are kept busy and made a part of something."

Brooklyn's New Supreme Court Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the ceremonies attendant upon the dedication of the new supreme court building in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959, were indeed fitting and most impressive. It is my pleasure to direct the attention of our colleagues to the remarks on that occasion of the distinguished presiding justice of the appellate division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, the Honorable Gerald Nolan; the remarks of the Honorable John B. Johnston, former justice of the appellate division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York and presently the administrator of the courts of the State of New York; and the benediction of Dr. Alexander Alan Steinbach, the president of the New York Board of Rabbis. They are as follows:

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to say now just a few words about a man for whom we all have a somewhat special affection. I first met him many years ago when we were both much younger judges. I had the privilege later of serving with him in the appellate division. I soon found out, and not to my surprise, that he had the entire respect and the warm affection of all of his associates.

After he had finished what for a lesser man would have been a notable career, the State of New York was indeed fortunate in persuading him to take on the administration of other and very important duties. He brought to their performance a great ability, a tremendous energy, and a fine store of judicial experience.

It is with a great sense of pleasure that I present at this time the administrator of the courts of the State of New York, the Honorable John B. Johnston.

HON. JOHN B. JOHNSTON. If it please Your Honor, my former and successor colleagues of the bench, my brethren of the bar, and friends, he would need to be a bolder man

A New York Official's Views on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert a brief article which was published in the New York Daily Mirror on February 8, 1959. The article, written by Neal Ashby, deals with the problem of juvenile delinquency and some interesting views on the subject as expressed by Flavius N. Costerella, assistant State attorney general of New York.

than I who would attempt to add to what has been so appropriately and so eloquently said. But I would be less than candid if I failed to say that at this very moment I am stirred, perhaps beset, by conflicting emotions.

While I rejoice with you upon the erection and completion of this sorely needed building, I confess I have a grateful recollection and hence a genuine fondness for the old building across the street, for it was there, just about a half century ago, I tried my first case, and it was also there, 32 years ago this very forenoon, that I ascended the bench of this court, which is older than the State itself, the very bulwark of our judicial system, and the fame of many of whose jurists is not confined to the borders of this department or limited to the boundaries of this State.

While you and I share a justifiable pride in this beautiful edifice, it is well to remember that a courthouse, however ornate, is not merely a structure of steel and stone, mortar and marble. This building is a symbol. Yes, it is the embodiment of our American system which guarantees the safety of the individual and the security of his property. And it is more; it is a harbor and a haven for the people of all shades, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the powerful and the less fortunate, to which they may take recourse for the vindication of their rights and the redress of their wrongs.

Just an additional word. Those who enter the portals of this building may not only be confident, but certain, that they will receive a patient and a fair hearing at the hands of the distinguished men, the justices of this court assembled here before me, who serve a single purpose, which is to do right and equity between man and man, and whose sole aim is to administer justice in humble imitation of the impartiality which is reigning on high.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Today, as always, we ask for the guidance and the blessing of God, particularly today, that the building that we dedicate may stand throughout the years as a symbol of justice to all who pass through its doors.

We have had the privilege of hearing a very eloquent invocation from the bishop of the diocese of Long Island.

I think you will agree that it is only fitting and proper that we should pause at this time and hear from another of our clergy who have honored us with their presence on this occasion. The distinguished president of the New York Board of Rabbis, Dr. Alexander Alan Steinbach.

[All arose.]

Rabbi ALEXANDER ALAN STEINBACH. Eternal Spirit, Father of all mankind, so far above us and yet so deep within us, so great that our minds cannot fathom Thine infinitude, and yet so close that Thou art nearer to us than we are to ourselves, we thank Thee for the privilege of dedicating this structure in whose presence the administration of justice will become an inextinguishable flame.

May the distinguished judges who will sit here be motivated by the scriptural admonition, "The Lord is a God of justice. Therefore, justice, justice shall ye pursue." And may they interpret the law in consonance with the teaching of a Solomon. Thy righteousness is like the mighty mountains. Thy judgments are like the great deep.

Fervently we invoke Thy blessing and Thy guidance upon those in whose trusteeship will be placed the great pillars of jurisprudence.

May those who hold liberty precious in our free world labor together in that inner spiritual hemisphere of brotherhood and human understanding which recognizes that justice must always be the highest and the only expediency. Conformity with justice is conformity with the will of God. No govern-

ment can be free that has not learned to be just. Therefore, Eternal Father, O God of all humanity, let Thine inevitable spirit hover over this majestic structure and in the hearts of those who will occupy it.

And let the light of Thy countenance shine upon those charged with the solemn and sacred responsibility to give to every man, whoever he is, his just due.

Dear God, let justice ever be the bread of our Nation, that everyone who hungers for this bread may come here and find it and eat of it and be satisfied. Amen.

Congress Should Authorize an All-Out Attack on Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit an article every American should read, "Trends in Cancer Control," from Progress in Health Services, February 1959, Health Information Foundation, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.:

TRENDS IN CANCER CONTROL

With the elimination of communicable disease as the leading cause of death, the rising death rate from cancer has made this disease a steadily increasing health problem. From seventh in 1900, cancer rose to become the second leading cause of death in 1938 and has remained there since. It is now the leading cause of death among women aged 30-54 and (excluding accidents) among school-age children. In 1900 this disease accounted for less than 5 percent of the deaths in this country, but by 1958 the comparable figure was 16 percent, or approximately one out of every six deaths.

Cancer took more than 250,000 lives in 1958, mainly in the middle and older years but including some 4,000 children under age 15. Its death rate is now higher among males than females, among nonwhites than whites, and is highest in the northeastern part of this country. Even though cancer mortality is rising, however, the prognosis for cancer patients is today much better than it used to be. Many forms of the disease previously incurable can now be treated.

Cancer is the generic name for a group of diseases characterized by the irregular and uncontrolled growth of cells. The invasive growth and metastasis (spread) of these cells, often through the lymph channels or blood, to other areas usually leads ultimately to death.

Cancer is the end-product of an exceedingly complex chain of circumstances. Research into the etiology of this group of diseases investigates mechanisms within the cell, stimuli arising outside the cell, and hereditary and environmental factors. Malignancies of specific sites have been associated with different agents. The list of biological substances and chemical compounds known to cause malignant tumors in animals is impressively large and growing. Nevertheless, the cause of the overwhelming proportion of the malignancies seen in human populations remains unknown.

In 1900 about 80 persons for each 100,000 of the population died from cancer. This rate climbed steadily early in the century and reached 114 by 1926. After some fluctuation up to 1933, the rate began to rise again, but more slowly. It reached 128 by 1957 but

dropped to 125 in 1958.¹ These rates were about 60 percent higher than in 1900.

Part of this increase is undoubtedly due to improved diagnosis of the disease and to the development of better techniques for case-finding and detection. Thus many deaths perhaps erroneously attributed to other causes are today more correctly attributed to cancer. But part of the increase is probably real.

Mortality from cancer is low during infancy and the preschool years, and drops to its minimum level during the subsequent childhood period. In 1956 cancer caused 8 deaths per 100,000 among infants under 1, 11 at ages 1 to 4, and 6 at ages 10 to 14. At older ages the rate rose consistently to a peak of 1,464 per 100,000 at 85 and over. More than half the cancer deaths today are of persons aged 65 and over.

Women constituted a larger proportion of the cancer victims than men early in the century, but recently this has changed. Thus in 1900 the cancer mortality rate among females exceeded that for males by 65 percent. Later this ratio narrowed, and by 1946-47 mortality for the two sexes was at the same level. By 1956 the former positions were reversed—the male mortality rate now exceeded the female by 22 percent.

The female mortality rate from cancer, after rising continuously since 1900, began to level off during the late 1920's and early 1930's and has declined since then. In contrast, the male mortality rate has continued to rise steadily, in part because of the rapid rise of respiratory cancer among men, but also because in general cancers afflicting males more often occur in less accessible sites.

CANCER MORTALITY BY SITE

The distribution of all cancer deaths by primary site has changed greatly since 1930. For example, cancer of the respiratory system has become a more important part of the total picture. It accounted for only 3 percent of all cancer deaths in 1930, but by 1956 its proportion had risen to 13 percent. The death rates per 100,000 population for these years rose from 3.7 to 17.1. The rise in mortality from leukemia was also notable, from 2.3 to 6.0. However, death rates from cancers of the other major primary sites have generally been leveling off, and in some instances actually declining, since 1930.

The respiratory system has become one of the main cancer sites for males. Their mortality rate in 1956 was six times as high as 1930, while the rate for females doubled in the same period. In 1930 this site accounted for 5 percent of all cancer deaths among males, but by 1956 the proportion was 21 percent. For females the comparable rise was from 2 to 4 percent.

Although part of this rise may be spurious (because of better diagnosis, case finding, etc.), the strong sex differential and other factors suggest that most of the rise represents a true increase in incidence. This is the most rapid ever recorded for a noninfectious disease.

Recently a number of large-scale investigations have shown that lung cancer² occurs 5 to 15 times as frequently among cigarette smokers as among nonsmokers, and that there is a direct relationship between the incidence of lung cancer and the amount smoked. From a public health point of view, the conclusion of a cause-effect relationship between lung cancer and cigarette smoking has now been accepted by many responsible health agencies.³

But in addition, studies have shown other possible causal factors in the environment, especially motor-vehicle exhaust and other forms of air pollution. And also, specific factors in particular individuals may in-

Footnotes at end of speech.

crease their susceptibility to environmental influences.

LEUKEMIA DEATH RATE RISES

Recent increases in the death rate from leukemia have also attracted considerable attention. The largest increases in leukemia mortality have occurred among children and older people, where the rates were highest to begin with. During the preschool years leukemia accounts for nearly 50 percent of all cancer deaths.

It is now widely accepted that exposure to nuclear and allied radiations (including X-rays used for medical diagnosis and therapy) can cause leukemia in man. The evidence for this is derived from extensive laboratory investigations on animals and from studies of the distribution of the disease in humans.

These studies have shown a higher mortality from leukemia among radiologists than other physicians, a decrease in incidence of this disease in proportion to the distance from the center of the atomic bomb explosion among survivors in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and a relationship to past exposure to X-rays for various conditions (including children exposed in utero during X-ray examination of the maternal abdomen and pelvis).¹ Nevertheless, many aspects of this relationship remain unexplained, and many investigators do not accept a linear cause-effect linkage.

Although cancer mortality as a whole has risen, a decline has been recorded for the digestive system as a primary site, and this despite its relative inaccessibility.² This site today accounts for only about one-third of all cancer deaths, while in 1930 the comparable figure was about one-half. Mortality from cancer of the digestive system declined 33 percent among females from 1930 to 1956—from 55.4 deaths per 100,000 to 37.2. For males the comparable drop was only 13 percent—from 59.7 to 51.9.

In a similar manner, opposing trends for the sexes in mortality from cancer of the genital organs have contributed to the current excess of male mortality from cancer of all sites combined. While mortality from genital cancer rose for males, from 10.6 per 100,000 in 1930 to 15.3 in 1956, the rate for females declined about 25 percent, from 31.9 to 23.8.

The better female record probably results in part from recent advances in obstetrical technique, from their greater propensity to seek medical care (even exclusive of pregnancy), and also from the widespread use within the last 10 years of the Papanicolaou "vaginal smear test" for early detection of uterine cancer. Among males, most of the mortality from cancer of the genital organs (94 percent in 1956) is from cancer of the prostate. Detection at this site often occurs at a late stage of the disease, when a cure is difficult to achieve.

Mortality from cancer of the breast—restricted almost entirely to females—has changed little since 1930, despite the accessibility of this site and intensive educational campaigns to promote early detection and case finding. In 1956 breast cancer caused 23 deaths per 100,000 females, and accounted for nearly one-fifth of the total female cancer mortality.

DISTRIBUTION AMONG POPULATION GROUPS

In 1914 (the first year these data were available), mortality from cancer among the white population exceeded the rate for nonwhites by 30 percent. But by 1950 mortality for the two groups was approximately the same. By 1956 the rate for nonwhites actually exceeded the white rate by one-eighth.

Much of the more rapid rise among nonwhites is attributable to their increased mortality from cancer of the digestive system,

especially for males, in contrast to a decline among whites. Similarly, the rise among nonwhite males of mortality from cancer of the genital organs was more rapid. But cancer of the skin, an accessible site and only a minor component of the total of cancer mortality, is twice as frequent among whites.

Cancer mortality is highest in the urban and metropolitan areas of the United States and in the industrial Northeast and North Central States. It is lowest in the South Central and Mountain States. The industrial Northeast exceeds the remaining regions of the United States, especially in mortality from cancers of the digestive and respiratory systems and the breast. The South, low in other forms of cancer, exceeds the national average in skin cancer incidence, especially among whites.

ILLNESS AND SURVIVAL

In 1959 over 700,000 Americans will be under medical care for cancer, and about 450,000 new cases will be diagnosed for the first time. More than 40 million Americans now living—one in every four, according to present rates—will eventually have cancers.³

No real cure is yet available for all cancers, and the results of treatment are still generally defined in terms of years of survivorship free of clinical evidence of the disease. However, the prognosis for cancer patients is more favorable now than formerly, especially where there has been early diagnosis.

A few years ago one cancer patient in four was being saved—alive 5 years after diagnosis. Today the proportion is one in three. Currently, the number thus saved is estimated at 150,000 annually. There are 800,000 Americans alive today who have been cured of cancer—free of the disease at least 5 years after diagnosis. And at least an additional 500,000 cancer patients, diagnosed and treated within the last 5 years, will live to become cured.

The record of improvement has been clearly shown in a study of survivorship in Connecticut. The portion of male cancer patients in that State surviving at least 5 years from the time of original diagnosis in 1935-40 was 24 percent; the figure rose to 32 percent for those diagnosed during 1947-51. For females the corresponding improvement was from 33 to 45 percent.⁴ This improvement in survivorship has involved most of the major sites, including some of the more difficult, inaccessible areas. But the greatest improvements were reported for cases diagnosed at an early stage of the disease.

Surgery and radiation, still the only effective methods of cure, are successful only when the cancer cells have remained localized in areas which permit such treatment.⁵ These techniques have become immensely more effective than in former years, partly because other scientific and medical advances now permit them to be used more extensively against tumors that were previously considered inoperable or inaccessible to radiation. The operative mortality rate has decreased, and great advances have been made in knowledge of the radiation sensitivity of different types of cancer.

One of the most promising fields for research, and one which has expanded greatly in recent years, is chemotherapy. Some therapeutic chemicals have already shown effectiveness in temporarily halting the progress of certain cancers, alleviating pain, and rehabilitating the body to provide greater chance for survival. These chemicals are now regarded as valuable supplements to surgery and radiation. Moreover, hormones as well as radioactive substances have proved valuable against some forms of malignancy.

FUTURE RESEARCH GOALS

Although much is being done against the disease today,⁶ far more could be accomplished merely by bringing present knowledge more effectively to bear. Perhaps as many as 75,000 cancer patients will die this

year who might have been saved by earlier and better treatment. The hope for the future lies in research into the nature and etiology of the disease, to discover an effective diagnostic test suitable for large-scale screening, and to find more effective therapies than those known at present.

¹ Comparisons of long-term trends are based on mortality rates adjusted to the age distribution of the 1940 U.S. population and, except for the discussion of specific sites, to the Fifth Revision of the International List of Diseases and Causes of Death. Data for 1958 are estimated by the research department of Health Information Foundation.

² As used here, this term refers to epidermoid and undifferentiated types of carcinoma of the lung, but not adenocarcinoma.

³ Statement by Surgeon General Leroy E. Burney of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on Excessive Cigarette Smoking and Health, July 12, 1957; and statement by John Vaughan-Morgan, parliamentary secretary of the Ministry of Health, to the House of Commons, June 27, 1957.

⁴ A malignant disease of the blood and blood-forming organs, involving the excessive formation of white blood cells.

⁵ See W. M. Court-Brown, "Radiation-Induced Leukemia in Man, With Particular Reference to the Dose-Response Relationship," *Journal of Chronic Diseases* 8, 1:113-122 (July) 1958.

⁶ This decline may be partly spurious, representing little more than improvements in the accuracy of reporting or changes in classification of primary site.

⁷ American Cancer Society, "1959 Cancer Facts and Figures," New York, N.Y.

⁸ Survivorship ratios adjusted for normal life expectancy. The discussion here refers only to cases reported in hospitals. M. H. Griswold et al., "Cancer in Connecticut, 1935-1951," Connecticut State Department of Health, Hartford, 1955.

⁹ J. R. Heller, "Progress in Cancer Control," *Journal of the Florida Medical Association*, 44:347-356 (October) 1957.

¹⁰ Especially through the programs of such agencies as the American Cancer Society, the National Cancer Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service, and the research departments of pharmaceutical manufacturers.

Dedication Ceremonies of the New Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert the text of some of the remarks made at the dedication ceremonies of the new Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, N.Y., which took place on January 5, 1959.

These include the observations of Presiding Justice Gerald Nolan of the supreme court's appellate division, second department; an address by Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna, chairman of the board of justices of the second judicial district of the supreme court; and the benediction by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward P. Hoar, one of Brooklyn's most distinguished religious

leaders. All three are men of great esteem in Brooklyn and I am privileged to know them all personally.

Their remarks are as follows:

Presiding Justice NOLAN. I, too, am sorry that Mayor Wagner was unable to be here today because I thought that we might have had the opportunity to express to him in person our deep gratitude for his many fine achievements in the aid of the administration of justice and the sponsorship of this magnificent Supreme Court Building. He cannot be here, so we shall proceed with the program.

I would like to say just a few words about one who comes last among your speakers but who is by no means least. Young in years, but old in judicial experience, an able justice of the supreme court, he takes the regular turn with the other judges. In addition to that, he sits on that great intermediate appellate court, the appellate term of the second department, which decides so properly and of course so correctly many important appeals from courts of limited jurisdiction.

In his spare time, after he has finished with those duties, he discharges a great quantity of other responsibilities. By the discharge of those responsibilities and the performance of those duties the supreme court of the Second Judicial District is enabled to run smoothly and has done so for many years, and I know it will do so in the future under his able guidance and leadership.

It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to present at this time the distinguished chairman of the board of justices of the second judicial district of the supreme court, the Honorable Anthony J. DiGiovanna. [Applause.]

HON. ANTHONY J. DIGIOVANNI. Reverend clergy, Judge Proessel, our visitor from across the river, our presiding justice of the first department, Justice Bernard Boteln, the distinguished jurists, judges of the appellate division, my fine and esteemed colleagues of the supreme court, our visitors from the other and varied courts here in Brooklyn and throughout the city of New York, our distinguished presiding chairman and presiding justice of the appellate division of the second department, distinguished speakers, members of the bar, first of all, Justice Nolan, I thank you very much for the very kind expression of opinion which you have given the people who are kind enough to attend this morning concerning me and concerning the work of our supreme court. I am gratified to hear such expression, gratified to know what your feeling is concerning the work that has been done by our justices of this court.

Of course, credit does not go to me alone, but it does go and it should go to all the other 14 justices of the supreme court of the second judicial district who have done, as has been pointed out by our distinguished previous speaker, Andrew Roscoe, a great, a magnificent and a devoted job in trying to clear up the congested calendar as much as we have been able to accomplish.

The ceremonies today see realized a dream which has taken so many years in fulfillment, but which now supplies a concrete and realistic accomplishment in achieving a much needed Supreme Courthouse Building. This courthouse will provide more adequate and substantial judicial and trial facilities, and avoid the embarrassment and inconvenience which has resulted from our conducting the judicial and legal business in an antiquated, dilapidated and outworn building.

I extend my own personal thanks and those of my colleagues to the mayor of the city of New York, to Borough President John Cashmore, and to Commissioners Frederick Zurmuhlen and Joseph Spagna and to their representatives for their cooperation and

help in the execution of plans and the furnishing of the equipment and courtroom and chamber facilities. I am certain that an inspection of our building will be most pleasantly revealing in its attractiveness and utility. Among its many unusual and startling features are six detention and confinement cells, as well as courtrooms panelled in eight different types of wood with indirect fluorescent lighting, acoustical ceilings, and marble walls and terrazzo floors.

Commissioner Zurmuhlen has told me that this is the first courthouse ever built in these United States which is completely air conditioned from top to bottom and throughout its corridors and courtrooms. The commissioner of public works can be justly proud of his tremendous contribution in the construction of our new courthouse.

I can not let this occasion go by without expressing my appreciation to those members of the judiciary who pioneered in the planning of this magnificent temple of justice. I do not know how many of you realize that for many years, even when I first became a justice of this court on January 1, 1949, there has been a new courthouse committee. It was and has been the function of this committee, selected by the board of justices, to work together with the mayor of the city of New York and with the various heads of his city departments in planning, designing, and constructing the proposed new courthouse.

Some of these justices are now retired, and, sadly, some of them have gone to their great reward and have passed from our midst. Happily, several of the former members of this committee, who are now justices of the appellate division, are with us today, and I would like them to know that the resident justices are ever mindful of the assistance they have rendered in making possible the erection of this building.

Of course, I cannot and should not forget to give credit to our present resident justices who have been members of this committee. I would like to single out its present chairman, Justice Vincent Keogh. All of the 15 justices of our court have, during the past 2 or 3 years, become architects, engineers, and interior decorators, and each has had his own ideas concerning how the building should be constructed and the manner in which the courtrooms, their facilities and their own individual chambers should be painted, decorated, and furnished. But Justice Keogh's patience and perseverance were able to successfully satisfy and compromise these minor criticisms, and his strong and enthusiastic leadership of the committee has evoked our unanimous commendation and approval.

I, therefore, take this occasion to express to him the appreciation of our board of justices for his unselfish, conscientious, and untiring efforts. And I may say that before we gathered here this morning, a presentation was made in the cloakroom of a gift from all the justices of our court to Justice Keogh in appreciation for his great work.

I take this opportunity, also, to give thanks to the general clerk, the Honorable James V. Mangano, and the personnel of the court who worked under his supervision and who were assigned to the committee for giving the committee their assistance and support.

I know that you will bear with me if, on this occasion, I express, as briefly as possible, the thoughts which impress me with the importance of these ceremonies. As we gather on this impressive occasion, whose dignity and importance is enhanced by the presence of so many eminent jurists, distinguished public officials, and members of the bar, we do well to pause to reflect upon its nature and significance.

We are assembled to dedicate a new courthouse of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. It is an event and purpose

worthy of dedication. By its true and classical definition, a dedication implies the setting apart and consecration to high and noble purposes. It is a solemn act which is historically reserved for temples and places of worship.

Yet, it is indeed appropriate that we dedicate this courthouse, for it is a modern temple—a temple of justice. Here the majesty of the law will be invoked to safeguard the rights and freedoms of all peoples who seek its protection and demand the equal and impartial administration of justice.

As Judge Conway, our chief judge of the court of appeals, has so beautifully expressed it: "The history of the supreme court is a proud honored one. Its panorama must give pause to anyone who would, for whatever reason, weaken it or destroy it. Guardian of the right it has always been; impregnable in its virtue; impervious to passing fads and fancies; dispenser of even-handed justice; resolute and unchanging in its ideals despite wars, public clamor, social unrest; the resort of freemen who seek justice, confident of receiving it."

It is a place where the great heritage of liberty and freedom, enshrined in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, will be perpetuated for all generations to come.

Although this reflective inventory is of importance for all citizens, it is of particular significance to lawyers and judges, for they have devoted their lives to the study of the law of the land, and can best appreciate the role of the law in the maintenance of peace, tranquility and order.

The greatness of civilizations and their people are often almost entirely judged by their contribution to the development of law and their ability to have substituted the rule of law for that of force and violence. In this respect, we are confident that future historians will portray the efforts of this generation, if not in glowing terms, at least approvingly.

The truth will reveal that, although we have not yet completely succeeded, no reasonable effort has been spared in our constant striving to improve the administration of justice.

This new building stands as eloquent testimony to our efforts and sacrifices in lifting the dignity of the law itself, and the place where it will be administered by devoted judges, and practiced by dedicated members of the legal profession.

Lawyers have reason to be justifiably proud in any ceremony which dedicates a temple of justice and upholds the dignity of the law and our cherished American heritage. In such an environment their thoughts naturally turn to the leading role that their profession has played in the growth, development, and survival of this great Nation which was founded upon a belief in God and the equality of man. It is in this connection that the American lawyer can proudly proclaim to the world that, of the 56 signers of our Declaration of Independence, 33 were lawyers, and that, of the 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention which was held in Philadelphia in 1787, 34 were lawyers.

Let it be remembered, however, that the importance of this ceremony is not limited to bench and bar. It is not confined to any segment of our society. It is a ceremony for all Americans. It is a ceremony for all who reap the rich harvest of liberty and justice—the glorious bequest of our forefathers. It is, therefore, fitting that on an occasion such as this we should also emphasize our national ideals and rejoice in the benefits of liberty under law.

For all of this we are grateful and give thanks to Almighty God and to our forefathers who established this great Republic of ours and who have made our American

way of life beneficent and beneficial to all its citizens who have sought or will seek the fruits of a true administration of justice.

It is now our sacred duty to transmit this heritage of freedom and liberty under law to our children and all future generations. With God's help and our firm and resolute determination, we will perform it well. [Applause.]

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Ladies and gentlemen, during my spare time during these ceremonies, I have looked out over the audience. It has been a great pleasure to see here today so many past presidents of the Brooklyn Bar Association, so many of our distinguished practicing lawyers, so many fine, prominent, and distinguished citizens of the Borough of Brooklyn.

I wish that I could call on each and every one of you so that you might take some part in this very important and historic ceremony. I wish that I could call on my distinguished brethren of the bar for whom, of course, I have great respect and a very sincere affection. I would like to hear from each of them.

I am particularly annoyed that I have not had the opportunity to call on a representative of the ladies whose presence has made these ceremonies, I assure you, much more enjoyable. But I have been working, as you know, under orders from Judge Keogh, who is a tough boss, and I try to obey my orders, to the best of my ability.

I am going to break the rule just in one respect because I think that I should. We have many welcome visitors here today. I am not going to try to name them; that would be useless. But I am going to mention just one.

With his customary modesty he has told me, before the ceremonies commenced, that he did not wish to make an address, that he would like to sit quietly with his friends in Brooklyn and enjoy the dedication with them, the dedication of this courthouse.

I am going to respect his wishes. I am not going to call on him for an address, but we are highly honored that he is here today, and I am going to ask him if he will just rise for a moment so that I can present him to you.

We in our court have a very cordial relationship with the appellate division of the first department, with all the judges of the first department. The fact that we have that relationship is due in no small measure to the personality of the able and distinguished presiding justice of that court.

I am going to ask him if he just won't stand up for a second. Judge Botein. [Applause.]

The Judge, with his customary paternal spirit for the members of his court, has just informed me that Jim McNally and Owen McGovern are in the audience. Even with my bad eyesight, Bernie, I found that out. We are very glad to see them here.

May I say again that we are glad to see you here, Judge Botein.

Now, may I again have the privilege, in closing these ceremonies, of calling on, I think, Brooklyn's most beloved citizen to pronounce the benediction, the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward P. Hoar.

(All arose during the benediction.)
The Right Reverend Monsignor EDWARD P. HOAR. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, Amen.

We give Thee thanks, Almighty God, in whom all things begin that are good, and by whom all things that are good are completed.

We thank Thee sincerely from the bottom of our hearts for giving us good purpose not only to see the culmination and the preparation of this temple of justice, but also to have realized by these speeches the ideals which are being practiced daily in this and other courts in our good land which is so

much blessed by Almighty God that we feel that we can never express or practice the manifestation of our gratitude; for here justice is what it is supposed to be, not by the permission of any tyrant, no matter how much he might be apparently important in his own mind, or even by the immediate servants of his tyranny, but because these good men, the judges of this and other courts, realize that it is Almighty God who gives the justification for the justice that we know and live by.

We thank Thee, therefore, for having given us not only that marvelous gift, the Constitution made by the forefathers of our land, but also for the practice of the principles and the laws which that Constitution makes possible for all of us.

We thank Thee again for having let us know that You have given us a body of men through the ages since the old courthouse was built, and even before, who will be, no doubt, the predecessors and exemplars of another generation of judges and keepers of justice.

For that reason and for that hope we thank Thee, Almighty God, and trust that we will be always appreciative of it, because in this great land of ours we may say, as the inspired writer, "Justice and Peace have kissed."

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Ladies and gentlemen, I am now about to do what every sensible judge does at every possible opportunity. I am going to turn this meeting back, and the court back to the clerk of the court, the Honorable James V. Mangano, who has, I think, an important message for you.

HON. JAMES V. MANGANO. Ladies and gentlemen, will you please remain standing while we recite the Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag, and upon concluding the recitation, will every one please remain in their seats while the justices leave the room.

Will you recite after me.
(Pledge of Allegiance recited by the audience.)

On behalf of the board of justices, I wish to express our best wishes to you for a very happy New Year, and thank you for your attentiveness and the manner in which you have participated and cooperated in these ceremonies.

Who Are the Jobless?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker. We are all pleased with the news that the proposed march on Washington by the unemployed has been called off. Nevertheless, the problem exists and it requires our earnest attention. In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New Republic of February 23, 1959:

WHO ARE THE JOBLESS?

As of last month, 76 of the 149 major areas on which the Department of Labor keeps unemployment records were ranked in the D, E, and F classifications, as having 6 percent or more of their labor force unemployed. Eleven of these areas were in the F grouping, with 12 percent or more of their workers look-

ing for work and unable to find it: Detroit and Muskegon, Mich.; Huntington, W. Va.; Buffalo, N.Y.; five cities in Pennsylvania; and two in Puerto Rico.

In the week of January 11-17, 4,724,000 people were looking for work in a civilian labor force of 67,430,000, a rate of 7 percent compared with a 6.7 percent rate 1 year ago. Who are these unemployed; how long have they been without work; what are their regular jobs when they have them?

As of now, 3,282,000 of the jobless are men; 1,441,000 of them are women. Compared with last year, 141,000 more men are looking for work and 99,000 more women.

Unemployment is always a problem among the school-leaving young: this year, 216,000 boys between 14 and 17 are looking for work as compared with 145,000 last year. The girls are doing better: where 72,000 of them were jobless last year, only 48,000 are without work today.

Among workers over 18, the biggest group last year were the 752,000 unemployed 18-24 year old men; this year, the biggest group are the men between 25 and 34—730,000 of them. Among men aged 18 to 45, the 1,977,000 looking for work are 99,000 fewer than last year. Among women of these ages it's the other way: 121,000 more of them are jobless.

Among older workers, the men over 45 looking for work—1,089,000 of them—number 169,000 more than a year ago. The number of unemployed women—8,000 fewer—is 369,000.

This year's figures differ from last year's also in the length of time the unemployed have been looking for jobs. Last year 2,007,000 of the 4,494,000 unemployed had been job-hunting for only from 1 to 4 weeks; a further 1,622,000 had been out from 5 to 14 weeks; 556,000 from 15 to 26 weeks; 309,000 longer.

This January, many more people had been out for a long time: While 1,861,000 had lost their jobs within the last 4 weeks and 1,488,000 had been unemployed from 5 to 14 weeks, 557,000 were in the 15 to 26 week group, and the group without work for more than 26 weeks had jumped from 309,000 to 818,000.

Available figures on unemployment in various occupations gives some idea of which workers have shared in the business recovery, and which have been left aside. In steel, the unemployment rate, 11.2 percent in January 1958, has dropped to 8.2 percent (but in January 1957, it was only 2.6 percent); in autos, there has been an over-the-year improvement from 14.7 to 10.3 percent. For manufacturing as a whole, the year's increase has taken the rate only from 8.9 to 7.9 percent; in nondurable industries it is little changed at 7.5 percent, though in apparel an 11 percent rate a year ago has deteriorated to 12.5 percent.

Mining is worse off this January than last, with a 9.6 percent unemployment rate climbing to 11.7; construction, always badly off in cold weather, stands at 19.3 percent in comparison to 18.7 a year ago. Railway and railway express joblessness, at 9 percent last year, is now 8.4, but in other forms of transportation the rate has gone up from 5.7 to 8.4 percent.

Even in the service trades which, along with government employment, have fluctuated little recently, the rate is up from 3.5 percent last year to 4.7 now.

One cheerful note is the improvement in hours worked by employees who are on part-time for economic reasons: A pickup in the hard goods industries—fabricators of machinery and equipment for producers—where unemployment usually lingers longest after a business upturn, has reduced the number of part-timers from 1,953,000 a year ago to 1,255,000 today.

Morris Forgash: Champion of Our Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, Morris Forgash, of New York City, whom I am proud to claim as a dear, personal friend, is one of the greatest businessmen of our day. He is hailed as the champion of our railroads and is determined to help put the railroads back on the tracks financially.

His rise in the transportation business was meteoric. He is president of the United States Freight Co., which position carries the responsibility of chief executive officer of all United States Freight subsidiaries. His business responsibilities are tremendous, but he unselfishly gives of his spare time to philanthropic and community endeavors. He is a man of integrity, honor, and kindness, as well as of dynamic action and great capabilities.

The New York Times of February 22 carried an article about Mr. Forgash and I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may read it:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1959]

PERSONALITY: CHAMPION OF THE IRON HORSE—
FORGASH IS STRIVING TO HELP RAILWAYS,
CURB TRUCKERS—UNITED STATES FREIGHT CO.
HEAD IS BIG PROponent OF PIGGYBACK

(By Robert E. Bedingfield)

Morris Forgash is determined to help put the railroads back on the tracks financially and to confine the truckers to within a 400-mile radius of the spots where their cargoes originate.

The chief tool with which he expects to work these miracles is his ability as a salesman of transportation, sharpened during 41 years of working for the United States Freight Co. in capacities ranging from stenographer to president. He also will ring in the Interstate Commerce Commission if that is necessary.

Mr. Forgash tends to minimize the enormous obstacles in his path, because, as he puts it, "the economics of the matter" is on his side. Railroads, he said, in a recent interview, must stop thinking of pounds or even tons of freight and begin to think in terms of carloads, which are the smallest units that they really move. He concedes that trucks with their door-to-door mobility have a vast advantage over any distance that can be spanned between morning and night, but insists that after a day's move their inherently higher costs make them the least economic handlers of freight.

BIGGEST FREIGHT FORWARDER

Mr. Forgash is not to be taken lightly when he announces a program, no matter how ambitious. Under his guidance as president (1941 to date), United States Freight's annual gross revenues have grown from \$50 million to more than \$175 million. Moreover, in the last 5 years, while his company's gross has moved up 20 percent, net profits have jumped more than 100 percent.

U.S. Freight, through 31 subsidiaries, forms the Nation's largest freight-forwarding organization. The company's forwarding subsidiaries operate solely in the l.c.l. (less-than-carload) field. A carload is about

30,000 pounds. Using local and over-the-road trucks, the freight forwarder is the middleman in the transportation field. He picks up less-than-carload merchandise at a factory, consolidates it with other products going in the same direction, ships the lot via rail or truck and makes delivery to a consignee's door. He buys transportation wholesale, at the carload rate, and retails it at a higher price, roughly the l.c.l. rate.

The first point of his program to help put the railroads back on their feet is to have them take a more aggressive attitude toward handling freight in piggyback fashion—moving it in loaded highway trailers or containers on flatcars. About 48 of the Nation's 113 big class I railroads are using this method. The service has been growing rapidly in the last 3 or 4 years, but Mr. Forgash laments the railroads' cautious approach to it.

Last year, for example, about 1 percent of rail freight carloadings went piggyback.

"Yet, this type of service," Mr. Forgash said, "is the one way that the rails can say to the truckers 'I can do what you can do, only I can do it better.'"

PIGGYBACK ADVANTAGES

Piggyback's advantages include an incentive toward speed—within the last year under pressure to get the forwarders' business, the rails cut the time of Chicago-California shipments from fifth night delivery to third night and lowered terminal and handling costs.

The costs are lower all around—for shipper, forwarder and railroad—because the freight doesn't have to go through a series of costly and expensive switching operations in large terminal centers. Once a shipment reaches the city of destination, the piggyback freight train just stops and the truck tractors come along and take the trailers or containers off the flatcar and carry them directly into the consignee's plant or warehouse. Mr. Forgash has been endeavoring to show the railroads the extent of the available economies.

He cited the fact that in a recent month one of his company's subsidiaries moved 765 boxcars of freight from Chicago to Los Angeles, with an average loading of 19,633 pounds a car. The railroads received \$658 a car, on average, for handling the movement. During the same month, however, the company moved 94 flatcars, each carrying two loaded highway trailers, piggyback between Chicago and Los Angeles. The average weight a car was 61,918 pounds. The average revenue paid the railroads was \$1,009 a car.

In this piggy-back movement, United States Freight's subsidiary provided the railroads not only with the loaded trailers, but with the flatcars, too. This is what in the transportation industry is called plan IV piggybacking. There are three other types. Under plan I, the rails haul the trailers of the common carrier motor trucker. Plan II is strictly a railroad service, with the railroad moving the freight in its own trailers on its own flatcars. Plan III requires the shipper or forwarder to provide the trailer, but the railroad provides the flatcar.

Mr. Forgash favors piggybacking, so long as it isn't of the plan I variety. In fact, he means to go before the Interstate Commerce Commission very soon and demand that plan I piggybacking be stopped.

"When a motor carrier goes off the highway onto the back of a railroad," Mr. Forgash complains, "the trucker is no longer operating as a common carrier in accordance with his certificate [Interstate Commerce Commission authority]. The arrangement certainly isn't a true joint rate either in the accepted sense of the term. If you get down to the substance of the law, and outline what the motor carrier actually does alongside the forwarder as defined in the Interstate Commerce Act you will be hard put to tell the difference."

As for the other three modes of piggybacking, which Mr. Forgash concedes are legal, he prefers plan II or III. He expects plan IV to remain only so long as it serves an economic purpose. Plan IV holds an appeal to the railroad that isn't in a position to finance large amounts of new specialized equipment. It was inaugurated only last year.

HE GENERATES ENTHUSIASM

Mr. Forgash is a man able to generate a tremendous enthusiasm for any idea.

His mission of rescuing the railroads is not a vision of youth; he is 58 years old. He's assured of an income of \$108,000 a year for the next 7 years as president of his company, \$50,000 a year thereafter on his retirement, but still he goes about his work as if every day is most important of all. He's been going at everything he ever undertook at super-sonic speed ever since he left Boy's High School in Brooklyn in 1918. The year of the Armistice he found his first job selling Florida water, a men's cologne.

But that was no challenge to the aggressive youth, so he promptly went to an employment agency which helped him get his first stenographic position at Universal Carloading and Distributing Co., a United States Freight subsidiary. He moved up the ladder in nonstop fashion and, by 1929, had reached the post of general manager. In 1931, he was made assistant to the president and 10 years later obtained his present position, which carries the responsibility of chief executive officer of all United States Freight subsidiaries.

Mr. Forgash was married in 1926 to the former Natalie Frendell. Mrs. Forgash has long since abandoned any ideas of slowing down her husband's hectic pace and so has the Forgash's chauffeur.

"When the boss gets in the car," the chauffeur says, "it is a lot easier to let him take the wheel and let him do it his own way than have him tell you how to do it."

Eulogy for the Late Bernard Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the late Assemblyman Bernard Austin represented the Fourth Assembly District of Brooklyn in the State legislature in Albany for many years. He died most unexpectedly on January 6, 1959, and his passing is a great loss to our community.

On February 26 the Williamsburg Post, No. 1004, of the American Legion, of which Bernard Austin was organizer and first commander, will hold a special memorial service for him. I have been invited by the post commander, Leo Price, and by Ira D. Brav, chairman of the memorial committee, to deliver a eulogy. I have prepared a few remarks expressing my feelings and thoughts regarding the deceased and wish to insert these remarks in the RECORD at this time:

EULOGY FOR BERNARD AUSTIN

I join with you on this sad occasion in paying tribute to the memory of a dear and departed friend with whom I was close for many years. His passing is a great personal loss to me. The 4th Assembly District, which he represented in Albany since 1935,

is a part of my congressional district. I shall always remember the many times when we campaigned together and when we collaborated in helping constituents with their personal problems, as well as the community at large in its welfare, educational, civic and other problems.

It is now close to 2 months since Barney Austin has left our midst and has gone to the Great Beyond. For me, it is still difficult to believe that he is no longer with us. In the prime of his life he left his dear ones and his numerous friends who knew him so well and loved him so much. He left a great void in their hearts—one which will never be filled, one which will never be healed.

How weak and fruitless must be any word of mine to console his near ones and dear ones from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. Yet, I cannot refrain from bringing to them the consolation that may be found in the fact that Barney Austin was loved and highly respected by all who knew him.

It is sometimes said that while, on the one hand, the Black Angel destroys a mortal, on the other hand it presents him to us in boldest relief. The living man is too close to us, too much a part of us, to be viewed objectively. Death reveals him in his entirety. Thus we now can visualize in its fullness and grandeur the unique personality that we knew as Bernard Austin. How rich and how beautiful was the life and the soul of him whose achievements meant so much to so many of his generation.

And what is it that stands out most in this hour of bereavement? It is the inner man himself, his honesty, his sincerity, his unselfishness, his wise counsel, his friendship. There was no cause touching upon the welfare of the people of our community that did not find in him a staunch and devoted supporter. He was a man of keen intellect, a person of good judgment, one who was able to see through a problem to its end.

When we think of Barney Austin, we think of the words of the poet who said:

"Here was a man whose heart was good,
Who walked with men and understood.
His was a voice that spoke to cheer,
And fell like music to the ear.
His was a smile men loved to see,
His was a hand that asked no fee
For friendliness or kindness done.
And now that he has journeyed on,
His is a fame that never ends,
And leaves behind uncounted friends."

Barney Austin was indeed a man of leadership, one of whom it can be truly said that his noble deeds have won for him a devoted following. These noble deeds will live forever in the hearts and in the minds of his many friends who came to pay their tribute to him today. He was a pillar of strength in our community for many years, and here among his friends his name will always occupy a foremost place of honor and love.

"And now he rests; his greatest and his sweetness
No more shall seem at strife;
And death has moulded into calm completeness
The status of his life."

May his memory be blessed and honored.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 8½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee)." His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix, and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St. Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Bailey, Cleveland M., W. Va.-----
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), Ga.-----
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave. Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., Mich.-----
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----

Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., Mich.-----
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chiperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), Ill.-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), N. J.-----
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Alme J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Fairfax Hotel Tenn.
Frellinghuysen, Peter, Jr., N. J.-----3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E., N. J.-----

Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Giaino, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), Pa.-----
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), Mich.-----
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio-----1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa-----100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr., Ala.-----
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W., Wis.-----
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), W. Va.-----
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

The Corregidor War Memorial Which Will Cost \$17,500,000 Should Be Replaced With Something More Fitting and Modest, Says New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times advised us in an editorial on February 26 that protests are being made in Manila against the plan to spend \$7,500,000 to erect an elaborate Corregidor-Bataan Memorial in honor of the Filipinos and Americans who died there together. It points out that suggestions have been made that the actual memorial be much more modest and that part of the funds be used for permanent projects in the public interest.

Even though the Armed Services Committee of the House has favorably recommended the proposed Corregidor-Bataan Memorial there does seem to me to be a number of reasons why further consideration should be given to this matter before it is voted on by this body.

In view of the deteriorating relations with the Government of the Philippines today it seems to me unwise to take any step, such as erecting a war memorial that has already inflamed the opinions of many, which conceivably might further unsettle things.

I include here the editorial from the New York Times, as well as the text of a recent report on the Corregidor-Bataan War Memorial which was given to the congressionally chartered National Music Council by Dr. Herbert Zipper, director of the Manila Symphony Orchestra:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1959]

THE CORREGIDOR MEMORIAL

Protests are being made in Manila against the plan to spend \$7,500,000 to erect an elaborate Corregidor-Bataan Memorial in honor of the Filipinos and Americans who died there together. It has been suggested that the actual memorial be much more modest and that part of the funds be used for permanent projects in the public interest. In this country it has been suggested in some quarters that the memorial fund might endow a much-needed cultural center.

These objections to the memorial plan are valid. The monument to the men of Bataan and Corregidor ought to be a living thing, not some collection of lifeless marble. The money can be spent in a way that will do even greater honor to the men who are memorialized.

An attractive alternative is the construction of a good children's hospital and a convalescent home. "Topside," on Corregidor

itself, would even be a possible location. These services are badly needed and their provision, surely, would be an ideal way to pay our tribute to the dead on behalf of the living. The Filipinos, we are convinced, would be in complete agreement with this viewpoint.

COMMUNITY MUSIC CENTER OF THE NORTH SHORE,

Winnetka, Ill., January 27, 1959.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Sir: Being aware of your genuine interest in cultural matters through the excellent bills you have introduced in Congress, I take the liberty of drawing your attention to the Corregidor-Bataan War Memorial as planned by the War Memorial Commission.

I am not exaggerating in stating that if the present plan is to come to fruition, it will do a great deal of harm to the prestige of the United States in the Far East. For this reason, I take the liberty of enclosing a report that I gave at the last general meeting of the National Music Council in New York and a copy of a resolution passed unanimously by that body.

For the past 20 years I have been the musical director of the Manila Symphony Orchestra in the Philippines, where I spend 3½ months every year; therefore, I am rather well acquainted with conditions in the Philippines and with the feeling in regard to the memorial of a goodly number of Filipinos in high places. The American community in Manila practically unanimously holds the views as expressed in the report.

May I assure you of the sincere appreciation of my associates and of myself for anything you can do to bring about a more realistic approach to the memorial question, and to make your voice heard when an appropriation for this project comes to the floor of the House.

Needless to say, I am at your service for any further information.

Believe me to be,

Yours very truly,

DR. HERBERT ZIPPER.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN WAR MEMORIAL

(A report given at the general meeting of the National Music Council on December 18, 1958, in New York City)

The United States is about to erect on Corregidor Island in the Philippines a war memorial of gigantic proportions. It appears that if present plans are not changed now in the 11th hour, we are bound to become, unwittingly, a party to a monstrosity that will do a great deal of harm to the prestige of the United States.

Instead of planning for a memorial that could be useful to the living, an abstract monument has been designed that will serve no useful purpose, to stand on a spot where it cannot be seen but by a few, on a rock in the sea far out in Manila Bay, remote and hardly accessible.

In 1953 the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission was created by act of Congress and charged with the task of making a study for the survey, location, and erection on Corregidor Island (in Manila Bay) of a building and other structures and the use of Corregidor Island as a memorial to the Filipino and American soldiers, sailors, and

marines who lost their lives while serving in the Pacific area during World War II. This task should be accomplished, according to the act, in cooperation with a similar agency which may be appointed in the Republic of the Philippines.

Such an agency—the National Shrines Commission—was created subsequently by President Magsaysay in the Philippines.

In August 1957, President Eisenhower submitted to Congress a report of the U.S. Memorial Commission in which their accomplishments were enumerated: mainly, the holding of a national contest for an architectural design of the proposed memorial. Forty-three architects and architectural firms entered the contest which was judged by a jury of 11 members, seven of which were prominent architects of the United States and five high ranking officers of the U.S. Armed Forces. The winning design submitted by Naramore, Bain, Brady & Johanson, of Seattle, Wash., was awarded a prize of \$10,000.

It is significant that, for some strange reason never made public, the contest was confined entirely to the United States. Filipino artists were not invited to compete in the contest nor invited to act as judges of the contest. In other words, the people of the Philippines were presented with an accomplished fact. Even the U.S. Memorial Commission did not accept in a formal meeting the winning design as the final plan for the erection of the monument, instead and I quote from the printed record: "Several attempts were made by the chairman (the Honorable Emmet O'Neal) to hold the meeting of the Commission members, but in each case a quorum could not be obtained. In lieu of a formal meeting, eight members were contacted personally and on May 21, 1957, these members of the Commission accepted the recommendation of the final jury of award and designated the design submitted by Naramore, Bain, Brady & Johanson, of Seattle, Wash., as the Commission's choice."

The Philippine National Shrines Commission did not give a formal approval of the design, although the chairman of the Philippine Commission was in Washington and had meetings with the chairman of the U.S. Commission on May 2 and May 9, 1957, the record states "concurrence in this choice has been requested of the Philippine National Shrine Commission but had not been received as of June 30, 1957."

As I have been told subsequently, a majority of the members of the Philippine Commission were dubious about the whole matter but they felt that at this point when the American Commission went as far as it did without Philippine participation, it would be impolite and embarrassing to raise objections or to tell the U.S. Government how to spend its money.

The winning design in the architect's description "Is essentially in the shape of outstretched arms, an inherent form of hope and supplication universally understood. It was intended that the form be abstract enough to permit the individual viewing it to read into it values of his own experiences."

The design was published in the Philippines during the past summer and it turns out, that viewed by Filipinos, the memorial looks like a pair of carabao horns (the carabao is a water buffalo, the working animal of the Philippines).

There is now legislation before Congress favorably recommended by the Armed Services Committee of the House that "authorizes that there be appropriated to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission an amount equal to amounts, not in excess of \$7½ million, which may be received by the Secretary of the Navy from the sale of vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register."

These are the facts as of today. I should like to state, without hesitation, that the realization of the well-meant intentions to create a visible expression of the bonds that exist between the United States and the Philippines will not be achieved if the proposed monument is erected. The purpose, as stated by the Commission, that: "Corregidor, properly memorialized, will be extremely important to the Philippines and our foreign relations work in the Far East" will not be achieved if the proposed monument is erected. Present plans are ill conceived and the design adopted unfit for the Philippines.

Corregidor is a small island at the mouth of Manila Bay nearly 30 miles distance from the waterfront of Manila. The island itself can be seen from Manila only on very clear days. The monument, although 263 feet in height, contrary to the claims of the Honorable Emmet O'Neal will not be seen from Manila. The island is not easily accessible. The claim that it will attract a large tourist trade is wholly unrealistic and disregards the facts of geography and economy. The claim that it will be seen from the air disregards the fact that not a single major air line passes in sight of Corregidor. The claim that the memorial will serve as "A forum from which the doctrines of democracy can be proclaimed to the people of the Far East" is aptly answered by a columnist in the Manila Evening News: "To whom? The sea gulls?"

A special citizens committee in Manila formed last October gathered more than 10,000 signatures to seek reconsideration of the present memorial plans. Nevertheless the Chairman of the U.S. Commission, the Honorable Emmet O'Neal circularized all Members of Congress 3 weeks ago claiming enthusiasm here and in the Philippines for the present plan.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS who until recently was a member of the Memorial Commission wrote to a friend of mine on December 4: "I am glad we are in agreement opposing the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial. The more I went into that matter, the more I became convinced that it had taken a form that I could not approve. After I was able to discharge my obligations to the group, I resigned."

I have been asked by the President of the American Chamber of Commerce in the Philippines, Mr. J. L. Mannings to use all avenues open to me to help bring about a reconsideration of the present plans. I have been told by our Ambassador to the Philippines, the Honorable Charles E. Bohlen that he shares the views of the chamber of commerce. I have been told the same by a great number of prominent Filipinos in government, civic and cultural affairs.

It is certainly not my intention to detract from the high purpose originally intended by the U.S. Congress, but I am pleading for a more realistic approach and a more useful expenditure of such a large sum. Naturally, an appropriation of \$7½ million for memorial purposes would be economically beneficial to the Philippines. The greater part of the amount would be spent there and would help to boost their economy.

Manila was badly hit by the war; in destruction it was only second to Warsaw. Its only good theater, the Metropolitan, was destroyed and could not be rebuilt. Manila at present has no suitable place for the holding of concerts, operas, and other theatrical per-

formances. Manila at present has no museum and no library. The American orchestras, ballet companies, and concert artists visiting Manila now on the President's special international program have to perform in gymnasiums. I feel, therefore, that a simple memorial on Corregidor costing a fraction of the amount of \$7½ million, together with a large theater comparable to the War Memorial Opera House in San Francisco, placed in Manila on the edge of Manila Bay would be a fitting and practical memorial that would serve Filipinos and Americans alike. Above all, I plead for the drawing up of plans with full and equal participation of Filipinos because in the final analysis it does not matter how much approval the present plans may receive in this country; after all, the memorial will not be erected in the United States, but on Asian soil, and, therefore, should also have approval of the people who live there. The present plans tend to make the memorial and, with it, the U.S. Government an object of ridicule.

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL MUSIC COUNCIL ON DECEMBER 18, 1958, IN NEW YORK CITY

Whereas the Corregidor Bataan War Memorial Commission has adopted a design as the Commission's choice for the war memorial to be erected on Corregidor Island; and Whereas there is now legislation before Congress to authorize that there be appropriated to the Corregidor Bataan War Memorial Commission amounts not in excess of \$7½ million for the erection of said memorial; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the National Music Council, a portion of the funds available for the purpose can be better employed for the construction of a war memorial more useful to Filipinos and Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in full recognition of the high purpose of the U.S. Congress, the present plans be revised to the extent that a smaller portion of the available funds be used for the erection of a simple memorial on Corregidor Island; the remaining portion to be used for auditorium for the performing arts in Manila in replacement of facilities destroyed during World War II, and dedicated as war memorial, and that the choice of the purpose and the choice of design for said building be accomplished with the active participation of Philippine citizens.

Address by Hon. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, at Indiana State Jefferson-Jackson Day Victory Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on February 14, 1959, I had the pleasure of introducing the very distinguished junior Senator from Missouri to the Indiana State Jefferson-Jackson victory dinner at Indianapolis. His remarks were inspiring and thought-provoking. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. STUART SYMINGTON, OF MISSOURI, AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY VICTORY DINNER, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., FEBRUARY 14, 1959

Thank you for the great honor of being with you tonight at your victory dinner.

You Democrats of Indiana certainly have a real victory to celebrate. In just one election, you have taken a Republican stronghold and made it Democratic. If anybody wants to know how the country is going politically, I suggest they take a look at Indiana.

Let me salute your successful candidates. I salute this young man here who is already making a name for himself in the Senate as a hard worker, a gracious gentleman, and a faithful servant of the people, VANCE HARTKE.

I salute your able and vigorous Hoosier Congressmen: WINFIELD DENTON, RAY MADSEN, JOHN BRADEMANS, ED ROUSH, FRED WAMPLER, EARL HOGAN, RANDALL HARMON, and JOE BARR. There are 8 names on that honor roll—8 Democratic Congressmen out of 11—and last year there were only 2. Keep up the good work, and next time you will have all 11—and a Governor. And then, 2 years after that, you can elect yourselves a second Democratic Senator.

We have been working along this line in Missouri. Now we have only one Republican Congressman left; and we expect next time to make it unanimous. Of course, out in Missouri, we are helped by having in residence the leading Democrat of the whole country, Harry S. Truman. We work all the harder for Democratic victories in Missouri, because we never want to let him down. You in Indiana know that he works at it, too, as his campaign trip here last fall amply demonstrated.

There is no mystery about the Democratic victories that swept the country last November. There is no mystery about the rising tide of Democratic sentiment throughout the Nation. It is no secret that we are going to put a Democrat in the White House in 1960.

The reasons for all these things are out in the open, and apparent to everybody. The people have been oversold on what is really a second-best, do-nothing administration. They were taken in by the fancy packaging, and they bought it. But the product inside was below American standards. So now they are shopping for the genuine article—for a party and an administration that will represent the people, meet their needs, and offer real leadership. And that is exactly what the Democratic Party is going to give them.

If the times were not so dangerous, and the problems we face were not so serious, it would be pleasant to spend a little time discussing the woes of the Republican Party. We Democrats could offer them quite a little advice—in a helpful spirit, of course.

We might, for example, take part in the great debate that seems to be shaking the Republican leaders just now—on the subject: Is the elephant dead or merely sleeping?

Or we might offer our help to Mr. Arthur Larson, the apostle of modern Republicanism, who wrote a sensational book just a few years ago entitled "A Republican Looks at His Party."

We might help him gather material for the sequel, "A Republican Looks for His Party."

Or we might offer some amendments to the Republican theme song—you all have heard it—"There's No Business Like Big Business." Now that the party of big business is shrinking in size its members ought to be more sympathetic to the small businessman's problems. If the Republicans don't stop shrinking, pretty soon they themselves may be able to qualify for a small-business loan.

I have been told that the Republican Party is taking a poll—among people who will still admit they are Republicans—to decide what the public image of the Republican Party

should be. Now this phrase "public image" is a bit of Madison Avenueese that needs translation into plain English. It means not what you are, but what people think you are. So the Republicans are trying to find out what will be the best thing for people to think they are. I could give them the answer to that. It's very simple. Democrats.

And don't think that some of the Republicans haven't caught on—in fact, they are trying it out. There's a Republican governor in one of our eastern States who got elected recently by acting like a Democrat. But now, unfortunately, he has put forward a "soak the poor" tax program; and the voters are already beginning to wonder.

In my opinion, it's a mistake for the Republican Party to be looking for a new public image. It's not an image they need so much as a backbone. They need the determination to stand up to the problems we face—unemployment, high prices, poor schools, poor housing, depressed areas, flood control, declining agriculture, Russian arms, and international upheavals—to put forward some new ideas, and to take some action to solve them.

It is rather a sad business, my friends, to count up the losses we have suffered because of the inability of the Republican Party to cope with the problems of the present day. Step by step our national position has deteriorated until we are now in a mess at home and in danger abroad.

In 1952, America was by far the strongest of all nations. We stood at the head of a united free world, a free world which had stopped Communist aggression in its tracks. We had full employment, full parity on the farm, and a Government that worked for the people. Most important, we had the spirit to push ahead, with all our resources, to make America a better place to live.

And what have we today? Nearly 5 million unemployed. National output lagging. Inflation still unchecked. Four million farmers driven off their farms because of this administration's indifference to their problems. Stagnation in some of our key industries, and economic depression in some areas. A diplomatic crisis in almost every part of the globe.

These things would be a big enough price to pay, without more, for a Republican administration. But there is more—a lot more. The most ruthless and most successful dictatorship known to history has now broken through, in the scientific and technological fields, to possess itself of weapons of unbelievable power and deadliness. These new weapons, added to its admitted superiority in submarines and land armies, make the Soviet Union more than ever formidable, in its attempt to communize the world.

I know that this is bad news; and a lot of people would rather not think about it. But the job of a Senator is not always pleasant. And if the country is in danger, it is the duty of every knowledgeable citizen to present the facts to the people. A second-best defense is no good to us. As has been well said, it is worth exactly as much as the second-best poker hand. And the task of creating a first rate defense is a task the Republican administration is failing to perform.

In fact, the Republican administration has not only been failing to perform this task—it has been striving to hide the whole problem from the people. The Republican Party has been feeding us tranquilizing pills compounded of evasion, and at times outright inaccuracies. They try to surround the whole question with a fog of complacency, along with an iron curtain of security.

But when you penetrate these defenses, get to the heart of the matter, and ask them why this task is not being performed, they come up with a curious answer. We cannot have a first rate defense, they say, because we cannot afford it.

And this same answer is given, in the President's budget, to all the important problems of our time. They say we cannot afford to stay in the missile race with Russia. They say we cannot afford to invest in an adequate educational system for our young people. They say we cannot afford to erase unemployment, or step up the fight against disease, or renew our cities, or control our rivers, or put our depressed areas back on their feet.

If this were true, then our Nation would be bankrupt. If a man can't afford a decent house, an education for his children, and can't pay his doctor's bills, we say he is broke. And so it is with a nation. But is the United States of America really broke—as the Republicans would have us believe? Of course not. We can afford these things. America is the richest and the greatest country on earth. We can afford to do whatever we must do, for our security and our welfare.

I think I know why the Republicans give this curious and defeatist answer to the growing needs of the country. They are either unable or unwilling to understand the economic systems of these United States. They fail to understand that government and business must work together for the great goals of national security and domestic prosperity—and that if they do work together, there is no limit to our future progress.

I spent many years in private business, most of them in an effort to convert run-down businesses into going concerns. There is a great deal of difference between rehabilitating a company, and running a country; and I do not pretend to know all that must be done for either. But if there is one concept which would get this country back on the beam again, it is this: Full production.

Today, more than 20 percent of our Nation's industrial capacity is idle. In the steel mills, in the automobile factories, in the textile plants, our production capacity is not being used. Let's look at it this way. We have a machine which could produce 1,000 units. But it is only producing 800. The machine itself is just as expensive, even though it is producing less. And as we all know, if it does produce less, unit cost goes up. This is just not good business.

Let us take the men that are idle, and the production capacity that is idle—and in the interest of our security, as well as our prosperity—put them back to work.

America has more productive ability than any nation on earth. During the war, and afterward, we achieved a miracle of production. And we can do it again. We have the wealth, the manpower, and the skill to accomplish whatever we want. What we lack—and have lacked for the past 6 years—is the leadership.

If this Nation plans successfully to operate at full production, it will remain the world's No. 1 economic system, far, far ahead of the Communists. Khrushchev's goal of catching up with us in industry and agriculture in 7 years will never be realized.

Full production would lick unemployment, and eliminate the pool of chronic joblessness in our small and large cities that is being predicted for the next 2 years. Every able-bodied man and woman anxious to work would be able to work, and at a wage compatible with self-respect. With full production, inflation could be checked, because the new flow of goods would bring supply in line with demand. And finally, the heavy new tax revenue generated by full production, swelled by the very growth of our economy, would pour into the Treasury. That new money could finance both our current necessary expenditures and our needed new ones. We would then have a real chance to balance the budget.

The Democratic Party wants to balance the budget just as badly as do the Republicans. But we want to do it by ex-

panding the economy—and the Republicans want to do it by shrinking the economy. We intend to take the economy out of the Republican straightjacket and put it on a Democratic launching pad.

Our problems abroad are even more complex than those at home. But the application of the principles of the Democratic Party can lead us to their ultimate solution. Let us apply the basic principle of Thomas Jefferson: "The cherishment of the people." From Woodrow Wilson through Franklin Roosevelt to Harry Truman, the foreign policy of the Democratic Party has always been based on sincere concern for the people of every nation in the world.

The greatest task facing the world today is the attainment of a just and lasting peace. The first part of that task is the negotiation of a meaningful disarmament agreement. Ten years of negotiation have taught us that negotiating disarmament with the Communists is not easy. It is frustrating and often heartbreaking. A meaningful disarmament must be mutual. It must be continuous. It must be based on a foolproof system of inspection. And it should include as many countries as possible. Every possible effort should be made to reach this kind of agreement.

If America could take just one-tenth as much as it spends each year for arms, and contribute that money to a world development fund, we could advance world progress 50 years; and at the same time bring underdeveloped countries into the 20th century.

The markets this would open up for American goods could only add to our own prosperity, and the upsurge of economic activity this would produce would liberate the masses of the people in the poorer nations from much poverty—and would aid in turning back the political tides of communism. When the day comes when there can be a reduction in the arms burden, there could well be an easing of the present rate of taxation, and still plenty left over for the great unfinished business of the country—better education, improved health care, security for our older people, and a massive attack on the poverty which still exists in America.

At first glance, it might seem illogical to say that on the one hand we must have more missiles; and on the other, we should continue negotiations for the limitation of arms. But 14 years of cold war makes nothing more certain than this: In order to have any chance of successfully negotiating world disarmament, we must be so strong that the Communists know, if they attack us, they are insuring their own destruction. The reason, therefore, that we should sustain our arms effort is to be able to negotiate for peace from a position of relative strength instead of relative weakness.

If America can bring the world two accomplishments—peace and economic security—then all the effort, all the money, and all the patience will have been more than worthwhile.

This, then, is the Democratic policy: Full production at home. And in the interest of lasting peace, a secure foundation abroad. This challenge is bigger than politics. But at the same time it is part of politics; for as long as the Republicans refuse to face the challenge, as long as they continue to permit America to fall behind, we Democrats must exert even greater effort to win back control of the Government. We of the Democratic Party are ready for this challenge. We have met it and conquered it before. We can and will do it again.

Let us all tonight, as Democrats, and even more important, as Americans, dedicate ourselves to a strong Nation—an America economically, physically, and spiritually strong. In that way, we will be sure to preserve our individual and our national freedom.

Address by Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, at Finance Industry Staff Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Friday, February 20, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], made one of his first statements since he became chairman of the committee, before the Finance Industry Staff Conference held in Washington under the sponsorship of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that this very fine statement by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, AT THE FINANCE INDUSTRY STAFF CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 20, 1959

It is a pleasure for me to meet, on one of the first such occasions since I became chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, with executives of the banking trade associations under the sponsorship of the chamber of commerce. It is also a pleasure to see representatives of publications interested in banking legislation.

Of course, my succession to the chairmanship of the committee did not mark the beginning of my interest in banking legislation. I have had an interest in this subject which long antedates my election to the Senate. After my election to the Senate, I sought and obtained membership on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it has been one of my ambitions to succeed, one day, to the chairmanship of that important committee.

Ever since I have been a member of the committee, and even while I was a relatively junior member, I have carried a substantial burden of the workload of the committee in the banking field. During my entire membership on the committee, under Democratic chairmanships, I have served as chairman of either the Federal Reserve or Banking Subcommittees.

Although some of the activities of the committee may seem more glamorous politically than banking matters, there are none, in my opinion, which are more important.

The banking field, as you know, involves the money power of the Federal Government. The money power controls the economic lifeblood of the Nation. This has been true throughout our history. It was no accident that the struggles of the American colonists, which culminated in the Constitutional Convention, followed almost a century of disheartening monetary experience. The desire to obtain a sound and freely circulating currency was one of the main springs behind the movement toward federalism. The keynoter of the Constitutional Convention, Edmund Randolph, listed what he called the havoc of paper money high in his enumeration of the inadequacies of the Articles of Confederation.

Throughout the history of this country since that time, from the case of *McCulloch*

v. Maryland through the political and economic struggles over the Bank of the United States; from the populism of William Jennings Bryan to the battles of Woodrow Wilson and Carter Glass to establish the Federal Reserve System, to the bank holiday of Franklin Roosevelt—during all our history—the money power has been the subject of contention and one of the focal points of political decisions until the present day.

The power of the Federal Government in this field, as it developed through all these years, was summed up by Mr. Justice Jackson shortly before his death. In 1955 he wrote:

"Two of the greatest powers possessed by the political branches, which seem to me the disaster potentials in our system, are utterly beyond judicial reach. These are the war power and the money, taxing, and spending power, which is the power of inflation. The improvident use of these powers can destroy the conditions for the existence of liberty, because either can set up great currents of strife within the population which might carry constitutional forms and limitations before them."

"No protection against these catastrophic courses can be expected from the judiciary. The people must guard against these dangers at the polls."

The money power, of course, includes these other powers: The power to tax and the power to spend. As a Member of the House, I served on the Committee on Ways and Means, and, as a Member of the Senate, I have served on the Committee on Appropriations. I have had some experience, then, with the powers of taxing and spending. My present position complements this experience, because it is through the banking system that the money supply is regulated.

I make these opening remarks, emphasizing the importance of the money power, for the purposes of assuring you of my appreciation of the responsibilities of my position and of my humility in the face of them.

Now I should like to discuss with you briefly some of the particular legislative items in which I know you are interested.

As you all have seen in the newspapers recently, the leadership of the Senate apparently has given clearance to the Joint Economic Committee to undertake a full-scale study of our economic system. You will recall that for several years there has been agitation for a National Monetary Commission to undertake a similar study. President Eisenhower proposed in the last Congress that this study be undertaken by a commission of his own appointment. There have been other proposals for joint Senate and House committees, or mixed commissions of private citizens and public officials. The Committee on Economic Development has organized a private study and, as you know, the President has appointed a Cabinet committee to be headed by the Vice President.

It is one of the misfortunes of our present divided Government that we have been unable to reach agreement on a truly nonpartisan and objective study of our economic system, which many of your organizations have advocated for many years. I do not think there is much disagreement on the need for such a study. There is only disagreement about the way in which it should be done and mistrust of the objectives of its various proponents.

Almost 10 years ago, on June 1, 1949, I reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency a bill which would have provided for the establishment of a National Monetary Commission along the same organizational lines as the Hoover Commissions on Government Organization. The Senate passed this bill, but it failed in the House. I often have wondered how the course of our economic system might have been affected had the Commission then proposed succeeded in its objectives.

As to the studies which have been, or are about to be undertaken, I will follow them with great interest. For while these committees and commissions may propose, to a large measure, the committee of which I am chairman, will dispose. To the extent I am able to do so as chairman, be assured that I shall weigh any proposal which affects our jurisdiction most carefully. In this connection, I have directed the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency to observe the proceedings of these committees and commissions carefully and to give me periodic reports on them.

Some of you may be interested in my attitude toward reviving the Financial Institutions Act which passed the Senate in the last Congress. I still believe firmly that this act is a much needed one. I do not intend to reintroduce it, but I would like to see it introduced on the House side and sent to us for concurrence. It is a good bill and should be enacted into law. In the meantime there may be opportunities to enact some of its substantive provisions as separate bills.

For example, with the cosponsorship of Senators FULBRIGHT and CAPEHART, I have reintroduced our bank merger bill which has passed the Senate on two separate occasions. In view of the renewed interest in the problem of bank mergers, it would seem to me that the approach of this bill ought to enlist the support of all bankers and bank organizations. While it may not be perfectly satisfactory to all, it already enjoys the support of most of you, and it seems to me to be the vehicle by which the public demand for control of bank mergers can be satisfied, and that mergers can be controlled under it in an effective way which takes into account the peculiar nature of banking.

The alternative, it seems to me, is a much different kind of control, one which would treat a bank as an ordinary commercial enterprise and would not take adequately into account the nature of banking as an institution affecting, most vitally, the welfare of the depositors and general public. I urge your support of this bill.

Yesterday I introduced a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act provisions concerning member bank reserves. The bill was proposed by the Federal Reserve System, as a result of an exhaustive study.

The bill would make three changes in present law. First, it would authorize the Federal Reserve Board to permit member banks to include all or part of their vault cash holdings in their required reserves. Second, it would change the reserve requirement for demand deposits of central Reserve city banks from the present rate of 13 to 26 percent to a range of 10 to 20 percent, the same range as Reserve city banks. Third, it would give the Board more flexible authority to permit individual member banks in central Reserve or Reserve cities to carry reserves at the lower requirement levels specified for Reserve city or country banks.

The statutory provisions for reserves have been the subject of discussion for many years, and the provisions have been changed from time to time in the past. However, no major revision in the reserve requirements has been made since the Banking Act of 1935, and it is necessary to bring these reserve requirement provisions up to date, in the light of present day conditions and needs.

I hope hearings on this bill will result in a reconciliation of the views of all interested parties.

There are, of course, many other matters within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee which will be of interest to you as this session of Congress progresses. Time does not permit me even to mention all of them.

These will include, of course, any number of proposals for new Federal credit programs and the expansion of existing ones. With

respect to these, my own position will be, as it has in the past, one of determination to serve the needs of a sound economy.

In this connection, although I am no disciple of his, let me quote a remarkably apt comment of John M. Keynes. He said: "There is . . . an unbroken chronicle in every country which has a history . . . of a progressive deterioration of the real values of . . . money."

He went on to say that this was no accident, but had behind it as one of its driving forces, what he called "the impecuniosity of government."

So far as I am concerned, I shall resist this force. No group of citizens, public or private, has a greater stake in this struggle than those who make up your organizations.

Equal Protection Upheld as Citizen Council Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate will recall "Cotton Ed" Smith, of South Carolina, who served in this body for six terms—from 1908 to 1944. The late Senator Smith's son, Farley Smith, of Lynchburg, S.C., last week accepted the position of executive secretary of the South Carolina Citizens' Council. The citizens' councils, and they exist in every county in the State, have in their membership many of the State's finest people.

The leadership which the eloquent Farley Smith will give this movement will, I hope, spread to other States desiring a return to constitutional government.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by Farley Smith on accepting the executive secretaryship of the South Carolina Citizens' Council be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD under the title "Equal Protection Upheld as Citizen Council Goal."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL PROTECTION UPHOLD AS CITIZEN COUNCIL GOAL

Farley Smith, of Lynchburg, has issued the following statement:

"In accepting the executive secretaryship of the South Carolina Citizens' Councils, I do so with the full realization that no people on earth are more independent, individualistic, than the liberal-minded, freedom-loving South Carolinians. We deplore the fact that present conditions make it imperative that we organize ourselves as an effective force to combat highly organized outside influences.

"These influences are constantly attempting not only to disrupt the peaceful and harmonious relationship between the races, which has contributed so much to the advancement of all our people but, if left unchecked, will eventually destroy the very foundations of constitutional government itself, and with it will be destroyed all human dignity and liberties.

"We are steadfastly determined that violence, bitterness, and hatred shall be only

the weapons of our enemies; for we do not believe that overthrow is requisite nor fire must burn nor blood must run on some new deceitful altars.

"Our mission is not to destroy the laws of the old prophets but to fulfill them. Uncompromisingly dedicated to the principle of equal protection under the law to all citizens regardless of race, creed, or color, we are just as uncompromisingly dedicated to the principle of the separation of the races, not only as a constitutional guarantee nor as a manifestation of bigotry and prejudice, but as the only proven working solution that will assure the advancement of both races with mutual respect and understanding.

"We do not adhere to the modern sociological theory that all change is progress nor that all progress necessitates a violent change.

"In stormy, savage times when the equilibrium is disrupted, the individual must choose one side or the other. When persecution, hypocrisy, and stupidity tend to suppress the human mind and spirit, when the destruction of everything traditional becomes a dominating trend as in America today, men of good will regardless of race or creed must stand ready to work to the point of martyrdom to protect and preserve the fundamental principles of our constitutional form of government which has made America the greatest nation on this earth."

Why the Dollar Price of Gold Must Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Why the Dollar Price of Gold Must Rise." The article was written by Sir Roy Harrod, one of the foremost experts in the world on the question of the price of gold.

The article appeared in the September 1958 issue of *Optima*, a quarterly publication which deals with the major problems facing the Nation. Sir Roy Harrod is a lecturer in economics at Christ Church, Oxford University, and is joint editor of the *Economic Journal*.

Mr. President, problems of trade and inflation will continue to plague the world until we recognize the natural evaluations which people place upon gold. The article by Sir Roy Harrod should be read by everyone who is concerned with these problems; and I am glad to make the article available, through the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the printing of the article in the Appendix of the RECORD will require 2¾ pages, at a cost of \$60.75. In accordance with the tradition and the rule, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that the printing of the article will exceed by three-quarters of a page the ordinary allowance, it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE DOLLAR PRICE OF GOLD MUST RISE (By Roy Harrod)

The acute shortage of gold in the world—because its currency value has not been adjusted in line with the fall in the goods value of the various currencies—has been a familiar fact for some time now. None the less, it may be useful to recapitulate by reference to certain salient features of the situation.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to use any particular past period as a yardstick of absolute validity for measuring the present gold shortage. But I believe it will be agreed that the interwar period was not one of undue abundance. In the twenties experts pointed out that the gold stock was not increasing as rapidly as the flow of commodity trade; some easement was caused in the thirties by Roosevelt's devaluation of the dollar, but this was not sufficient to remove all embarrassment; there is no doubt that the trend toward bilateralism in commercial arrangements was due in part to the inadequacy of gold reserves. In putting forward his plan for a Clearing Union, Keynes had in mind that, if it was to be possible to implement the keen American desire for the restoration of fully multilateral international trade, it would be essential to increase the liquid reserves available to each country, by comparison with the prewar situation. Consequently, an estimate of the existing shortage based on a comparison with 1937 is likely to understate that shortage.

The figures in table I are extracted from International Financial Statistics (International Monetary Fund). World exports f.o.b. are taken as an index of world trade, owing to well-known difficulties arising from the c.i.f. valuation of imports.

The failure of monetary reserves to rise in proportion to the dollar value of world trade is sufficiently evident from the table. The increased holding of foreign exchange as a medium of reserve has not gone far to fill the gap. It may be well to specify more particularly the nature of these foreign exchange holdings, as shown in table II.

TABLE I.—Exports and gold since 1937
[1937=100]

(i) Dollar value of world exports:		
1950.....	234.9	
1957.....	455.3	
(ii) Dollar value of monetary gold (including gold held by international institutions):		
1950.....	139.1	
1957.....	152.4	
(iii) (ii) plus dollar value of foreign exchange holdings of central banks, treasuries, etc.:		
1950.....	169.3	
1957.....	190.9	

The gold held by the international institutions is included in the second column. It seemed right not to include in the third column the foreign exchange holdings of the international institutions (mainly the International Monetary Fund). These are referred to later in the text.

TABLE II.—Distribution of reserves percent

	(i) 1937	(ii) 1950	(iii) 1957
Gold.....	91.337	72.43	70.80
Foreign exchange.....	8.663	27.57	29.20
Total.....	100.000	100.00	100.00
Of which—			
Dollars.....		9.62	15.15
Sterling.....		16.00	10.81
International institutions.....		1.95	3.24
Total.....		27.57	29.20

The increased proportion of foreign exchange holdings in 1950 was, in major part, due to the existence of the sterling balances. The growth in these was not normal, but due to the special methods used by Britain to finance her war effort on the external side. Their large size has been an embarrassment to Britain. For a number of years the balances held outside the sterling area exceeded her own gold reserves; thus she was in a true sense a factory of liquidity for the rest of the world; but in this part of the period they could be sold only at a substantial discount against gold or dollars, so that they ought not, in those years, to be reckoned as part of the world's liquid reserves for international settlement in the fullest sense. More recently they should be so reckoned, as the British authorities have been willing to convert them into gold or dollars at a very small discount.

The British have continued to feel that they should have a larger gold holding as a reserve against these liabilities. Accordingly, it is likely that in the coming period Britain will wish to increase her holding of gold by more than the amount of the normal increment of gold reserves required to match the growing gold value of her foreign trade, unless the external sterling liabilities are greatly decreased. Either way—namely, whether Britain increases her gold holding by more than the normal amount or the external sterling liabilities are drawn down—the rest of the world will experience a loss of liquidity.

SHOULD NOT TRY

In my own person I hold that Britain should not make this attempt, but this is a minority opinion. I hold that, on grounds of good neighborliness, she should not seek to increase her net reserve (viz, her gold and dollar holdings less her short-term sterling liabilities outside the sterling area) by more than some sum such as £50 million a year, which would represent roughly the proportionate fair share of the sterling area in the annual additions to the world's monetary gold stocks. But that would be asking much of Britain in her capacity of good neighbor, since her existing net reserve is minimal. This policy would require exceptionally strong financial leadership, such as is not always forthcoming.

Anxiety about her reserve position has been a contributory cause of her maintenance of a tight monetary policy recently after the need for it, from a purely trade cycle point of view, had passed. Thus here industrial production has been stagnant for 3 years, during which, but for repressive measures, it would undoubtedly have expanded strongly, thereby entailing the need for higher imports. The failure of British imports to rise at a normal rate has, in its turn, been a contributory cause of the current world recession.

But Britain is not alone in this position. Other European countries have had similar anxieties. The flattening off and decline in the European demand for imports in 1957 was the cause of the recession of world commodity prices to levels below the pre-Suez period. The American recession came later and could not have been the cause of the world recession, since her imports, both in total and from all the different regions of the world except Canada, continued to rise until the end of 1957.

RESTRICTIONS SEEN

Thus the shortage of reserves has already played its part in setting up a world-wide recessive tendency. Unless new forces of revival come into play quickly (June, 1958), the shortage of reserves is likely to play an increasing part in accelerating the downward spiral, since each country will be compelled to impose restrictions—which hurt others—much more quickly than it would

be disposed to do if its reserves were at a more normal level.

The British contribution to liquidity (rise of sterling balances) occurred for the most part during the war. External dollar holdings also rose during the war, remained stagnant in the post-war quinquennium, but have risen notably again since 1950. None the less, they have made only a small contribution to the world requirement for liquidity (tables I and II).

For many years foolish statements have been made by non-Americans, and indeed by Americans themselves, about the vast hoard of gold in Fort Knox. By spending so much overseas on the defense of the free world and by the generous continuance of aid, the Americans have, in effect, made what can be spared from this hoard available for the rest of the world; this has been effected, not by an actual withdrawal of gold, but by the external holding of dollars.

EXTERNAL HOLDINGS

Official external holdings of dollars rose from \$4,600 million at the end of 1950 to \$8,200 million at the end of 1957. (International Financial Statistics, May 1958, p. 17). But there were also unofficial holdings, and the two together rose from \$7,100 million (1950) to \$13,600 million (1957). (The same source, pp. 238-239.)

At the end of December, United States gold holdings were \$22,900 million. Adding her short-term foreign assets and subtracting short-term foreign liabilities, one gets a net reserve of \$11,500 million.

The law requires the Federal Reserve System to hold a 25 percent reserve of gold certificates against notes and deposits, by no means an exorbitant requirement and one reduced from former days. This law would require at present a gold holding of about \$11,000 million. Thus, if one reckoned only the net reserve as available to fulfill the legal requirement, as would be strictly proper, the United States is already very near the bone.

Be that as it may—since reserve requirements against internal liabilities are now thought obsolete in many quarters—if her net external liability increased in the next 7 years by as much as it has in the last 7 years, this would undoubtedly cause her grave misgiving.

Before developing that argument, it may be well to consider the gold position further.

A comparison of table III with table I shows that, if the dollar price of gold had been raised in line with the deterioration of the goods value of the dollar, the major part of the world liquidity shortage would have been solved, but not the whole of it. There would probably remain a true gold shortage problem, as there was between the wars, additional to the artificial problem that has been created by the failure of the American authorities to alter the dollar price of gold.

TABLE III

(To be compared with table I)

Assumption that the dollar price of gold had risen in line with the dollar prices of U.S. exports viz 2.1 times.

[1937=100]

(i) Dollar value of world exports: 1957	455.3
(ii) Dollar value of monetary gold (including gold held by international institutions): 1957	319.8
(iii) (i) plus dollar value of foreign exchange holdings of central banks, treasuries, etc.: 1957	340.8

However, other matters have to be brought into the reckoning. Had the dollar price of gold been adjusted, gold production would have been higher, and not so much gold would have disappeared into private hoards, since private hoarding has been stimulated by the belief that the current undervaluation of gold will be revised. In table IV I have

taken the average ex-Soviet gold production for 1937-40 (I.M.F. staff papers, O.L. Altman, p. 259) at \$1,175 million, and supposed this rate maintained till 1957. The Orange Free State gold production would have helped it along. I have deducted 10 percent as the normal demand for industrial use and a little bit of private hoarding. In column (iii) I have added in the actual increased holdings of foreign exchange. In column (iv) I have supposed that, under the beneficent influence of the larger gold stocks, countries would have felt willing to carry larger holdings of foreign exchange in absolute amount, but still no more than 29.2 percent of gold reserves, as shown in column (iii) of table II.

TABLE IV.—Increase of reserves on certain assumptions

[1937=100]

(i) Dollar value of world exports: 1957	455.3
(ii) Dollar value of world gold, supposing price raised in proportion to price rise of U.S. exports, production in 1937-57 at 1937-40 level, and 90 percent of it available for monetary stocks: 1957	385.2
(iii) (ii) plus actual current value of foreign exchange holdings: 1957	409.2
(iv) (i) plus value of foreign exchange holdings, if these constituted 29.2 percent of total reserves, as they did in 1957: 1957	496.9

Thus, on these assumptions, which are not inherently unreasonable, the liquid reserve position would now be fractionally better than it was in 1937. It is, therefore, not groundless to attribute the present frightful shortage at root solely to the failure to mark up the dollar price of gold to match the depreciated goods value of the dollar.

SHORTFALL NOTED

Let us now look at the matter in another way. In 1937 the official gold holding amounted to \$25,300 million. If this was to be increased to match the enhanced dollar value of world trade, it would now have to stand at \$115,100 million; actually it stands at \$38,550 million. Consequently there is a shortfall of \$76,550 million.

Foreign exchange holdings in 1937 are stated to have amounted to \$2,400 million. If they were to be increased to match the enhanced dollar value of world trade, they would now have to stand at \$10,900 million. Actually they stand at \$15,900 million. Thus, owing to the growth of sterling balances under the force majeure of war and owing to the willingness of many to increase their holdings of dollar balances during the war and again since 1950 in lieu of gold, there has been an out-of-the-trend increase of foreign exchange holdings of \$5,000 million (viz, \$15,900 million less \$10,900 million).

The importance to the world of the increase in foreign exchange holdings, which have caused some embarrassment to Britain and meant the making available by Americans of almost all their spare gold reserves for the outside world, should be carefully noted. The increase in question consisted of \$5,000 million. This must be compared with the shortfall of \$76,550 in the dollar value of gold reserves, owing to the dollar value of those reserves not having risen in proportion to the increased dollar value of world trade. With all respect to the embarrassments of Britain—and it must be said that there was an element of good neighborliness in her refusal to take the sterling balances out of the world monetary system after the war, as she was strongly advised to do—and with all respect to the United States, which has generously continued aid, despite an overall adverse balance of external payments, it must be said that these additional foreign exchange holdings of sterling and of dollars have made but a trifling contribution towards easing the shortage of

reserves owing to the shrinking of the value of gold stocks—a contribution of \$500 million against a shortfall of \$76,550 million.

In addition to the foreign exchange holdings mentioned above, countries were given drawing rights, amounting in all to \$9,016 million, in the International Monetary Fund. Of these only \$4,096 could be honored in gold or hard currencies. These do not go very far to fill the gap either.

In his proposal for a "clearing union" Keynes wrote as follows:

"We need a quantum of international currency, which is neither determined in an unpredictable and irrelevant manner, as, for example, by the technical progress of the gold industry, nor subject to large variations depending on the gold reserve policies of individual countries; but is governed by the actual current requirements of world commerce, and is also capable of deliberate expansion and contraction to offset deflationary and inflationary tendencies in effective world demand."

KEYNES' HOPE

Despite the neutrality of this wording it can be stated that he hoped that the "clearing union" would add something to the quantum of reserves available, before the war, for international settlement, and he hoped also that the International Monetary Fund, although designed on a smaller scale than his plan, would do the same; and it was for this reason that he regarded its acceptance as a precondition for Britain and other countries reverting to the principle of nondiscrimination in commercial policy, so much desired by the Americans. Alas, he had not had time, for all his wise prescience, to foresee that the increased liquidity involved in his proposal, or in the Harry White proposal, or in any other acceptable proposal, would be far more than offset by the change in the gold position. This may not be quite fair to his own proposal in which drawing rights were to rise in proportion to the increase in the value of world trade, which increase has been very great since Bretton Woods (1944).

Recently there have been suggestions that, as an alternative to a rise in the dollar price of gold, the resources of the International Monetary Fund should be increased or some new international institution established. I believe that these proposals reflect the fact that eminent bankers or economic experts sometimes fail to appreciate the quantitative aspect of global totals. We are dealing with a shortfall of \$76,000 million.

It is not within the realm of practical politics that any new institution would have a capital of the order even of \$50,000 million. And even if it did, it has not yet been made clear precisely how this would increase net liquidity, since the newly created assets would also be the liability of someone. So far as new institutions are concerned, these figures belong to the realm of fantasy. But a doubling of the dollar price of gold could make a difference of this order of magnitude, partly at once and partly in the coming decade.

If it is objected that a considerable part of the gain would go to the United States, owing to her large holding, it must be remembered that this would render possible something that is now quite impossible—namely, a considerable acceleration in the growth of the dollar holdings of the non-dollar world (through, for example, an enlargement of U.S. investment), allowing a corresponding increase in the value of liquid world reserves to happen, without placing the United States in Queer Street.

BRITISH QUESTIONS

Some British experts have argued that a rise in the dollar price of gold would not greatly benefit Britain in particular, since her current holdings are relatively small.

Would it make no difference to her, with her vast exports, that the rest of the world would be less inclined to clamp on import restrictions on the occasion of the most trifling oscillation in the balance of payments? Would it make no difference to her, with her great external sterling liabilities, that the countries would be less often driven to convert their sterling balances into gold or dollars? Would it make no difference to her, as a great exporter, that a world recession, like the present, would not be aggravated by each country being driven at an early stage to impose restrictions? Would it make no difference to her, as the world's greatest gold bullion market, if the value of the gold annually coming to her were doubled, or, allowing for higher production and less disappearance, trebled?

These rhetorical questions may serve to introduce a reference to the future. Table IV suggests that, if only the dollar price of gold had kept pace with the deterioration in the goods value of the dollar, the present liquidity position might be as good as, even better than, the prewar position. The future prospect is not quite so cheerful.

INFLATION

The increased requirement for gold now, as compared with 1937, is in part due to the inflation of dollar prices. We ought not to budget for any further inflation. Since 1937 the volume of world trade, or its value at constant prices, has increased at the rate of about 4 percent per annum. If we assume the requisite reserves now to be \$115 billion (see above), on an arithmetical calculation we should require an annual increase of gold stocks of \$4,600 million a year. In the years from 1950 to 1957 the annual increase in gold stocks was \$464 million. According to this calculation the annual increase would require to be raised tenfold, and that appears a hopeless proposition. But this extreme figure should be modified in a number of ways.

(i) If foreign exchange holdings carry part of the burden (and assuming that the British do not try to increase their net reserve too much), we should need an annual increase of only 70 percent of the aforementioned amount, viz. of \$3,220 million. (See table II, col. iii.)

(ii) The annual increase in the volume of world trade from 1937 to 1957 of 4 percent may well be abnormal. It may be sensible to take 3 percent as a target figure, reducing the requirement for an increase in reserves to \$2,415 million.

(iii) If reserves are not increased above their present level by far more than anything that can be done by raising the resources of the International Monetary Fund or establishing ancillary banking institutions, I dare predict that within a decade foreign trade will have degenerated into a restrictive bilateralist, and indeed totalitarian, system. Each country will have to tailor its demand for foreign goods administratively by reference to resources currently accruing; no room will be left for free enterprise in importation. But hard experience may have taught the central authorities to get along, on a free enterprise basis, with less than the prewar ratio of reserves to turnover. Everyone will have, in this modern world, to pursue the bold policy of living dangerously. I suggest that on this ground the required annual increase in liquidity can be reduced to \$2 billion.

(iv) Mr. Altman (op. cit.) has estimated the likely increase in coming years to be above that previously prevailing, viz. a minimum of \$500 million per annum and a maximum of \$920 million per annum, and he suggests a probable figure of \$730 million per annum.

(v) If the dollar price of gold were doubled, this last-mentioned estimate would be raised to \$1,460 million per annum.

(vi) If the raising of the dollar price of gold led to an eventual increase of production and to diminished private hoarding, the annual accretion to world stocks might well be not far below the target ((iii) above) of two thousand million dollars.

BARE MINIMUM

I should regard the doubling of the dollar price of gold as the bare minimum required to salvage the system of free enterprise. In the worldwide conflict between the idea of totalitarian planning and that of a competitive system, which, by its essential nature, requires a certain amount of free play for trial and error, I am convinced that the issue depends precisely on this: on whether the U.S. authorities decide to double the dollar price of gold, as a bare minimum.

But, owing to the leeway that has to be made up, as we have seen from table III, owing to the fact that, under the maximum of full employment, which is, rightly, here to stay, more reserve is required than in prewar conditions, and owing to the eminent desirability of having a slight margin above bare requirements, if I were an authorized and detached mentor to the U.S. authorities on behalf of the world economy, I should recommend an increase in the dollar price of gold by two-and-a-half times, or even a rise to the convenient figure of \$100 an ounce.

Now we must return to the hub of this matter. What are the U.S. authorities likely to do in the years immediately ahead? Practical pressure is likely to account for more there, as elsewhere, than abstract argument.

U.S. CONFIDENCE

The existing world recession may bumble along at about its present level, or deepen; no forces making for strong revival are yet apparent. The United States has remained confident on the basis of what has now become a narrow net gold reserve, partly, indeed, because that country has not yet come to appreciate how narrow it is, but also because there is the feeling that a world recession is likely to improve the external U.S. balance of payments, while those of other countries decline. Thus the recession does not cause her exchange anxieties, although it does cause her other grave anxieties.

But the recession will not improve her external balance by very much. For the other countries of the world are running their commerce on the basis of reserves that are narrower than they have ever been before, and import restrictions will accordingly be imposed more rapidly on the occasion of a recession of exports. If the United States is participating in the recession, the reduction in her exports entailed by the import restrictions elsewhere will exacerbate matters. This fact she is likely to observe. Proposals may then be made for giving large funds to international agencies or setting up new agencies. But there are two factors militating against this solution.

One is that, so long as the United States is herself the victim of recession, home opinion is likely to favor the using of any additional funds, which will necessarily involve a cash deficit for the Federal Government, for giving work to American citizens rather than for additional external aid. This opinion is sound, not only from a nationalist, but also from a cosmopolitan, point of view. The maintenance of U.S. imports, by the boosting of her internal economy, is likely to be of much more help to the outside world than the expenditure of an equivalent sum in external aid; for the spending upon imports has a more prompt effect, since it gives income to those who have the goods ready to consign.

QUANTITATIVE EFFECT

The other point which militates against the solution of providing more funds for in-

ternational agencies, is that the quantitative effect will be very small, by comparison with even a moderate rise in the dollar price of gold. It is true that, in the preparation of public pronouncements, spokesmen and experts are apt to be blindly impervious to quantitative arguments. But I do not believe that this imperviousness extends so often to practical decisions. In the furnace of pressing day-to-day events, in war, when to do or not to do makes a vital difference, the human being has a hunch, perhaps provided by his own electronic brain, for what is quantitatively important. He will not bother so much about international agencies, with their chicken feed, when there is all the time lying to hand the dollar price of gold, a rise in which can bring in so much larger returns.

If, on the other hand, there is a marked world revival, or, alternatively, if the recession does not have any strong effect in improving the U.S. balance of payments, then the increase in external dollar holdings, such as occurred between 1950 and 1957, will presumably continue. The effect of this may be slow, but it will be sure. Gradually the time must come when the U.S. net reserve sinks to a demonstrably dangerous level, or to zero. It will then become evident that the price of gold must be marked up.

PROPOSAL BRUSHED ASIDE

The matter might be precipitated. So far the proposal for a rise in the dollar price of gold has been brushed aside as a bee in the bonnet of South African gold producers. But coming events are bound to give it more serious consideration. This may lead non-resident holders of dollars to cash them, from a precautionary motive. Something of that sort has happened already. To cash dollars for gold does no injury to the United States, since she loses nothing by discharging a gold liability in gold—unless it be deemed an injury to provoke what is always a painful process, that of hard thinking. The thought provoked by an outward drain of gold from the United States might cause a revaluation of the dollar to come earlier than it otherwise would. That it will come in the end I believe there can be no doubt.

The obstacle to revision is in part mere inertia. One has to produce some head of steam to get an old-established thing changed. There are also deep prejudices, which one might perhaps dub as theological, though they may have a backing in the unconscious mind, which a layman is not capable of analyzing. There is a rational although unsound argument that to raise the dollar price of gold would benefit the Russians. To deny so great a benefit to the rest of the world, in order to avoid giving gain to the Russians is surely rather curmudgeonly in peacetime. The case of war has to be considered, although I regard this as extremely unlikely. In a press-button war, which lasted but for a few weeks or months, the gold position would presumably be irrelevant. In a longer war all would depend on whether it was the United States or Russia that was in trading relations with the major part of the neutral world. If it were the United States, then to have raised the dollar price of gold before the war, and thereby the goods value of her existing gold reserve, would bring greater gain to her than it would to the Russians. It may be objected that it would do for this purpose to raise the dollar price of gold after the war had broken out; but to do this at a time when gold had to be paid out in discharge of dollar commitments would savour of sharp practice and might not be accepted by neutrals, if they felt strong enough to say "No." From the war point of view, it would be much better to raise the dollar price of gold in advance, at a time when there is no immediate prospect of war. That would add

to the sinews of war both of the United States herself and of her potential allies.

In his funny, tortuous way man is a rational being. What is so eminently rational as an increase in the dollar price of gold must surely come in due course.

Our Friends From Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years thousands of people have come to the United States from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

According to the latest figures, our friends from Puerto Rico are still migrating to this country at the rate of 24,000 annually.

Their lot has not always been an easy one, but I am pleased that at long last there are indications that a brighter future is ahead for our Puerto Rican friends.

In introducing the following editorial from the February 24 issue of the New York Times, I am certainly in hearty agreement that the Puerto Rican people now in the United States are a part of the American race that is still in the making.

The editorial follows:

OUR FRIENDS FROM PUERTO RICO

This country's latest immigration group consists, as we all know, of people from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. So many Puerto Ricans have come to New York City and to 38 other mainland cities that they have seemed to some impatient souls a problem. This week spokesmen from our town, and from the other towns which have sizable Puerto Rican populations, are attending a police seminar in San Juan to find out how Puerto Ricans live, work, and play in their own cities and villages.

It should be reassuring to the Puerto Ricans and their spokesmen to realize that they are like a great many other immigrants who came to this country, beginning with the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620. The Indians didn't always care for the Pilgrim Fathers, despite the friendly relationships of the first critical years. We were a mixed race at the time of the Revolution and we have grown more mixed. The Africans, the Irish, the Germans, the Italians, a few Orientals, some Mexicans, and other Latin Americans, and a numerous assortment of other races and nationalities have made us the nation that we are today. Yet the adjectives applied, from time to time, to most of our ancestors on this continent are extremely unflattering. We can't tack any epithets on today's Puerto Ricans that were not applied to our own fathers or grandfathers. Nor can certain native-born Americans, who often cheat and exploit the Puerto Ricans, do much worse than was done to those who came earlier.

It is hard for people to be patient when they are having a rough time of it. On the record, however, our friends from Puerto Rico who have been coming here for some years at an average annual rate of about 24,000, may look forward to a brighter future. Time always cures the kind of situation in which they find themselves. They are a part of the American race that is still in the making.

Industrial Development of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent editorial from the February 25, 1959, issue of the State, of Columbia, S.C., entitled "South Carolina Leads." This outstanding newspaper is ably edited by Samuel L. Latimer, Jr.

The editorial from the State presents factual data which completely refutes the argument of integrationists that the South's stand, and particularly that of South Carolina, against integration of the races is detrimental to industrial development. In fact, Mr. President, the South's stand in favor of the principles of constitutional government has played a prominent part in the industrial boom which is increasing year after year. I am particularly pleased that South Carolina, one of the smallest States in the South, is leading the South in the rate of industrial expansion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA LEADS

Antisouthern liberals warn menacingly that unless the South sacrifices its biracial traditions and institutions, the section will be doomed industrially.

Their crocodile tears are shed in vain. In the midst of the tumult caused by the campaign to crush southern defenses against forced integration, the South is growing stronger industrially and economically.

Its industrial progress is greater than that of any other section of the country except the West, where population migration is most numerous. (In the West, unemployment is not a serious problem, except in a few spots. In the South, it is rapidly disappearing.)

Industry is looking south because of this section's soundness, mounting prosperity, and its proven advantages over other parts of the country whence the walls of self-righteous indignation are loudest.

The highly respected and reliable magazine, U.S. News & World Report, made a survey and came up with these significant findings:

"The South's industrial boom keeps rolling. . . . Despite all the race problems, industry keeps pouring money into the South, opening plants at the rate of three a day. . . . Southern growth gained momentum in 1958, a year of recession as well as school crisis. . . . The Southern States did better last year, as a group, than the country as a whole. . . . In 11 Southern States, 8 percent more new plants were established in the recession year 1958 than in the boom year of 1957."

Speaking specifically of this State, the magazine said:

"The upswing in new plants in South Carolina—from 32 in 1957 to 58 in 1958—was accompanied by a rise in manufacturers' outlays. These nearly doubled, going from \$67 million to \$129 million, according to the State development board."

"The official business indicators show that South Carolina in 1958 fared a little better than the Nation as a whole in new construction and nonfarm employment, not quite as well in gain in personal income." The Southern State statistics paint an even rosier picture of South Carolina.

Here is the scoreboard on new plants of 25 or more employees established in the last 2 years, listed in order of the geographical sizes of the 11 States:

Southern States	New plants in 1957	New plants in 1958	Percent change
Texas.....	188	257	Up 36.7.
Georgia.....	139	189	Up 21.5.
Florida.....	232	201	Down 13.3.
Arkansas.....	99	74	Down 25.4.
North Carolina.....	80	122	Up 52.5.
Alabama.....	134	77	Down 42.7.
Louisiana.....	62	42	Down 32.3.
Mississippi.....	59	86	Up 45.7.
Tennessee.....	95	108	Up 13.6.
Virginia.....	48	64	Up 33.3.
South Carolina.....	32	58	Up 81.2.

The figures show that South Carolina, the smallest State among the 11, is leading the South in the rate of industrial expansion. South Carolina is also the heart of that section of the South which is making the fastest progress. And if the data were available for all 49 States, South Carolina probably also would be revealed as the leader in the Nation.

Both races are benefitting from the advances, working in harmony and without frictional crises.

A Veteran's Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by a veteran, Mr. William E. Watilo, of Lakewood, Calif., to express to Members of Congress his gratitude for making it possible, through Public Law 550, for him to obtain an education. His letter, which follows, speaks eloquently of this young veteran's appreciation:

LAKESIDE, CALIF., February 20, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: Today my final check arrived for training allowance under Public Law 550, and I request that you either represent me before the Congress of the United States in offering my gratitude, or represent the Congress in accepting my deep thanks for the life that lies ahead for the five of us.

The sum expended on me would scarcely make a dent in the cost of one missile, and proportionally that missile has a far greater opportunity to be felt around the world than I do. However, in aiding human lives, we can see that that money will show a good return in the higher financial, educational, and humanistic values of my family, and Providence willing, of my future pupils.

Never would this have been possible on my own. My education is not over; no degree will end it, but now I will be able to continue from here. For the helping hand when it was most needed, I say, thank you gentlemen. May I always be able to live

up to the faith that Congress showed in creating opportunities for a man to answer the questions he finds within himself.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. WATILO.

Mr. Speaker, it is, however, his fellow Americans to whom Mr. Watilo's gratitude actually is to be expressed. The American people acting by and through their elected representatives decided to embark upon a program of educational assistance to veterans. It is the American people, who, through the taxes they pay, finance the program.

Intelligent Citizen Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great personal pleasure and pride to pay tribute today to two distinguished All-America Cities in my State—Westport and New Haven, Conn.

Both these fine communities, one of which is in my own congressional district, have been chosen, with nine other cities throughout America, for the Look magazine awards for intelligent citizen action in 1958.

On Friday, February 27, the good people of Westport will stage a community celebration in proud recognition of the honor bestowed upon their town.

Westport, Mr. Speaker, is a good town to live in and a community in which its citizens can be justly proud.

In honor of this great celebration on Friday, I am introducing into the Record the front-page news story heralding Westport's selection as one of the All-America Cities, along with an editorial commenting on the honor from the Town Crier, Westport's hometown newspaper.

Both the news story and the editorial appeared in the Town Crier's issue of January 22:

WESTPORT ALL AMERICA CITY FOR INTELLIGENT CITIZEN ACTION IN 1958—TOWN AND NEW HAVEN FIRST CONNECTICUT RECIPIENTS OF 9-YEAR-OLD NATIONAL AWARD

Westport, long celebrated as the happy home of artists, writers, and Madison Avenue communicators, and more recently sensationalized as the locale of a litter of novels featuring martinis, marital tangles, and other exurban pastimes, has been named as one of 11 All America Cities honored for progress achieved through intelligent citizen action during 1958. The coveted award was announced today by the National Municipal League and Look magazine, cosponsors of the competition.

Much as an Iowa quarterback awaits the Grantland Rice all-America selections for the gridiron, so did Westporters who knew that Westport was one of the finalist cities quake while the board of judges, headed by Dr. George Gallup, picked the first team from the list of 100 entries.

This year, for the first time in the 9-year history of this national contest, two Con-

necticut cities broke into the charmed backfield. Both Westport and New Haven were chosen as 2 of America's 11 most farsighted and progressive communities.

The rest of the team is composed of Bloomington, Ind.; Columbus, Ohio; Granite City, Ill.; Hayden, Ariz.; Highland Park, Ill.; Huntington, W. Va.; Leadville, Colo.; Phoenix, Ariz.; and Sheridan, Wyo.

At high noon on Saturday, First Selectman Herbert E. Baldwin will receive the pennant emblematic of the All America City Award, and will raise it on the flagstaff in Parker-Harding Plaza. The flag-raising ceremony, first of a series in recognition of the award, will take place in the Plaza, and will feature a color guard of local Nike troops, and units of the police and fire departments. Musical entertainment will be provided by members of the U.S. Army Air Defense Command choral group, a singing organization designed to contribute to the morale of guided-missile personnel at installations throughout the Nation.

Before the presentation of the banner, which will fly under the Stars and Stripes, Dr. Ralph Bishoff, of Kings Highway, who is serving as chairman of a committee in connection with local observances of the event with Albert Dorne, president of the Famous Artists School, will make a short address. The official notice of the award will be read by Richard Holmquist of the planning and zoning commission. The public is invited to attend the ceremony.

Westport's claim to the award was compiled by a committee consisting of Dr. Guy Robbins, past president of the citizens planning association, R.T.M. member Fred White, William Leonard, Holmquist, and CPA Executive Secretary Dominic Del Guidice, and was presented to the National Municipal League's annual meeting in Colorado Springs, Colo., held last September, by Holmquist.

Westport was cited by the jury of 12, headed by Dr. Gallup, for "successful citizen action in solving problems stemming from a rapid population growth, and outmoded city government, and inadequate city services."

"It gives me great pleasure to notify you that Westport has been named an All America City for 1958 by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

"This decision was reached by the All-America Cities Award jury, of which I was foreman, at Colorado Springs last September following the presentation of your story by Mr. Richard Holmquist. Subsequent investigation confirmed our judgment.

"As you know, the awards are given for citizen teamwork rather than municipal perfection. To be selected an All-America City, a community must show noteworthy accomplishments through alert, continuing citizen participation. Such is the only way to make self-government effective.

"I salute the citizens of Westport whose effective action has won this award and sincerely hope they will continue to play a positive role in the affairs of their community.

"GEORGE M. GALLUP,
"Chairman."

Cited specifically were the accomplishment of a new town charter, progress in town planning, a program for tax reform, educational progress including the new high school, a successful effort to correct poor garbage disposal techniques, new recreational areas, and a reorganized police department. The Citizens Planning Association was credited with stimulating of the activity, and Dr. Guy Robbins previously was given an individual award for outstanding citizen service.

New Haven was honored for what Look will call, in its issue of February 17, a bold attack on blight and deterioration. The

program undertaken in New Haven to defeat decay and traffic congestion would, according to Look, do credit to a city many times the size of New Haven. The present mayor, Richard C. Lee, was given special credit for supplying leadership.

The Westport committee on arrangements for the celebration have announced a town-wide event for the evening of February 27, featuring a dinner at the Woman's Club, a formal presentation in Staples Auditorium, and a dance in Staples Cafeteria. At this time, the award will be made by Vernon Meyers, publisher of Look, and distinguished guests will help Westport note the event. Additional details will be published soon.

A number of other plans are in the works, including highway signs, a special postage meter cancellation, buttons for the schoolchildren, and a special commemorative edition of the Town Crier, due for publication on February 26.

The All America Cities Awards were inaugurated in 1949 by the National Municipal League, and for the past 8 years have been cosponsored by Look.

The jury selecting the all-America cities for 1958 included Dr. Gallup, jury foreman; Mrs. Dorothy Brimacombe, treasurer, Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; John C. Cornelius, president, American Heritage Foundation; Mrs. Frederic Gilstrap, vice president, American Association of University Women; Mrs. Alf Gundersen, vice president, League of Women Voters of the United States; Willard V. Merrihue, manager of personnel practices and community relations services, General Electric Co.; Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look magazine; Quigg Newton, president, University of Colorado; H. Bruce Palmer, president, Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.; Philip M. Talbot, chairman of the board, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Donald H. Webster, director, Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Washington; and Arnold S. Zander, president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.

ON THE FIRST TEAM

As readers of the front page will already know, Westport has made the first team in the annual all-America cities competition. It has been named by a body of jurors selected by the National Municipal League and Look magazine, co-sponsors of the competition, as one of the 11 American cities which made the greatest progress during the past year. Westport and New Haven, which also was honored for its extensive redevelopment program, have thus become the first two cities in Connecticut to be cited in the history of the award.

Westport's national publicity usually consists of hyped-up, phoney baloney about gallons of martinis, two sport cars to every barn, and a theoretical existence of irresponsible gaiety that most of us have little time for. It is, therefore, especially heartening to see the town recognized for what it is—one with an unusually high quota of civic pride and an exceptionally large share of imaginative and intelligent citizens who are willing to work to make their community a better place in which to live.

For the award is not undeserved. Skeptics will rightly point out that a number of the areas in which the town has been applauded are far from finished business. That's so—and no one would claim otherwise. The award is for significant progress, not the achievement of the millennium. And, further, it should be clearly noted that many of the achievements cited were not accomplished within the 12 months to which the award applies. They are cumulative in the best sense; persistent citizens have been working at them for years. While Westport

has certainly not finished its job, neither can its present progress be called a flash-in-the-pan.

The town has been specifically cited for advances in the areas of governmental structure, rational land use, tax reform, school improvement, better refuse disposal, and a sounder police organization. Each one of these can be fully justified.

With its new charter, Westport has an entirely modern form of small city government, which can operate as effectively as the voters staff it. The town's form of government is, in the very least, no longer an obstacle to coping with the problems of its growth; on the other hand, it can be a very useful tool. And those who fought for the charter, as well as those against it, realize that constructing it and passing it was a long and arduous task.

Under the planning and zoning commission's regimes of Cutler, Mackie and Dreyfous, Westport has taken giant steps toward more adequate zoning and more comprehensive planning. By this summer, the town hopes to have completed an overall town plan.

Largely because of the efforts of a typical Westport volunteer committee, the town is currently getting its tax assessments in order. To say that taxes have been unfair is putting it a little bit strongly, because they have been inequitable only in the sense that the town has grown a little faster than assessment procedures have developed. But we are now clearly on the way to a really professional revaluation in all categories of property.

Westport schools have long been of much better than average quality. Here the reward must certainly relate to cumulative efforts of Westport's boards of education and school administrators over the last decade. Progress has not stopped, but no one year is more notable than the other.

Some will be surprised to see refuse disposal mentioned in the list of positive factors. They should be reminded that, less than 2 years ago, Westport was conducting a smelly and sloppy dump; now, it is applauded for the best sanitary land-fill operation in the State. The fact that the town has not been able to settle on future sites as yet in no way should take away the credit for a professional technical job.

The police department also deserves its nod. Procedures have been modernized, morale has been improved, and leadership is sounder. The results are beginning to become apparent in an improved safety record and more efficient operation.

The credit for these achievements goes to the whole town—not just its officialdom or pundits. Town officials, town boards, volunteer study committees, unofficial committees to get things done, organizations like the CPA, the LWV, the PTA, and the women's groups, behind-the-scenes encouragers and schemers, those who keep our political parties vital, and the thousands of volunteer workers and voters who have contributed in one way or another, can all take satisfaction in Westport's selection for the first team—and we hope that plans are underway so that they can all share in the celebration.

The Town Crier has reason to be particularly proud and well-satisfied at this award. During the last 5 years, this newspaper has, as any good citizen should have, been active in promoting the progress of Westport. Some of the things accomplished, we initiated; and in none of the major victories for the cause of good town government did we fail to explain and support. These are, after all, a newspaper's principal obligations—to contribute to an enlightened democracy through clear and accurate presentation in an understandable manner, and to act as coach, cheerleader, and encourager

to all those individuals and groups who are working for a better town.

We knew Westport was a good town to live in, before the award. But we also know it can stay that way only if it realizes that it must win a hypothetical award every year. Knowing Westport as we do, we have a hunch that it will stay on the first team of civic progress as long as have old pros like Sammy Baugh and Frank Gifford persisted in the top ranks of professional football.

Urban Renewal Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Anniston, Ala., the Honorable George T. Morris, delivered a statement stressing the need for adequate funds for urban renewal, during the recent meeting of the Alabama League of Municipalities with Alabama Congressman here. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include this very fine statement:

OUR URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM MUST HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDS

(By George T. Morris)

Our urban renewal and slum clearance program is at the cross roads. It is a fundamental policy question on which we must make a final decision.

Happily both Houses of our great Congress are showing a willingness—even an eagerness—to make this decision once and for all. The Senate bill would provide \$350 million for title I slum clearance grants annually over a 6-year period. The House bill as approved by the Rains housing subcommittee would provide \$500 million for 3 years.

Both of the bills stress two fundamentals. First we must provide adequate funds to get the job done. Our cities are just too hard pressed to raise the necessary funds themselves. Unless the Federal grant program continues on an effective scale, we will never even scratch the surface of eliminating our cancerous slum problem.

PROGRAM MUST HAVE CONTINUITY

The second fundamental truth is that to be successful the slum clearance program must have continuity. These vast programs of slum clearance and urban renewal require planning and an orderly process of rational development. They cannot succeed on a stop and start basis.

Both the Senate and House bills have excellent slum clearance titles, but if we accept these two fundamental principles, I think it fair to say that the Senate bill with the 6-year period is more satisfactory from the point of view of program continuity, whereas the Rains bill on the House side is much more acceptable in terms of the size of the annual authorization. I am confident when the two Houses meet in conference that our two great Alabama legislators—JOHN SPARKMAN on the Senate side and ALBERT RAINS on the House side—will mesh the two bills together so as to achieve a final result which will provide both necessary continuity and ample program funds.

I am delighted that both Houses have rejected outright the administration's proposal to reduce the Federal contribution from two-thirds to one-half. I can think of no single

item better calculated to stop the urban renewal program in its tracks.

THE PRESIDENT HAS BEEN POORLY ADVISED

I can only conclude that the President's advisers have misled him. Any one at all cognizant with the facts of life of municipal finance knows that we have no further tax resources available to us. If our cities are forced to put up a larger share under the urban renewal program, the program will die and our slums will gradually engulf us all.

I am pleased to see that both the Senate and House bills contain a number of important and perfecting amendments which will make the urban renewal program more workable. Frankly, gentlemen, it is a horror of bureaucratic red tape at the present time. The dead hand of Federal bureaucracy has slowed progress to a snail's pace and I am hopeful that congressional action will get faster results from Washington.

I am hopeful that in the current legislation and in future legislation, the Congress will continue to search for ways to make better financing programs available in order to encourage the rehabilitation of existing dwellings. One of the great unsolved problems we face is how to prevent the constant slide of neighborhoods into a stage of blight and deterioration.

I am convinced that the Congress is demonstrating the courage and drive which we must never relinquish if we are ever to rid our cities of slums and blighted areas. Our greatest enemies are the timid and half-hearted proponents of half measures. We must brush them aside and approach the future with a confident, vigorous, and expanding urban renewal program.

HOW ALABAMA COMMUNITIES HAVE GONE FOR PROGRAM

You gentlemen will be interested in the fact that Alabama municipalities have taken a leading role in urban renewal since the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949. Mobile and Montgomery started planning activities for slum clearance projects in 1950. Birmingham and Florence in 1951, and Gadsden initiated two projects in 1952. To date, acting through their housing authorities, 19 Alabama cities have received advances of funds for the planning of 30 urban renewal projects. For these 30 projects, a total of \$1,091,090 in planning advances has been approved and \$14,581,805 in capital grant reservations has been made available. Alabama has more urban renewal projects in actual execution (23) than any other Southern State. The Hare project in Auburn enjoys the distinction of being the first urban renewal project in the South to be completed and closed out, and Florence's Handy Heights project and Birmingham's medical center should be closed out by June 30 of this year.

I am not going to take up more of your time to read the statistics, but I have listed them here for the record and you may see the extent to which we have gone in using the advantages of this wonderful program.

The following is a breakdown of the 30 projects by congressional districts:

Congressional district	Number of cities	Projects	Planning advances	Capital grant
1st.....	3	4	\$107,610	\$1,223,088
2d.....	1	2	102,570	2,086,358
3d.....	5	5	140,910	1,193,452
4th.....	0	0	0	0
5th.....	1	2	78,280	1,100,963
6th.....	0	0	0	0
7th.....	1	2	37,121	281,779
8th.....	5	9	252,874	2,629,175
9th.....	3	6	371,725	6,066,990
Total.....	19	30	1,091,090	14,581,805

OUR CITIES PARTICIPATE IN WORKABLE PROGRAM
Alabama towns and cities were quick to grasp the workable program for urban re-

newal concept and have utilized the workable program as a guide for sound community development, both in the present and for the future. As of January 15, 1959, 68 Alabama communities had workable programs in effect, or submitted for approval. The distribution by congressional districts follows:

Congressional district:	Workable programs
1st.....	4
2d.....	7
3d.....	15
4th.....	6
5th.....	5
6th.....	9
7th.....	12
8th.....	7
9th.....	3
Total.....	68

USE OF SECTION 221 HOUSING IN STATE

Section 221 is a mortgage-insurance program of the Federal Government under a special section of the National Housing Act to help private industry provide low-cost relocation housing for sale or rent, through new or existing construction. The program authorizes liberal terms for private financing of low-cost relocation housing for eligible displaced families and offers attractive opportunities for builders and lenders to participate in this undertaking. Twenty-one Alabama communities now have section 221 mortgage insurance approved. As of October 31, 1958, this represented more "221 cities" than any other Southeastern State. A breakdown by congressional districts follows:

Congressional districts	Cities	Number of units approved (white and nonwhite)
1st.....	2	1,258
2d.....	1	96
3d.....	7	334
4th.....	2	120
5th.....	1	709
6th.....	0	0
7th.....	1	8
8th.....	5	1,151
9th.....	2	2,720
Total.....	21	6,387

Milwaukee's Mayor Zeidler Points Up Real Issue in Chicago Bid To Divert Lake Michigan Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mayor Frank Zeidler of the city of Milwaukee has made an exceptionally able and succinct statement of the argument against the enactment of H.R. 1, which would authorize the city of Chicago to divert 1,000 cubic feet per second of Lake Michigan into the drainage system of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mayor Zeidler be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY FRANK P. ZEIDLER, MAYOR, CITY OF MILWAUKEE, WIS., IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1, 86TH CONGRESS, TO REQUIRE A STUDY AND TO AUTHORIZE INCREASED DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY, PREPARED FOR THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Bill H.R. 1 before the present Congress asks for an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion of Lake Michigan water into the drainage system of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago in order to test the effect of this fresh water supply and the oxygenation caused thereby on the drainage canal.

It seems to me that the determination of what the effect of introducing further Lake Michigan water into the district will be is largely dependent upon what is happening in the works of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Obviously, the effects of added Lake Michigan water on the water in the Chicago Sanitary Canal will be profoundly influenced by the degree of efficiency which the sanitary district maintains in its operations and by many other factors under the direct and sole control of the sanitary district.

Thus, it seems to me to be an absurd proposition to ask the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers) to investigate the effects of the additional diversion of water into the sanitary canal of Chicago if no one is to closely scrutinize and watch the operations of the sanitary district. The findings of the investigation can have no validity whatsoever if the operations of the sanitary district are not carried on at their highest degree of efficiency.

The Congress of the United States and various national governments have been reluctant to look into the operation and methods of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago largely on the grounds that this agency is a creature of the government of the State of Illinois, is responsible to that State government, and also is responsible to the people in the Chicago area. However, one has but to point out the contradictory position of the officials of this sanitary district in the past to learn that the operations of the sanitary district are not uniform in their efficiency. While the district officials have claimed the highest efficiency, apparently from recent testimony this has not been so.

For instance, the testimony given by Casimir Griglik, a trustee of the district, before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on March 26, 1956 asserted that the Chicago Sanitary District was operating at a degree of efficiency of around 90 percent. However, news articles which appeared in two of the major Chicago papers, the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily News on September 4, 1957, point out the fact that Chief Engineer Horace P. Ramey of this district appearing before a grand jury testified that the district was not operating at the efficiency which Mr. Griglik stated to the House subcommittee but was operating at much less efficiency and was dumping increasing tonnages of untreated sludge in the canal each day.

I submit that it is ridiculous and absurd for the U.S. Army Engineers to attempt to make any scientific determination of the effects of Lake Michigan water on the water in the sanitary canal, for the sanitary district can always demonstrate that the canal is in a state of pollution simply by dumping more sludge into the canal. The sanitary district, the city of Chicago, and the surrounding communities have no justification in asking for increased water diversion because they do not operate their sanitary system at its highest efficiency.

The city of Chicago still has many un-metered water outlets which increase the flow of water through district facilities and make the treatment and pollution problems more difficult for the sanitary district. The sanitary district, according to a report made by the Illinois legislative council in 1953, is not taking enough vigorous steps to reduce industrial pollution and, as it has lately been proven, has not operated its works at greatest efficiency.

How is the Congress of the United States going to insure the rest of the communities and States of the Great Lakes who also have an interest in the level of the lakes that the sanitary district and the Chicago communities within the district are engaging in a maximum effort to treat their sewage before pouring an effluent into the sanitary canal? No one yet has been able to make this district meet its obligations.

Since no other State has the right to interfere with the sanitary district and since the imperfect operations of this district are leading to incessant demands to diminish the rights of others in the waters of Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes, the only alternative left to communities outside of the District is a categorical opposition to the proposals to divert more water from Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes. This is the only means by which the people of Chicago and other communities will be brought to the realization that they are paying money for the operation of a sanitary district which is not carrying out its responsibilities.

It is not too much to suggest that if the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, the Chicago people, and the Chicago newspapers (who are fooling the people by not reporting the full story of the operations of the sanitary district) insist on their demands for additional diversion of Lake Michigan water, then the rest of the States could demand that the sanitary system of Chicago be federalized in order to insure that the diversion of water from the Great Lakes is not taking place unnecessarily. H.R. 1 should be categorically opposed because it is absurd from a scientific point of view, and because the sanitary district still has much that it can do to end pollution in the sanitary canal before it should ask for more water from Lake Michigan to flush untreated sewage down to the Mississippi.

FRANK P. ZEIDLER.

Address of Mayor Willy Brandt, of Berlin, and Governor Stratton, of Illinois, at 150th Lincoln's Birthday Celebration at Springfield, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the most colorful and inspiring observances of the 150th birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln took place last Thursday in Springfield, Ill., the final resting place of the beloved Great Emancipator.

It was colorful because of the presence in Springfield of the governing Mayor of West Berlin, Willy Brandt, and of many of the ambassadors representing free nations throughout the world. It was one

of the largest gatherings of foreign envoys ever witnessed in the Midwest.

The ceremony was inspiring, Mr. President, not only because of the occasion, but also because of the moving address delivered by Mayor Brandt and the distinguished speech of Governor Stratton of Illinois.

Mayor Brandt displayed at Springfield the same combination of toughness and vision that marked his discussions in Washington, New York, and elsewhere during his tour of the United States. This 44-year-old Social Democrat, who entered Berlin politics under the late Ernst Reuter, after World War II, and who was a voluntary exile in Norway during the Hitler regime, is a symbol of liberty to the 2½ million free Berliners whose city is surrounded by a Communist police state.

Governor Stratton, who will celebrate his 45th birthday next week, is no stranger to many Members of this body. He served with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives in the 77th and 80th Congresses. The son of the late William J. Stratton, who for many years was an illustrious Secretary of State of Illinois, Governor Stratton is now serving his second term as Governor of Illinois.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a partial text of the Governor's address and newspaper reports on the observance, including an excerpt from Mayor Brandt's speech, which was published in the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Daily Tribune.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the addresses and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY GOVERNOR WILLIAM G. STRATTON, OF ILLINOIS, AT THE ABRAHAM LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL BANQUET IN SPRINGFIELD, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

We are privileged here tonight to have with us one of the largest assemblies of representatives from around the world ever gathered in our State. They have come with one purpose in mind—to honor Abraham Lincoln on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Why is this? Why do you from free nations gather and pay tribute to this humble Illinois citizen? There is but one answer—it is your respect for Lincoln's great gift to the world—his regard for human right and liberty, and his symbolic stand for unity in peace, born out of the rigors of war.

I bid you welcome to this land where Lincoln walked with life and where his spiritual presence still abides. I suggest that a gathering of this kind here every year might be beneficial to the world, for here tonight we emphasize the values of humility, of belief in the rights of all, of the might that is made by right.

In 1858, Lincoln said our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. This is the principle at stake in Berlin today. It is the principle for which brave men gave their lives in Hungary. It has closed the ranks of free nations to an extent never before considered possible against the threat of a new era of despotism and slavery. Nations that once fought against each other have joined, not only in common defense of their security, but in united works for the

human betterment of their peoples. The European economic community is a giant step forward toward asserting what Lincoln held to be, and I quote, "The natural right of man to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns."

The preservation of freedom cannot be achieved by static defense. Indeed, freedom cannot long survive if it is isolated from the mainstream of human needs and aspirations. Were he alive today, Lincoln would surely welcome the move toward unity on the European continent represented by the European economic community. It can scarcely be doubted that he would consider this to be an opportunity to achieve an even larger unity of free men and a standard around which liberty loving peoples in every corner of the globe could be brought to rally.

The move toward closer unity in Europe brings within reach Lincoln's hope for wider freedom, political and economic, for the common man. There are different opinions today as to the relative military postures of the free countries and their adversaries, but there cannot be any argument as to the relative economic capacities. Our enemies are amply equipped to make war against small peoples and their political institutions and aspirations, but we are surely better equipped to make war against hunger and disease. This is a war that Lincoln would urge us to wage without stint in the world of today. Let us by all means maintain our common military staffs—for indeed this necessity is forced upon us—but let us also combine our best productive and economic minds in a joint chiefs of staff for the human betterment of humble peoples throughout the world—people whose judgment of freedom or slavery is measured by a piece of bread.

The great scientific and economic advances of the last hundred years have made it possible to translate many of Lincoln's hopes for humanity into reality. This community in which Lincoln's career as a young lawyer had its beginnings is now only hours away from the leading capitals of Europe. A hundred years ago, the State of Illinois was a figment of wild west literature to Europe's citizenry. Today, the State's colleges and universities include European, African, and Asiatic youth in their student bodies. A hundred years ago, this heartland of America defied access by any but the most hardy overland traveler. Today its airports accommodate the aircraft of every international airline and the St. Lawrence Seaway is a major artery through which oceangoing vessels of every land can bring passengers and cargo directly to the shores of Mid-America. These advances make it possible on a larger scale than ever before to further the personal bonds between the free peoples of other lands and their counterparts in the United States. More and more, in the days ahead, we must exchange farmers, and factory workers, students and professional people, as well as diplomats. Now, the smallest hamlet of inner America is as accessible as our larger cities, and from this accessibility can come a new perspective. Now the sum total of what America thinks and feels is open to visitors from abroad. It is up to us to use these advantages intelligently and for the common good. In groping for a *modus vivendi* with the Soviets, the United States has been able to win some agreement on exchanges of persons between the two countries. Such exchanges are desirable as far as they go, but are they really serving the purpose that the United States, for its part, hoped to achieve?

They do not appear to have changed any fundamental thinking in the Soviet Union. On the other hand, there is a great mutual benefit to be derived from a substantial increase in exchanges between the peoples of the free countries. Here, I would place

special emphasis on person to person exchanges between the free nations which have joined together in mutual commitments and those nations which, though retaining their freedom, remain uncommitted. These are countries, where, in the main, economic development has lagged, where living standards are low and individual privation is a constant target of alien propaganda aimed at the overthrow of democratic institutions. Here, too, is an area in which the free nations can and should join in common planning and common action. The experience and know-how of our combined foreign services add up to an immense reservoir of knowledge that can be put to valuable use in establishing a joint program for people-to-people exchanges between Europe and the United States on the one hand and those nations of Asia, America, and Africa where the will to freedom is still alight. By their visit to the final resting place of the humble man who will always be Illinois' first citizen, the distinguished representatives of our sister nations abroad have here pointed the way to that more personal relationship between their people and ours which will be so greatly needed in the days ahead to preserve freedom in a troubled world.

I thank these representatives of lands across the seas for joining with us in honoring Abraham Lincoln. Let us remember, from tonight, that Lincoln is actually a symbol of unity—of unity based on the highest ideals.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 13, 1959]

BERLIN'S BRANDT HAILS LINCOLN SPIRIT

(By Tom Littlewood)

SPRINGFIELD.—The leader of freedom's vigil in West Berlin fingered through the century-old lessons of Abraham Lincoln Thursday for inspiration and guidance in an anxious hour of crisis.

Most of the free men of the world were represented at a festive international banquet marking the 150th anniversary of the great prairie President's birth.

Men of many tongues and races journeyed to the resting place of the gangling country lawyer whose peculiar plainfolk genius was nurtured in Illinois.

It was in this community where Lincoln lived, practiced law, sharpened his political skills—and where his body was returned.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AT DINNER

About 1,400 persons attended the dinner in the state armory, at which Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin delivered the principal address. Some 2,000 others watched from the balcony.

He called for flexibility—but with inflexible principles—to solve the problems of his divided city within a divided nation.

"For the days ahead, firmness, unity and patience are as important for the West as the willingness to examine changing conditions and to accommodate ourselves to them whenever possible," he said.

Neither an isolated nor a sudden solution is possible for Berlin, the mayor declared. "We must hope for gradual changes, for step-by-step solutions as the result of persistent negotiations," he added.

ELOQUENT TRIBUTE

The robust, square-jawed German delivered an eloquent tribute to Lincoln as the champion of self-government everywhere. Brandt recalled the words of Lincoln about "the electric cord that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together throughout the world."

Lincoln sensed, too, Brandt said, that "there is much talk about freedom, but the concept of freedom is often filled with very different substance."

That is relevant today, Brandt said, in the Russian demand that Western powers leave Berlin to make it a "free" demilitarized city.

WANT UNILATERAL CHANGE

"Those who talked about a demilitarized city and who accuse the West of wanting to prolong artificially the occupation status, want in fact," asserted the mayor, "to squeeze Berlin like a lemon by means of the ring of Soviet divisions encircling the city."

The world must understand, he said, that "the East wants nothing but a unilateral change in circumstances to their own advantage and to the disadvantage of the West."

A new and permanent settlement cannot be built on breaches of justice and treaty law, Brandt stressed.

WON'T LOSE FREEDOM

"This can and will not come to pass," he said. "You can rely on the people of Berlin. We know how important it is to preserve peace, but we do not want to lose our freedom. If freedom is at stake, we will bend our knee to nobody."

Governor Stratton paid tribute to Brandt as a man in the Lincoln tradition who holds a position at the hub of the fight of the free world against human slavery.

The Governor said, "Our enemies are amply equipped to make war against small peoples and their political institutions and aspirations, but we are surely better equipped to make war against hunger and disease."

"This is a war that Lincoln would urge us to wage without stint in the world of today."

Brandt told of the freedom bell that hangs in the townhall of West Berlin, inscribed with Lincoln's words that the whole world "under God shall have a new birth of freedom."

"Each day at 12 noon," said the mayor, "we listen to the sound of this bell, which reminds us of what we have to preserve and what we have yet to achieve."

UNITED OF PEOPLE

Lincoln in martyrdom has gone down in history as the unifier of his people, Brandt noted.

"But this man belongs to all of us, above all to our young people, and he lives in the hearts of mankind everywhere."

"In Abraham Lincoln intellectual force was matched with moral strength. He understood the spirit as well as the needs of his time; and he was possessed of that pragmatic way of thinking which is conducive to successful action and which always stands the test if it is anchored in firm convictions."

SAYS GERMANS KNOW

The great majority of Germans know from bitter experience, Brandt said, Lincoln's mention of the duty of the whole people never to entrust "to any hands but their own . . . the preservation of their own liberties."

Brandt referred also to Lincoln's famous statement that a government cannot endure half slave and half free.

"The truths which Lincoln spoke here in Springfield in June 1858 are perhaps even more applicable to the present situation of the German people than to the one which he faced; that is, to the arbitrary disruption of their lives, for which, of course, they are not without guilt themselves."

"I can only tell you that the Germans in the East and in the West have not accepted this situation and that they will not accept conditions under which a son is separated from his mother, a brother from his brother."

REFUGEES IN OWN COUNTRY

"I can only ask you to imagine what it means when each and every day for 10 years and more hundreds of Germans become

refugees in their own country, because they can no longer endure the tyrannical pressure put upon them in the part of Germany ruled by the Soviets."

The Thursday evening affair, sponsored by the Illinois Sesquicentennial Commission, highlighted the day's celebrations.

ENVOYS PRESENT

The international flavor at the banquet was provided by a delegation of foreign envoys from Washington.

Three—Ambassadors Sir Harold Caccia of Britain, Herve Alphan of France, and Ernest Bonhamme of Haiti—delivered toasts to Lincoln's memory.

Caccia said that "even in this tragic and bloodstained century," the cause of freedom has advanced. He said this has happened because the State has assumed a larger role in making the dignity of man a reality for all individuals, "and not merely a pious aspiration."

One of the emotional highlights of the evening occurred when Alphan climaxed his speech by turning to Brandt and declaring in a firm voice:

"Speaking as a Frenchman to a German, when we talk of freedom for all men everywhere, we are thinking above all tonight of the 3 million citizens of West Berlin, with the resolve to fight if need be for the preservation of their freedom."

The only Iron Curtain representative to accept an invitation, Dr. Carl Duda of Czechoslovakia, canceled out on the last day.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Feb. 13, 1959]

BRANDT TERMS LINCOLN A WELL OF FAITH TODAY

(By Percy Wood)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., February 12.—Voices of foreign envoys were heard here Thursday night in respectful and eloquent tribute to Abraham Lincoln on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Governor Stratton presided at the event, a dinner by the Illinois Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission at the State armory, which drew 1,400 people including diplomatic representatives of 21 countries. Hundreds of other spectators filled the galleries to hear speakers from Germany, France, and England.

Mayor Willy Brandt, of West Berlin, made the principal address, and toasts to Lincoln were given by Harold Caccia, British Ambassador, and Herve Alphan, Ambassador of the French Republic. Countries represented extended from Canada to Indonesia.

STRATTON SETS THE STAGE

Stratton keyed the international character of the affair by saying that Lincoln is a symbol of unity based on the highest ideals—"his regard for human right and liberty, and his symbolic stand for unity in peace, born out of the rigors of war."

The war against hunger and disease, the Governor said, is one "that Lincoln would urge us to wage without stint in the world of today."

"Let us by all means maintain our common military staffs, for indeed this necessity is forced upon us," Stratton said, "but let us also combine our best productive and economic minds in a joint chiefs of staff for the human betterment of humble peoples throughout the world—people whose judgment of freedom or slavery is measured by a piece of bread."

Mayor Brandt, the 45-year-old German opponent of communism chosen as the dinner speaker because of the similarity of his position to Lincoln's "house divided," told the gathering that millions of freedom loving men and women, worldwide, honor Lincoln "who in martyrdom has gone down in history as the united of his people."

LINCOLN NOT OURS ALONE

"But this man does not belong to you alone," he continued. "He belongs to all of us, above all to our young people, and he lives in the hearts of mankind everywhere. In Abraham Lincoln intellectual force was matched with moral strength.

"He understood the spirit as well as the needs of his time; and he was possessed of that pragmatic way of thinking which is conducive to successful action and which always stands the test if it is anchored in firm convictions."

In his address, Brandt said that while he felt his audience would not expect him to give an interpretation of Lincoln in terms of domestic American affairs, "yet even an outsider may venture the guess that those who stood 'on the other side of the barricade' during the Civil War would also agree today without hesitation that the United States could not have become a haven of freedom and the leading world power had the unity of the Nation been shattered.

WORDS MEAN MORE TODAY

"Lincoln spoke," the West German statesman continued, "of the eternal struggle between democracy and tyranny. We know that this struggle has torn apart the European Continent and that it has assumed worldwide dimensions. He quoted the passage from the Bible about the house divided against itself, and expressed his conviction that this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free."

These truths of Lincoln, spoken in Springfield in June 1958, "are perhaps even more applicable to the present situation of the German people than to the one which he faced," Brandt said, "that is, to the arbitrary disruption of their lives, for which, of course, they are not without guilt themselves.

SPIRITS STILL HIGH

"I can only tell you that the Germans in the east and in the west have not accepted this situation and they will not accept conditions under which a son is separated from his mother, a brother from his brother.

"I can only ask you all to imagine what it means when each and every day for 10 years and more hundreds of Germans become refugees in their own country, because they can no longer endure the tyrannical pressure put upon them in the part of Germany ruled by the Soviets. I must make you aware of the danger resulting from this arbitrary division. It is a threat to peace in Europe and to peace in the world."

Berlin has once more become the target of Soviet "probing and blackmail," Brandt declared, and he predicted that the climax of this Russian-provoked crisis has not yet been reached.

FAITH IN ALLIES GROWS

"I wish to say to you here in Springfield," the mayor added, "as well as to all the people of America, how greatly indebted we are to you. I have just passed several pleasant and encouraging days; and they have strengthened my conviction that Berlin can rely on its friends and that we shall march forward shoulder to shoulder, permitting nothing to come between us."

In other remarks, Brandt said Lincoln had been a friend of labor, having called "the free laborer a bulwark of democracy," and that he considered those particularly worthy to be trusted who toll upward from poverty.

"This spirit of impartiality and of faith in equal opportunity was also understood on the other side of the ocean. A police conference in Berlin in June 1885, however, regarded it as improper that the General Association of German Workers expressed its sympathy on the occasion of Lincoln's death in addresses to the American Government.

"ANOTHER HUNGARY PROTEST"

"Perhaps we should also remember that Lincoln was one of those men in Springfield, more than 100 years ago, who put it on paper that Russian action with regard to the Hungarian freedom fighters of those days was an 'illegal and unwarrantable interference.'

"In other words, Lincoln and his friends avowed their solidarity with all those people in the world who fought for freedom, for human rights and for the right to self-policy have since borne the mark of this reluctance. Important periods of American principle. The world would look bad indeed had not the American people and their Government been permeated by this basic attitude, especially during recent decades."

Heroic Work of U.S. Mail Carriers Along the Oregon Seacoast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as the third-ranking majority member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I take pride in presenting for the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Oregonian of Portland of November 30, 1958, which describes the heroic and valiant deeds of rural mail carriers during the frontier era along Oregon's rugged seacoast.

This article, by Marjorie Jorgenson, special writer of the Oregonian, tells of another vivid chapter of achievement in the efficient and effective delivery system of the U.S. Post Office Department. I know it will interest my colleagues, who only last summer passed our bill providing for a 10 percent pay increase for the underpaid men and women who sort, classify and deliver the U.S. mails. We also improved the mileage allowance of present-day rural mail carriers who use their own vehicles on Uncle Sam's business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON COAST

(By Marjorie Jorgenson)

At the turn of the century carrying the U.S. mail the 40 miles from Florence to Waldport was a rugged undertaking. The circuit followed the coastline north to Cape Perpetua, with an overnight stop at an Indian cabin, on to Waldport—then back again.

The postman's creed spoke strongly here. Men bid the job from Uncle Sam for \$200 a year, covered the route every 4 days, fair weather or foul, even when there were only 20 families the whole distance to send and receive it. Often, "the sack weighed more than the mail," but it always went through.

A hazardous hurdle was the half-mile stretch around Cape Perpetua, the "windy cape." A narrow track blasted out of the cliff face was the trail. Not over 3 feet wide at any point, it was a shoehorn fit between rough rock wall and outer space. Often patches of horsehair were seen where the horse's flank rubbed as he hugged the cliff.

Heavy winds could billow a man to the ocean below.

At Yachats recently Mr. and Mrs. Nick Ludemann and Pete Jorgensen, pioneer residents, laughed over remembrance of the salesman who, in October 1897, essayed to follow Jorgensen on his mail run.

At Howell House, in Waldport, the stranger had inquired if someone could guide him to Florence. Mail carrier Jorgensen was walking through the lobby.

"I'm going to Florence. You're welcome to come along," he invited.

With a fresh horse from the livery stable, the salesman followed.

The first 12 miles lay along the beach, hard packed by rain and tide, with only the minor hurdle of Yaquina John Point, where you matched your time to the tide and raced the ninth wave to get around. Then the trail led abruptly upward over rock, through salal, Oregon grape, and huckleberry brush.

On a headland overlooking the gray and squally Pacific, Jorgensen dismounted. He tightened the horses' cinches, carefully tied their stirrups over the saddles, checked his mail-pouch fastenings. He took off his heavy rain slicker, rolled and tied it to his saddle. Now his neat black suit, his ankle-tie shoes, made odd contrast to the black "sou'west" strapped tight under his chin and glistening with seaspray and rain.

Nervously eyeing Jorgensen, then the blank cliff wall, the salesman blurted, "Where's the trail?"

"Right there," Jorgensen pointed to the rocky ledge which wandered out over the cliff face to a point in middle distance, abruptly disappearing as it rounded the cape.

"I'll find another way to Florence," the salesman said firmly. He turned his horse. Back at Waldport, he caught the stage inland to Corvallis, south to Junction City, west again to Florence. Six days and three mail runs later, Jorgensen bumped into him in Florence. But, do you know, he barely nodded.

Twice in the eighties horse, rider, and mail were lost without trace off Perpetua Trail. That was before the improved trail of 1897. But only twice. No other mail was ever lost except the contents of one lone packet spilled into the postman's leather pouch and trickled through a tiny hole in the bottom. The man to whom the package was addressed received only the empty envelope, but he got his value, anyway. It was a packet of seeds ordered from London—tiny English daisies, for which he was homesick.

A few years later the mail route was a wash of white flowerets. They spread out along the coastal communities. Today they are sometimes called bachelor buttons, and even the inland towns are often blessed, or cursed, with them popping up on lawns.

USIA Fails To Tell Other People of Respectable Position of Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the well-informed Constantine Brown, national columnist, calls to the attention of his readers in a column published in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, February 24, the poor job being done by the U.S. Information Agency in explaining the plight of the Negro in the United States. Mr. Brown illus-

trates that the American Negro lives in far greater luxury than most of the foreigners who feel sorry for him, and also states that a large number of Negroes prefer segregation. These views are never given to our foreign friends; as a result, race relations in the United States are not helped by agitation from abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brown's column, entitled "USIA Seen Failing To Tell Other People of Respectable Position of Negroes," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GIVING WORLD TRUE U.S. PICTURE—USIA SEEN FAILING TO TELL OTHER PEOPLE OF RESPECTABLE POSITION OF NEGROES

(By Constantine Brown)

With the assortment of crises, dilemmas and issues which confront our Nation in almost monotonous regularity, the question is often heard, "What will our allies think of us?" or "This is grist for the Soviet propaganda mill."

American taxpayers have contributed millions of dollars to the U.S. Information Agency and its offspring, the Voice of America. Our USIA offices around the world and in every important capital are well staffed and, we hope, well supplied with all the information available to counteract Soviet propaganda and to explain some of the vital issues we must see in this country.

One of the most important issues in the last 3 years has been integration. When this reporter made his last trip around the world in the fall of 1958 he was asked in almost every country he visited about our racial problems. Far too often the questioner's tone of voice reflected a feeling that America was treating its colored citizens in a very shabby fashion.

In Karachi, Pakistan, for instance, the leading English language newspaper, Dawn, ran a lead editorial severely criticizing the United States on the subject.

In France I found people who actually believed that American Negroes were starving given no voting rights, and lived in ghettos, much like the Jews in Hitler's Germany.

In Tokyo I heard that many people believed that Negroes were lynched every day.

Nowhere did I find any attempt of the USIA to explain how well off American Negroes are comparatively; how many of them live in well-built houses, how many of them drive the most expensive cars. Nor that the majority of American Negroes live in far greater luxury than many of the foreigners who are feeling so sorry for them.

Neither did I find any evidence that our USIA was presenting to our friends both sides of our segregation question. To the people overseas it would seem that all of America's white citizens hate all American black citizens, and vice versa. It was never told to them, for instance, that there are a large number of Negroes who prefer segregation and who are working alongside and with the whites who also prefer it.

There is ample evidence which the USIA could present. A leading publisher of a string of weekly Negro newspapers, Davis Lee, has written several editorials on the subject. In one published in the Anderson, S.C., Herald on January 18, Mr. Lee said: "These (Negro) advocates of desegregation want to force white people to desegregate, but they haven't desegregated within our race. In some sections of South Carolina the yellow Negroes won't have anything to do with the dark Negroes. I know Negroes in Charleston who will not speak to other Negroes because they are of different stations in life.

"In some sections the yellow and mulatto Negroes have churches that dark Negroes cannot attend. The educated Negro shuns the uneducated of his race. The professional members of our race will rob and exploit the unfortunate members of our race. But they refuse to associate with them on an equal social basis. . . . At the rate they are going, in a few years there will not be a Negro race. You can hardly conceive of sensible leaders advocating a movement that is going to do away with our race. But that is what they are doing."

If the USIA wanted to present proof to our friends overseas that the American Negroes are not a downtrodden and starving minority in our country, they need only to quote Mr. Lee further. He wrote: "Ted Lewis is one of Atlanta's leading Negro businessmen. Some time ago he was having financial difficulty. He went to some of the city's leading Negro businessmen, including the bankers, and tried to borrow \$2,500.

They turned him down flat. He went to the small-loan department of the C. & S. Bank. One of the officials went over his plans with him, and then recommended that he borrow \$5,000 instead of \$2,500. The bank let him have the money without questions. As a result he is a success today, a credit to Georgia and his race.

There are many things our USIA could do to let the world know that the American Negroes are respected, intelligent, and first-class American citizens. It is only a vocal few of both the black and white race who are giving our country a black eye on every continent of the world.

Social Security and the Municipalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Tallahassee, Ala., the Honorable Roy C. Billings, delivered a statement showing the relationship of the social security program to the municipalities, during the recent meeting of the Alabama League of Municipalities with Alabama Congressmen here. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include this very fine statement:

THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM AND THE MUNICIPALITIES

(By Roy C. Billings)

Thanks to the untiring efforts of the Alabama congressional delegation for years, the Federal social security law was finally amended in 1950 to make possible coverage of municipal government employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the law. Prior to that time all public employees were completely excluded from coverage under the program. Coverage now amounts to the only retirement plan for the overwhelming majority of city and town government employees in our State.

This coverage was available provided the States had enacted proper State enabling legislation to take advantage of such coverage. Alabama was one of the first States to get proper legislation passed which is known as Act No. 48, House Bill 34, Fifth Special Session, 1950.

The Federal Social Security Act amendment of 1950 made provisions for the coverage of State and local government employees under voluntary agreements made by the individual States with the Federal Security Administrator.

SAME BENEFITS AS WORKERS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Employees covered through these voluntary agreements gain the same rights and benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program as covered employees in private industry. The responsibilities of the State are similar to those of any large corporation which has branches in several geographical locations.

Naturally there are some features of the program for the coverage of State and local government employees which have no parallel in private industry because the organization of governmental units is not identical with that of private organizations and because certain functions and the way they must be carried on are peculiar to government. Also the election of coverage for employees of the State and its political subdivisions require that a State develop and put into operation procedures for the performance of responsibilities which are new to it—the responsibilities for negotiating agreements, for reporting wages and for paying contributions.

The State of Alabama entered into an agreement with the Federal Security Administration on July 6, 1951. This agreement has been amended from time to time at the request of the State with respect to bringing additional eligible coverage groups under the old age and survivors insurance program. The following is a breakdown of municipal governments and related instrumentalities now participating in the program by yearly operations—cities and towns, waterworks boards, gas departments, electric departments, municipal utilities boards, libraries, hospitals, housing authorities, city boards of education, park and recreation boards, city improvement authorities and city community centers:

Year	Number of reporting units	Number of employees	Total covered wages	Total tax remitted
1951	190	5,700	\$11,443,432.55	\$343,302.98
1952	258	9,800	14,885,034.98	446,551.05
1953	285	11,300	17,471,941.86	524,158.26
1954	327	14,100	19,362,141.79	774,485.67
1955	516	20,700	50,038,140.57	2,001,525.62
1956	601	48,100	61,591,039.51	2,463,641.58
1957	673	51,200	65,156,987.79	2,932,064.45
1958	690	64,000	68,228,989.46	3,070,304.53

ONLY 17 PLACES ABOVE 500 POPULATION NOT COVERED

At the present time there are only 4 cities with a population of over 1,000, and only 13 with a population of over 500, that are not participating in the program.

During the year 1958 the Federal law was again amended by the enactment of Public Law 85-226 (providing coverage to policemen and firemen on an elective basis) to certain States, one of which was Alabama. Seven Alabama political subdivisions extended coverage to policemen and firemen under the provisions of this legislation. At the present time only five political subdivisions with local retirement plans have not taken advantage of coverage for policemen and firemen.

There are certain items of particular interest that we would like to see enacted into law by amending title II of the Social Security Act which would, if passed, benefit many State and local government employees. They are listed as follows:

1. To provide legislation which will establish the same safeguards with regard to a statute of limitation for State and political

subdivisions as is now applicable in the case of private employers—that is, public bodies should be required to go back only 3 years, 3 months, and 15 days, after the year of occurrence of event, to correct errors in reporting employment, and taxes collected.

2. To continue opposition to any plan of annual reporting to the Internal Revenue Service as it affects State and local governments. Cities and towns remit social security taxes not to Internal Revenue but to Social Security Board through the State agency.

3. Remove limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits. Some more reasonable limitation than the present regulations would be more realistic.

FULL BENEFITS FOR MALE EMPLOYEES ON REACHING 62

4. To provide that full benefits, when based upon retirement age, will be payable to both men and women at age 62. Women may now retire at 62.

5. To increase the number of years which may be excluded under the dropout feature in computing an individual's primary insurance so as to permit the computation of such amount on the basis of his 5 years of highest earnings. As it stand at the present time, it will be many years before an individual will be eligible to draw the present maximum benefit of \$127. In fact, the \$400 monthly average will generally not be possible for anyone who has attained the age of 27 before 1959. Payments based on the \$400 average cannot be made unless all credits used in figuring the benefits are earned after 1958. In other words, if the 5-year dropout provision is not amended, it will be necessary for years of lower income to be used in computing benefits which would mean the individual could not receive the maximum benefit. The law increasing the maximum benefit to \$127 per month did not make any provisions for increasing the number of years for dropout purposes.

6. To establish a program of insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance.

7. To permit the child of a deceased individual to continue to be eligible for child's insurance benefits after attaining age 18 and before attaining age 21 if he has regularly and continuously been a student during such period.

Retirement of Ray Conway, of Oregon State Motor Association, and Appointment of A. N. Weir as His Successor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Roads and Highways Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee, I realize the crucial need of an adequate network of roads in our great country. The leadership of our able subcommittee chairman, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has been especially helpful in this regard.

But we also require able counselors throughout the Nation. Many of these have come from the ranks of the American Automobile Association, the famed AAA. One such leader has been T. Ray

Conway, for many years manager of the Oregon State Motor Association. Mr. Conway is one of the men whose wisdom has been a factor in making Oregon the first State to finance its roads with a motor-fuel tax and also one of the foremost States in the development of its highway program.

In December of 1958 Mr. Conway announced his retirement. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the January 5, 1959, issue of the Oregonian of Portland, in tribute to Mr. Conway's foresight and leadership, under the title of "Ray Conway's Record," be published at this point in my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, together with an article from the December issue of the Oregon Motorist, giving the highlights of Mr. Conway's outstanding career.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Jan. 5, 1959]

RAY CONWAY'S RECORD

Ray Conway, who has probably traveled more of the highways and back-country roads of Oregon and the Northwest than any other Oregonian, has retired as manager of the Oregon State Motor Association so he and Mrs. Conway can do more traveling. Mr. Conway joined the infant association in 1927 and became manager in 1933. Except for two 3-year leaves of absence, to run the Oregon war bond drive and to be administrator of the liquor control commission, he has been promoting travel and recreation in Oregon's interest on a daily basis.

In those years, when travel and outdoor recreation grew into big business, Mr. Conway has chalked up a remarkable record of service. The Oregonian has cooperated with the motor association for 30 years, with staff members touring the State and region in white OSMA cars, taking pictures and getting stories for the popular Motorlogs.

Under Mr. Conway's management, the motor association sponsored a constitutional amendment adopted in 1942 to prevent diversion of gasoline tax and motor vehicle license funds to other than highway purposes. The association has always been in the forefront of good roads movements. It helped initiate and win an early bond issue to extend the primary highway system; the gasoline tax in which Oregon led the Nation; traffic safety programs to reduce the death and injury toll. The State is grateful to Mr. Conway and the association.

[From the Oregon Motorist, December 1958]
RETIRING MANAGER JOINED ASSOCIATION IN 1927

A staff of 8 persons and a membership of around 7,000 motorists constituted the Oregon State Motor Association when Ray Conway joined the young motor club in 1927 to serve in the public relations department.

With offices in the Terminal Sales Building, the association was just beginning to exert influence in the field of motoring in Oregon and in his capacity as public relations officer, Mr. Conway spent considerable time lecturing and showing his own motion pictures on the vacation and travel advantages of Oregon.

"There was very little promotion of travel in Oregon at that time," Mr. Conway remembers. "There was no formal State promotion program and it was up to interested groups such as chambers of commerce, and our own association to stimulate interest in our State as a travel and vacation area."

During his early years with the club, Mr. Conway traveled extensively over Oregon and became known for his wide knowledge on the recreation resources of this State. It was

during this period that the famed Motorlog series of travel articles started in the Oregonian with the cooperation of the motor association. This series has been carried on continuously for 30 years during which time the motor association-Oregonian travel teams traveling in the well-known white travel cars, have covered every possible travel and vacation area in the West.

In addition to his activities in the public relations department, which included legislative representation at legislative sessions in Salem, Mr. Conway did editorial work on the Oregon Motorist.

He became manager of the motor association in 1933, succeeding Joseph Shelton.

The retiring manager has served continuously with the association since 1927 with the exception of 6 years leave of absence. During the years 1941-43, he was loaned by the association to serve as Oregon administrator of the war bond program for the U.S. Treasury Department.

Then, in 1943, he accepted the post of administrator for the Oregon Liquor Control Commission under Gov. Earl Snell. He held this position till 1946. During that time, he maintained his connection with the motor association by serving as a member of the board of directors.

During Mr. Conway's managerial career, the association consistently has taken a lead in motoring and highway affairs in Oregon. The association led many of the early battles for the improvement of the highway system in this State, including the initiated legislation for a bond program to finance improvement and extension of the primary system; gas tax and license fee proposals and activity on behalf of greater safety in traffic.

The association inaugurated the antidiversion amendment to the State constitution in 1942, whereby it was decreed that all motor vehicle funds must be used for highway purposes only. Sole exceptions, which the association took the lead in obtaining, were that motor vehicle funds be used to finance Oregon travel promotion advertising, for State park development, and State police.

Mr. Conway has been active in national AAA motor club affairs for many years and just recently was a member of 30 AAA Club officials chosen from clubs throughout the Nation to go to Europe under AAA auspices to inspect travel facilities in 9 countries.

"We have no definite plans other than to do some traveling and to take it easy," Mr. Conway says. "Both Mrs. Conway and I are intensely interested in travel and we hope to utilize part of our time in this fashion in the future."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon State Motor Association is indeed fortunate in having so able a man as A. N. Weir to fill Mr. Conway's shoes as manager. Mr. Weir has been with OSMA since 1939, and during World War II served as acting manager in Mr. Conway's absence. Since then he has held numerous important executive positions in the association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Oregon Motorist describing Mr. Weir's wide background and experience and announcing his appointment as secretary-manager of the Oregon State Motor Association. The Oregon Motorist is the official publication of the Oregon State Motor Association and is ably edited by Mr. Sidney A. King.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WEIR NAMED MANAGER OF MOTOR CLUB

The appointment of Assistant Manager A. N. Weir as secretary-manager, succeeding T. Ray Conway who is retiring at the end of 1958, has been announced by Charles E. Snell, president of the Oregon State Motor Association.

Mr. Weir will assume the duties of manager of the club January 1, 1959.

"The board of directors is sorry to see Mr. Conway leave the association, but his more than a quarter century of service to motoring in Oregon certainly entitles him to a relaxation from the rigors of executive leadership in the association," President Snell said.

JOINED ASSOCIATION IN 1939

"The board is most happy to be able to announce that Mr. Weir, who has been with the association since 1939, will take over the duties of the secretary-manager upon Mr. Conway's retirement. Mr. Weir is thoroughly experienced in every phase of the motor association's work and in addition, he has an intimate knowledge of AAA activities on a nationwide basis as a result of his service on national AAA committees.

"The board also is happy to announce that Mr. Conway has agreed to place his wide AAA club experience and knowledge at the service of the association and we deeply appreciate his willingness to counsel and advise in club matters in his retirement."

The new club manager first came to the motor association in late 1939 where he served in the accounting department and in the touring department. He later shifted to the emergency road service and official appointments department in which capacity he traveled over the entire State and became intimately familiar with motoring problems on a statewide basis. He has been able to maintain this knowledge through subsequent years as assistant manager with direct supervisory powers with the club's branch offices throughout the State.

SUPERVISES MOVES

Mr. Weir became assistant manager in 1942 in which capacity he had charge of personnel, office procedure, purchasing, and building supervision. As assistant manager, he supervised two moves of the association, the first from the Terminal Sales Building to the location at SW. 11th and Washington, and then to the present location of the new Portland headquarters in 1955. Mr. Weir also coordinated and directed much of the planning for the new headquarters building.

During World War II Mr. Weir served as acting manager for nearly a year while Manager Conway was on leave of absence.

The new club manager has had wide experience in AAA club affairs on a national basis through his membership on national AAA committees. He served 3 years on the AAA membership development committee, working with club officials from many States. He is at present a member of the AAA safety committee and has taken an active part in the planning and development of AAA safety programs and the formulation of national AAA safety policies.

ON NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Through his national committee activities, he has become acquainted with members of the American Automobile Association staff at Washington, D.C., headquarters, as well as with AAA club officials throughout the Nation and in western Canada.

Before joining the association staff, Mr. Weir served 3 years in the Regular U.S. Army, being a member of the old Motor Transport Corps and seeing service in the Pacific area.

Mr. and Mrs. Weir have two children, Mrs. John M. Donnell, whose husband is a practicing surgeon in Olympia, Wash.; and a son David, of Portland. They live at 9759 SE. 46th Avenue in Portland.

Forty-first Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which was recently adopted at a meeting of Lithuanian Americans of Greater Boston to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

This is one of many expressions of our American resolve to maintain the ties which we have always had with Lithuania and which have not been broken despite the long years of subjugation which that country has endured since its occupation in 1940.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF GREATER BOSTON, HELD AT THE SOUTH BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL, ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1959

Recalling the invasion of the peaceful Republic of Lithuania by the military forces of the U.S.S.R. on June 15-17, 1940, by which the Soviet Union committed acts of unprovoked aggression in violation of numerous international commitments;

Reminding that the Soviet Union replaced the independent government of the Republic of Lithuania the very next day following occupation, by a new one composed of Communist sympathizers obedient to Moscow, and introduced a Communist regime in Lithuania in flagrant violation of the will of this nation;

Recalling further that the Soviet occupation authorities organized mock elections on July 21, 1940, in the presence of Soviet occupation forces and foisted upon the Republic of Lithuania, the so-called people's parliament, which, upon Moscow's orders, adopted Soviet-type constitutions and decrees of expropriation, called nationalization;

Having in mind that on August 3-5, 1940, the Supreme Soviet staged in Moscow a unilateral incorporation of the Republic of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, in spite of the explicit provisions of the Hague Convention, defining the rights and duties of the occupant, and that this act of force was not recognized by any Western great power;

Remembering that the prevention of the exercise of the rights of sovereignty in Lithuania went hand in hand with systematic violation of all civil rights and liberties as well as with mass deportations of political, social, economic, cultural and religious leaders and that this mass deportation has taken on dimensions aiming at the systematic destruction of Lithuania;

Considering at the same time that Lithuania has never ceased to protest against the subjugation of her homeland and Lithuanians living in the free world are observing the 19th anniversary of Lithuania's struggle for liberation;

Now, therefore, the Lithuanians of Greater Boston assembled on Sunday, February 15, 1959, at the South Boston High School in South Boston, Mass., in observance of the

41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, reaffirm their condemnation of Soviet aggression committed against Lithuania and call upon the United States to include in its foreign policy the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet enslaved countries as an integral part of its program; and

That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United Nations, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Members of the Senate, the House of Representatives and Congress from this district.

ANTHONY MATIOSKA,

Chairman.

JACQUE SONDA,

Secretary.

The Democratic Party and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 17, 1959, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [ALAN BIBLE] spoke to the Young Democratic Clubs of North Carolina at Pfeiffer College at Misenheimer, N.C. As is always the case, the Senator from Nevada gave his audience much delight and enlightenment.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Senator from Nevada on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, OF NEVADA, AT PFEIFFER COLLEGE, MISENHEIMER, N.C., JANUARY 17, 1959

Governor Hodges, Senator ERVIN, Mr. President, distinguished guests, and young Democrats, at the outset I want to thank Congressman ALEXANDER for his very gracious introduction. And I also want to tell you that I am not a total stranger to North Carolina. Four years ago I was in your wonderful State and was inducted as a chief in the Cherokee Tribe. The tribal headdress occupies a prominent spot on the wall in my office and is the center of attraction for the various Indian portraits that surround it. If I can just figure how to collect a few Cherokee votes out in Nevada, along with my normal complement from the Plutes, Washoes, and Shoshones, it might lighten my burdens the next time I run.

The tremendous victory recorded by our party last November was not the result of some magic formula. What happened was really quite simple. We had a message for the people—a message pointing to the fact that the Democratic Party is the party of the people. The big problem lay in getting that message across. And get it across we did. You young people demonstrated the importance of organization in disseminating those truths, and the results were dramatically found in the great sweep across the Nation.

I am proud to report that I am a charter member of the Young Democrats of Nevada. I look back with nostalgia on the many hot and heavy interparty fights we used to have. There were times when I thought that our only political enemies were not the Republicans, but members of some faction within our own party who were opposing us. I soon

learned, however, that we could close the ranks and move forward together when the chips were down in the general election.

A philosopher once said that a sure sign of growing old is to indulge continually in reminiscence. I will try to avoid that pitfall. It still disturbs me a little bit, however, to realize that I am now an honorary member of the Young Democrats of the District of Columbia—an honor to be sure but one that can only be gained by growing old.

Speaking of age, it is interesting to note the results of a postelection survey which showed that last year the Democratic Party elected 8 of the 10 youngest Governors, the 19 youngest U.S. Senators, and 12 youngest Congressmen. The Democrats elected 49 Congressmen of Young Democratic age, while 5 of the Nation's Governors and 4 U.S. Senators are also under 40.

Nelson Landon, national president of the Young Democrats, commented that these election results clearly demonstrate the recognition which the Democratic Party gives to able young people. He added a significant footnote, however, and I quote: "The record of such revered and beloved senior Democrats as Speaker SAM RAYBURN, 77; Senator CARL HAYDEN, 81; Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, 91; and Senator JAMES MURRAY, 82; are positive proof that a youthful and progressive approach to politics is not just a function of age."

In our understandable elation over the election, we might tend to bask too long in the warm glow of victory, instead of getting on with the job to be done. The road ahead is not an easy road; nor can we travel it without constant plodding, persistence, and unflagging spirit.

The distinguished majority leader of the U.S. Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, set the tone for our legislative endeavors in a masterful address to the Democratic caucus just prior to the opening of this Congress.

"Our strength is what we are, and what we prove ourselves to be," he said. "What we hold we have earned. What we keep will be no more than what we deserve. That is our special challenge. Freemen can afford much. They can never afford the price of inertia." I agree with Senator JOHNSON and I am sure that my warm friends and colleagues from North Carolina share in that agreement.

As we probe the mysteries of the space age, the unlimited capacities of our young people will come more and more into play—boldness, imagination, vigor, and determination. From the campuses of colleges such as this one where we are gathered tonight will come the answers that the new age is clamoring for—not just in the fields of science and technology, but in all lines of human endeavor.

The advances made by the Soviet Union in the fields of missiles and outer space have made one thing crystal clear: We can no longer enjoy the luxury of a status quo attitude in America. We must reject the fallacy that we have the most and the best, and the future will take care of itself. Softness and complacency are the twin evils of our time. They must be struck down with the same tenacity and force that we would use in destroying any evil that would attack us. Survival is not determined by any timetable. Freemen are free only as long as they realize that freedom is not a birthright, but something that must be fought for continually.

The seeds of party responsibility that are sown in an organization such as yours inevitably flower into an even greater arena of human relationships. I refer to the field of politics as an honorable calling for any young man or woman. The urgency of our times has happily destroyed the old and unfair image of a politician as a glib, selfish type of individual, intent only upon plun-

dering the Public Treasury and hoodwinking the gullible voters. Public enlightenment has served the very useful purpose of exalting, rather than demeaning, public office. More and more knowledgeable people are beginning to look at politics as a dignified profession of useful service.

Interestingly enough, the South has long held the concept that politics was nothing to be ashamed of—and the caliber of men you have sent to Congress over the years gives eloquent testimony to this fact.

During World War I President Woodrow Wilson leaned heavily on North Carolinians for the support of his programs. Senator Simmons of your State was chairman of the important Finance Committee and Senator Overman also held responsible posts that were of great benefit to the administration. Also occupying a high place in the Wilson councils was Josephus Daniels, editor of the Raleigh News and Observer, who served as Secretary of the Navy.

I have done some homework for this talk tonight. I learned, for example, that North Carolina provided more than 86,000 men in the service in the First World War, and more than 2,000 North Carolinians made the supreme sacrifice in that conflict. The record of your State in World War II, when 360,000 of your young men and women served around the world and more than 7,000 of them died, was equally heroic.

To show that I did more than surface digging, in the War Between the States, North Carolina furnished about one-fifth of all the southern soldiers, although it had only about one-ninth of the southern population. Approximately one-fourth of the Confederates killed in action—more than 40,000—were North Carolinians. It was no idle boast when they said that North Carolinians were "first at Bethel, farthest at Gettysburg, and last at Appomattox."

One occasionally reads of southerners being described as too sectional—that southerners in Congress are really ambassadors from their own States to a foreign nation headquartered in Washington. History belies this slander. When the war clouds were gathering in Europe in the late thirties, and in the war years immediately following, it was the voice and strength and unanimity of the South that led the way in responsible legislation for our Nation's security. Such was the courage and leadership of the South at this critical time that even a New York newspaper was moved to comment as follows:

"The recent record of the South in world affairs is inspiring. Lend-lease would have been beaten in Congress without southern votes. When the first year of the first draft expired, 4 months before Pearl Harbor, it was southern Members of Congress who insured its extension. When by one vote Congress decided not to send the soldiers home, it was the South that turned the scale. Representatives of 12 Southern States cast 102 votes in favor of extending the draft and only 6 votes against it."

There have been times in my Senate career when I have been criticized by some as voting like a southerner. Although I am sure it wasn't meant that way, I took this charge as a compliment and readily admitted its validity.

As a matter of fact, there is a natural affinity between the South and the Far West. Sparse in population as compared to the East, our voice in the Senate is nevertheless strong, thanks to our Founding Fathers who decreed that each State shall have two Senators, regardless of population.

The problems of the South and the West have been similar in many respects—the industries of both regions suffer from Federal tariff policies that encourage a steady flow of foreign products to compete with our domestic output. Our mining industry in the West today is staggering under the load

of that unfair burden. And your great textile industry has also felt the oppressiveness of such a policy.

Beyond the similarities in the fields just mentioned, there is also the mutuality of interests in a traditional concept of government, which stresses the sovereignty of the State over the complete dominance of the Federal Government. As your own Senator ERVIN once said: "We wear our sovereignty under our own hat." And to that I say: "Amen."

As the sinews of the growing West become stronger, I envisage a shift in voting trends that will catapult that great area into a dominant position in determining the guidelines for American progress.

As this phenomenon develops, I hope that the natural affinity between the South and the West will become even more pronounced—to the point of forging an unbreakable alliance for mutual good. In suggesting this I by no means wish to imply that there should be an arbitrary exclusion of any other section of our country. I only suggest that the day will come when, politically speaking, the tail will no longer be wagging the dog.

Let us affirm that we are, first of all, Americans and our loyalty to the Nation is unswerving, while at the same time, as constitutional Americans, we zealously guard our rights as free citizens of the various States. There can be such a thing as too much government on a Federal level. There can be such a thing as too much so-called benevolence as a synonym for greater control. There can be such a thing as too much dominance from the top and too much submission from the bottom. As a moderate, I want to see a balance—a middle zone—where the States and the Federal government can meet to work for the general good of all the people.

In this connection, I would like to dwell briefly upon another problem that is growing to alarming proportions and can indirectly affect the overall strength of our Nation. I refer to those two distinct economic dangers: big government and big business.

Each passing day gives added evidence of the vast centralization of government in Washington and a corresponding relinquishment of power by the sovereign States. Those of us who believe that the best government is the one that is closest to the people have our work charted for us. Until the time comes when citizens decide to affirm that fundamental, independent concept, I can only predict more government, more red tape and more taxes.

As a member of the Senate's Select Committee on Small Business, I have had the opportunity to see first hand the dire plight in which the small business man finds himself. Our committee has held grassroots hearings all over the country. Out of the mass of testimony from small business men there emerges the unanimous and foreboding prophecy that unless drastic steps are taken we will witness the tragic economic irony of this century—the gradual disappearance of America's small producers during an era of tremendous business activity.

As I said at the beginning of my talk tonight, I have no simple formula to solve all the problems that beset us. I do know this, however. As members of a great political party, we can move forward with a strength of purpose and a dedication to duty that will translate the policies of our party into concrete action. We have the principles. We have the courage. And we have the will. Let's all roll up our sleeves and move forward with our party to meet the exciting challenges that lie ahead.

Thank you very much for your warm and courteous attention.

Policy Implications of the Economic Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD comments which Walter W. Heller, of the University of Minnesota, made during his participation in a panel discussion before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

(By Walter W. Heller, University of Minnesota)

In its preoccupation with the problem of inflation and the goal of price stability, the 1959 Economic Report provides a natural point of departure for a discussion of policies appropriate to the present economic outlook. For if price stability is not the transcendent economic issue of 1959 and if inflation is not a clear and present (or omnipresent) danger, the report has missed its mark.

That half of the President's letter of transmittal which lays down economic policy for the future is concerned entirely with stable prices as related to economic growth. "Price stability" and its synonyms appear 14 times during the 2 pages of policy discussion. Similarly, chapter 4, which programs future economic policy, presses home the case for price stability and the measures to promote it, before turning to other aspects of economic growth.

A balanced Federal budget is the chief offering at the altar of price stability:

"The principal means by which Government can express leadership in the effort to preserve price stability is to conduct its own financial affairs prudently. The budget submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1960, which balances expenditures with receipts at a level of \$77 billion, seeks to fulfill this responsibility."

Are the sacrifices of military and civilian programs which lie behind the balanced-budget offering justified in terms of the present economic outlook? Would further deficits in the next 12 to 18 months run off in price inflation, or would they continue to stimulate production and serve the cause of recovery?

The answer lies largely in the amount of slack left in our economy and the rapidity with which natural economic forces will take it up. Substantial manpower slack is reflected in the current 6.1 percent adjusted rate of unemployment, the 40.2-hour manufacturing workweek, and the potential enlargement of the labor force. Even more slack is reflected in the figures on plant capacity: In the 17 basic materials industries (such as steel, copper, cement, textile, selected chemicals) on which the Federal Reserve Board maintains unofficial capacity and output indexes, current production represents only 76.5 percent of capacity (an output index of 140 against a January 1959 preliminary capacity index of 183, both on a 1947-49 base.) It is hardly surprising that plant and equipment outlays continue to lag \$8 billion, or nearly 20 percent, below their 1957 peak. Only a brisk revival of markets will bring full recovery here.

Finally, if the productive potential of our economy in mid-1957 was close to \$450 billion, it will have risen to \$500 billion by the

end of 1959, taking account of (a) the accelerated growth rate we typically enjoy in climbing out of a recession, and (b) the intervening rise in the price level. The official Treasury forecast of a \$480 billion gross national product rate at the end of the year implies that, apart from bottleneck problems, a substantial cushion to absorb the impact of rising demand will still exist. In short, the large amount of unused productive capacity throughout the economy provides substantial protection against demand-induced inflation in the near term.

As to cost-push inflation, our best defense is increased productivity. If we can increase the return of output per unit of input fast enough, we can satisfy the rising demands for higher wages, higher profits, and higher farm prices by sharing in expanding product rather than by pushing up the price level. Here, the immediate prospect is excellent. Productivity is rising sharply as the economy reaps the benefits from (a) the 1955-57 surge of investment in plant and equipment (as well as in professional and technical personnel, as the report cogently notes), and (b) recession-induced measures to cut costs and improve managerial efficiency. Also, as output rises toward optimal output-capacity ratios, unit costs will fall. These pleasant economic conclusions are reflected in Secretary Anderson's estimate of a jump in corporate profits from \$38.5 billion in 1958 to \$47 billion this year. The prospect for satisfying appetites for higher profits and higher wages without higher prices seems excellent at this stage of our economic recovery.

When total demand again presses hard against our productive resources, our monetary weapons will operate in a more favorable setting than during the boom following the 1953-54 recession; liquidity is lower in the household, business, and banking sectors; bank holdings of short-term Government bonds are relatively lower; saving continues at a high rate; and consumer expectations seem much more subdued than in 1955.

If the foregoing assessment of the economic situation is correct, an obsession with Federal expenditure cutbacks and early budget balance as a prerequisite to price stability is unfounded. Continued, though shrinking, budget deficits appear likely to be reflected in expansion of output rather than inflation of prices for some time to come. Budget cutting and budget balance may be urged to hold or cut the Government down to size, perhaps in the conviction that Government use of resources promises lower returns than private use of resources, or that expansion of Government endangers freedom. In our present external context—which confronts this country with the possibility of annihilation or humiliation—and in our present internal context—in which much of our affluence is being frittered away in indulgences, luxuries, and frivolities—I would sharply disagree with this position. But, at least, it would not be built on such an uncertain economic foundation as the stability argument for budget balance. (In addition to the basic deficiency of this position, the setting of the budgetary target for price stability in terms of the \$77 billion administrative budget rather than the \$93 billion cash-consolidated budget is a serious technical deficiency.)

In the projections of tax policy for the future, the President's Economic Report also employs questionable economic logic. For if deficits are injurious to price stability, as the report contends, symmetrical reasoning suggests that surpluses which develop out of boom conditions would be beneficial in dampening inflationary forces. Under these circumstances, it seems strange that the President should hold out the prospect that, given continued recovery and a tight rein on Federal spending, a significant additional step in tax reduction and reform can be taken in the reasonably foreseeable future.

It is worth noting that the peak budget deficit occurred in the second quarter of 1958, at \$9.9 billion (as shown in the national income accounts, report, p. 120) and has been shrinking since that time, to \$8.6 billion in the third quarter and \$7.2 billion in the fourth. In a dynamic sense, therefore, the Federal budget has been a declining stimulus, which must be offset by other stimuli if recovery is to continue at a brisk pace.

The argument thus far questions the basis for concluding that inflation is such a clear and present danger as to call for Federal expenditure paralysis at the level of budgetary balance. But even if inflation were a more immediate and menacing problem, the President's report fails to give us a balanced basis for judging the primacy of price stability in current economic policy. To make this judgment requires a balancing of benefits against costs, of the risks we incur in biasing our policies toward price stability rather than, say, toward full employment.

Yet, the potential costs of a restrictive budgetary policy to promote price stability are great: Loss of production by slowing the pace of recovery; lower investment in public education and other public services that strengthen our long-run economic and military potential; attempts to push functions back on State and local budgets which are already under such extreme pressures, compounded by the adverse effects of recession, that at least two-thirds of the State legislatures must raise tax rates in 1959; and, perhaps tragically—if we are to believe the Gaither, Rockefeller, CED reports and General Gavin's statements on national security needs relative to Russia's advances—a lagged defense budget.

To the extent that these results are risked in the name of price stability and balanced budgets, they represent as great a risk, calculated or otherwise, as this country has ever incurred in peacetime economic policy.

No Presidential Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed an editorial entitled, "No Presidential Platform," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on Tuesday, February 24, 1959, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO PRESIDENTIAL PLATFORM

Someone of their political friends should tell Senators STUART SYMINGTON and HUBERT HUMPHREY that the best platform for the Presidency is not the prone form of a sick man. Their public comments regarding the replacement of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles leave much to be desired, and can at best be excused as little more than opportunistic politicking.

Senator SYMINGTON's cure for the international problems of the Nation, and the world, has been the construction of additional bomber fleets, while Senator HUMPHREY has developed the knack of talking when he should be listening. He proved this in an 8-hour talkathon with the leader of Communist Russia.

These members of the Democratic Party should be reminded that an entire Nation forebore serious consideration of the illness

of a President at a time of equal international gravity. Secretary Dulles should at least be given an opportunity to receive the benefit of medical attention before his ouster is demanded. If he is not capable of properly performing his duties, Mr. Dulles would be among the first to recognize the need for a successor.

To date, Mr. Dulles has faced up to the Reds all over the world, an ability not exhibited by some of his predecessors in the State Department. Putting it baldly, John Foster Dulles in many respects is a better Secretary of State flat on his back in a hospital bed than some of the Democrat-appointed appeasers were standing on both feet. There is no reason to take seriously this comment from a pair of over-eager politicians who want to be President.

The Two-Package Approach to Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial which was published in the Denver Post on February 4.

I believe that the editorial presents convincingly the merits of the two-package approach to labor legislation this year.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HAVE TWO LABOR PACKAGES

The last major change in the labor laws of the United States took place more than a decade ago, when the 80th Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act over the bitter opposition of organized labor.

Since that time, a half dozen attempts have been made to subject Taft-Hartley to a major legislative facelift. Every one of these efforts—whether by labor or management, Republicans or Democrats—ended in failure.

A minor noncontroversial change was made in the union-shop provisions of the act, but the big package proposals, with 19 or 20 major amendments, could never pick up the votes to pass.

Controversy and political bickering appeared to rise with the number of amendments proposed. Many Taft-Hartley strategists became convinced that the act could only be changed, one piece at a time.

In their new and separate attempts to win Taft-Hartley changes in the 86th Congress, both President Eisenhower and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, have unfortunately rejected the one-piece-at-a-time approach.

Their package proposals would bring about badly needed improvements in the labor statute. But, unless the size of the packages can be reduced, they may stir too much antagonism to succeed.

Both sets of proposals can be divided into two categories:

First, there are proposals based on the McClellan hearings. These aim at making unions cleaner, more democratic, and free from the control of racketeers.

Second, there are proposals based on a dozen years' experience with labor-management relations under the act.

They revive long-standing arguments over picketing, secondary boycotts, the structure of the National Labor Relations Board, and the rights of strikers. The relation of some of these subjects to the union corruption issue is remote.

In the first category, the President's proposals and those of Senator KENNEDY are not far apart. There are minor differences in the amount of information unions would have to make public and in the penalties that are provided. But it is likely that these differences can be composed in committee.

Unfortunately, these union-corruption proposals are tied up in the same package with proposals in the second category. This is where the major labor and management shafts will be aimed and where the whole package is in danger.

In this category, the Eisenhower and Kennedy proposals diverge in three major respects:

On picketing: The Kennedy bill would only regulate picketing for purposes of extortion. The Eisenhower bill takes in picketing for organizational purposes—as, for example, picketing resulting from interunion jurisdiction disagreements—and regulates it more severely.

The objectives of the Eisenhower picketing regulations are excellent. But the amendment is loosely drawn and could affect some legitimate kinds of picketing that shouldn't be banned.

On secondary boycotts: The Kennedy bill leaves this area untouched. The Eisenhower bill offers four constructive proposals, two favorable to management, two to labor. Management complains that the proposals don't go far enough; labor that they go too far.

Jurisdiction of the NLRB: The Eisenhower proposal would turn over to the States those cases rejected by the NLRB. The Kennedy bill would require the NLRB to take all cases, except where cession agreements can be worked out with States with labor laws similar to the Federal statute.

At these issues and a number of other highly technical ones raised by Taft-Hartley, Congress would be wise to take a separate look. They ought not to remain in the same package with the union-corruption proposals.

Senator KENNEDY has asked nine extremely competent labor experts to examine the noncorruption problems of Taft-Hartley and come up with recommendations.

Congress would be wise to defer action on picketing, secondary boycotts, and a number of other issues until those recommendations are in. But the proposals on union corruption ought not to wait.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-nine Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on February 25, my colleague, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, was the principal speaker at the luncheon at which the semifinalists and the winner in the 1959 Voice of Democracy contest were named. Because his speech was so eloquent and what he had to say was so pertinent in these days when democracy is facing some of its sternest tests, I take pleasure in asking that the text of Sen-

ator GRUENING's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure and privilege to be present to honor the winners of the 1959 Voice of Democracy contest. All 50 of you are to be congratulated. It's a real achievement to win a contest that gets you to Washington. It is particularly thrilling on this occasion to be able to greet for the first time a representative from the 49th State, Melba Phillee.

Indeed, the entry of the 49th State into our Union was, and is, the Voice of Democracy speaking. It spoke through the elected representatives of the people of the United States when the Congress voted to make Alaska a State. That voice declared that the people of Alaska should no longer remain in their Territorial status; that they should be admitted to the full equality of first-class citizenship. This was the application of the principles of democracy to what had previously been one of America's dependent areas. It was an illustration of what I should like to stress in these brief remarks, namely, that to fulfill the promise of democracy we must buttress our words with deeds. We must, if the voice of democracy is to ring out convincingly, couple democratic precepts with practices. We must, if the voice of democracy is to be believed, constantly bear in mind that actions speak louder than words. In short, that "by their works ye shall know them."

The admission of Alaska to the Union, which was formalized by Presidential proclamation less than two months ago, was a shining evidence of performance matching professions—perhaps the most striking example of our time.

It was—it is—a living demonstration that Uncle Sam does practice what he preaches. It was the application, in fact, of the abstract principle proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Alaskans did not have self-government as long as Alaska remained a Territory. They have it now.

That coupling of promise with fulfillment, of preachment with practice, was never more important than now. When I say now, I mean in our time.

As we all know, democracy has in this, our time, been under savage attack as never before in our history. It has been in the last quarter of a century, and is today, challenged by a basically different philosophy and way of life. That philosophy has taken diverse forms, but only slightly diverse. These forms have variously been presented as fascism, as in Italy under Mussolini; as national socialism, as in Germany under Hitler; and, today, as communism, as in Russia and China. We may correctly describe these as only slightly different forms of totalitarianism. We may accurately assert that the nation which adopts any one of these forms is a police state. It is the purpose and design of the rules of those police states to extend their philosophy and way of life to the rest of the world. It is our hope and purpose, as Americans and members of the free world, that they shall not succeed.

Now the differences between the police state and our free society, between totalitarianism and democracy, are familiar to all of you who are here to give expression to the voice of democracy.

You all know that our democratic faith prescribes certain basic freedoms: Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, freedom from search and seizure. These basic freedoms are enshrined in our Constitution through the first 10 amendments which we know as the Bill of Rights. They were placed there

because the fathers of our country had experienced the violation by the government of King George III of those freedoms which the founders deemed natural rights and had earlier declared that fact to be self-evident.

Our forefathers made no provision to safeguard the right to travel freely, to change one's place of residence, to choose one's employment, the right to organize, the right of association. These rights were not safeguarded by the founders because those rights had never been questioned or threatened. Indeed, their violation had not been dreamed of under the colonial rule against which our forefathers rebelled. In fact, the tyranny against which we Americans launched our Revolution was a far milder and far less oppressive tyranny than that which has been imposed in our time on the victims of contemporary totalitarianism. Contrast, for instance, one of the most fundamental grievances of our colonial forefathers—that of "No taxation without representation"—with the ruthless total confiscation of property, the imprisonment without trial, and the so-called "liquidation," which is not other than murder, to which dissenters, or even peaceable nonconformists, are liable under the police state.

I won't dwell at length on this evident contrast between our land of the free and the most loathsome and brutal tyranny the world has known since the Dark Ages. What I want to revert to is the need of our squaring our declarations with our deeds.

What should be and is clear to all of us is that we Americans have not always, by any means, lived up to the principles we profess. It has been so from the beginning; it continues to be so; and, being human beings with human frailties, will always be so to a degree, but let us hope to a steadily diminishing degree. The great men who drafted the Declaration of Independence, whose principles, by and large, have guided us through the most wholesome and inspiring experiment performed by men in all history—those great men saw no contradiction between the Declaration's assertion that all men were created equal and with liberty one of their inalienable rights and, on the other hand, the perpetuation of the institution of slavery. It was not until 87 years later that that inconsistency was removed by the Emancipation Proclamation. In the early days, too, the franchise was often limited to the ownership of property. But time cured that. For over 130 years suffrage was for men only. The 19th amendment, adopted in 1920, decided that women, too, could vote and that they were men in the sense that the word men was used in the Declaration of Independence.

These progressive changes emphasize that democracy is not static; that it is not and never will be a finished product. It is a great legacy handed to us, a trust for us to keep and cherish. But not merely to keep and cherish—also to validate. Democracy, in short, is constantly in evolution and, let us hope, with proper vigilance, devotion, and dedication, becoming ever better. The heartening fact to remember is that while democracy may, and often has, fallen short of its professed ideals, the opportunity for rectification is always there. Whenever there is a failure of democracy, let us take heart that democracy carries within itself the seeds of self-regeneration. It must be our continuing, unremitting effort to make democracy true to its best self. If we bend all our efforts and purposes to that end, then the voice of democracy will sound a clarion call and be heard and listened to wherever men are free or want to be free.

How shall we apply that unremitting effort to make democracy true to its best self?

Let us first understand that the task to which all of us who believe and cherish the democratic system must be dedicated, is to

make democracy work. This is a privilege, an opportunity, and, indeed, an obligation, not merely for those in public office, but for every citizen. Democracy should become a work-a-day religion. It must be a militant, not a passive, faith.

Having reached that understanding, what next? How do we proceed?

Well, first, we must all take a keen interest in public affairs and in Government—in government on every level. It is our Government. In a democracy, government is only as good as the people want it to be. If ours is to be—in Lincoln's immortal phrase: "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—it can be so only to the extent that the people, by their vigilance, interest, and concern make it so. It is a cause of just reproach that so large a proportion of our citizens do not even take the trouble to vote. Voting, the exercise of our right as citizens, is a precious heritage. Those who neglect this duty betray their heritage.

In addition to voting in elections—city, school district, county, State, and national elections—there is the obligation to inform oneself. I have been painfully impressed throughout the years to find how many citizens—presumably responsible citizens—do not even know the names of their Representatives in Congress. I have encountered this all over the United States. And merely knowing the name of one's Representative in Congress is a far cry from knowing what his attitude is on public issues and how he votes on them.

One of our first duties, therefore, in the assignment of making democracy work, is to inform ourselves. We must banish political illiteracy. If public opinion, which we like to assume is the ultimately ruling force in representative government, is to be effective, it must be an informed and enlightened public opinion.

To put it in another way, we get out of democracy what we put into it. So we had better put in generously. Democracy will be as good as we make it, and only as good. So our relationship to democracy is a reciprocal process. We must give to it to the extent that we expect to receive from it. We must ever sow if we want to continue to reap.

Therefore, let us think and act on the assumption that for every right which is ours under democracy, we have a duty to perform; for every benefit we enjoy, we owe a corresponding obligation; for every privilege which our freedom confers, we should render a corresponding service.

And thus thinking and thus acting, is the way—perhaps the only way—we can preserve and strengthen our democratic faith and our democratic works.

Thus, and thus only, can we make the voice of democracy ring true and enable it to carry its message to the farthest corners of the earth, penetrating even iron curtains and bearing beyond them its message of good will, peace, and freedom.

Physical Education and Physical Therapy Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

given by Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director of the U.S. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, which she delivered at the opening exercises at the new building and gymnasium at Boston University for Sargent College. Sargent College has for many years given outstanding leadership in the field of physical education and physical therapy training, and will now be equipped to do an even better educational job. Moreover, with its new buildings it will be much more closely integrated with the regular campus of Boston University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a genuine pleasure for me, both as a Bostonian and as a Federal official with responsibilities for the health and rehabilitation of our disabled people, to participate in the dedication of this magnificent new college building.

To those of us who were brought up in Boston—especially those of my generation—Sargent College has a very special meaning. For most of us started our physical education in high school and continued in college under the tutelage of its graduates.

Sargent is particularly fortunate in its new setting as an integral part of Boston University for the university is one of the key centers of training of professional workers in vocational rehabilitation and related fields.

From the time the training program of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation was begun in 1954, the school of medicine here has been active in teaching rehabilitation principles and practices to undergraduate medical students. The school of medicine also is giving strong leadership to the extensive program of interdisciplinary teaching in the field of rehabilitation—a program in which many schools within the university—including Sargent—are actively and effectively engaged.

Over its 77 years of excellent instruction and service, Sargent has had notable success in preparing hundreds of students for worthwhile service. These, in turn, have contributed to the well-being of thousands throughout this country and abroad. The opportunity for improved and continuing service is enhanced by the integration into Boston University.

With the stresses of our modern technological society and our speeded-up life, both work-a-day and social, this is of great importance to preserving our sense of well-being.

It is not an easy task to plan for our own future in health—whether it be in medicine, in physical education, or in rehabilitation. We live in an age when the pace of progress gives us little opportunity to rest upon yesterday's achievements—for all too soon, the new and different demands of tomorrow are upon us. With the advent of missiles and satellites, the time-tables of scientific development have been upset—and with them, the slow evolution by which our gains have previously been made in so many fields, for we in health and rehabilitation cannot work or plan in isolation.

Those of us who work with the problems of handicapped people feel an obligation to play our full role in meeting the challenges of this exciting period in which we live—for the social, economic and educational development of all our citizens, as individuals, will ultimately determine the rate of our progress, whether it be in science, the humanities or in health.

The vigor with which Sargent College has moved into the needs of our times is evident in many ways.

With the addition of the physical therapy curriculum and laboratory, the college's sphere of usefulness and effectiveness has been greatly extended. I take this occasion to say that the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is quite happy with its investment in your physical therapy training program.

We look forward to continuing growth of the college's usefulness and hope that you may soon, as I know you plan to do, add occupational therapy to your field of instruction and practice.

President Eisenhower has recognized the need for all of us to make ourselves fit—not only physically but in all ways. The President's Council on Youth Fitness attests to this, as does its supporting group—the President's Citizen's Advisory Committee on the Fitness of American Youth.

This accent on youth is all to the good as you so well know—but it does not stop there. Nor does the President's interest. In a recent speech in the Football Hall of Fame, his words expressed the depth and breadth of that interest. I quote: "This (our contest with other ideologies) requires fitness—fitness in its deepest and broadest sense. We know that fitness is far more than a healthy body. It is more than an alert, disciplined mind. Fitness is the sum of all values which enables a man to act effectively in his nation's behalf in this great contest in which we are engaged."

"In this meaning, fitness is the individual's maximum development for the Nation's good."

While advocating fitness as an essential, the President consistently has advocated and given his strong personal support to the rehabilitation of the handicapped among us.

It is my responsibility to head and help develop the national program of vocational rehabilitation of our handicapped people, so that they may lead useful, productive and satisfying lives. So, as you see readily, it is a joy to me to witness the development and expansion of facilities that contribute to rehabilitation. And I congratulate the trustees, the faculty and, yes, the student body upon the forward look that characterizes this institution.

Vocational rehabilitation of our handicapped people is of the utmost importance to the handicapped themselves, to their families, to their communities and to the Nation.

Yet, for some years—until 1954—the program was at a standstill. In that year the Congress enacted a new law which has served as a new charter for expansion and progress. It provided the sinew with which we are breaking the bottlenecks.

One of these bottlenecks was a lack of money to do an adequate job. Both the States and the Federal Government have stepped up their annual investments in rehabilitation until the total has risen from \$37 million in 1954 to \$85 million this year.

But there were other hindrances. One was a marked shortage of trained professional personnel to carry on an expanding program. Another was a lack of research into new and better ways of enabling handicapped people to return to self-sustaining effort. We are steadily reducing both of these barriers and Boston is the center of a very high proportion of our efforts.

For instance, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has made training grants to many educational institutions in the area. At Boston University, as an example, we are supporting training programs in almost every short-supply rehabilitation profession. These include grants for training counselors, physicians, nurses, social workers, and physical therapists (and that, of course, is centered in Sargent College.)

Boston University also has cooperated with us in short-term training to improve the skills of those who have already entered vocational rehabilitation work.

Other institutions that are cooperating with us to fill the growing need for trained professionals in the field of rehabilitation are Tufts University, Springfield College, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston School of Occupational Therapy, Bouve-Boston School, Boston College coupled with Simmons College, the Harvard School of Public Health, Harbridge House, and Emerson College.

Boston's contribution to the research program is impressive also. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is supporting some of the most imaginative and important work in this area that it is possible to envision.

In the mental health field, the Massachusetts Mental Health Center is working to determine the effectiveness of coordinated efforts of hospital, ex-patients, patient groups, and community agencies in the vocational rehabilitation of the mentally ill.

The Massachusetts Association of Mental Health has completed a project which has provided us with much useful information on employers' hiring practices and attitudes where discharged mental patients are concerned. This reveals that few employers knowingly hire a discharged mental patient and it thus points the way for us to work toward development of more acceptance of such people by employers, not only here but everywhere.

The Mental Health Association also has finished another project involving a study of the vocational adjustment of discharged mental patients. This will help us to improve matters in this field, because it gives us many factors which must be considered in developing new approaches.

In other projects, the Boston Dispensary is developing vocational rehabilitation services for chronically ill persons in a community home-care program, the Catholic Guild for the Blind has undertaken a study of the effectiveness of adjustment training programs of various lengths for blind adults, and QT Inc., is experimenting in rehabilitation of ileostomy patients in three hospitals.

Thus we are moving to meet problems on many fronts. We do this because we, in this country, believe in equality of opportunity. In justice, we cannot deny equality to the handicapped. Wherever possible—and generally rehabilitation is possible—our society must provide the necessary help to enable the handicapped person to make his or her own way.

The dignity of usefulness, the satisfaction of contributing to community life, of belonging—these are precious things, and we must not deny them.

To the extent that we do provide the services necessary to handicapped people, the individual profits; the family has a happier member and thus the handicapped person and the community have a happier family; the community profits from his contributions of work and citizenship and the Nation from his productivity.

Too few of us realize the burden that neglected disability places upon our society and I should like to underscore that—while assuring you that the picture is growing brighter each day. As it brightens, we must remember, our responsibilities as so-called normal citizens increase rather than diminish.

Over 2 million disabled men and women need and can profit from vocational rehabilitation services—the medical, psychological, social, training and job-finding help that is available through the State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation.

The cost of disability in loss of productive energy and effort is incalculable. The cost in human despair is greater than anyone can estimate. But we do know that in public assistance alone, the cost of disability is more than one-half billion dollars a year. This involves monthly payments to approximately 400,000 children of disabled parents and a total of 600,000 adults—a million people in all.

In Massachusetts alone there are roughly 6,000 children of disabled parents and roughly 17,000 adults who are reduced to public assistance for their livelihood because of disability. The annual bill is about \$25 million.

Not all of these disabled people can be rehabilitated, of course, but many of them could be returned to self-support through rehabilitation services. Fifteen thousand public assistance clients were rehabilitated last year at a one-time cost of \$13 million. Their public assistance payments were at the rate of \$14 million a year—and that could have gone on and on except for rehabilitation.

All told, throughout the Nation, the State rehabilitation agencies set a new high in the number of rehabilitations for the third consecutive year. The total was above 74,000. And another 260,000 are receiving active help today. They eventually will be on their own.

They will repay in Federal income taxes alone in about 5 years the total cost of the rehabilitation program last year—\$66 million of State and Federal funds.

In Massachusetts the rehabilitation outlook is up, just as it is in most of the Nation. The total of rehabilitations has increased gradually over the past 4 years from 762 in 1955 to 1102 in 1958. That's better than 50 percent but Massachusetts still has a long way to go.

I'm happy to say that the Commonwealth program is well on the way to better results and we of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation are bending our best efforts to help.

Much of the progress here is due to the strong efforts of Commissioner Francis A. Harding who heads your State rehabilitation agency. Mr. Harding, while a member of the legislature, saw the need for a strong program of rehabilitation and when the agency was reorganized a few years ago, he was selected as the logical man to be Commissioner of Rehabilitation. It was a happy choice because Mr. Harding has brought new support and new vigor to the work.

As an example, last year Massachusetts used \$744,000 of Federal funds for rehabilitation and contributed \$569,000 of State funds. The program received more than 96 percent of the maximum of Federal funds available.

For the current year, the Federal Government expects to increase its support of the Massachusetts rehabilitation program to \$823,537 and we understand that the State will contribute \$633,000—an increase of \$55,000. Thus Massachusetts this year will use the maximum available Federal contribution.

You can imagine what a comfort this is to me, both personally and officially. This is my home and I want to be able to speak of my State always with pride. Since I am charged with responsibility for heading the entire national program of vocational rehabilitation, I feel happy at every advance, whether it be in one of our States or in one of our more remote Territories. But my pride is greatest when I see progress in Massachusetts. So this is a proud day for me. It is a pleasure to report progress in my field of responsibility and it is a great joy to participate in the dedication of the new home of Sargent College.

Alaska's Flag, a Schoolboy's Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President the beautiful, symbolic flag of which we Alaskans are so proud was the creation of a 13-year-old boy, Benny Benson. The story of Benny Benson has been touchingly re-created by Ethel Blake in an article which has appeared in Senior Citizen magazine for October 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record. The title of the article is "The Alaskan Flag and a Teenage Boy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A 13-year-old boy, Benny Benson, had an important part in the ceremonies, when the Alaskan flag was flown for the first time, July 9, 1927. He fastened the flag to the halyards below Old Glory. For a moment the two flags touched the boy's head and shoulders. Then with the Stars and Stripes leading, the Alaskan flag with its field of deep blue and eight golden stars followed. When the top of the tall flagpole was reached, the two flags straightened out in the cool breeze coming in from the Gulf of Alaska.

Citizens of the city of Seward and dignitaries of the Methodist Church stood with hats off. A captain of the U.S. Signal Corps, other men in the uniform of the U.S. Army, and a troop of Boy Scouts stood at attention.

Benny Benson stood at attention, too, his face shining with happiness, as he watched the two flags in the bright sunshine. The Alaskan flag was his flag for he was a native Aleut. But it was his flag, also, because he had designed it.

The American Legion in Alaska held a flag contest among Alaskan schoolchildren, grades 7 through the 12th. Schools from all over Alaska sent in designs to a committee of two Senators and two Representatives of the Alaska Legislature and three members named by the American Legion. From 142 designs submitted, the one by Benny Benson was selected unanimously, as the winning design. The legislature made it the official flag in 1927.

The flag raising was held on the grounds of the Jesse Lee Home, a Methodist orphanage near the city of Seward. Benny Benson had lived in the Jesse Lee Home since he was 4. He and his little brother, 2 years old, had been brought to the home by their father, who needed someone to care for his motherless boys. Benny and his brother were given good care at the home. The teachers became very fond of them. One day one of the teachers gave Benny a doughnut. He broke it in two. "This doughnut is like you and me, Mrs. Winchell," he said. "Brown on the outside like me and white on the inside like you."

Benny was in the seventh grade at the time of the flag contest. He was one of the three most promising pupils in the mission school. He had done excellent work in drawing, making posters, and in carving ivory.

The Legislature of Alaska voted \$1,000 to be used by Benny in making a trip to Washington, D.C., to present the new Alaskan flag to the President of the United States. Benny did not make the trip. He said he would rather use the money for his future education. But he did have a stateside trip, anyway.

It happened this way. The Jesse Lee Home was established by the Women's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Church. When the superintendent of the home and his wife attended national conventions of the society in the States, they took Benny with them on one of these trips. They were proud to present him, as a boy who had been cared for and educated in the Jesse Lee Home and who had won distinction in designing the Alaskan flag.

The stateside trip was only one of several rewards that came to Benny. Another reward was different than money from the legislature or travel that took him several thousand miles from his homeland. Perhaps it was the most important of all. Probably Benny could not appreciate its importance until he was older. The fact that he was unanimously selected the winner in the flag contest gave a lift to his own people and all other native Alaskans.

Aleut businessmen and other native Alaskans came to the superintendent of the home and said to him: "Now for the first time, we can hold up our heads, because we know our children are as bright as the white children. We had always been told that our children were not the equal of the white children. Now we know they are. What Benny Benson has done has given a lift to Aleuts and other natives all over Alaska."

The Alaskan flag is beautiful in its simplicity. On its deep blue field there are eight golden stars. Seven of the stars represent the best known of all constellations—the Big Dipper. The eighth and largest star on the flag is Polaris, the North Star. The two stars in the outer side of the Big Dipper are called the Pointers, because they point toward the North Star and are always in line with it, no matter in what position the Dipper may be. The stars are arranged on the flag as they appear in the sky.

Benny Benson was born on the Aleutian Islands, which stretch out for thousands of miles from the mainland of Alaska, southwest, between the Bering Sea and the Pacific Ocean. The Jesse Lee Home was at Unalaska in the Aleutian Islands when Benny and his little brother were brought to the home by their father. In Benny's homeland, the nights for part of the year are much longer than in lands farther south. So Benny had been familiar since childhood with the Big Dipper overhead, as it wheeled slowly and majestically around the North Star. He knew that the great North Star was a guide for the sailor, explorer, hunter, trapper, prospector, woodsman, and surveyor.

Benny Benson's design for the Alaskan flag was original and appropriate. The blue field is like the color of the sky, the sea, the lakes. The golden stars are symbolic of the gold in Alaska's streams and mountains.

The people of Alaska are proud of their flag and its history. The license plates of Alaskan automobiles have been made to show the Alaska flag since 1948. Alaska's State song, entitled "Alaska's Flag," was written by Marie Drake, who is still living in Juneau:

"Eight stars on a field of blue—
Alaska's flag, may it mean to you
The blue of the sea, the evening sky,
The mountain lakes and the flowers nearby;
The gold of the early sourdough's dream,
The precious gold of the hills and streams,
The brilliant stars in the northern sky,
The Bear—the Dipper—and shining high
The great North Star with its steady light,
Over land and sea a beacon bright,
Alaska's flag—to Alaskans dear,
The simple flag of a last frontier."

The contest sponsored by the American Legion of Alaska produced a flag that is different than any other of the 48 State flags and is unique in having been designed by a teenage boy.

Food Surpluses and Foreign Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Appendix of the Record an outstanding editorial which was published last week in the New Republic. The editorial has a number of incisive recommendations as to how we can more effectively integrate Public Law 480 into our overall foreign assistance policy and how we can more effectively put counterpart funds to practical use in less developed nations of the world.

I believe that the editorial deserves the attention of the many persons who are anxious to develop new ways in which our food surpluses can be made a part of an international effort.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ABUNDANT OPPORTUNITY

As a result of bumper wheat and corn crops the estimated value of surplus farm commodity stocks held by the Federal Government will soon reach an alltime high of \$9 billion. And who will even guess when the end will be in sight? Farm groups searching for ways to broaden foreign outlets for accumulating U.S. stocks of food and fiber pushed through the surplus disposal program (Public Law 480) in 1954, and Congress has renewed it three times. Although the program has included some famine relief grants (\$1.1 billion) and barter deals for scarce ores through private trade channels (\$900 million), the biggest single item has been the sale for foreign currencies of surpluses which were not selling in the regular dollar market. Two and one-half billion dollars worth of agricultural commodities had been sold abroad for foreign currencies as of the end of 1958.

The fact that the United States sells the surpluses for local currencies is to the farm bloc simply an unfortunate temporary expedient incidental to getting rid of the stocks. But Public Law 480 has acquired an altogether different significance for the countries receiving the surpluses. The less developed countries which are the principal recipients are short on food and dollars: Thus the program has the special virtue of simultaneously easing local food scarcity (and price inflation) and releasing dollars for capital goods imports. Moreover, roughly half of the sale proceeds accruing to the United States are loaned to the recipient countries for U.S.-approved economic development projects (the remainder is used for U.S. local currency procurement, e.g., in military aid programs, and for educational purposes such as the Fulbright student exchanges). What was designed purely and simply as a disposal program has become, in short, an important part of our foreign aid program.

This dual significance of Public Law 480 has long been apparent to some far-sighted aid officials and aid supporters who have doubted whether Congress would ever appropriate the large dollar sums needed for an effective U.S. economic contribution to the less-developed countries, and who have seen in a redesigned Public Law 480 a means for marrying desperate necessity abroad with political reality at home—not to mention reconciling the paradox of U.S. overabundance in a hungry world. But farm

bloc sentiment for a broadened Public Law 480 program did not crystallize until very recently. With Secretary Benson using the high cost of storing the surpluses as one of his main arguments against price supports, the farm groups are now unanimously pressing for a Public Law 480 program placed on a more permanent basis than the present year-to-year schedule. The administration had been considering a special report on the possibilities in an expanded Public Law 480 program by Harvard agricultural economist John H. Davis when the political winds from Capitol Hill began to pick up velocity, and the result was an apparently last-minute decision to place "Food for Peace" in the President's farm message. But although the President has designated Secretary Benson "to explore anew with other surplus-producing nations all practical means of utilizing the various agricultural surpluses of each in the interest of reinforcing peace"—which might mean, in specific terms, a world conference of food ministry representatives later this year—the administration has no immediate plan beyond renewing Public Law 480.

In Congress, on the other hand, there are major legislative initiatives in the making. Representative W. R. POAGE, Democrat of Texas, has introduced an amendment providing for a 10-year surplus program on a loan basis with repayments in dollars over a period of up to 50 years. Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Representative McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, have introduced resolutions affirming congressional support for a long-term surplus program as an integral part of our foreign assistance, and Senator HUMPHREY is readying an omnibus bill which would, among other things, set up a peacetime agency comparable to the War Food Administration—thus giving the program administrative independence and, equally important politically, budgetary independence from the foreign aid and Agriculture appropriations. By attributing the cost of surplus disposal programs to some agency other than the Department of Agriculture, in the name of an objective other than farm price supports, Secretary Benson's misgivings about the high cost of surplus disposal (on top of supports) might be modified.

Senator HUMPHREY is, in our view, to be commended for his leadership on the surplus issue and his omnibus program will be studied with great interest. There are, however, very serious limitations inherent in any long-term program conceived essentially, as are all of the programs contemplated, in terms of loans. The less developed countries are aware that the United States does not know what to do with its abundance. Thus in this instance the often mentioned preference of sensitive Asian governments for loans rather than grants is less weighty than their clear recognition that the United States could quite painlessly make the surpluses available as grants. This becomes peculiarly important in the light of the enormous accumulations of local currencies by the United States already taking place in the case of India, Pakistan, and Israel—which together claimed more than half of the Public Law 480 surpluses in 1958—and of the profound and growing uneasiness inevitably resulting from that accumulation in these newly independent countries. As Matthew Kust, former legal adviser to U.S. Embassies in South Asia, pointed out in these pages in the case of India, rupees acquired by the U.S. Government under Public Law 480 (and soft currency development loan programs) might in the conceivable future exceed those held by the Government of India. The mere thought of this is politically explosive in India, which is now in the midst of a frenzied reappraisal of its economic—which is to say political—future. The main theme of Indian Communist propaganda is that the

Nehru government is mortgaging itself to Washington.

At present 48 percent of Public Law 480 sale proceeds in India are reloaned for U.S. approved economic development projects; another 15 percent goes for grants to non-development purposes (e.g., education and health); 12 percent for U.S. Embassy administrative expenses, and up to 25 percent for local currency loans to U.S. business operations in India (under the so-called Cooley amendment). Any substantially expanded Public Law 480 program would mean that the 48 percent allocated for economic development would become a larger and larger sum—looming larger and larger in relation to the totality of the Indian Government budget—and a sum increasingly hot to handle. Why, Indian leaders might well ask (and this is also true in Pakistan and other surplus recipient countries), does not the United States follow the precedent of the Marshall plan? The Marshall plan was a grant program and the counterpart funds in European currencies accumulated under the plan belonged to the recipient governments. To be sure, provision was made in the program agreements for virtual U.S. control over decisions as to how the funds were to be spent; but this would be easier for the recipient governments to justify to their peoples than direct control of large sums of the national currency by the United States, with all of its implicit political influence.

The Davis report now before the State Department recognizes this state of mind in the less-developed countries and recommends that the grant portion of Public Law 480 allocations be increased from 15 to 25 percent. In our view there is no reason why the increase should not extend to the 48 percent portion now being reloaned and perhaps in later years to the bulk of the proceeds.

There is danger that in the absence of a clear definition of "Food for Peace" as something different from a bigger and better disposal program—perhaps restyled "Food for Economic Development"—some of the merit of the program may be canceled out. It may become an excuse for many Congressmen to vote against vital dollar aid appropriations (e.g., for an expanded Development Loan Fund) while not having the saving grace of the grant authority so necessary in the light of political realities in the less-developed countries. The National Grange frankly urges the Federal Government to "use surplus agricultural commodities whenever practical instead of dollars as a means of aid and relief." What the farm belt politicians are perhaps afraid of is an isolationist rural reaction against giveaways. But given the facts and some leadership we suspect that farmers could be won to a grant program. They have, after all, nothing to lose.

Civil Defense Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civil Defense Folly," published in the Springfield (Ohio) Daily News of February 18, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE FOLLY

Whether top officials of the Federal Government are trying to delude the people, or whether the Civil Defense organization is trying to entrench itself solidly into a permanent position, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG did the public a favor when he brought the question of the Civil Defense setup into the open. Senator YOUNG says the program is obsolete and futile, and there can be little question but what he is right.

Both the evacuation and the shelter plans have been rendered wholly ineffectual as protective devices by the newer developments in the H-bomb and other nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, the Civil Defense Office has asked Congress to double its appropriations for the coming year. As Senator YOUNG says, in the face of the facts, any further funds for Civil Defense are just being thrown away.

Some efforts to bolster up the Civil Defense case have been made through the contention that the Civil Defense has rendered good service in disaster areas. So has the Red Cross. So have thousands of volunteers not connected with either agency. Service for disaster victims has been just as good if not better in those areas in which the Civil Defense organization has not participated as in the ones in which it did take part. And as for the distribution of surplus equipment, one has only to look at some of such distributions which have already taken place to realize that insofar as heavy masses of the population are concerned, such distribution could have little effect.

There has been some talk about the making of a paid Civil Defense director for Springfield, and possibly including Clark County. It is extremely doubtful if any good practical results, more than are now being had with a volunteer nonpaid director, could be obtained.

Whenever a new governmental agency has been created for any purpose, it has proved extremely difficult to terminate the agency when the purpose has been fulfilled. Seemingly, the present Civil Defense organization is determined to perpetuate itself whether or not it is doing any effective work.

The Public School Situation at Front Royal, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials dealing with the situation in the public schools at Front Royal, Va. One of the editorials is entitled "Ridiculous Situation in Front Royal" and was published in the Savannah Morning News of February 23, 1959. The other editorial entitled "Boycott by Front Royal School Pupils Could Be Supreme Test of 1954 Ruling," was published in the Augusta Herald of February 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Savannah Morning News, Feb. 23, 1959]

RIDICULOUS SITUATION IN FRONT ROYAL

The independent-minded people of predominantly rural Front Royal, Va., pose quite a challenge for the Federal authorities.

According to the ways and means committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, otherwise known as the Supreme Court, the "law of the land" says Front Royal's school must be mixed—no evasion, no delay, no circumvention.

The people of Front Royal closed their new million-dollar school last fall rather than open it on an integrated basis. The students, instead, attended private classes. But the NAACP lawyers stayed busy, and the courts kept grinding out laws to make the people abide by the laws they had already made, and by last week every legal defense had been exhausted. The people lost, the court won.

As a list-ditch measure, Warren County, where Front Royal is located, held a referendum on whether or not to continue private schooling for the children. The vote was 545 to 4 in favor of private schools.

The parents wanted to keep their children in makeshift classes run by the Warren County Education Foundation since last September, and they appealed to a Federal judge in Baltimore to permit them to continue to do so, citing the election results to show that the people wanted it this way.

But the judge said "No."

Thus, court-ordered integration was scheduled to begin on Wednesday. But on the appointed day the white students stayed away en masse, and only 22 Negro students reported to the 30-classroom high school, built to accommodate 1,000.

There was no disorder. The 800 white students continued to attend their private classes. Nine white teachers were on hand to teach the 22 Negro students.

The next move, whatever it may be, is up to Federal authorities and the courts, and the signals, as usual, will be called by the NAACP.

The white students are, in a sense, cutting off their noses to spite their own faces—but that is not the point. The point now becomes whether or not in this land of ours, the courts can make a new law making it illegal for a person to cut off his nose to spite his face. We already have compulsory attendance laws in all States, but these are State laws and do not specify which school a student is compelled to attend. Attendance of a private school satisfies this law, so far as the State is concerned. Therefore, the Supreme Court must—if it acts consistently with its former rulings—assume control over compulsory attendance and change this to mean compulsory attendance at an integrated school.

Then we suppose U.S. marshals or perhaps even Federal troops could be used to clear the white private school in Front Royal and herd the children over into the integrated public school. It would be sort of like a Little Rock situation in reverse.

Unless something of this nature is done, the law of the land will stand repudiated—and this is something our courts and Federal authorities must never permit. Ask any liberal.

Some students in areas marked for integration already attend segregated private or parochial schools. If Front Royal's white students are forced to transfer to the integrated public school, what disposition will be made of other students attending segregated private schools in other areas?

Perhaps each case will have to be judged on its merits—if the student transferred to private school to avoid racially-mixed classes, he could be enjoined in Federal court from continuing such attendance; but if his motive was to get a better education, to receive religious instructions, or just to permit his parents to "keep up with the Jones," then he would not be transferred.

Ridiculous?

Of course it's ridiculous. But it could not be otherwise in this instance since it is a natural outgrowth of a preposterous proposition—the Federal usurpation, without legal foundation, of a local community's inherent right to run its own public schools.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald, Feb. 20, 1959]

BOYCOTT BY FRONT ROYAL SCHOOL PUPILS COULD BE SUPREME TEST OF 1954 RULING

The first predominantly rural county in the South to face court-ordered integration of its schools has perhaps shown a way to circumvent judicial tyranny by glumly giving up its own public white school to Negroes in order to maintain segregation.

As the country now knows—if the Northern press saw fit to print the story, that is—22 Negro pupils walked into a million-dollar high school at Front Royal, Va., Wednesday—and walked in alone. None of the county's more than 800 white students showed up. Not a single one. Instead, they chose to remain in private classes.

It was a 100-percent boycott—the first of its kind in American history. Moreover, it wasn't a Deep South incident, either, but the protest of an area of northern Virginia, not far from desegregation zones.

And it was a protest that could prove to be portentous if attempts are made to force Deep South compliance with the Warren Court's reckless ruling.

No doubt the Chief Justice has heard the adage that a horse can be led to water but can't be made to drink.

By the same token, he should now be aware that there are parents who balk at sociological medicine being forced down their children's throats.

The Warren Court first butted its inflated head on Little Rock. Now it is up against a figurative mountain in the Shenandoah Valley—a mountain that will be hard to whittle down unless the Federal judiciary, at the proddings of the insatiable NAACP, should declare private schools unconstitutional and thus involve every church-operated educational institution in the country.

But in view of past performances, it wouldn't be too great a surprise to the South even if it comes to that.

The Front Royal school, which closed last September 12 to avoid compliance with Federal integration orders, was one of those where racial barriers were removed some weeks ago upon collapse of Virginia's massive resistance stand.

Thus, its all-out white boycott was in contrast to the outcome of three metropolitan areas—Norfolk, Arlington, and Alexandria—which, bowing to Federal coercion, finally mixed on a token basis.

As pointed out, however, Front Royal was the first truly rural community to face the test—and it met it stubbornly.

Comments The Charleston News and Courier:

"Because the people of Warren County have refused to be robots manipulated by remote control, they may be subjected to new pressures and penalties. Regardless of what is done to them, they have provided an example of courage, coolness, and character. They have shown the way."

And as Washington columnist Holmes Alexander wrote the other day:

"The theme of equalitarianism has been translated into the vulgate to mean forced integration of white and Negro children. It is a movement by nonsoutherners which is pressed upon the South with the hope of getting the Negro vote and no idea of the ultimate consequences."

But so far the reckless program hasn't panned out too well—as witness the latest episode at Front Royal.

Instead of massive conformity, a Virginia county has handed the Federal courts and

the NAACP a massive slap. And our idea is that the President will use no troops in this instance, regardless of what Asia and Africa may say—or how Earl Warren may feel over the anomaly of a strictly one-way mixed school.

Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the GTA Daily Radio Roundup dated February 3, 1959.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN., FEBRUARY 3, 1959

There are a lot of facts and figures that consumers ought to know about food prices. They deserve to know, because they are entitled to abundance at fair prices.

One farm magazine, for example, explains that if farmers farmed now as they did in 1940, the consumers' food bill would be at least \$13 billion a year higher. And it asks: "Which is better, to have a surplus costing the consumer \$3 to \$4 billion a year in taxes, or to have a scarcity, costing him \$13 billion more a year at the retail level?"

And that's a real question, which must be answered. The farmer used to get 55 cents out of the consumers' food dollar. Now he gets 39 cents. That's because food prices are up, while farm prices are down. No other industry has had its income cut so drastically.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis explains the situation in the last year this way: "There have been shifts as farm prices drifted lower, and industrial prices firmed, but the total wholesale and consumer prices have remained stable."

That can be said in fewer words, simply that agriculture is subsidizing industry and business and consumers. And all of us ought to be grateful to farmers, not angry with them, for producing so much, so cheap. Most farmers know this, and wish they could get city people to understand.

We received a letter the other day from a farmer near Minot, N. Dak. "We know," he says, "that Secretary of Agriculture Benson is working to reduce farm prices, because he says that will reduce prices to consumers. But let's just compare grain prices with prices of finished products."

He explains that a year ago he sold his wheat for \$2.12 a bushel, and paid \$2.98 for 50 pounds of flour, and 18 cents for a loaf of bread. Now he sells his wheat for about \$1.70 a bushel, pays \$3.59 for the same flour, and 23 cents a loaf for bread.

Or take malting barley, this farmer says. "A few years ago I got \$2 a bushel for my barley, and beer sold for 15 cents a bottle. Today my barley is worth 90 cents, and beer is 25 to 30 cents a bottle." He goes on to make the same kind of comparisons for oats and milk. Consumers just aren't getting any benefit from lower farm prices, he concludes, because retail food prices go up faster than farm prices go down.

And I'm sure we all agree with that. Now, what this farmer proposes is that farmers get together and exercise some intelligent

production controls, in return for fair and reasonable prices. "But getting the farmers together is the tough job," he says, and he urges them to join up with their organizations and cooperatives.

Well, a lot of farmers tell us that makes sense to them. The last thing they want is an all-out free-for-all on farm production, with each farmer pitted against his neighbor in a disastrous price war.

Gradually, more and more people are coming to understand that in a legislated economy, no single group can be cast out without bringing down trouble on all groups. The better that is understood, the better our chances for decent farm legislation, fair to consumers, taxpayers, and farmers.

Presidential Item Veto Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "How To Get Economy," published in the Salt Lake Tribune of February 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOW TO GET ECONOMY

President Eisenhower, speaking through Representative HALLECK, Republican House leader, has appealed to the public to join him in his fight to keep the \$77 billion budget in balance.

A hearty public response could have telling effect.

But the public, despite its professed interest in economy, is sometimes apathetic when it comes to making its voice heard. Moreover, Congressmen and Senators, who get letters from home urging that the budget line be held, also must work for projects demanded by their constituents. One man's economy often is another man's necessity. That leads to logrolling and increased appropriations.

There is, however, a way to curb this latter practice. It is item veto legislation which would give the President the power to disapprove individual items in an appropriation bill.

As matters stand now, the President must either accept or reject an appropriation bill as a whole. And when an appropriation bill may run to 50 pages and contain thousands of items, he ordinarily has to accept it despite his objection to what he considers extravagances.

Presidents as far back as Ulysses S. Grant have asked for item veto power. Adlai Stevenson endorses it. Senator DOUGLAS, who was an economics professor before he went into politics, estimates it would save the taxpayers \$4 billion a year. President Eisenhower called for the item veto in his recent state of the Union message.

But Congress undoubtedly will continue to say, "No." For the item veto would deal a deadly blow to logrolling and would break the pork barrel into small pieces.

Many State Governors, including Utah's have the item veto power. We think the same power should be given Presidents. But it will take a public upheaval of earthquake proportions to get anything done.

Edward F. O'Meara, of Oregon Daily Journal, Spends 30½ Hours in Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the propeller-driven airplane has dwindled the size of our terrestrial home, and the jet aircraft will reduce the globe in size still further. It even is possible for a journalist from my home city of Portland, Oreg., to visit many of the great communities of Western Europe during a 10-day journey.

One such pilgrimage involved 30½ hours in Ireland by a Portland newspaperman who traces back his ancestral lineage to that Gaelic land. He is Edward F. O'Meara, city editor of the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland. Mr. O'Meara has written for his paper a lively and vivid tale which gives highlights of his relatively brief stopover in the country of his forebears, under the title of "30½ Hours in Ireland." It is a heartwarming story.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. O'Meara's articles, as condensed and edited, be published in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THIRTY AND ONE-HALF HOURS IN IRELAND

(By Ed O'Meara)

There didn't seem to be much use arguing. "So you're going back to Ireland! Well, it'll look pretty much the same!"

That's what my Gaelic-brogued plane seatmate was telling me as we winged through the December night's darkness toward Shannon Airport and the land of St. Patrick.

"I've never been to Ireland before," I told him for the second or third time, "so I couldn't be going back."

"Yes, yes," the Gael said, "that's what I say—you won't be noticing any changes."

It was a big switch, this stopover in the Emerald Isle, "stolen" from our mid-December over-the-Pole Pan American trip to London and Paris. And getting to Ireland isn't too easy during the winter season, but one of Pan Am's Paris office staffers, Mme. Micheline Renoux, proved that French girls are not only pretty but also smart by finding an aerial way to Elre for me.

GIRLS IN THE GREENEST GREEN

We dropped in to Shannon Airport on the shores of Shannon River a few minutes before midnight. Even at that dark hour there was green in sight, mainly the uniform of Aer Lingus, which is the greenest green imaginable, and mainly on pretty Irish girls who were (as is the wont of Irish girls almost everywhere) directing traffic.

At this point I was fortunate in falling almost immediately into the convenient and capable clutches of Matthew Kelly and his boss, Derry McCarthy, drivers of cars for hire. Otherwise I might still be standing there, dazedly staring at the \$1.80 price tags on bottles of Irish whiskey in the Shannon shops.

Then followed a 14-mile drive to headquarters, the Royal George Hotel in Limerick—locked tighter than a drum at 12:30

a.m. Limerick, a town of 50,000, was as dead as a mackerel at that hour.

ROOM WITH BATH EXACTLY THAT

Ringling of the Royal George bell produced "night man" Dick Leahy, who proudly led the way to one of "the finest rooms" (yes, a lot of them to talk that way!) in the century-old hotel. It turned out to be No. 68, which is—naturally—on the fourth floor. The "with bath" turned out to be exactly that—a neat little anteroom equipped with a long white bathtub, two round cakes of "oatmeal soap" and four large bath towels. Nothing more. "The other conveniences," Dick explained, "are down the flight of stairs, turn to the right and at the end of the long hall."

Limerick is a little bit like Chicago—it's hog butcher of the Irish world. The breakfast of bacon and eggs was like nothing I've had in years of rather intensive cuisine-testing—huge slabs of sliced bacon with two-inch width of lean meat and practically no fat!

NAMES MAKE SOOTHING SOUNDS

Then the aim was to visit high spots of counties and towns with familiar names—names mentioned over the years by Ireland-originated members of both sides of the family. With Derry McCarthy, a light-hearted but heavy-footed driver of a small English-built car who knows the main roads, the back roads, by-roads, alleys and shortcuts, as well as the way in and out of various pubs and the best eating houses in towns along the way, I made the best of my 30½-hour visit in Ireland.

Names on this soft, green land are colorful, intriguing and unusual and they unfolded before us as we raced some 160 miles through the heart of the country—through what's called the Golden Vale of Elre, as Derry described it.

From County Limerick to County Tipperary, past Silvermine Mountains near Nenagh; alongside Lough Derg, the lakey bulge in the Shannon River; to Cloughjordan, tiny village with a blazing claim to fame because a martyred patriot-poet was born there; into Roscrea, amid fields dotted with abbey ruins and marked by a "round tower of Ireland"; a brief excursion into county Offaly, a fair stretch of miles in Galway and back to Limerick.

"HIMSELF" WAS JUST OUT BACK

Only place we met another O'Meara was in well-named Toomyvarra village, which seems to have almost as many spellings of its name as there are residents. It's near the Devil's Bit, a big nick in the otherwise smooth line of the Silvermine Mountains. And it means O'Meara's Hill.

In the middle of the town sits a neat building with a two-foot-high red-lettered sign—"J. O'Meara." So McCarthy and E. O'Meara went in. Turned out to be a pub. The pub division was at the back of the room and the front half of the shop was a sort of light grocery department. It looked as though the back half of the shop did the major business.

"Is Mr. O'Meara about?" asked McCarthy.

"Himself is out back," said the gray-haired lady sweeping up. Turned out she was Mrs. O'Meara.

"Well, Mr. O'Meara here from Oregon, would like to meet Mr. O'Meara, of Toomyvarra," McCarthy explained, and she ran to get himself.

James Patrick O'Meara, soft-spoken and sixtyish, came in from outdoors and was happy to welcome us to Toomyvarra. We sampled the products of the back half of the shop. James Patrick did some card tricks ("though me hands are too cold to do it properly") with a facility no other bearer of the name has ever shown, to my knowledge. Other O'Mearas in the neighborhood? "Oh, yes," he said. "Must be 15 or 20 families of them—and hardly any of

them will admit to being related to any of the others."

RELATIVITY'S NO PROBLEM

"Probably," said James Patrick with a smile, "they wouldn't admit to being related to you, either. You Oregon O'Mearas have been gone a long while."

"So," he said turning to the back of the shop, "let's have another."

At this point it developed that we had to be on our way, and James Patrick had to be going, too—he was to be a pallbearer at a funeral Mass in a few minutes.

Guidebooks say "the road northwards from Nenagh to Portumna passes the town of Borrisokane, which is of little interest to the visitor." But it was a colorful sight when we reached it, a little before noon.

The main street was jammed with farmers, small trucks, cows, sheep, gesturing men in thick overcoats, bicycles, carts with donkeys, ducks, and some small boys rushing pell-mell out of St. Mary's School nearby.

ALL'S FAIR IN BORRISOKANE

We edged our way through the melee of a typical Irish fair day (McCarthy said it was typical, anyhow), then stopped to query one of the citizens. Did he, by any chance, know of an O'Meara running the local blacksmith shop? (For about 200 years up to the grandfatherly departure in the 1850's there had been an O'Meara forge in Borrisokane).

"O'Meara blacksmith?" he said. "No—there's a McKenna been runnin' the forge here for years. But there's an O'Meara has a fine pub over in Toomyvarra."

Thanks, we said, but we couldn't go back right away.

And then we were off again in McCarthy's Consul, over the well-paved but narrow Irish highways, through Portumna, Ballinasloe, Aughrim, Loughrea and Athenry in east Galway and along the Shannon into Clare as mid-December's early dusk caught up with us hurrying back to Limerick.

IT'S NO TRICK TO GO BACK

And then I climbed aboard a Pan Am plane for London, and in London took off a bit later in another Pan Am plane for a 20½-hour ride back to Portland over the polar route. And the new jets will cut the trip to a mere overnight flight. Since Portland's that close to Limerick and Tipperary, it'd be no trick at all to go back some time.

So that was it—a brief visit to the Ould Sod, a couple of short nights' sleep at the Royal George, a few minutes at Nenagh, an hour or so in the back half of James Patrick O'Meara's pub in Toomyvarra, fleeting glimpses of the Shannon, a peak at the tinker's colorful carts on the roadside, a few short walks in the Irish countryside, a few short beers with Derry McCarthy (who seemed more like a relative than a man with cars for hire), and that was it. No Dublin, no Blarney castle, no Cork. It's a fine, soft, green and quiet land, Ireland is—and a man ought to spend more than 30½ hours there to pay it a decent visit.

Ah, well, as the Irish say, "Slainte"—good health and here's to you.

Our Soybean Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 25, it was my pleasure to attend with other members

of the House Committee on Agriculture a market development luncheon together with representatives from our farm organizations and from industry and industry organizations.

Representing the soybean growers and industry were Mr. Howard Roach, president of the Soybean Council of America, and Mr. Coleman Crews, of Keiser, Ark., representing the American Soybean Association. These two gentlemen had at their fingertips splendid information on the development of our soybean economy in the United States and the address that Mr. Roach gave was heartening as to the work of the soybean organizations, allied with the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, in developing and expanding foreign markets for soybeans and soybean products.

This foreign trade development is essential when production of American soybeans is noted. The following table indicates the great expansion in American production. It is seen that, from 44 percent of the world production in the years 1950 to 1954, American production amounts now to 58 percent of the world production:

Soybeans: World production by areas and U.S. share, average 1950-54 annual 1955-58

[In millions of bushels]

Area	Average 1950-54	1955	1956	1957	1958
Foreign production:					
Non-Communist:					
Brazil.....	3	4	4	4	4
Canada.....	4	6	5	7	7
Indonesia.....	11	13	13	13	13
Japan.....	17	19	17	17	16
Others.....	8	7	11	11	11
Total.....	43	49	50	52	51
Communist countries:					
China.....	330	335	340	335	350
Others.....	11	10	10	10	10
Total.....	341	345	350	345	360
United States.....	298	374	449	480	575
World total.....	682	768	849	877	986
U.S. percent of world.....	44	49	53	55	58

Using only 1 percent of the funds in the Public Law 480 programs for marketing and promotion programs, the various commodity organizations have performed excellent work in creating and expanding markets for American farm products. Mr. Roach, in his statement, illustrates this fact in the case of soybeans. It is a pleasure and a privilege to include with these remarks the statement presented by Mr. Roach.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD L. ROACH, OF PLAINFIELD, IOWA, PRESIDENT, SOYBEAN COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC., COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 86TH CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 25, 1959

When the American Soybean Association was organized in 1920, to promote a new and almost unknown crop, few present realized the possibilities of an agricultural achievement that is now history.

In 1925, the first year that the U.S. Department of Agriculture published records of soybean production, 5 million bushels were grown which were worth between 10 and 11 million dollars. Thirty-nine years later, in

1958, 574 million bushels were grown (an increase of over 1,000 percent) which put into the pockets of American farmers over \$1 billion.

The same foresight that nursed the small soybean crop, also nursed an infant processing and handling industry. It was but natural that these segments of our agricultural economy, realizing their mutual dependence, should conceive the Soybean Council of America to tell the story of soybeans and soybean products to the world.

With the passage of Public Law 480 by the 83d Congress, in 1954, which contained the concept of using counterpart funds for market development activity abroad, the council entered into agreements with Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to tell the story of soybeans and soybean products; to encourage existing overseas markets and to develop new business for American agriculture.

The remarkable increase in acreage devoted to the growing of soybeans has changed the United States in the field of fats and oils from an importing to an exporting nation.

We must, therefore, find and develop new markets. With a broad concept that we must encourage greater consumption among people where possible, and with the still broader concept that edible fats and oils can be substituted one for the other, the council feels responsible for cottonseed oil, lard, butter, and other fats and oils as well as for soybean oil. We are, therefore, engaged in increasing the consumption of fats and oils.

Since our first project, started in Japan, cooperating with the Oregon Wheat Growers, we have now written 15 market development agreements with Foreign Agricultural Service covering the following nations: Austria, Germany, Italy, Spain, Turkey, Poland, Mexico, Central America, Chile, Peru, Caribbean Area, Burma, India, Thailand, Pakistan, Greece, and Israel. In past years we have shown in agricultural and trade fairs in Italy, Germany, Spain, and Greece and during the current year, 1959, will show in a total of 14 fairs in Europe, South America and Asia. This trade fair activity, alone, costs the Council between eighteen and twenty thousand dollars per year in cold cash while our overseas cooperators contribute much more than this amount. This is all possible through cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and with the Department of Commerce.

The Council early learned, in market development work, that our overseas friends expect us to share some soybean meal and knowledge on how to use same in livestock and poultry feeding if we expect them to keep quiet while we ship our surplus edible oil to them which competes with their own fats and oils. We are, therefore, holding schools, seminars and feeding demonstrations on how to use soybean meal efficiently. As a result, our dollar sales to Italy of soybean meal for example have risen from a little over 3,000 short tons in 1954 to over 70,000 tons in 1958. We have also held oil schools and seminars in Spain, showing and telling the trade and Government officials, about U.S. methods of grading and testing vegetable oils. As a result the Government of Spain has recently removed restrictions on the sale and mixture of soybean oil.

The job before us is stupendous. Without assistance, from Foreign Agricultural Service, the task and cost would be too great for us to attempt. American agriculture is the beneficiary of those who conceived the use of funds from Public Law 480 sales for market development work. Our concern is that enough of these funds continue to be directed for market development work until such time that agriculture fully realizes its value and is willing to carry on alone.

Most of us remember the slogan used during the last war to encourage agricultural

production "Food will win the war and write the peace." Food did win the war, but we have never given it the chance it should have to "write the peace." Russia is able to match us in guns, Sputniks, rockets, and in every other product that implies destruction. Russia is still unable to match us in food and the knowledge that goes with its production and processing. In this field they cannot compete with us today. Now is time for us to use food to write the peace and demonstrate to the world the wonders that plenty and proper food can do. Market development, made possible through the continued availability of Public Law 480 funds is the greatest single medium through which we can carry on a program for universal peace.

Save Millions by Curtailing or Eliminating Civil Defense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Harsh Words for CD," published in the Toledo Blade of February 18, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARSH WORDS FOR CD

Ohio's Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG has said what a good many people think when he calls the civil defense program futile and suggests that Congress could, without jeopardy to the Nation, save millions of dollars by curtailing or eliminating CD expenditures.

In the Senator's opinion, most of the \$500 million appropriated for this purpose over the past 9 years has been wasted. Neither we nor the Russians have any defense against nuclear weapons except retaliation. Opposing the request of the CD agency for increased funds, he charges that the organization has grown topheavy with high salaried officials. Further money, he says, would mean more for officials, for useless bomb shelters, for supplies and equipment of doubtful value.

This severe judgment on a program to which it has become customary to pay lip service will, of course, be challenged. There are those who believe that millions of American lives might be saved if a truly comprehensive CD program were put into effect. The trouble has been, they assert, a negligently scale of appropriations and the lack of Federal leadership for a program of life-and-death importance. Some complain because the Federal Government has failed to come through with a huge program of shelter building.

But while it may be argued that a CD program could and should be made far more effective, there would not appear to be much question about the ineffectiveness of the present one. It is still limping along on a golden shoestring, is still entangled in doctrinal dispute about whether the best defense against nuclear attack is to run or dig in, is still operated on a sort of poor relation basis to the overall defense program, is still without the sort of administration or congressional support that might give it some importance, is still viewed largely with

an indifference by the public that reflects general skepticism of its usefulness.

The administration and Congress have been going through the motions of supporting CD all these years. Perhaps it is thought better for morale to spend a few hundred million on a perfunctory program than to admit to a fatalistic attitude about what would happen if the bombs ever did begin to fall. But Senator Young, in putting into blunt words his ideas of the CD operation, has challenged his colleagues to weigh realistically its value.

Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives—Report by Committee of the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 24, 1959, the American Bar Association, at its midwinter meeting in Chicago, adopted the report of its special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. This report has received nationwide attention because of its momentous impact in the field of American law, dealing with recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the field of internal security and communism. It is a courageous and forthright document, from a highly responsible source, which deserves the serious consideration of all Americans who are concerned with the preservation of the American way of life.

Mr. President, I ask that a number of newspaper editorials concerning this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 23, 1959]

SUPREME COURT UNDER FIRE

The American Bar Association's Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives, after publishing last August a preliminary report, has now come forth with a report—as yet unreleased to the press—which will specifically cite and criticize 23 Supreme Court decisions which coddle Communists and communism. The report, which is being presented today to the ABA's entire House of Delegates at their meeting in Chicago, will be voted upon by the entire organization.

A quick look at the results of some recent Supreme Court decisions should prove the necessity of the ABA taking strong action. The court has refused to uphold or pass on the constitutionality of the Subversive Activities Control Act, thereby delaying the effectiveness of the act. The Court has held that teaching and advocating the forcible overthrow of our Government, even with evil intent is not punishable under the Smith Act. In freeing five Communist Party leaders and ordering new trials for nine others, the Court said it must be proved that there is some effort to instigate action to that end.

The Supreme Court freed Steve Nelson, Pennsylvania Communist Party leader, and

in effect voided the antisection laws of 42 States, Alaska and Hawaii. The Court construed the Summary Suspension Act of 1950, as it applied to Federal employees, to apply only to employees in sensitive positions, although such was obviously not the intent of Congress. Reversing two Federal courts, the Court, despite incriminating evidence, set aside the discharge of John Stewart Service by the State Department, thereby undermining the McCarran amendment which gave the Secretary of State discretion to discharge any employee in the interests of the United States.

The Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and held it is unconstitutional to automatically discharge a teacher, in accordance with New York law, because he took the fifth amendment when questioned about Communist activities. Even though the Court later admitted that it erred in stating that the teacher was not aware that his claim of the fifth amendment would result in discharge, it denied a rehearing.

Here in New England, the Court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court and held that the attorney general of this State was without authority to question a lecturer at a State university, financed by taxpayers, concerning a lecture at the university and other suspected subversive activities.

The notorious Jenks and Watkins decisions need no elaboration, but only serve to prove the point that the Supreme Court is displaying an obvious bias in favor of Communists and suspected subversives.

Now that Chief Justice Warren has "disowned" the American Bar Association, perhaps the latter will summon up all its courage and endorse the recommendations of the 10 lawyers who comprise its Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 25, 1959]

LAWYER'S ATTACK ON SUPREME COURT—BAR GROUP'S DISAPPROVAL OF DECISIONS SEEN IMPLYING MISUSE OF POWER

(By David Lawrence)

Seldom in American history has there been such a scathing criticism of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States as has just come from the American Bar Association.

This has nothing to do with the decisions of the Court on segregation or integration. Nor do the members of the bar—who by overwhelming vote approved at the Chicago convention this week a committee report on the subject of Supreme Court decisions—come from any one section of the country.

The action taken is a formal disapproval of several decisions of the Supreme Court, not only in matters of law but in the misuse of the judicial power itself. The report, comprising about 20,000 words, does not criticize the Supreme Court as an institution nor recommend any limitation of its powers, but does say Congress should at once, in the proper way, endeavor to correct the ill effects of the decisions. The report declares:

"Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States through invalidation of State sedition statutes, and limitation of State and Federal investigating powers in the field of subversion, although these cases might readily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting National and State security efforts."

"The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objectives."

"This trend was treated fully in the Conference of State Chief Justices last year

when they called upon the United States Supreme Court to exercise the power of judicial self-restraint. The dissenting opinions of certain Supreme Court justices have been crystal clear in charting the effect of the failure of the majority to recognize the underground forces that are at work and to appreciate how these decisions affect our internal security."

The bar association's report says it is the duty of members of the bar "to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks" and that proposals to limit the Court's jurisdiction should not be approved. But at the same time the committee report, as adopted by the convention, says that, where remedial legislation can be enacted by Congress to deal with Communists and other subversives, this should be given prompt attention. The report cites a long list of Supreme Court decisions in the internal-security field and points out exactly how they can be overcome by action of Congress.

Also, a chapter is devoted to "current fallacies about communism." The report says: "It is just as false to measure the strength of communism in the United States by comparing the small number of party members with the large number of non-Communists, as it would be to measure the seaworthiness of a ship by comparing the area of its holes with the area of its hull. A few strategically placed holes can sink the largest ship."

Adding that the "danger and the menace of communism are worse than ever," the report calls on the members of the bar to alert the Nation on the menace of international communism.

As one reads the report, there comes a feeling that its writers tried to be as tactful as possible in their references to the present membership of the Supreme Court but nevertheless reveal again and again their dismay at the abuse of power by the highest Court.

"Our internal security," says the report, "has been weakened by a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the public and technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind have had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and free the subversive to go forth and further undermine our Nation."

The indifference of the public may be due to the job performed by some of the opponents of the late Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin. Unfortunately, the period in which he struggled to direct attention to the Communist menace now is brushed off as merely one of hysteria, and there is no effort nowadays to separate what was valid in the crusade from that which was due to overzealousness and emotionalism.

Since the famous battle took place in the Senate in 1954, moreover, it has been an open secret in Washington that the Democratic Party leaders in both Houses have been under pressure from its so-called liberal elements to soft-pedal the inquiries into communism. Though two committees still do some work in this field, they are restrained by word from higher up in the party whenever they really want to expose some palpable manifestation of Communist effort inside the United States. Some prominent American citizens, for example, who have been openly siding with the Soviets against their own Government in certain controversies have never been called as witnesses by the committees of either the House or the Senate to explain their activities or their connections with the Communist propaganda machine. Maybe the American Bar Association report will awaken American public opinion and help to overcome the timidity of the Democratic Party leadership on these subjects.

[From the Newark Evening News, Feb. 24, 1959]

BAR AND SUBVERSION

The board of governors of the American Bar Association has approved a report of a special committee on Communist tactics, strategy and objectives which recommends congressional reversal of Supreme Court decisions in a series of subversion cases.

The report affirms the duty of the bar to defend the judiciary from unfair and unjust attack, an apparent reference to last year's resolution of the Conference of Chief Justices and to intemperate speeches in Congress. Analysis by members of the faculty of the University of Chicago Law School has shown that the charges of legislative encroachment made by the State Chief Justices had little basis. New Jersey's Chief Justice Weintraub said as much at the time.

However, the bar association committee does insist that many cases, decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activities, could have been disposed of without so broadly limiting national and State security efforts.

Congress last year wisely rejected proposals for limiting the Court's appellate jurisdiction and nullifying some of its decisions. These were dangerous measures of unpredictable effect. They could have denied law-abiding citizens the judicial protection they need against tyranny and persecution.

The bar association report makes an obvious distinction between the Court's interpretation of constitutional principles and decisions in which it interprets the intent of Congress or defines the scope of statutes.

In the Steve Nelson case, which the bar association would reverse, the Court declared that Congress "intended to occupy the field of sedition," to the exclusion of the States. In the passport cases the Court held that the statutes do not authorize the State Department to withhold passports because the applicant was a Communist or refused to answer questions about party memberships. This is the judicial function.

Where the Court's declaration of congressional intent is quite different from what Congress did in fact intend, Congress has a right to change the law to make its purposes clear. Where the Court finds that a statute does not grant authority Congress intended to grant, Congress has a right to supply the lack. This is the legislative function.

In contrast with the blunderbuss that was the 1958 Jenner-Butler bill and the sweeping generalizations of the chief justices, the bar association recommends specific case by case revision which would not impair the indispensable doctrine of judicial review.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 26, 1959]

THE BAR AND THE HIGH COURT

The American Bar Association's House of Delegates, meeting in Chicago, adopted the other day a series of recommendations that, though for the most part politely put, amount to a critical rejection of some United States Supreme Court decisions affecting communism and our internal security.

It is necessary, perhaps, to understand the role of the House of Delegates if one is to measure fairly the meaning of its criticism. The House is the policy-making body of the A.B.A., composed of some ninety thousand members. The delegates themselves number 246 lawyers from every State of the union. They cannot, and do not claim to, reflect the views of every individual member. But there is not much question that the House of Delegates not only sets policy for all the rest, but that it actually does reflect the views of the great majority of members of the bar.

Now, what did the House of Delegates have to say about Court decisions and communism? In its recommendations, designed to nullify the effect of recent rulings, are found such descriptions of decisions as "unsound and incorrect"; as "interpretations" tending to "impede the work of Congress" the result of which is that "internal security is weakened."

Yet the bar did not simply criticize; it recognized that, in some areas, the Supreme Court was faced with imprecise language, sometimes in the law, sometimes in congressional resolutions, sometimes in judicial decisions. So its recommendations were not for limiting the Supreme Court's jurisdiction, as some lawyers and Congressmen have suggested, but for other legislative remedies.

By and large, the recommendations will, we think, meet with approval from both Congress and the public which is also mystified at times by Supreme Court decisions (professional baseball is a sport and not a business; but professional football is a business and not a sport).

Certainly there is little logic in the decision which denied States the rights to enact sedition laws because the Federal Government had preempted the field; States can become as much a target of seditionists as Washington can.

Nor is there much logic in the ruling of the Supreme Court that held, in effect, that it was legal to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government and only illegal to actually try to do it. That is the same as saying the Government could protect itself only when the shooting started.

There are other recommendations, too, that would close some loopholes in internal security. One, for example, would require all Federal employees to answer questions concerning communism before duly constituted congressional committees or authorized officers of the executive or judicial branches or lose their jobs. It makes sense to us to suggest that Uncle Sam should have a right to know whether his employees are loyal and to get rid of those whose loyalty is doubtful.

Congress doubtless will give these bar association recommendations serious study, and it would be well if it acted upon them where necessary to close judicial loopholes in our internal security laws.

It would be well also if the Justices of the United States Supreme Court would read the recommendations and the report on which they were based. This is not the first time the Court has been criticized; a short time back the justices of the State supreme courts pleaded with the Supreme Court for more judicial self-restraint in matters affecting State sovereignty.

It is possible, of course, that the American Bar Association and the State supreme court justices are themselves in error in their criticism of some Supreme Court decisions.

But that is not very likely. And it is even less likely when it is remembered that sometimes minority members of the Court are as critical of the majority decisions as anyone else.

[From the New York Mirror, Feb. 26, 1959]

AIMS OF THE ENEMY

The report of the special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives of the American Bar Association, headed by Peter Campbell Brown, formerly corporation counsel of this city, is one of the ablest prepared documents that has appeared in a long time.

It is a comprehensive study not only of the infiltration of Communists into American life but it is an itemized brief of the

protection that Communists receive under our laws and their ability to use our laws and our institutions to damage this country.

There are recommendations to the American Bar Association which will undoubtedly influence the opinion of lawyers throughout the United States, particularly those which are critical of the Supreme Court's recent Communist decisions and call upon Congress to pass legislation to correct them.

However, what will have a still greater influence than the resolutions in the 57-page brief which goes to the heart of the subject, which piles fact upon fact, and which makes out so thorough a case against the Communist use of our laws and institutions that even the leftwingers in the American Bar Association found themselves silenced before the shining array of indisputable data.

This brief states:

"The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objects * * *."

The majority in the Supreme Court choose to ignore the world in which they as well as we live. It prefers judicial dogmatism to a realistic appraisal of the danger in which this country finds itself. National security has been weakened by Supreme Court decisions in such cases as *Pennsylvania v. Steve Nelson*, *Communist Party U.S.A. v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, *Watkins v. U.S.*, *Cole v. Young*, *Jencks v. U.S.*, and about a dozen more cases, most of them between 1956 and 1958; that is, since Earl Warren became Chief Justice of the United States.

The difficulty is that the U.S. Supreme Court—that is, the majority—ignores the fact that this Nation is at war—a cold war at present—with Soviet Russia and that that country maintains a fifth column and an espionage organization in this country which must be rooted out.

The report calls attention to facts which the Supreme Court has ignored:

"The Communist master plan for world conquest has been outlined by both Lenin and Stalin as entailing the violent smashing and overthrow of all non-Soviet governments, including those of Great Britain and the United States. Prior to this overthrow and to prepare for it in each instance, the Communist Party is to make 'transmission belts' of all possible nonparty agencies for the diffusion of the Communist line, weakening the country to be overthrown. Already this has become a historical fact to which once free peoples, now enslaved, can testify. Need we have more evidence of Soviet intent?"

Laws have been passed by Congress to provide the means to lessen the effectiveness of Communist fifth column activity in the United States. The Supreme Court has nullified many of the steps taken against the Communists undoubtedly on the supposition that the Communist Party is something like the Populists or Father Divine's heaven or maybe a high school debating society. The honorable and learned justices fail to recognize the nature of the treacherous utilization of our laws and institutions to do us damage.

They now have a brief which can guide them in the right direction. It ought also guide Congress toward legislation which will correct the nonjudicial dogmatism of the scholarly justices.

Criticism of the Supreme Court by the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of February 23, 1959, entitled "What Is a Technicality?" The editorial deals with the recent criticism of the Supreme Court by the American Bar Association.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS A TECHNICALITY?

The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is in danger of attack again by an organization as powerful and as responsible as could be invoked—the American Bar Association. A committee report favorably—if somewhat belatedly—presented by the association's board of governors and due to come before the house of delegates at this week's meeting in Chicago carries weight because the bar association has not lent itself to indiscriminate attacks on the Court. Indeed, the board of governors last May denounced the Jenner-Butler Court reform bill as a threat to the independence of the judiciary. This was one reason why that bill was tabled in the Senate last August by a vote of 41 to 40.

The report now submitted pays tribute to the Supreme Court and an independent judiciary as the ultimate guardians of the Bill of Rights and the protectors of our freedom. It goes on, however, to charge that "many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activities in the United States."

It adds the disquieting indictment that "our internal security has been weakened by technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind have had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and freeing the subversive to go forth and further undermine our nation." The principal citation here is usually that of Steve Nelson, convicted of seditious activities under a law of the State of Pennsylvania and given a new trial on the theory that sedition had already been taken care of by Federal legislation.

The bar association report suggests a number of issues that have worried persons who see Communists under every bush. The report suggests that States should enforce their own laws against sedition, which would take care of the Nelson case; that the Secretary of State be given broader power to deny passports to persons he considers subversive; that Federal employees in non-sensitive agencies be put through the same doctrinal wringer as those in the sensitive agencies; that the Smith Act be broadened to remove the distinction between theoretical advocacy of sedition and actual incitement to action; and that the charter of the Committee on Un-American Activities be more precisely worded—obviously a response to the Supreme Court's requirement that a witness needn't answer questions unless they are pertinent to the purpose of the inquiry.

These suggestions are not necessarily criticisms of the Court. In some cases, indeed, the Court itself has expressed a desire for more precise expressions of the lawmakers' intentions.

We do believe, however, that an assembly of distinguished lawyers should think twice before condemning technicalities as of small importance. Lawyers use in their own pleadings all the technicalities they can. Why not? One man's technicality may be another man's property, liberty or life.

We live in a time of great stress, of great dangers, of a great necessity for discipline. Nevertheless, the basic rights of our society are not those of governments, or of any agents of government, but of the individual. And the ultimate act of treason is to despise those rights and undermine them, just as the ultimate loyalty is to protect them and carry forward the great traditions of democracy.

Time To Review Civil Defense Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Still No Place To Hide," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL NO PLACE TO HIDE

Most Americans seem either blissfully or fatalistically unconcerned with civil defense. The minority of persons who think that civil defense is important are disturbed by the inadequacies of the present program. Probably few would go so far as Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG when he said that civil defense is a "shameful waste of public money." But surely it is time to review civil defense planning once again now that missiles have reduced warning periods to no more than 15 minutes and Americans still have no place to hide.

One thing is clear, and that is the folly of evacuation plans. As the civil defense advisory board in Montgomery County has stated, "mass evacuation following an air raid warning would probably result in increased rather than decreased deaths." The still undistributed civil defense guidebook to evacuation routes for the Washington area which Senator Young criticized as a waste of money certainly will be of little use if indeed it is ever distributed.

The present alternative to evacuation is the construction of private as well as public shelters. The advisory board in Montgomery County estimates that a home shelter can be built for about \$100. Shelters are commonplace in England, and in Norway and Sweden many underground garages have been constructed in such a way as to serve a dual purpose. But nowhere in the United States are public or private shelters being built.

What civil defense organization there is in the United States has been helpful in the aftermath of such disasters as the recent

tornado in St. Louis and the floods in Indiana and Ohio, Mr. Young's own State. But the general indifference to civil defense is as great as the lack of shelters. This indifference is due in part to the failure of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization to settle on a workable plan. Even now, when evacuation seems patently unrealistic, it remains as part of the civil defense program. But leaving aside the question of bureaucratic bungling, the great majority of Americans still do not believe that a nuclear war is likely. As long as this attitude persists no civil defense organization is going to be able to do much more than shuffle papers.

Statement of Hon. Steven V. Carter,
of Iowa

SPEECH
OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. CARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I speak without a script and from a full heart.

First, I should like to tell you that I am tremendously grateful, and it is a wonderful feeling to be back among the land of the living. Just a moment ago I sat here thinking that the last time I sat in this Chamber I sat with the specter of death with me, certain that I had only a short time to live. Since that time the marvelous and tremendous efforts of medical science have treated a cancer that returned. I have been in the hospital since January 30. That treatment has been effective, and my doctors tell me now that I have a normal life expectancy. I am grateful to them and to a gracious God for this chance to live, for this opportunity to serve.

I should like to tell you a little bit about this treatment. The first treatment I took was nitromustard gas in liquid form. They put it into your veins. That was a little rough. But what I do want to mention to you, and what I think the American people should know about the treatment of cancer, is this:

This morning I took, and each morning for the next two weeks I will take, radiation treatments from a 2-million-volt machine. I have no feeling; it does not hurt. There is no reaction at all in my system. They are completing the cure of a cancer that has grown on my spine and caused the terrible pain that I suffered the last time I sat here. I wish the American people who suffer from cancer and who are fearful of the treatment could know this, so that they will not fear this kind of treatment. It is tremendous what medical science has done.

There is much that I would like to do. My life will be dedicated to service. I do not know what your response would be to this experience. Cancer, you know, always happens to the other fellow. When it does happen there are many

things that go through your mind. Your perspective changes and your sense of values is greatly affected. I now have a deeper sense of what is valuable and if anything I am more greatly dedicated to service.

The day I got out of the hospital, Mr. Speaker, I was confronted with a tabloid statement concerning the fact that I had hired my son as administrative assistant, as they call it. Actually, of course, we have no administrative assistants in the House. He was my top secretary.

When I first came here the pain had become so great in my left arm that I was quite certain that I had only a short time to live, because the last time I had this cancer they told me I could expect to live 3 weeks if they did not cure it. So you see I was privately certain that I would not live very long.

While I was undergoing treatment for cancer I wanted someone who was close to me, to be with me, and to help me serve—someone I could depend upon—someone who knew me—who knew how I thought. I hired my son on a basis that was temporary. I gave him a salary of \$11,000, which is about the average salary paid to the top secretary. It was a temporary thing. Now the truth of the matter is that as of today his basic salary will be cut in two, because, now that the pain is gone, I can work. I can sleep at night. I can build up my strength and I will be able to be in the office regularly and to serve. The truth of the matter is that it was only a temporary arrangement in the first place. The truth of the matter is that he worked many, many hours a week above and beyond the call of the office, to be with me, to tell me the things that happened and to take the answers and to work with me in giving the kind of service and building up the kind of service that a congressional staff must build if they are to represent their district. And know this—I am proud of the staff that serves the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa. They were superlative. They have kept current with every demand for service from the Fourth District during this period of time when I was being treated. My son's present salary will be less per hour than he earned on a road gang last summer.

There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention here, I would feel and I do deeply regret it, if this that I have done be a mistake, and I seek forgiveness from the American taxpayers and, particularly, from the people I serve in the Fourth District if it is a mistake and if what I have done has cast any reflection on any other Congressman who serves here diligently, please forgive me and know that in my heart I am dedicated to your service. I would not hurt any one of you for anything. Know, too, that if it has cast any reflection on the bill that has been under discussion and has been recently submitted out of the House Administration Committee, that if there has been any reflection on that bill to retain an administrative assistant for the Members of Congress that it is not fair because there are many districts in this Nation where the taxpayers will be greatly

benefited if their Congressman is allowed an administrative assistant. This must be considered.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I would like to mention here. Every reporter who has talked with me concerning this period of nationwide publicity has become a warm personal friend. They have been very kind. They have been very honest. But, during the period of time I have studied this thing before coming to you to talk to you about it, there have been some matters that I have learned about that makes me wonder why their editors have not let the people know about. For example. On the very day that the fact that the young Congressman from Iowa had hired his son appeared in the headlines, one of the truly great public servants of this Nation and one of the best informed men in the country, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, introduced from this floor a statement with conclusive evidence that the Federal Reserve System has bilked the American people out of \$10½ billion and given it to their relatives. And you know—and this is a query I would place to the fourth estate—I searched every newspaper that I could find and I did not find it in the headlines. I did not even find it on page 15. I could not even find it mentioned. Why?

This query I place because I have a feeling that for some reason, that is beyond me and beyond my experience, they have been straining at a gnat when a camel was passing by.

Mr. Speaker, the Members have been very attentive. I express gratitude from a full heart. I want to mention also that the leadership, through this whole ordeal, has been very kind and very gentle. I am especially grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, to the majority leader Mr. McCORMACK, and to Mr. ALBERT. You have been strong men and great men. It is a great honor to serve with you. Thanks a million.

An Inspiration From a Californian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the problem of helping the physically handicapped find employment and take part in activities which will restore their morale and their psychological health has been receiving increased attention in recent years—as, indeed, it should.

Our Nation has learned that many persons who have been doomed to go through life with different forms of handicaps are able, with encouragement and with the requisite determination, to make for themselves a rewarding and useful place in society. The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped has been energetic in

seeking to assist such courageous individuals.

An inspiring example of what can be achieved by a person who has suffered a physical disability is given in an article published in the monthly magazine, *Performance*, issued by the President's Committee. It relates the achievements of a young woman in California who won both high collegiate honors and a responsible position, despite three handicaps which easily might have discouraged a less aggressive person. Because I believe this account will be challenging and reassuring to others, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REHAB STUDENT WINS TOP COLLEGE HONORS

A vocational rehabilitation student with three handicaps won top honors at Ventura College, Ventura, Calif., last year and became a college employee immediately after the honors were conferred.

The student, Merry Hart, has a spinal injury which prevents her from accepting jobs which require all-day standing. She has an inoperable visual defect which at times leaves her unable to read her assignments.

Yet at the recent college awards assembly she won top scholastic honors—the Rotary medal for straight-A scholarship. She also won permanent membership in Alpha Gamma Sigma, national scholastic honor society, and received the Altrusa and Elks Club scholarship awards. In addition, she received top publication honors: a gold key with a pearl inset, awarded for 2 years' service on college publications. (Currently she is on the editorial boards of all Ventura College publications; is editor of the annual; and serves as news bureau manager for the college.)

The highest honor which can be conferred upon a Ventura College student also went to Mrs. Hart: the Circle K award for outstanding service to the college. She is the second woman student ever to have been named for the honor.

A fifth-semester student at the college next year, Merry will be employed by the county library 26 hours a week and by the college library 5 hours a week while completing her requirements for the associate arts degree. The mother of a 4-year-old daughter known to VC students as "Little Loveliness," Merry has served for three semesters as president of Alpha Omega, campus creative writers' and artists' club, for one semester as its corresponding secretary; for one semester as vice president of Alpha Gamma Sigma; for two semesters as intracollege council representative, and has maintained membership in Digamma Tau Alpha, educators' club.

While at the college, Merry has achieved publication in three college-level anthologies, and hundreds of her poems have appeared in a Chicago newspaper.

When Merry looks at the six medals she has won while attending Ventura College, she remembers the dark day before Rehab gave her a second chance. Utterly defeated because unemployable, she stood on the ocean pier, looking at the cold waters of the Pacific, and thinking how easy it would be to end her troubles by suicide. A friend who stood there with her said, "You can't do it, Merry. A winner never quits—and a quitter never wins."

Those words saw her through the rehabilitation period, and in a few months she will be entirely self-supporting, with a secure future. To add to the joys of that future is her present project: the completion

of a children's picture book. After this she plans to write a 300-page book on "psychopathic personality."

Mrs. Hart served for 3 consecutive years as NEPH chairman in Bradley County, Tenn., and holds the national commander's citation for meritorious service from the Disabled American Veterans.

She recently received the first Altrusa International Founders' Fund Grant at a meeting of the Altrusa Club of Ventura. The award consists of a \$225 grant for a camera and other equipment which Mrs. Hart will use in her work as a freelance photographer. The founders' fund provides training or equipment for women seeking employment.

Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on February 23, a moving tribute to a great soldier-statesman, Gen. George Catlett Marshall, was paid by William S. White, one of America's outstanding journalists. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. White's column, as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of that date, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL: PATRIOT, GENTLEMAN—AILING GENERAL MAINTAINED DIGNITY IN FACE OF ACCUSATIONS AND CRITICISM

(By William S. White)

General of the Army George C. Marshall is sick with a great sickness, and with his life a gallant and lost era is coming to its close. This was the era of World War II, in which General Marshall, without ever having a field command at all, served so nobly and so well.

He was the Secretary of State who gave his name to the Marshall plan for the post-war recovery of Europe. He served also as Secretary of Defense. But before this he had been Chief of Staff of the United States Army. And though this post in Washington's hierarchy was far below the others he held, it was this post which most of all he honored in his private thoughts.

This was the man—this rather thin and gray and coldly kind military man—who more than any other on this side of the oceans brought an end to Hitler and to Tojo and to all the evil power that they represented.

It was this man also, with Will Clayton of Texas and others now lost from public sight who made the plan by which a Europe then spent and broken has now come upon a new life of strength and hope.

And it was this man who went to China and made proposals for ending in that ancient land a civil war that has had no end and perhaps will never have any end.

General Marshall went there as a representative of the President of the United States and as a good soldier going into a place he did not know. His purpose was to put a stop by agreement to civil strife between the Nationalists and Communists in China. His fear was that this strife and resulting chaos, if long continued, would eventually benefit only the Russians, as land-hungry neighbors of China.

They said later—the bitter politicians of the Republican right wing said it—that Marshall had gone to promote communism and to push into an abyss the last hope and the last power of our last ally in the far Pacific, Nationalist China.

They called Marshall many terrible things: I remember that the then Senator William Jenner of Indiana called him, "a front man for traitors * * * a living lie."

This was perhaps the most brutal thing ever said in our long history of passionate partisanship about a man who is as great a patriot and as great a gentleman as we have ever known.

Marshall had given up, to a man named Dwight D. Eisenhower, the glory of the top command in Europe when we were all fighting Hitler. Marshall, with a quiet and heartbreaking loyalty to the great common cause, had stayed in Washington to be simply Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. Through these great years he had stuck here at his post, a great soldier quietly doing the best he could while other and lesser men put their names and their marks upon battle history.

He stayed here and he stayed with his duty. And the men who were full of rancor had their way with him in Congress. They taunted him, they screamed at him, they did everything of hate that could be done against any man anywhere, anytime.

Not in all our history has one man done, in a military way, so much for all of us. And surely never in all our history has one man been so ill-rewarded for all that he had done.

Now, in the Army hospital at Fort Bragg, N.C., General of the Army George Catlett Marshall is fighting, with gentility and uncomplaining courage, against the final antagonist of all who live.

There are no Valhallas in our life any more. But if a single Valhalla—a single gallery of great fighting men—should survive somewhere, one could hear from this gallery a great shout: "Marshall, well done."

Rabbi Morris Silverman, of Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on February 19, the session of the Senate was opened with prayer by Rabbi Morris Silverman, of Hartford, Conn. Yesterday the Hartford Courant published an editorial entitled "A New Honor for Rabbi Silverman." The editorial is a splendid tribute to an outstanding gentleman. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW HONOR FOR RABBI SILVERMAN

The award of a George Washington Honor Medal to Emanuel Synagogue will bring gratification to persons of all faiths and races in the community. For Rabbi Morris Silverman has been tireless in his efforts for interdenominational and interracial amity. He richly deserves this honor, in addition to the ones he has already received. The Emanuel Synagogue is being

given recognition by the Freedoms Foundation for sponsoring a Boy Scout troop including more gentle than Jewish members. The best traditions of Americanism are being fostered by such programs, recognizing as they do that unity in spite of diversity in racial and religious origin is the foundation stone of national strength.

This was recognized by Rabbi Silverman, who has said his idea was "to work toward the attainment of equality for all as is defined and guaranteed in the first words of the Bible and the Constitution of the United States." This is not the first time he has been honored by the foundation. In 1952 he received a third place Freedoms award of \$100 for an address he gave at a dinner at which he received a citizenship award. And a year later he received two plaques, one from the Connecticut Civil Rights Commission and one from the Hartford branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. These recognized his work toward equal opportunity for men of all faiths and races.

In addition to his spiritual duties as leader of a flourishing congregation, Rabbi Silverman has assumed national leadership in the field of civil rights. He is national spokesman for the civil rights commissions of the 13 States that have such organizations. Two years ago he was head of a delegation of 12 States' civil rights commissions that went to Washington to ask support of Federal agencies in withholding support from employers who do not follow State laws against discrimination. This was in support of his belief that human relations are the Nation's most important field of human endeavor, a belief to which he has given 36 years of devoted service.

As an original member of the Civil Rights Commission, he spoke with authority last year when he said, "America is being judged by our treatment of minority groups. The outlook is good; we have seen more done in the past 15 or 20 years than was done in the previous 100 years."

These sentiments, when put into action and backed by deep religious faith, have made Rabbi Silverman one of the distinguished citizens of this community. A spokesman for justice and progress, he is to be congratulated on the honor given to him and to Emanuel Synagogue.

The same article lists nine new national parks which the Nation now needs to acquire, in order to provide our rapidly expanding population with recreation areas and to preserve outstanding and interesting areas in their natural state.

One of the nine areas listed is Padre Island, Tex., a 117-mile-long barrier island in the Gulf of Mexico, stretching roughly from Corpus Christi to Brownsville.

Of the 3,700 miles which make up the Atlantic and gulf coasts, only 240 are in parks for public use. Some 640 more worth saving are still available.

I have introduced Senate bill 4, which provides for establishment of a national park on Padre Island. We must do this now, because a commercial development has already started on part of the island. Other parts are up for sale.

The magazine article tells how completion of the boundaries of the Gettysburg battlefield, in order to protect it for a park, would cost \$2 million. To do this to all battlefields now either wholly or in part in park status would cost \$10 million; and for the entire national park system, the cost would be \$30 million.

Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, is quoted in the article as saying:

Twenty years ago we could have purchased all the land we now need for \$5 million. But in those days no money was earmarked for land purchase. Now we receive \$1½ million a year from Congress. At this rate, with land prices soaring, it could take another 50 or 60 years and more than \$100 million to complete the boundaries.

Padre Island today is facing the same situation. If we do not act now, more of the land will be under private development, and prices will rise.

The benefits of this virgin stretch of windswept sand, with beaches on both sides of the island, and with an historic past stretching back to some of the earliest explorers of the New World, must be protected for the enjoyment of the public now and in the future.

The natural life, both on the island and in the waters around it, is abundant. There are skeletons of oldtime ships, wrecked on the shores, and as covered with legend as they are with moss and barnacles. There are tales of pirate treasure, small settlements, soldiers from a variety of battles, and vacqueros and cowhands.

Another thing to consider about this coastal location is the type of recreation offered: swimming, fishing, hiking, beachcombing and similar beach pastimes, and boating. In 1904, 15,000 boats were being used for recreation in the United States. By 1947, the number had grown to 2,440,000. The total last year was 7,330,000. This year it will probably top 8 million. In the United States 21 million fishermen spend nearly \$100 apiece each year. Their numbers are rising all the time.

If Padre Island were made a park, the benefits to the people of the immediate area are obvious. Yet it should also be clear that this would help the Nation, by providing more jobs and more income.

Also, Padre Island has the potential to become a summer and winter playground, providing recreation for millions, just as Yellowstone, Yosemite, Big Bend, and other national parks already are doing.

This proposal to establish a national park on Padre Island has the backing already of several civic and conservation groups. Its value to the national economy and welfare is clearly evident.

Mr. President, in further support of my statement, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, by John W. DeVine, which appeared in the Nueces County News for Friday, January 30, 1959, under the heading: "Padre Island May Become a National Park in Future."

I also request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Texas Ornithological Society on February 10, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nueces County News, Jan. 30, 1959]

PADRE ISLAND MAY BECOME A NATIONAL PARK IN FUTURE

U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has introduced a bill—S. 4—which would keep a portion of Padre Island for public use—in simpler words, a national park. In presenting the bill, YARBOROUGH pointed out: "This beautiful half-mile wide natural beach, with its mild climate and bountiful wildlife, is one of Texas' greatest recreation resources."

Then he pointed out that "properly developed, there is no question that as a national park, Padre Island would become the winter park of America, just as Yellowstone, Yosemite, Glacier National Park, and the Smoky Mountains are summer playgrounds."

"Looked at from the standpoint of historical interest," he continued, "Padre Island is one of the closest links Texas and the United States have with the past, for it was there that one of the earliest explorers set foot on New World soil. The explorer, Alonso Alvarez de Pineda, a Spaniard, in 1519 sailed the gulf coastal waters from Florida to the Mexican port of Tampico, and mapped the coast for future navigators."

YARBOROUGH has asked State legislators of Texas, and other State officials to enact necessary supporting State legislation on this subject, and is urging all Texans to back the creation of Padre Island National Park.

Naturally such a move is going to draw some opposition. Private developers will oppose it; real estate dealers who are interested in selling Padre Island, and owners of land will be opposed to it; but to the average Texan it presents an opportunity to preserve for his own use a long stretch of island where he can go, camp out, fish, hunt, and generally enjoy himself.

Of course, Padre Island is a mammoth island—the coastline on the Gulf, extending from Port Aransas to Brownsville, 131 miles, is the longest island and the longest beach in the United States (probably in all the world, too).

There is plenty of room for establishment of a Government national park without taking away any of the valuable land now under development, and no doubt; it is this land Senator YARBOROUGH has in mind.

This is only one of hundreds of things, Senator YARBOROUGH has initiated since he became a Member of the U.S. Senate a few short years ago. It wouldn't hurt to take time out and drop him a few lines in appreciation.

From Gettysburg to Padre Island the Nation Needs Parks To Preserve Our Past, Present, and Future History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a recent article in a national magazine described how the Gettysburg, Pa., battlefield is gradually being taken over by private interests. A residential subdivision is being built on the field across which Pickett led his famous charge. A motel stands where Union defenses threw back the charge. On the spot where the two armies first clashed there is a free museum and souvenir stand. On another part of the land for which Union and Confederate troops struggled for 7 hours on the 3d day of the battle, rusting autos now are sprawled.

Every man, from the smallest to the largest, likes to know he is appreciated and his work is appreciated.

If you favor the establishment of a national park on Padre Island to preserve a large portion of it for future generations in its natural state (except for Government improvements that will not ruin it as a vacation resort), drop your State representatives and senators a line and tell them you will appreciate their supporting enabling legislation.

Don't worry, they will hear plenty from those who oppose it. And while you are at it, drop Senator RALPH a line, too. It will encourage him to keep up the good work.

RESOLUTION TO MAKE PADRE ISLAND A NATIONAL PARK

Whereas Padre Island contains a wealth of vegetation and wildlife in substantially the same condition as when this sunny region was first discovered by de Pineda in 1519 and boasts a superb sand beach 30 miles in length along a gulf coast shoreline admirably suited for safe swimming and wading; and

Whereas commercial development has gained two footholds on Padre Island and threatens rapidly to ruin its natural beauty; and

Where Padre Island is unique in scenery, climate, ecology and geology and fulfills in every way the standards for a national park; and

Whereas the establishment of Padre Island as a national park would permanently preserve natural treasures of Padre Island for the benefit of the public; Therefore it is

Resolved, That the undersigned organization hereby urges the adoption of the bill (S. 4) to provide for the establishment of Padre Island as a national park.

Passed this 10th day of February 1959.

A. EARL JOURDE,

President, Texas Ornithological Society.

A Writer and Patriot Warns Against Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 24, the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier published an article by Col. Paul Rockwell, a veteran of World War I service with the French Foreign Legion and of World War II service in the U.S. Army. A writer and member of many patriotic societies, Colonel Rockwell warns of the Communist threat. I ask unanimous consent that his article, entitled "A Writer and Patriot Warns Against Reds," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENEMY INSIDE U.S.A.—A WRITER AND PATRIOT WARNS AGAINST REDS

(By Paul Rockwell)

When the United States began drafting men for World War II the leaders of the Communist Party in America instructed its American party members to accept the draft without opposition. Members drafted were advised to be good soldiers, to try for promotion, to obey orders, and above all they were

told to await patiently the day when they could serve the Communist Party.

Almost immediately after the end of hostilities against Japan in 1945 the Communists in the U.S. Armed Forces received word to "serve their part." Soviet Russia wanted the U.S. Army demobilized and out of Europe especially, as quickly as possible. Near mutinies—"we want to go home" demonstrations—broke out simultaneously all around the world wherever there were American troops.

I saw the near-mutiny in Paris. It was disgusting and horrifying.

The "boys" were sent home in a hurry. Our once strong Army was reduced in number and in power. Soviet Russia remained mobilized and on a war footing. Poland, Hungary, Rumania, country after country, was taken over by the Communists under the protecting shadow of the Red armies.

The United States had demobilized. We were in no position to oppose the Soviets. Having taken over central Europe and menaced France and Italy by strengthening the Communist Parties there, Soviet Russia extended its views to Asia and Africa.

To weaken America and keep Americans preoccupied with internal troubles, the integration issue, America's weakest and most vulnerable point, was fostered and kept in active agitation by Communist agents, working through the NAACP, the fellow-travelers, uplifters, do-gooders, "liberals," and other crackpots.

The work of "finishing schools" such as the Highlander Folk School, at Monteagle, Tenn., was stepped up.

No opportunity was lost to magnify every racial incident. Cases of discrimination against Negroes were invented or blown up far beyond their real importance. The kissing case in North Carolina is an example. Virtual censorship of the press came about over most of the Nation.

If the Soviets can divide and weaken the United States, arouse the North against the South, incite the Negroes against the whites, create strife and dissension and trouble throughout the United States, we cannot oppose Russia in her drive for world domination. Already we are more concerned with the situation at home than with the crises in Berlin, Iran, Egypt, the Middle East, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and elsewhere in Asia and Africa, where Soviet agents and sympathizers are working tirelessly day and night, stirring up one race against the other, one people against their neighbors or former colonial administrators.

It is my sincere belief that any person or group of persons who are agitating any issue that divides Americans, are guilty of giving aid and comfort to the most deadly enemy the United States ever has faced—Soviet Russia.

Appointments to U.S. Service Academies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release I issued today, dealing with competitive examinations for appointments to U.S. service Academies.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY ANNOUNCES EXAMINATIONS FOR APPOINTMENTS TO U.S. SERVICE ACADEMIES

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Chippewa Falls, today announced that competitive examinations, scheduled for July 1959, would be given by the Civil Service Commission for appointment to the U.S. service Academies.

The available appointments include: 1 appointment to the U.S. Military Academy, 2 appointments to the U.S. Naval Academy, 1 appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy, and nomination of 10 young men to compete for 7 openings allocated to Wisconsin for the Merchant Marine Academy.

"The examination is open to any high school senior or graduate over the age of 17 but not yet 22, who has never been married and can meet the academic and physical standards," the senior Senator said.

"To be eligible to take the examination, all applicants must file with my office (1) a letter of intention, accompanied by certificate of residence in the State of Wisconsin; and (2) two letters of recommendation from applicant's principal, pastor, physician, or anyone who has personal knowledge of his character.

"This information must be received in my office, room 427, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., by June 15, 1959, which is the deadline for filing," WILEY pointed out.

"Unfortunately, anyone not filing letters of recommendation and certificate of residence with his application cannot be considered for the examination.

"The examination will be held in July (exact date to be announced later) for appointment in July 1960. The highest ranking candidate will receive principal appointment; second highest, first alternate; third highest, second alternate, etc."

To provide maximum opportunity for obtaining information, Senator WILEY is furnishing all public and private high schools in the State with brochures of each of the Academies.

"Appointment to a U.S. service Academy provides qualified young men with a fine opportunity to serve their country as well as to improve their education," WILEY concluded.

Lack of Market Interest in Government Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Highroad to Inflation," published in the New York Times of February 10, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHROAD TO INFLATION

The Government security market—which speaks with authority because it speaks with the public's money—repeated for the benefit of Congress at the close of last week what the President, his Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board have been constantly emphasizing in their recent public statements. The market spoke by action rather

than in words, but the message was no less clear on that account.

With \$14.9 billion in maturities to meet, \$9.2 billion of which was in the hands of the public, the Treasury offered the holders a choice of two new issues—a 1-year certificate bearing an interest rate of 3½ percent and a 3-year note carrying 4 percent. When the public won't scramble for U.S. Treasury issues on terms as attractive as this it bespeaks serious concern for the state of the Nation's financial position. Yet the fact is that holders of the old securities in the amount of \$2.1 billion turned down the exchange offer, demanding payment in cash.

But these figures tell only part of the story. Underscoring the market's lack of interest in governments other than those in the very short-term category is the fact that of \$7.2 billion in maturing securities that were turned in by the public (as distinguished from the holdings of the Federal Reserve System) holders of only \$1.4 billion, or less than 20 percent, took the 4 percent 3-year notes in exchange. The other 80 percent, plus, demanded the 1-year certificates with their yield of 3½ percent. That is an increase of 1½ percent over the interest rate of 2½ percent at which the maturing issue of \$9.8 billion in 1-year certificates was sold a year ago.

This means not only that the debt structure has suffered by the replacement of some three-quarters of the outstanding \$5.1 billion in notes with short-term obligations, but that the Treasury is forced to go into the market this week with an issue of even shorter maturity in order to raise the \$2.1 billion in cash to meet the demands of those who found the exchange offer unacceptable.

The Treasury has been able to market but one long-term issue during the past year, that in the amount of \$900 million. It is being forced steadily into the position of having to rely increasingly on the sale of securities for which commercial banks constitute the principal market. And this, as Chairman Martin of the Reserve Board declared last week, is "the highroad to monetary inflation."

The Garrison Diversion Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District supporting the budget estimate for the Garrison diversion unit for fiscal year 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, GARRISON DIVERSION CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, JANUARY 28, 1959, SUPPORTING BUDGET ESTIMATE FOR GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1959

Whereas the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, when developed will (1) enhance the future economic welfare and prosperity of the people of North Dakota, particularly those within the project area; (2) provide for the eventual irrigation of over 1 million acres of land periodically

subjected to insufficient rainfall and drought, thereby stabilizing agriculture in a large section of the State; (3) replenish and restore the depleted waters of several lakes, rivers, and streams and increase the levels and flows therein; and (4) make available within the affected areas water diverted from the Missouri River for irrigation, domestic, municipal, and industrial needs, for production of hydropower, and for recreation, fish and wildlife, and other public uses; and

Whereas investigations, engineering, and planning work under direction of the Bureau of Reclamation needs to be carried on during fiscal year 1960 in order to develop a definite plan report on the initial construction work on the pumping plant, supply canal, and layout on the first lands to be placed under irrigation; and

Whereas the President's budget for next fiscal year contains an item of \$550,000 for carrying forward such work during 1960: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District, meeting in regular meeting this 28th day of January 1959, in the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., That it wholeheartedly supports said budget estimate and urges Congress to appropriate said amount for continuing the work on said project for fiscal year 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be signed by the chairman and attested by the secretary and be mailed to the Honorable Clarence Cannon, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; Hon. Carl Hayden, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Senators William Langer and Milton R. Young; Representatives Quentin N. Burdick and Don L. Short; and to W. A. Dextheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

ROY A. HOLAND,
Chairman.

VERNON S. COOPER,
Secretary.

Attest:

The Eagle of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Nevada is justly proud of the 1959 State winner of the Voice of Democracy contest. She is Miss Sue Minehan, the daughter of H. A. Minehan, of Las Vegas, Nev. Because of the fine appreciation of America's high ideals and rich national traditions expressed in her essay it gives me great pleasure to request unanimous consent of the Senate that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE EAGLE OF DEMOCRACY (By Sue Minehan)

A bird's-eye view of America shows a country rich in a history of courageous forefathers, who tamed our young and wild land, and shaped and molded a government from their essential desires; life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A closer look reveals visions of patriotic heroes; common people, fighting for their belief in this Government, and struggling in the times of crisis to strengthen this valuable possession.

Glancing through the centuries clocked in our Nation an evident spirit of unity persists to prevail. And even now in my present environment, my community, State, and my Nation, the same ideals which governed our zealous ancestors are still apparent, only rooted deeper with the passing of time.

What is this mark of uniqueness embedded in our American heritage which accounts for the mutual stability of the United States?

Look. High in the sky. Sweeping over the land since 1776 has been and is the eagle of democracy in all his symbolization for which our country has lived and died.

He nests atop the towering tree of our Government as near to God as he can get to assure himself that the principles which he represents and goals which he has set are in accordance with the Almighty's wishes. This bird of freedom, depicting the essence of democracy itself, stands firm on the branches of our Constitution and the curved talons upon his sturdy feet are set solidly in the context of this charter of our liberty.

The striking plumage of this eagle is stained with the blood of our forefathers who fought to protect him and nurtured the once young eagle into the great and magnificent monarch of the skies which he is today.

The beak with its golden hues resounds with the voice of democracy and proclaims justice and fairness for everyone, regardless of race, color, or creed. Freedom of speech, religion, and press, are "natural instincts" to the American eagle.

Our eagle is not a bird in a gilded cage, hampered by the immovable bars of dictators, but rather is allowed to roam freely, spreading his wings over the land, bestowing equality evenly upon everyone. This king of birds may be challenged while in flight by tyrannically feathered foes, but will always ultimately emerge as the symbol of righteousness.

The eagle of democracy may someday migrate to other less fortunate climates to exert his influence over these lands, offering the ideal of freedom and a voice in the government. But first those distant skies must be cleared of the dark clouds of communism, and the thunderous storms of oppression and war, and instead be lighted with the stars of tranquility to guide our eagle to new nests. For this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people—man must only accept it.

The eagle will always stand steadfastly as a true mark of our free Nation. But the fate of democracy is in our hands. Only man, in his misconception of values can set out and track down this precious prey, killing him and taking the very breath of life from within his frame. Man must willingly discard all these dangerous weapons such as skeptical doubt and complacent disinterest, and seriously strive to preserve and perpetuate democracy, the eagle may continue to shed all his benefits upon our Nation and fly high in our free skies as the symbol of democracy.

Needed: Can-Do Christians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an address made by my dear friend,

schoolmate, and lifelong companion, Capt. Charles T. Mauro, U.S. Navy, at the 49th annual Washington's Birthday celebration, Knights of Columbus, P. N. Lynch assembly, in Charleston, S.C., on February 22, 1959.

Captain Mauro was the recent commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Canberra*, the second guided missile cruiser of the world. His brilliant naval career and world travels have permitted him to circle the globe by water and to cross both the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans many times by air. He served with the American Embassy, Rome, Italy, in the Office of the Naval Attaché. He has commanded a destroyer, a division of four destroyers, the destroyer tender *Sierra*, and the guided missile heavy cruiser *Canberra*. He was commanding officer of the last-named ship when she was the flagship of the President of the United States during Mr. Eisenhower's 6-day cruise from Norfolk to Bermuda for a meeting with Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of England. The *Canberra* also served as a flagship for the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, during the international Navy review at Hampton Roads.

Captain Mauro is now Assistant Director, Fleet Development and Maintenance Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, in Washington.

The address follows:

NEEDED: CAN-DO CHRISTIANS

(By Capt. C. T. Mauro, U.S. Navy)

It is great to be home. It is a particular pleasure to be with dear friends; those with whom your early training and formative years were spent. It was in the Knights of Columbus Hall (top floor) that the first Bishop England basketball team, in about 1921, practiced and played many games. Our coach was Doc O'Brien—the late Monsignor J. L. O'Brien—God bless his soul. He was responsible for the early character forming of many of us. Some of the most pleasant days of our lives were spent under his guidance.

Then, too, it was in those days, some 35 years ago, that the first football team of the Knights of Columbus was formed. All practices were held at night with the football painted white. We practiced on the King Street side of the citadel green to take advantage of the street lighting. We had fairly successful seasons under the coaching of Dick Kerr. One Saturday afternoon we got mighty cocky after defeating the Navy Yard Marines by an overwhelming score. The starch was soon taken out of our hides though by the shellacking the Parris Island Marines gave us.

I am sure many of you are wondering what prompted the subject of my talk this evening. Well, it was chosen since it brings to mind two thoughts which I hold close to my heart.

First, you dear friends gave me the inspiration to go to the Naval Academy and become an officer in the United States Navy; and

Second, my beautiful ship, the guided-missile cruiser, *Canberra*. Many of you were aboard her, I am sure, when the *Canberra* visited Charleston in September 1956.

It was a tremendous thrill for me to bring that beautiful, most powerful, modern ship of the Navy into the port of my hometown. But it was even more of a thrill to have papa and mama on the dock waiting for my arrival. I am sure most of you also know of my great fortune of having mama present here with me tonight. Getting back to the reasons for my subject this evening, my ship being named *Canberra* after the capital of

Australia—the country well known for kangaroos—brought the rhyme "can-do" kangaroo to my mind.

We used this catch phrase to symbolize our ship. The crew quickly caught on to this catch phrase. Can-do became the spirit of our ship—you name it and we could do it. The difficult we did today—the impossible took a little longer. As a result, all *Canberra* assignments were tackled with the positive can-do spirit and the ship became known as the "Can-do Kangaroo." During the first year of her life the *Canberra* was officially graded as the best of all the cruisers in the Atlantic Ocean. This was an honor seldom won by a ship so shortly after birth.

This can-do spirit is essential in all phases of life. We should accentuate the positive. Teach youngsters what to do, don't just keep saying what not to do. Remember, the polliwog learned naughty words by being taught not to say them. Of course, positive teaching takes considerable time and patience, but the dividends are more than considerable. For instance, what do we find the athlete who is training for a game doing? He goes into very rigid and long hours of training to develop those muscles which he needs to win. Similarly our game of life requires a moral muscle to be trained and strengthened for that game.

We must learn to take the initiative and do what is right. Because to know what is wrong and what we are against is not always enough.

We must learn what is right and then continually train doing those things to develop our spiritual and moral character. Being prepared and taking positive action is essential in the game of life. For example, as the Christopher movement emphasizes, lighting a candle in the dark is much better than cursing the darkness.

As you yourself know, any time you do something for the first time you have the fear of the unknown. This fear of the unknown is a type of frustration.

Children need to be frustrated. They are going to be frustrated lots of times in life, so it is good to get practice in the family when they are just children. If we are not accustomed to being frustrated, then it becomes difficult to endure that experience, and as a result we panic. There has been a lot of nonsense about the fact that kids shouldn't be frustrated.

Of course, I am not a child psychologist, but my life has been one of dealing with young men. The average age of my crew in the *Canberra*, consisting of 1,500 officers and men, was a little under 21 years.

Therefore, I think this frustration can become ridiculous. Later in life they darn well are going to have some major frustrations. Therefore, as kids they ought to start getting a little experience with minor frustrations. To solve large problems you must learn to solve small ones. You learn to resist big temptations by first learning to resist little temptations.

It appears to be perfectly normal in this day and age to have a youth get into life without a proper moral foundation.

A youth without a moral foundation is like a ship without a rudder. That youth is at the mercy of the current since he cannot steer his own course. A ship at sea without a rudder would be at the mercy of the current, wind, and waves. No one could keep it off the shoals. Not only would the ship wreck itself but probably wreck other ships also.

Likewise, the youth without a moral foundation is not only a danger to himself, he is also a menace to others.

Let us give our children an inheritance of (1) self-discipline, (2) spiritual-material prospective, (3) positive can-do Christians.

We speak of the word discipline. Many of us fear it because we don't stop to think exactly what it means. Discipline is an

austere sounding word that means nothing more than setting out an orderly path or series of paths upon which life can be approached and followed. These paths should have both the material and the spiritual prospective. One without the other is just as bad as neither or too much of both.

The spiritual and material need to be kept in proportion like the sides of a square or heads and tails on the same coin. When the equipment of the home becomes more essential than the care of the child, it is no wonder that the child brought up in that atmosphere gives preference to material things rather than to spiritual things. This spiritual-material balance, which is so essential, cannot be achieved if our moral muscle, which should be developed in our early life, is not daily exercised in our homes.

Let's be can-do Christians. This will reduce the spiritual unemployment typical of our times. To do this we must work daily at balancing the spiritual and the material phases of our lives. For instance, because a church is visited once a week that child will not get the necessary spiritual upbringing if the home does not have more of a spiritual than a material environment to offer.

We look at the Catholic Churches on Sunday and see them overcrowded. Immediately the thought comes to our mind about Catholics being much more religious than Protestants. There is a serious fallacy in this kind of thinking because if you were more honest with yourself you would compare the number of Protestants that go to church on Sunday with those Catholics who go to church on weekdays. Protestants have no obligation on Sunday as Catholics do.

Parents that do not develop the moral muscle in their children are the ones who suffer most after their children reach maturity. To be a physical man and not be a man emotionally and spiritually is like being a man but wearing rompers. When I was in command of the *Canberra* a conscientious mother wrote me a very thoughtful letter indicating that her boy was different. She said he was artistic, temperamental, high strung, and not accustomed to any type of discipline. She indicated I should be very careful in the manner which I treated her son if I wanted him to do his part as a member of the crew.

I replied politely, but told her the facts of life about Navy discipline. I also told her that if her boy had been treated with as much firmness as consideration he would have been a more courteous, dependable, and appreciative son. I told her that I would bear in mind all the things she told me, but I would still treat her son like all the other young men in the ship. I added he was now physically a man and had to learn to be a man among men.

A few months later, after a cruise to the Caribbean, this young man returned home on leave. After he was home for a while, I received a most inspiring and encouraging letter from his mother. She said that she didn't know what I did to her son, but she was most grateful for the tremendous change. She further stated that her son was now just what she always wanted him to be.

The moral of this is you can't stop kids from growing up physically. Therefore, you better be sure they grow up spiritually and emotionally at the same rate of speed. Incidentally, each night aboard my \$150 million guided-missile cruiser, just as my crew turned in their bunks for the evening, two short sentences relating to God were spoken into the ship's loudspeaker system.

God's the supreme authority, with the father the authority of the home. Whether intentionally or accidentally, there is endless propaganda attacking authority which passes as American comedy. On TV the stories pertaining to the family usually end up by having the father look like a dope. If the play

deals with the military, the officer is always stupid.

This constant ridicule of authority and discipline is harmful to our youth. The fact that it may be humorous doesn't change its propagandic impact on young minds.

Young minds need to learn what you as a Catholic and as an American already know: that with every "right" goes a responsibility.

The right of freedom goes further than being able to do what you would like to do when you want to do it and in any manner you desire. Freedom takes on a responsibility that requires you to think in terms of what is best for all rather than just what is best for you.

Selfish freedom ceases to be freedom. For instance, (a) you have the right of free speech but you have the moral responsibility to know what you are talking about, (b) you have the right to vote but you have a responsibility to be an informed citizen, (c) the newspapers have the right of a free press but they also have the moral responsibility not to violate good taste and morality, (d) you have the right to a lot of services from your Government provided you accept your moral responsibility as taxpayers to pay for them.

As citizens and Catholics you need both material and spiritual goals. You are not likely to reach your destination if you don't know where you are going.

First, we must try to find out what our target is and then never permit ourselves to stray from the paths which lead to that goal. When the bull's-eye is missed it seldom is the fault of the target. Many road blocks will be found in our paths. The path that we choose will not always be easy. We all know that freedom is bought and maintained at a terribly high price. The ideals we feel are worthwhile will always cost us considerable energy, thought and sometimes suffering.

Each of these difficulties, though, must be overcome if you hope to obtain your goal. Then, too, we must remember that tolerance is not always a virtue. Of some things we can be tolerant, others we cannot and should not tolerate.

Truth can never be tolerant toward falsehoods.

Morality cannot be tolerant toward immorality.

Christianity cannot be tolerated toward paganism.

It is not sufficient to be against things. We must emphasize the positive, and be for things.

Most of us say we are against communism. Unfortunately, our thinking is vague. It would be just as good to say you are against sin. Being against sin isn't enough. You have to be in favor of virtue. Similarly, being against communism isn't enough. What are you in favor of? Communism is a label like a brand name on ketchup. What is in the bottle? Would you still be against it if it had a different label? The content of communism is atheistic materialism. It says there is no God and all that matters is the material things of life. Now a lot of people who think they are violently anti-Communist are not so far from communism as they think because more and more we put the emphasis on material things and less and less do we put the emphasis on the spiritual aspects of life.

Our biggest unemployment is spiritually unemployed Christians. Unemployed moral indignation. We need to get mad. Fight for what we believe in.

A Christian who won't fight for what he believes in is spiritually unemployed. Communists are militant, dedicated atheists. They won't be stopped by halfhearted Christians filled with nebulous good intentions.

Blueprints don't stop bullets. Abstract Christians won't stop atheism. Don't just be against communism. Be for a wholesome Christian living. Be positive. Fight for

what you believe in. The chief end of man is to glorify God. To serve Him at all costs. The supreme obligation is to be true to Christ, true to truth, to justice, to righteousness even if one perishes. Since when has the Christian concluded that the end of life is the end of all things? No, for the Christian the cross is not the end. There is always Easter.

In closing, permit me to make three observations. One referring to each of the following: the Knights of Columbus, Washington's Birthday, and our Navy.

First, the Knights of Columbus, like the knights of old, stand for patriotism and service to God, to country, and to the church.

Second, Washington, in his message to the First Congress, said "to be prepared for war is a most effectual means of preserving the peace."

Third, it is the prime purpose of your Navy to insure for ourselves and for our allies the uninterrupted use of the seas. To do this your Navy must remain an integrated combat unit—a fast-moving, hard-hitting, self-contained surface and undersea force, which carries its fire power, its aircraft, its missiles and its landing forces wherever it goes.

Being a Navy man I firmly believe in loyalty to God and country and in preparedness. Preparedness, as I see it, includes both the physical preparedness of our Armed Forces and the spiritual preparedness of our Nation. God grant us both.

Deductions for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Representative HULL, of Missouri, has introduced H.R. 1264, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow income tax deduction for payments to assist in providing higher education. The measure would allow a deduction for expenses incurred in the education of dependents, or for sums given to colleges and universities for use in providing scholarships.

The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and I introduced a similar bill in the Senate, S. 929.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in support of Representative HULL's efforts, from the St. Joseph, Mo., Union-Observer of January 16, 1959, entitled "Now They Have Hope," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) Union-Observer, Jan. 16, 1959]

NOW THEY HAVE HOPE

Congressman WILLIAM R. HULL, Jr., has earned the gratitude of tens of thousands of American youngsters who until now had considered their chances of going to college as something less than nil.

At the opening session of the 86th Congress, the courageous, farsighted Missourian introduced a bill which would open new avenues to higher education for children of families in the lower income brackets.

In brief, the bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow tax deductions made by householders to maintain a child

in college. Another provision would permit deductions of contributions for scholarships.

What Mr. HULL proposes in introducing his measure is that America must keep abreast of changing world conditions. Russia no longer lags behind us in matters of education. In the Soviet Union promising young men and women from all strata of society are earning scientific degrees with the state picking up the tab.

What Soviet science has accomplished and is still accomplishing is faithfully chronicled in the free press of this country.

Almost coincident with Mr. HULL's action was an announcement by the AFL-CIO of its plan for awarding six \$6,000 scholarships to high school seniors of exceptional ability who want to enter college in September.

The awards will be made on a competitive basis in cooperation with the National Merit Scholarship Foundation, an independent, nonprofit organization.

Gifted youngsters should not be denied the advantages of a higher education simply because they or their parents lack money for that purpose. In this age of electronic marvels, missiles, and the conquest of space, brains are where you find them.

Congressman HULL's measure and the AFL-CIO's scholarship program clearly indicate that this Nation has not kept faith with its youngsters in the matter of higher education. What will be the fate of Mr. HULL's bill is anybody's guess. It will be placed in the hands of fallible men who could if they so desire place political expediency above higher concepts.

Organized labor in St. Joseph is proud of Mr. HULL for his statesmanlike approach to a matter of vital concern and his refusal to indulge in the wishful thinking that we can revert to a peacetime economy and way of life in a world where there is no peace.

Our labor movement is proud, too, that it supported Mr. HULL in his three successful races, but prouder still of the fact that it has never asked of him anything but what was in the public welfare.

For BILL HULL is the Representative of all the people of his district and the forthright champion of young people everywhere.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the GTA Daily Radio Roundup of February 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, FEBRUARY 20, 1959

How much will the Eisenhower administration's new cuts in grain price supports cost farmers?

Farmers are worried. So is Main Street. Co-op people are concerned because serving farm families and marketing their grain cooperatively is our business.

When the price cuts were announced to the newspapers Wednesday it hit with jarring impact. Secretary Benson said he had deliberately raised a secrecy curtain in the Department of Agriculture so no word would leak out and upset markets—while grain prices were being made lower in Washington.

But when the news hit the markets went down, as everyone knew they would. The

Wall Street Journal reported it with this headline: "Grain Futures Plunge Under Impact of Slash in Supports." The 1-day drop ranged from 1 to 4 cents. So even last year's crops are being penalized.

One of the big national news services says that cash market prices are expected to adjust downward to match the new lower supports. That's the way it always goes. But how much will it cost farmers? Nationally, this news service figures the support cuts will take about half a billion dollars away from farmers on this year's crops.

That agrees with the figures we had reached here—half a billion dollars less for farmers. But let's bring that closer to home and see what the Benson price support cuts will take away from farmers here in our upper Midwest.

Incidentally, we figured this by multiplying the price cuts on the various grains by last year's production. It will vary some, depending upon production this year. But the figures will be pretty close.

For Minnesota, the 1959 farm income loss can be expected to be about \$44 million; North Dakota, a loss of \$36 million; South Dakota, \$22 million; and Montana, 9 million. The total for the 4-State GTA marketing area, \$113 million. That's what our farmers stand to lose this year because of the price support cuts just made by Benson.

Now, losses that might occur on wheat and corn are not included in these figures because at this time they cannot be closely estimated. But several million dollars more could be added to these losses on wheat and corn. The corn support last year on compliance crops was \$1.36 a bushel, and \$1.06 on noncompliance corn. This year it is \$1.12 a bushel across the board. The wheat price support is down 1 cent a bushel—\$1.81 for 1959—compared with \$1.82 for 1958. These are national average figures and will vary State by State and county by county.

Time will tell what effect the new price support cuts will have on farm families and consequently, on Main Streets in farm towns. But farm experts agree it will not be good.

Perhaps this will jar Congress into prompt action because that is where farmers and rural townspeople must look for help.

The Radio That Speaks for the Silent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Enno Hobbing appearing in the Reader's Digest, condensed from the New Leader:

THE RADIO THAT SPEAKS FOR THE SILENT

"Radio Liberation," the Moscow Izvestia wrote on April 17, 1955, "is an organ for spreading dirty falsifications and black slanders fabricated by American intelligence."

The unflattering description was greeted with joy by the Soviet émigrés and Americans working for the broadcasting organization; it meant that they had arrived. For over 2 years Soviet authorities had avoided mention of this anti-Communist operation; an attack by name in one of their two most important newspapers was an admission that the station was becoming too widely known inside the U.S.S.R. to be ignored. Since then,

Kremlin abuse of Radio Liberation has grown steadily in volume and violence.

Radio Liberation broadcasts to the Soviet Union—and to its military forces stationed in Eastern Europe—around the clock in Russian and 17 other languages, from Ukrainian and Georgian to Ossetic and Kumyk. The voices in these many tongues belong to some 150 refugees from the U.S.S.R., who are now headquartered in Munich. Their scripts are fed on telephone circuits to a battery of transmitters in Lamberthelm, Germany, and tape recordings are flown to transmitters in Formosa. Thus beamed at Russia from both sides, the programs nearly blanket the country's major population centers.

Funds and professional counsel for this cold war operation are provided by the American Committee for Liberation,¹ a private organization of journalists, businessmen, educators, and political leaders who decided to do for Soviet Russia what Radio Free Europe was already doing for the Red satellites. Soviet citizens can, of course, listen to foreign stations like the Voice of America and the BBC, but these are government enterprises with the limitations this implies. Radio Liberation, being under no such constraints, can address Soviet listeners in terms of their own interests and yearnings. Its principal broadcasters are products of the Soviet epoch who became enemies of the regime through personal suffering. They can, and do, talk as "we Russians," "we Ukrainians," "we Moslems."

There is, for example, 42-year-old Leonid Pilajev, Radio Liberation's humorist, who pokes fun at the dictatorship and its bureaucrats. He grew up as an ardent Communist and became a functionary of the Central Committee of the Komsomol (Communist Youth). But the horrors of the Stalin purges of the late 1930's wrecked his faith in communism, and he ended up in the notorious Vorkuta slave-labor camps in Siberia. Released to serve in the Red army in World War II, he was captured by the Germans and at war's end chose to remain in the West.

Broadcasts into Soviet Byelorussia are supervised by Vladimir Dudzicki, who spent 3 years at hard labor for anti-Communist activity. The war enabled him to escape to the West.

The organization's Turkestani desk is run by Veli Zunnun, a lineal descendant of the ancient Asian conqueror Tamerlane and the first translator of Tom Sawyer into the Uzbek language. Captured by the Germans, he, too, refused to return home after the war, and he now talks regularly to his Soviet fellow Moslems.

To maintain close contact with current Soviet life, Radio Liberation screens scores of Soviet newspapers, magazines, and books, and monitors 83 Soviet radio stations. In addition, researchers do a massive job of interviewing Soviet tourists abroad, Westerners returning from Soviet Russia, new defectors, and others likely to have fresh information.

"Radio Liberation will not encourage any acts of premature violent resistance to the Soviet regime which could result only in fruitless sacrifice," the organization's statement of policy declares. It simply tries to provide its Soviet audience with mental and spiritual ammunition for their struggle toward freedom.

After Milovan Djilas, the former Yugoslav Communist leader, published his scathing analysis of communism, "The New Class," Radio Liberation broadcast the forbidden book at dictation speed, so that listeners

could make their own copies. There is evidence that this is precisely what some listeners did. During the period of the so-called thaw, in 1956-57, many Soviet writers produced essays, stories, poems which, in guarded language, were critical of the regime. Most of these works, however, had limited circulation. By continually broadcasting the most telling passages, Radio Liberation has made them available to larger Soviet audiences.

The Munich group has repeatedly been able to report antiregime episodes inside the U.S.S.R. that have been hidden from Soviet citizens by the Kremlin. For instance, in 1954 when inmates of the huge Kengir concentration camps rose against their guards and were crushed by T-34 tanks, the people of Russia first learned of it through Radio Liberation. And each year Liberation broadcasters commemorate the 1953 Vorkuta uprisings, to keep the memory of that dramatic slave revolt alive.

A substantial portion of time is devoted to airing cultural works blacked out by the Kremlin. Radio Liberation has broadcast extracts from certain nonfiction writings by Tolstoy, the music of Russian-born Igor Stravinsky, short stories of the satirist Mikhail Zoshchenko, and other works frowned on by the Soviet regime, such as the great new Russian novel, "Dr. Zhivago," by Boris Pasternak. But, above all, the broadcasters concentrate on bringing to the peoples of the U.S.S.R. news and world opinions that are withheld or distorted by their rulers.

Continually, Radio Liberation reminds its audience of the great traditions of intellectual freedom and political resistance in Russia before the Communists seized power. On appropriate anniversaries it reviews past events that have been blotted out by Soviet thought control. Early this year, for instance, an impressive array of political leaders from the United States, France, Denmark, Peru, and India addressed the U.S.S.R. on the 40th anniversary of the Constituent Assembly of 1918, a freely elected body which Lenin suppressed by force. Aware of the terrible isolation of the Soviet peoples, the Munich broadcasters make every effort to apprise them that free men outside distinguish sharply between the regime and the people.

The broadcasts also give Soviet Russians access to their own profound religious traditions. Last Easter the Orthodox service held in St. Alexander Nevsky Cathedral in Paris was put on the air. On the Jewish New Year a former Soviet army officer, who is now a rabbi in Brooklyn, broadcast over Radio Liberation a greeting to the 3 million Soviet Jews. Similarly, Moslem holidays are marked by special programs in the languages of Soviet Central Asia and the Caucasus.

Soviet jamming of Radio Liberation began within 10 minutes after it first went on the air, and has been intensified ever since. Engineers estimate that the Soviets are spending at least ten times as much to jam the broadcasts as the American committee spends to get them through.

In its determination to silence Radio Liberation, Moscow has gone to brutal lengths. Leonid Karas, a writer on the program's Byelorussian desk, was found drowned near Munich in September 1954. Two months later the head of the Azerbaijan desk, Abo Fatalibey, was murdered under mysterious circumstances. All evidence pointed to the guilt of known Soviet agents who fled behind the Iron Curtain after the murders.

These attempts at intimidation indicate that the impact of Radio Liberation is substantial. But the most encouraging evidence is the growing response to programs from inside the U.S.S.R.

At intervals, broadcasts mention an innocuous-sounding name and address in the free world to which Soviet citizens may

¹ First president was Eugene Lyons, a former Moscow correspondent, now a senior editor of the Reader's Digest.

² See "The Book That Is Shaking the Communist World," the Reader's Digest, October 1957.

write as if addressing a relative or wartime acquaintance abroad. The resulting letters—all anonymous, naturally—have meaning beyond their words. Some ask for the small comfort of a reply: "If you receive this, please sing 'We Met by Chance.'" A few harder souls transmit information they think may be useful to Radio Liberation. A Ukrainian wrote: "The Bolsheviks are as scared of your words as the devil is scared of incense. Many people listen to you, but they are afraid to write letters."

"Radio Liberation naturally cannot know how large its audience is," says Howland H. Sargeant, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and current head of the American Committee. "But every now and then a message comes from the target areas that makes staff members proud of their work." He cited one recent letter which said:

"When I hear your voice, my eyes fill with tears of joy. I have a feeling that I, too, have friends."

Operation Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I received a letter which summarizes the writer's reaction to what he calls a 4-day exposure to Operation Understanding, which he shared with six other persons. He states:

First of all, I should like to say that I returned somewhat reassured, having found so much of a necessary air defense already operational.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FALK CORP.,

Milwaukee, Wis., February 24, 1959.

Col. MARTIN B. CHANDLER,
Commanding Officer,
61st Antiaircraft Artillery Group,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL CHANDLER: With the hope that they may be of interest, I will attempt to summarize my reactions to the 4-day exposure to Operation Understanding that I shared with six other Milwaukeeans last week.

First of all, I should say that I returned somewhat reassured, having found so much of a necessary air defense already operational. It was somewhat of a revelation to witness at the Red Canyon Range a Nike missile climb at blinding speed some 5 or more miles into the sky and shoot down an unseen small target plane, and this by an electronic brain guided by radar. It is gratifying to know that this was accomplished by the same crews which guard the year around this city's concentrated population and the great productive facilities contained therein, and so essential to bringing a possible armed conflict to a successful conclusion.

The manner in which these Nike squadrons are integrated into the total North American defense system through the early warning radar network that encircles our part of the world, and the overall controls exercised at the nerve center in Colorado Springs comes as an amazing discovery for a civilian not previously briefed therein. My

one regret is that such an insight is not possible for the large numbers of civic and industrial leaders who could use their influence to assure the disposition of adequate funds for these endeavors.

Secondly, this orientation brought the realization that our air defense can never be static, but must continuously evolve new developments out of the funded knowledge and equipment already acquired, alert to every advance in the weapons to come out of enemy technology and completely responsive, insofar as it is possible, to counter them. This suggests that a major portion of our resources will have to be made available to those responsible for this defense effort, and we must reconcile it as essential to the continuance of our free society in the face of an aggressive totalitarian threat.

Thirdly, I am left with the impression that this evolution of defense material is following an orderly pattern in which the economic factor and the time factor are receiving the attention they merit. The greatly improved Hercules, to replace the Ajax, employing the same launching equipment with a minimum of delay and cost, is an excellent example of the long-range planning I found evident.

Fourthly, our visit to Colorado Springs indicated that the three branches of the Armed Forces are interacting creatively in these matters of mutual concern. This, in view of disparaging reports to the contrary, dispels needless concerns that have arisen, and are still voiced in some quarters. There is adequate evidence that the competition between Army, Air Force, and Navy is productive of the same vitality in striving for excellence that has characterized other areas of enterprise.

Fifth, and finally, I must express what is perhaps most important in my reactions, namely, the convictions that this struggle for survival is in splendid hands. The impact upon us of the many officers we conversed with, or heard describe the complex operations they were identified with, was one that must leave a lasting impression. Their technical competence is of such a high order that one wonders how it is possible to hold them in the services, knowing the great disparity in the remuneration they receive and that which they could command in industry.

In closing, may I express my gratitude to you and to Major Murphy and all those who contributed so generously of their time in order to make this a meaningful experience.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

WALTER P. SCHMITTER.

The Danger of Overspending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Brave Appeal for Integrity," published in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, January 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Jan. 20, 1959]

THE BUDGET MESSAGE—A BRAVE APPEAL FOR INTEGRITY

As he promised he would, President Eisenhower has now joined battle, full strength,

against inflation and the big government spenders. His two messages to Congress this week represent the first big guns.

The President's economic message today appeals for "self-discipline and restraint" by labor leaders in wage demands, more economies in production rather than raised costs on the part of business, "careful shopping" on the part of consumers, and a balanced budget on the part of Congress.

And his budget message yesterday emphasized the fight that may be in prospect on the last of those appeals.

That fight is timely and vital. The Nation has bounced back from last year's recession to the highest gross national product in its history. The recovery has created new inflationary pressures that will explode into a new cycle of inflation this year unless strong, effective leadership at the national level prevents it.

The budget message reflects such leadership—if President Eisenhower doesn't pull his punches in fighting to push it through Congress. It will be tragic if this budget turns out to be little more than an opening gambit in a campaign to maneuver the Democrats into an unfavorable position for the 1960 elections.

If he does intend to fight for a truly balanced budget, he faces a long, bitter, extremely difficult road. His estimates of \$77.1 billion receipts in fiscal 1960 (compared to \$68 billion in 1959) is probably overoptimistic. And few qualified observers give him much chance of keeping spending to the \$77 billion proposed in 1960 (compared to \$80.8 billion in 1959).

He will get that much income only if he can persuade Congress to boost gasoline taxes a cent and a half a gallon and to boost the price of a first-class postage stamp to 5 cents. His chances are not good on either.

And he can keep spending down to that level only by persuading Congress to cut almost a billion dollars from farm subsidies, cut out all public housing, make no new starts on public works, and keep defense spending close to its present level.

Again, Congress is not likely to go along with any, much less all, of these proposals.

Still, a balanced budget is worth fighting for—as the shocking \$8 billion budgeted merely to pay interest on the Federal debt so painfully indicates.

President Eisenhower will submit a series of special messages justifying in more detail his position on most major issues covered in his budget and economic messages. They will be analyzed editorially as they appear.

But let us call attention right now to what seems to us the most significant part of the message. It is buried in the middle of the 78-page document and has received little public attention so far, but it could begin the turning of a corner away from big government.

For 10 years and more, thoughtful citizens have been urging that we get the Federal Government out of programs where State, local, or private organizations could do the job. The second Hoover Commission made some far-reaching recommendations along that line. President Eisenhower challenged the Nation's Governors to help. But big Government has, meanwhile, grown steadily bigger.

This week, the President proposed action of his own. Throughout his budget message, he demanded that local and State government stop depending on Federal handouts. And he got down to specifics. He recommended that Federal grants to States for vocational education and for construction of sewage treatment plants be discontinued as of July 1, 1960. And gradually but steadily, he proposed, Federal support should decrease and local support increase for slum clearance, urban renewal, and airport construction,

To help States take up the slack, he proposed that they receive a share of the Federal excise tax on local telephone service.

This is not much, but it is a start. If the administration fights these proposals through Congress successfully, they may well begin a gradual movement back toward the local and State responsibility upon which the Federal system was founded. One only wishes the President had not waited until the final 2 years of a "lameduck" term to undertake this highly significant fight.

The budget proposals will, of course, be sharply criticized, particularly in respect to the level of defense spending. Some of the criticism may be sound; perfection in the spending of \$430 for each man, woman, and child in America is hardly attainable. President Eisenhower will not come out of this battle without bruises.

But overspending is a much greater danger to America's basic strength than underspending, and we welcome the President's budget and economic messages as standards around which supporters of sound government can rally.

Nominees for Academy Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian, it is my pride and pleasure to say a few words about an outstanding industry in my State—the production of motion pictures.

This past Monday evening Hollywood announced the nominations for the most gifted accomplishments in films during the past year. Among these 1958 nominees for the famous Oscars—the annual awards of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences—are included the stars and writers, the directors, producers, technicians, and artists of motion-picture making.

On April 6 some 90 million persons will hear and see the election results of these nominations in a program sponsored by the film industry over a nationwide network of NBC television and radio.

To me, these awards are reminders of what Hollywood has meant to us as Californians and also to us as Americans.

Hollywood has always made a major economic contribution to my State. It spends hundreds of millions of dollars on filmmaking. It employs thousands of persons in some 275 crafts and trades. And the people of Hollywood, in their own right, make important contributions to the civic life of the community. They are generous in charity, unstinting in giving time and effort to entertain at benefits not only in California, but around the world.

The best of our films are reaching audiences in the Communist lands. Until recently, most of these audiences have seen no films of any sort from the Western world.

And they are reaching audiences in that part of the world which may be of greatest moment to us in the years ahead. This is the world of less developed but developing free nations of Asia

and Africa. The future course of this new free world will surely affect our future.

And what do our films show the Communist world and the non-Communist world about us?

It would be folly to think that they show America as all good—or even as all bad. What they do show, and vividly, are the infinite, varied aspects of a many-faceted nation. They show the face of freedom and individuality and enterprise, the fact of a nation which was built up by peoples of all nations and creeds and colors.

The film, as a human creation, has the capacity to reach men's hearts everywhere, to show the brotherhood of man, to illustrate the human flaws and human triumphs which can link men together in our rapidly condensing world.

It is here, I think, that the film industry makes its distinctive and lasting contribution.

It will be a fine show on April 6. I invite all of you to tune in on the ceremonies of awarding the Oscars.

Now, finally, let me list this year's nominees for the academy awards:

Best picture: "Gigi," "The Defiant Ones," "Auntie Mame," "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," and "Separate Tables."

Best actress: Susan Hayward, Deborah Kerr, Shirley MacLaine, Rosalind Russell, and Elizabeth Taylor.

Best actor: Tony Curtis, Paul Newman, David Niven, Sidney Poitier, and Spencer Tracy.

Best supporting actress: Peggy Cass, Wendy Hiller, Martha Hyer, Maureen Stapleton, and Cara Williams.

Best supporting actor: Theodore Bikel, Lee J. Cobb, Burl Ives, Arthur Kennedy, and Gig Young.

Best director: Richard Brooks, Stanley Kramer, Vincent Minelli, Robert Wise, and Mark Robson.

The Cheyenne River Sioux Rehabilitation Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, to those of us who live among the American Indians, there is nothing more heartening than to observe instances of real progress and a better economic life for these original Americans.

It was for this reason that I was so encouraged after reading the story of the efforts made on the Cheyenne River Agency in South Dakota to assist tribal members get a start toward economic self-reliance. Under the able direction of Superintendent Noralf Nesset, and the Cheyenne River Sioux Council a rehabilitation loan program has been initiated from funds which the tribe has received from the Government. These funds were paid to the tribe when water from the Oahe Dam flooded the reservation.

The news story from the Aberdeen, S. Dak., American-News, tells the story of this rehabilitation program. Some members have engaged in a cattle program, others have attended schools of higher education, still others are engaged in business enterprises. Under the education loan program, 38 young men and women have graduated from colleges or vocational schools and their average income is \$3,350 annually.

The Cheyenne River Agency and the Cheyenne Sioux Indians are to be congratulated most heartily for these efforts. They have proven that the Indian in America needs to be given only one thing—opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this story of initiative and success of one of South Dakota's Indian reservations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE INDIAN RANCHERS MAKE GOOD HEADWAY IN REHABILITATION SETUP

CHEYENNE AGENCY.—The Cheyenne Sioux Indian Reservation is not the most prosperous post in South Dakota. But Supt. Noralf Nesset, in his latest news bulletin notes that considerable progress is being made.

The Cheyenne Sioux Tribe, with money received as indemnity for Oahe Reservoir flooding, some time ago set up a rehabilitation program for its own members.

The tribe aimed to give its younger members a beyond-high-school education, train and relocate families who had no economic future on the reservation, set up other families in either ranching or business enterprises and to give assistance to the aged.

CATTLE PROGRAM

A dramatic phase of the rehabilitation program is the cattle repayment phase. Tribal members who qualified were set up with 100 heifers and a line of machinery.

The operator was to pay for the heifers by returning 11 calves for each 10 heifers received. This repayment was to be over a period of 10 years.

Most of the operators received their cattle in the spring of 1957 and had their first income from the increase recently.

There are now 139 families in the cattle program, Nesset reports. This season they sold approximately \$500,000 worth of calves or an average of more than \$3,500 per family. Approximately 20 operators have discontinued. The tribe foreclosed on some. Others quit voluntarily because of health or other reasons.

All of the 139 have an abundance of hay and several have enough forage to last for 2 years.

INDIAN LAND FIGURES

The rehabilitation program has been one factor making for greater Indian use of Indian land. In 1953 Indian operators used 564,477 acres of trust land. In 1958 the figure was increased to 970,585 acres.

Indian trust land used by non-Indians dropped by about the same figure. In 1953, non-Indians used 808,730 acres of trust land; in 1958 they used only 408,740 acres.

In the educational phase of the rehabilitation program, 169 members of the tribe have received grants to attend colleges or vocational schools. Thirty-eight have been graduated and are now earning an average of \$3,350 annually.

Four major loans have been approved for business enterprises. They include a combination garage-service station and lunch counter, dairy farm, recreation parlor and theater. Nesset says all four enterprises will undoubtedly be successful.

Ex-Coach Blaik Believes in Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this Lenten season when individuals are most prone to reassess their relationship with God, and when our thoughts turn particularly to solemn prayer, it seems most fitting to call attention to the professed belief in prayer of outstanding individuals.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article from the New Hampshire Sunday News, Manchester, N.H., on February 15, 1959, entitled "Ex-Coach Blaik Believes in Prayer."

I have known Earl Blaik as a close friend for many years, as a coach at Dartmouth College in my own State of New Hampshire, and as the most recent coach of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. His coaching career was a most notable record of achievement, not only in the won and lost columns, but greater still, in molding the careers of so many fine young men of this Nation. His lessons in integrity, fair play and sportsmanship, will be well-remembered throughout their lifetime by the youth he coached. To those who know Earl Blaik as I do, it comes as no surprise that he felt so strongly about the source of power derived from prayer. His words which follow should be read and reread by all Americans, not only in this Lenten season but throughout the year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EX-COACH BLAIK BELIEVES IN PRAYER—SOURCE OF POWER AND CONFIDENCE ON PLAYING FIELD

The Lenten season each year brings new meaning to Christians the world over. It is a time for the individual to assess anew his relationship with God. Prayer, as the direct link, plays a vital role in this relationship. This selection is from the book, "We Believe in Prayer," by Lawrence M. Brings, published by T. S. Denison & Co., of Minneapolis.

"(By Earl (Red) Blaik, former Army football coach)

"If you were to ask my mother the value of prayer she, in her 92 years of Christian living, would cite over a half century of devotion to a Presbyterian faith which she and my late father, an immigrant Scotsman, knew was the foundation of their years of happiness. To them daily prayer was as natural as the need of food. Spiritual impoverishment could be tolerated less than physical hunger.

"The dedication of a daily hour to contemplation and prayer may be partially lost in these days when the mind has little respite from the continuous reminders that our civilization courts chaos.

"DAYS OF DIFFICULTY

"It may seem strange, however, that in face of these major world problems stoically accepted, there comes to all men days of great individual difficulty as personal events of seemingly overwhelming pressure cannot be

answered without guidance, and such guidance is only found in prayer.

"Strength through prayer is the foundation of confidence when the pressure of great spectator sports all but overcomes the minds of players. It is far more common than not, to see college teams get an added source of power and confidence as they pause for a short prayer before play; a prayer such as Coach Ray Elliot's is the one used by the hundreds of youngsters who play on Pop Warner midget teams:

"As we gather here today
We take a moment, Lord to pray;
That you will guide us in our play
And show us how to go Thy way;
Make us honest, fair, and true
In this game and all we do."

"NOT RATIONED

"Prayer is not rationed as a commodity is in war or reserved for those bleak days of sickness and trouble. Prayer is the means of spiritual growth which compounded, will give the individual the mental strength to surmount daily problems and provide the needed peace of mind.

We meticulously prepare for changing conditions which are met on the football field of play. Confidence which destroys anxiety, is based on faith, and is a top requisite for the competing champion. All the training of his great physical attributes are of little value to the champion without a faith in himself gained only through prayer and contemplation.

"Prayer may be a personal matter, but for the ordinary soul daily meditation with the following prayer given by Chaplain Clayton Wheat to the corps of cadets when I was a cadet, will strengthen your belief in the power of prayer.

"CADET PRAYER

"O God, our Father, Thou searcher of men's hearts, help us draw near to Thee in sincerity and truth. May our religion be filled with gladness and may our worship of Thee be natural.

"Strengthen and increase our admiration for honest dealing and clean thinking, and suffer not our hatred of hypocrisy and pretense ever to diminish. Encourage us in our endeavor to live above the common level of life. Make us to choose the harder right instead of the easier wrong, and never to be content with a half-truth when the whole can be won. Endow us with courage that is born of loyalty to all that is noble and worthy, that scorn to compromise with vice and injustice and knows no fear when truth and right are in jeopardy. Guard us against flippancy and irreverence in the sacred things of life. Grant us new ties of friendship and new opportunities of service. Kindle our hearts in fellowship with those of a cheerful countenance, and soften our hearts with sympathy for those who sorrow and suffer. Help us to maintain the honor of the corps untarnished and unsullied and to show forth our duty to Thee and to our country. All of which we ask in the name of the great friend and Master of men. Amen."

Labor in the World Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD, and commend

to the attention of the membership of this body, an article entitled "Labor in the World Picture," which appears in the February 1959 edition of the AFL-CIO American Federationist, and which was drawn from the remarks made by AFL-CIO President George Meany. Mr. Meany delivered this speech during a 2-day conference on Labor and Science in a Changing World, sponsored last month by the AFL-CIO industrial union department.

I was much impressed by Mr. Meany's thoughtful and provocative remarks. He has a clear understanding of the nature of the Communist international movement, and he does not mince words about their ultimate goal—the goal of world conquest, and the destruction of all free and democratic institutions. But Mr. Meany does not stop there: he outlines a clear course which the American labor movement and, in a larger sense, all of us must pursue if we hope to successfully meet the Communist challenge.

I shall not cite any excerpts from Mr. Meany's remarks, because I feel that his entire speech warrants our close and careful consideration. For that reason, I am placing it in the RECORD and commending it earnestly to the attention of the membership of this body:

LABOR IN THE WORLD PICTURE

(By George Meany)

Where does American labor fit into the rather somber picture of international affairs? What can it contribute and what are its special qualifications for contributing to the maintenance of peace and freedom in this changing world?

First of all, labor has the highest interest in having the greatest number of people share the benefits which modern science can bring to life. Labor has the greatest stake in atomic power being used solely for the pursuits of peace. Labor is by its very nature humanitarian in aspiration.

As in the first industrial revolution, so today in the second industrial revolution, it is not industrial progress as such but rather the mass human factor—the labor movement—which is the force making for and advancing individual dignity and personality.

The ideals of labor know no national boundaries. Here labor and science have much in common. Precisely because of the impact of the revolution in technology on military strategy, it is important that we do have a humanitarian approach. By its very nature, labor is basically humanitarian in its aims and in its values.

We of labor indict communism because it robs the people living under it of all human freedom and the possibility to share equitably and adequately in the benefits of technical progress behind the Iron Curtain. We indict communism for gearing its technical progress to military objectives. Until the Soviet Union discards its aim of world conquest, mankind cannot really tame atomic fission.

Lest we forget, Moscow is enraged over Tito's efforts to travel a different road to what the Kremlin calls socialism. And even helpless Hungary was not permitted to live in peaceful coexistence with the successors of Stalin.

American labor must help our Nation lend support to policies which recognize the right to nationhood as a basic human right. In the missile age, in the days of breakthroughs in outer space, free and independent nationhood has a larger meaning than ever before. Today more than ever, inde-

pendent nationhood means a distinct cultural entity and a spirit of self-respect and self-reliance among the great mass of the world's people.

More than half the world's population lives in economically underdeveloped areas. Labor has a special interest in having modern science and technology serve to raise the standard of living in these areas. The most vital interest of American labor and our self-preservation as a free labor movement make it imperative to have the workers of these countries enjoy a rising standard of living, better pay, better hours, more leisure, health and culture.

In our own country, where our labor movement is not prisoner of any economic dogma or political formula or party machine, the movement is especially qualified to work for a much more rapid and widespread utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

This is no time for conflict between private and public power interests over their respective roles in atomic power development. The public should have the benefits of modern science through private power if possible, through public power if need be, and through a combination of the two if necessary.

Once such atomic development is speeded up in our own country, the United States will find it easier to help other nations and strengthen them in their fight against poverty and subversion.

The record of American labor in regard to an adequate and sound foreign aid program is very clear from the Marshall plan right down to date. In the face of vast advances in science and technology, and in view of the great desire among the peoples of economically underdeveloped countries to industrialize quickly, we must stress that our foreign aid program should mean much more than giving dollars and providing machinery and technical know-how. There is a human element in this picture.

These economically underdeveloped societies seek to move rapidly from a backward rural stage to an advanced industrial stage. To avoid exploitation and concentration of economic power, to avoid a monopoly of political power is essentially a problem of social justice which the free trade unions can make a contribution to solve.

After all, the test in regard to the human value of science and technology is whether they serve the spiritual fulfillment and the material well-being of the individual, whether they are for the good of the great mass of the people or for the benefit of a few.

These standards can be met only in a free society, in which free labor can play a constructive role. Such a society is far superior to the dictatorial tyrannical setups we've seen.

Remember, Hitler in his day also lorded over a country with a highly developed technology. Hitler in his day was even more ahead of us in buzz bombs and missiles than Khrushchev is today. But under Khrushchev, as under Hitler, the high level of technological progress and achievement spelled massive exploitation, enslavement and war.

In contrast let me cite a distinct American experience which proves that the real value of industrial progress is in human service. I cite TVA and the development of the Central Valley of California. Neither Communist Russia nor any other totalitarian country can show similar institutions, similar undertakings, with free labor playing a vital role in the communities' enjoyment of benefits of flood control, electric power, reforestation, navigation, food production, health and education.

Of course, there are those who feel that we can meet the Soviet challenge at the conference table and that the threat of hu-

man destruction, total war, is enough to hold off, enough for our protection. Well, I think that this position is really a repudiation of the responsibility that all Americans must have—a responsibility even in this great age of technical and scientific advance—a responsibility to preserve this free way of life, a responsibility as trade unionists to preserve a system of government under which it has been possible for this trade union movement to advance the cause of those who work for wages in this great Nation.

Our criticism of the Soviet system must be accompanied by a living demonstration that man can achieve far more for himself and his community through democracy than through despotism.

We have demonstrated the superiority of democracy over Nazi despotism not only on the field of battle. It will be harder for us to defeat communism. Unlike nazism, it hides behind a humanitarian cover. It pretends to be the champion of labor.

The Mikoyans are harder to fight than the Goerings, but they are none the less our enemies, because they are the enemies of all freedom and human decency. Let none forget what Mikoyan and his regime did to the people of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia.

Our country should strive to do more in serving the cause of peace, freedom and expanded human well-being. The rapid progress of science and technology demands this.

But with all our shortcomings and failings, too many of us forget the contributions our country has made to the advancement of human liberty and welfare. America has meant much and done much for advancing political democracy and national independence for colonial peoples. We can be proud of our industrial progress and the increasing extent to which—thanks in great measure to our free labor movement—the great mass of people are benefiting from our front-rank status in science and technology. Our readiness to share our atomic resources in the interest of peace and human betterment is unparalleled.

Of course, there is more that we can and must do. The Soviet challenge and the rapid pace of scientific progress necessitate that our educational system be vastly improved and that more talented sons and daughters of the people—regardless of their race or religion—be given an opportunity to secure the highest learning. As the pioneer of free education in the United States, American labor must now be the most active force for such improvement and democratization of our educational system.

Even if the Soviet regime had not come to cast its dark, ugly shadow on the arena of history, the scientific and technological revolution which humanity is now experiencing would have produced profound social, political and economic changes and national emotions and even explosions.

The role of communism in this stage of history is far more complicating and destructive than constructive. Our best answer to the Communist challenge is constantly to humanize our society, improve our free way of life and make it invulnerable in every way to Communist subversion and assault.

Given the nature of the Soviet system and the new world role of our country in this age of miracles of science, the American labor movement must not only respond to events in the making but also influence, mold and help direct events.

Our labor movement must help our Government evolve and execute an effective democratic foreign policy. We must cement our relations with the international free trade union movement and expand our assistance to its weaker sections.

There are areas where American labor is especially qualified to serve the ICFTU

and the free world. I speak of awakening Africa and the struggle against every vestige and form of colonialism. I speak of exposing the true nature of the Communist enemy which has made our country and our free way of life its principal target.

There are no blueprints to social progress and human advancement. But there are certain practical steps—all in a humanizing direction and all aimed at strengthening the non-Communist world and its nations whether they are or are not our allies today in a formal sense. American labor should foster such policies with redoubled energy.

The advances in science make it most urgent that we work for effectively controlled and internationally supervised disarmament and the banning of nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction. Our foreign aid program should be put on at least a 2-year basis so that it can be a greater force for stabilization. We must energetically help our allies break with colonialism in Algeria and everywhere else. We must advance a most comprehensive program for rebuilding the Middle East so as to help Arab nationalism become a positive force for democracy and live in peace with Israel. We must open our colleges to more students from overseas on a free scholarship basis. We must maintain and strengthen our national defense and the capacity of our allies to maintain their national security.

Labor is the best equipped sector of our community to demonstrate that life in a democracy is better, fuller, and richer in a moral, cultural, and spiritual sense than it can ever be under communism or any other despotism.

It seems to me that in meeting all of these problems of living in this new great technical and scientific society, we must arrange, if we can, to stay alive. We must preserve democracy in being. That's the No. 1 objective, because all of these other things we talk about—aid to underdeveloped countries, great advances in our own economic picture here at home—all of these things depend on maintaining the American system under which we are privileged to have a free trade union movement.

It seems that the No. 1 objective is to use our influence in shaping a foreign policy that will always leave the door open for peace but at the same time present at that bargaining table an America strong enough to defend this way of life from aggression of any kind.

I think it's labor's job to make its contribution to that sort of America.

Resignation of Hon. Theodore Francis Green as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago when the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations met in regular session, its membership was not aware that the agenda included the resignation of their distinguished chairman, Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. They were deeply moved and those of us on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have worked closely with Chairman GREEN and his Senate committee over the years,

observing his outstanding leadership, were saddened to learn of it. Senator GREEN's decision to resign as chairman because of failing sight and hearing is typical of this patriotic American who, after determining that he could not continue to give his country service of the very highest order, felt he should step down. It takes real courage, Mr. Speaker, to reach such a decision and I want to add my tribute to the many well deserved commendations he has received from Members of both Houses of Congress and other grateful Americans. It is indeed a great comfort to know that Senator GREEN will remain a member of the Senate committee and that America will continue to have the benefit of his statesmanship and sage counsel.

Can We Win the Hot Economic War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 22d annual dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, which was held in Washington in honor of the New Jersey congressional delegation on February 5, 1959, the president of the State chamber, Lansing P. Shield, made a few remarks, entitled "Can We Win the Hot Economic War?" and I am very pleased to receive the permission of the House to have this brief address printed in the RECORD.

Mr. Shield says a great deal in a brief space and in my opinion he expresses the thoughts that have been in the minds of many people for some time. We should now take action and I feel sure that if management and labor can get together and discuss the great problems facing our country, they will reach some ground of agreement and we can show a united front in winning the hot economic war.

Mr. Shield's remarks follow:

CAN WE WIN THE HOT ECONOMIC WAR?

(By Lansing P. Shield)

An unusual gathering of leaders of Government, organized labor, and industry such as this provides an opportunity for all of us to achieve better understanding. In these critical times, is there anything more urgent than the development of teamwork between these three important segments of our society? And this applies particularly to New Jersey—the most highly industrialized State in the Union.

Despite unparalleled prosperity and spectacular achievements in mass production and mass distribution, our economy in New Jersey and throughout the Nation is labeled as a high-cost one—and as each month rolls by the break-even point for both industry and Government rises. We might as well face it: we are living in a plush economy. Because of high costs, world markets are slipping away from us.

Within the last 12 months, Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and company have made trade agreements with 11 countries. During that same period, we haven't signed a single agreement. In today's papers Khrushchev calls for the end of the cold war. This is

understandable, because he feels sure of victory in the hot economic war. In his speech yesterday before the 21st Soviet Party Congress in Moscow, he boasted that "economic competition was now enough to win the world to communism."

As a nation, we are in danger of losing out to a competitor who has a built-in low-cost austerity program. His economy, contrasted with ours, has a constantly lowering break-even point and the cost of goods in Russia is being steadily reduced.

The complete answer to the dilemma in which we find ourselves does not lie solely in reducing Government spending, freezing prices and wages, nor in further mechanization. We already lead the world in that area (I'm referring to mechanization, not spending) and it's ironical that the more we mechanize the higher go our costs. The President has warned us that unless we reverse this trend which is weakening us both internally and externally, it may be necessary to put our economic body into a strait-jacket in the form of wage and price controls. It is up to us to choose now between teamwork and dictation, or the freedom of choice may be taken away from us.

As leaders in Government, business, and labor, we have been fighting small battles among ourselves instead of presenting a united front—a truly United States of America against our adversary, the Kremlin.

As an example, here in the United States, industry and organized labor meet as antagonists annually or biannually at the bargaining table and then withdraw until the next battle. Between political campaigns, Government and industry often tear each other down.

While we have been trying to solve the problem of integration in race relationships, we have actually been practicing segregation in our economic relationships.

A form of class warfare is adding fuel to the flames that are licking at the foundations of our society and our freedoms. Recently a columnist in the New York Times pointed out that both political parties seem to be solidifying along the lines of class interests.

Can anyone say there is a conscious, common effort to promote integration and understanding between organized labor and management—and to a somewhat lesser degree, between Government and industry?

Recently, recognizing my own shortcomings in this area, I invited to lunch a well-known labor leader in a neighboring State and a U.S. Senator. After 2 hours in which we exchanged views (no holds barred) all three of us came away with a better understanding of the problems of the others and we all wanted another meeting.

This week one of the top labor leaders in New Jersey told me the time was overdue for management and labor to bury the hatchet, particularly in view of the international situation. It is heartening to find that leaders in every field are becoming aware of the necessity for Government, labor, and industry to close ranks.

In a shooting war, we get together because we are thoroughly aroused to the common danger. If we are to win this hot economic war, a united front is equally imperative. May I respectfully suggest to the representatives of Federal and State Governments present tonight that industry would be glad to join any effort to bring about a closer working relationship with Government and with labor? Perhaps an improved relationship might be initiated by a conference of leaders in Washington, followed by meetings at the State level. Such action would not only be good business and good politics, but would be a definite first step toward the objective of developing unity.

We must have unity to be productive—we must be productive to be strong—we must be strong to remain free.

Ernest Joiner, of the Ralls Ecles in the Hardest Hitting Community Ne. "urday Editor in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Ernest Victor Joiner, owner and publisher of the Ralls (Tex.) Banner, has become a legend in his home State.

Many persons do not agree with what he has had to say; yet all must respect him as a man who stands up for his beliefs, and who will fight for his ideals. He and his family have been cut at verbally. Joiner has even been shot at. Yet he continues to stand courageously for what he believes is right, and to lash with a cutting edge those whom he feels are not acting in the best interest of the people.

Ernest Joiner has been called a "voice crying in the wilderness." Yet this is not wholly accurate. He is heard not only in the wilderness, but also in the big cities and in the small communities. He is one of the most often quoted newspaper editors in Texas. His statements in his column, "It Says Here," have become bywords in many parts of our State. Knowledge of him is spreading over the Nation.

Ernest Joiner has his ideas and his ideals. He has the astuteness and intelligence to argue persuasively for his causes. And he has the willingness to work to put across a point or to bring about a community improvement, such as a new school auditorium, a new telephone building, and others. He stands for progress and good citizenship, and he has the courage to work actively for their accomplishment. I am proud to be able to call him a friend and to have the advantage of his wisdom and counsel in many fights for the betterment of the government of Texas.

Mr. President, two articles written about Ernest V. Joiner give a good description of him. I request unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The first is from the 1958 edition of the South Plains Yearbook, "Parade of Progress." The second article was written by Willie Morris, and was published in the Texas Observer on September 19, 1958, under the heading: "An Editor the Sheriff Missed":

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the 1958 edition of the South Plains Yearbook, "Parade of Progress."]

RALLS BANNER IS EDITED BY ERNEST JOINER, HARDEST HITTING COMMUNITY NEWSPAPER EDITOR IN TEXAS

"Here, read what Joiner says in the Ralls Banner," is a common expression at a political meeting in Austin, Washington, D.C., and around all of the coffee shops in Ralls. Ernest Joiner came to Ralls about 12 years ago, and from this time no local politician has ever dared to get his hand caught in the purse strings of this city.

pendent national convention in 1950, a room full of editors bluntly predicted that self-reliance would be out of the newspaper business in less than 6 months. He had broken every rule. He jumped on his town's preachers, lawyers, city councilmen, school board, civic club leaders—but most of all he roasted many of his best advertisers.

Recent Governors, State representatives, State senators, and most of all of the county political leaders have felt the sting of Joiner's pen.

Joiner, towering something over 6 feet, came into Ralls fully sold on the idea that America needed red-blooded editors who would call a "spade a spade."

He has been cussed and discussed. He's been shot at and missed! He's been openly preached against in Ralls' pulpits, and he has also been praised in the same places. He lays his ears back and kicks like a mule when he thinks someone is getting a raw deal. He's for progress. He's for people in his town being good citizens. Once he even single-handedly called a beer election because he said the only thing people would vote on was keeping the county dry.

In brief, a volume could be written about Ernest Joiner. His newspaper has captured many State awards for outstanding service to its readers. If you read his column and you don't like what he says, cuss him. Cuss him real good, but don't cuss him in Ralls. People in Ralls respect and love Joiner and the Ralls Banner. But why shouldn't they? He gives Ralls and this area the best news coverage of any community newspaper in the State.

[From the Texas Observer, Sept. 19, 1958]

AN EDITOR THE SHERIFF MISSED

Out here in the lonely whistling spaces, on the main road to Lubbock, sits Ralls. It has a red brick main street and a cafe to drink coffee called Jack Rabbit's. It also has Ernest Joiner, who edits the Banner and who gets quoted more than most newspapers on the mass circulation dailies.

In the daily and weekly output of grey matter that constitutes Texas journalism, the Ralls Banner (circulation 1,175) is a kind of journalistic oasis. Its editor is a man of raw courage, a thorough nonconformist, and an idealist. Beneath the eccentricities of his weekly column, "It Says Here," a sensitive social conscience is at work, ridiculing political greed, jousting with religious dogma, lashing unkindness and inhumanity and pettiness and whatever else he thinks ills the human race, 2,000 of whom have chanced to band together in this tiny community on the plains of west Texas.

Ernest Joiner is a stern critic of the times. "We have no angry voice to challenge this era of passiveness," he once wrote. "Here and there some minister of the Gospel addresses empty air from behind the Mexican border in a tone of anger, but the tone is a stage prop, more than likely and his aim is economic security for himself. There is no Thomas Paine to fan the flames of revolution, stir the imagination of Americans toward human rights and national independence; no Tom Paine to strike fear into the hearts of dictators, both clerical and lay. Gone are the Robert Ingersolls, W. C. Brannans, Voltaires, and Victor Hugos whose anger stirred men to justifiable action. Nobody emulates Jesus, who in anger, whipped moneychangers from the temple. Just give us for 1958, God, some thoroughly angry men."

"I think a man can be judged by his enemies just as he can by his friends," Joiner once said, "and I'm proud of my friends and my enemies." He has his share of both. In 1952, when his shop burned down, a group of hometown people raised \$1,000 for a new building. He also was a target for a bullet once—fired by a sheriff he had caught in the act of bootlegging. The bullet missed and the sheriff became

the only one-term sheriff in the history of Crosby County.

He once wrote of the school board, which was conducting secret meetings: "These little dictators, lacking only a small balcony for their strutting, take pride in saying, as one member certainly did say, 'We run this school business the way we want to run it.'" And later he wrote, "Once about 10 years ago this newspaper criticized the local school board for what it considered light-of-the-moon activity. And for just as many years one board member has nursed the conviction that the editor should drop dead, which seems a fair punishment for exercising freedom of speech and press as more or less guaranteed by the Constitution. Now the man has a child in school who studies the works of Mark Twain, who once said: 'First God made idiots. That was for practice. Then he made school boards.' Haw."

Ralls had a Negro population of about 200. Some years ago Joiner editorialized: "Every so often some solid, upstanding Christian gentleman feels called upon to criticize this newspaper for printing news of the colored population of our town. Last week we printed the honor roll for the colored school. A couple of these characters gave birth to a two-headed calf, sideways, when they read it. Our opinion is that colored students, with three strikes against them on books, equipment, and facilities for study, are to be commended above a lot of white children we know who can't make the honor roll with the best of instruction and educational facilities. We think effort should be recognized. We think news should be printed. If these two convictions of ours soil the lily-white hands and Christian consciences of a handful of bigoted Klux Kluckers, they are invited to get the hell off our subscription list."

THE RASCALS

When the political dismissals took place at Joiner's alma mater, Texas Tech, last year, a Banner editorial was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "It is fitting that the infamy of a handful of scoundrels be permanently recorded in the national archives so students and historians of every age may know how the public's servants conducted the public's business at Texas Tech. It couldn't have happened to a more deserving bunch of rascals."

Joiner belongs to the American breed of agrarian humorists; his style bears the imprint of Twain. His description of a Californian's directions on how to get to Texas is to go east until you smell it and then south until you step in it. Once, in a column reflecting his rationalist views on religion, he quoted a mayor who said that God saved his life, after a tornado wiped out his town, killing some 79 men, women, and children. "Man has been given the power of reason," Joiner wrote. "Why doesn't he use it? It doesn't square that God should be given credit for saving Mayor Rowe's life unless we also assign him credit for killing 79 others."

Joiner and his staff of two publish the Banner in a neat new building a half block from the stores and offices in the center of Ralls. Wearing black horn-rims, he is a tall, handsome man of 47. He speaks and moves like the west Texan. On the desk in his private office is a plaque saying "Vice president" with a phrase below it "In charge of vice, naturally." His window looks out onto the business section, and onto the weird old town assembly hall, red and weatherbeaten, built by the people of Ralls not long after it was founded in 1910.

He was raised in Dalhart. His mother was a Populist and an admirer of Eugene Victor Debs, the Socialist. Joiner's middle name is Victor, after Debs. He worked 5 years in Fort Worth before he went to college. He studied 2 years at the University of New Mexico, and spent his last 2 years

at Texas Tech, where he studied political science and got into trouble with a conservative administration when he edited the school paper. He first angered the officials there by conducting an election for the biggest horse's neck on the campus. "We had our share. How was I to know the dean of engineering would win hands down?" he said.

This was when Pappy O'Daniel was Governor, and when Joiner discovered the dormitory cafeteria was purchasing carloads of flour for the first time, and O'Daniel flour at that, he asked why in several editorials. He never got an answer. The day he crossed the stage to get his diploma, Clifford E. Jones, then president of Tech, handed it to him and whispered, "Joiner, this is the happiest day in my life."

He toured the whole country looking for a newspaper job, and the only one he could find was with the New Orleans Times-Picayune at \$15 a week. So he went to work for the U.S. Corps of Engineers in Galveston.

In 1942 he married a Georgia girl. They had met at a college editor's convention in Iowa and carried on a romance through the mails until Joiner showed up at her home the summer after he left college.

He spent 4 years in the Army, first with the infantry, then the paratroopers, and finally the criminal investigation department, but he never got overseas. He almost did, but he'd cracked his back as a paratrooper at Fort Benning and was sent up to be shipped to Europe when a doctor noticed his cast and notified his commanding general.

FROM A JUNKHEAP

Right after he was discharged in 1946, he bought the Banner with a GI loan. "It was a real junkheap, nuthin' would run, and it had 600 circulation," he said.

"I came here," he said, "because I believed, and I believe it more every day, that the only independent and uncontrolled press in the United States are small weekly papers. It's obvious I couldn't do what I'm doing on a big-city daily. Why, I wouldn't last as long as a paper shirt in a bear fight. Those big papers are only honest when it pays 'em to be honest."

He chuckled often, between phrases. He is a jovial man who likes to amuse.

"I don't think too much of the weekly press in Texas either," he said. "I don't think much of a paper with no personal column or editorial page. Too many weekly editors are printers instead of editors." He does admire H. M. Baggary's Tulla Herald, just 70 miles to the north, as well as the Kountze News and the Dallas White Rocker. He reads over 40 weeklies every week.

He leaned back in his chair and reminisced. "Out in this country up until recently," he said, "people were friendly. But that ol' West Texas hospitality is damned near a thing of the past. I guess it's the pace people live now—improved transportation, and more money and time, and TV. I wanta tell you somethin'—you can't phone people around here. They'll leave the phone off the hook if they're watchin' TV. Try to get people out to a public meetin' the night Gunsmoke's on, and, brother, you've had it. I'd like to have five cents a pound for all the food consumed in front of television."

"I don't know any satisfied folks anymore. They're weighted down with their new freedom or somethin'. If other people're usin' their new leisure the way folks around here are, this country's in bad shape. I imagine we could use about four psychiatrists in this town already."

Joiner is proud of the Banner's editorial campaigns. "I imagine we have more voters in city elections percentage-wise than any community in Texas," he said. When he came to Ralls, only seven votes had been cast in the last city election. "The first thing I tried to do," he said, "was organize an opposition for the city commission. Once

I had to put myself up and get beat. But now there's no more business about lettin' a small group handpick the leaders.

"Another thing—for a dry county there's more drinkin' here. Just about everybody's got beer and whiskey at home. I circulated a petition to get a referendum, must've been back in '48, to see if they'd vote to drink openly. An hour before the votin' people were lined up a block in front of the Legion Hut. Why, more people voted in that election than any presidential election in history here. Every night for a solid month they were havin' rallies and things. You'd of thought Ringling Brothers'd come to Ralls.

A COCKTAIL BAPTIST

"I remember there was a big man against it, and one night not long after it'd been defeated I was deliverin' some printin' over at his house, and he invited me in and mixed me a cocktail, right before his wife and teenage daughter, them knowin' full well in 2 hours he'd be at the Baptist Church. I could've dropped my teeth. When I finished with him in the paper I didn't get any more invitations to his house. You lose more invitations that way."

Then he remembered when a big squeeze in the Baptist Church got caught bootleggin'. He pleaded guilty and they never fined him. Two Negroes had been brought in on a bootleggin' charge at the same time and they pleaded innocent and rotted in jail 6 months before they were even tried. I wrote it up, but I guess the people in town didn't mind, 'cause they didn't do anything, so the next week I apologized for botherin' 'em. That's equality under the law for you."

Joiner praised the Ralls Jaycees. "They've really accomplished some wonders around here. The Banner helped them in a campaign to get a \$35,000 swimmin' pool, and we got it over the dead bodies of the church people. It was preached against in the pulpit all over town, they called it 'public bathin' and they gave me and the Jaycees hell."

"There's one thing I'll give these people credit for—they get bitter and they don't forget. That ol' Christian virtue of forgiveness doesn't thrive out here."

Joiner picked up the phone and called his wife to tell her she'd have a guest for dinner. "Louise had a little trouble gettin' adjusted way out here, bein' from Georgia," he said, chuckling. "She had a language problem for one thing, and then she had a time gettin' used to this carryin' on on a paper. It took her a good 5 years to where this stuff rolled off her back. Now she likes it. She usta say let's sell this paper and go open one in the South, and I said, 'What're you tryin' to do, be a young widow?' Of course the weather threw her too, and it was a lot worse than this is now."

ON CUTTIN' PEOPLE

"I'll tell you this, you'd be surprised at the things people do to strike back at you—at your wife at parties, kids at school. Men can take lessons from women in the fine art of cuttin' people dead."

How does he feel on foreign aid? "I'm opposed to it now, because I don't think any of the people it was supposed to help are gettin' helped. Too much foreign-aid money is goin' to bolster every dictatorship on the face of the globe except Khrushchev." He pointed to a Christian Science Monitor he'd been reading. "It says here we're givin' Chiang over in Formosa more money than ever. If I had my choice of goin' to war with Khrushchev or Chiang, I think I'd take Chiang. We have a knack for fallin' in bed with some of the shadiest characters. . . . When a man's in trouble, his friends don't deliver him a pot of money. They encourage him, understand him. Givin' money creates its own problems. What must it do to people who have pride?"

"I suppose catholicism is my big prejudice and I admit it. It's the most authoritarian form of life in the world today. Communism's patterned after it. I don't have a thing against it on religious grounds. But when Catholic politicians start runnin' the government according to the dictates of a church, that's where we separate. The Catholics are too involved in big business too."

"I just got involved with my own church on the same score, on gettin' into business. Business has nothin' to do with the work of God. I raised hell when the Methodist Church bought this big, beautiful hospital at Lubbock. I saw this preacher and asked him about it, and he said Jesus was a healer, and I said, yeah, he didn't charge for it either."

Joiner supported Gonzalez for governor despite his catholicism. "You know," he said, "Gonzalez came to Ralls and made a speech and those who heard him were charmed. The consensus seemed to be, he just wasn't a Mexican. He's a fine fella. He's a whiter man than a lot of whites. He's been good for Texas. People have seen a first-class Mexican in action."

Joiner said he'd show me around town. We closed up the office and got into a battered green Ford. By now it was late, there was a touch of fall in the air, and it was crisp, pleasant. He pointed out the new school auditorium and the new telephone building that he'd campaigned for. "Now I wanta take you out to the Ralls International Airport and show you my plane," he said. Down the highway toward Crosbyton a couple of miles we turned right, onto a wide, bumpy road where the planes land. "If you can set her down here, you can anywhere," he said. The plane was parked under a shed, a little blue and white job with "The Ralls Banner, Ralls, Texas" written across it. Joiner and his wife go everywhere in it—Mexico City, California, Austin, Dallas. The first time he flew alone for any length of time was in another man's plane from El Paso to Ralls. He got lost and had to crash land in a cotton field up near Dimmitt. "I harvested four acres of that fella's cotton," he said. "Once we were flyin' out to Las Vegas and it was the first time I'd ever flown at night usin' instruments. I was checkin' the radio and my wife tapped me on the shoulder and said, 'Honey, aren't we upside down?' and sure enough we were. That's the last time I'll ever fly at night."

We got in the car and drove over to Joiner's house; it was small, new, and modern. They designed it themselves. Louise Joiner, beautiful, intelligent, and Southern, with traces of Georgia in the way she talked, cooked us steaks. Their two girls, 15 and 11, came in and then left, to see the Ralls Jack Rabbits play a football game. We sat around until late drinking coffee and talking, and march music from the band drifted over from the football field, telling in the cool evening that summer was dying, almost gone. When I left Joiner made me promise to come back, "I'll take you up in the plane," he said. "We'll go somewhere. You name it."

The End of Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include

the text of one of the articles in the series "Adventures of the Mind" which recently appeared in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The End of Empire." The author, Dr. D. W. Brogan, is a professor of political science at Cambridge University in England. I believe this to be an excellent essay and would like to bring it to the attention of those who have not had an opportunity to read it:

THE END OF EMPIRE

(By D. W. Brogan)

More than one foreign observer has noted, admired and envied the unconditional loyalty of the average American to the American political tradition. And as a source of internal, of external strength, the loyalty that sends boys and girls on pious pilgrimage to the National Archives to revere the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution is wholly admirable. But when the good American transfers his gaze to the outer world, when he innocently looks for equivalent institutions in that less fortunate part of the globe, when he takes as having the same meaning as he gives them inside America such common words as "freedom," "good government," "progress," he asks for trouble. And with the promptitude of superservice, he is given it. His plate is filled with problems, and he is driven to realize that he is the victim of the old Chinese curse. He "is living in interesting times."

The good American is confronted all over the world today with two linked phenomena, the decline of empires and the rise of nations. He can, as a good American, have no doubts as to the sentiments he must feel at the news and noise of these phenomena. He must rejoice that empires are falling (did not America give the first push in 1776?) and rejoice that new nations devoted to freedom are arising (did not America set the example in the same fateful and admirable year?).

But having paid this respect to the national tradition, the American notes with bewilderment and often with downright annoyance that peace, progress, good will, order and liberty don't seem to be in any greater supply than in the bad old days. He hears doubts expressed as to whether some free nations (Indonesia, Burma) are as well off as they were in the days of imperialist tyranny. He notices that there are two nations on very bad terms with each other in that land called India that was united under British rule, and that their creation was the signal for massacre, rape, and exile on a colossal scale. He has to face in his morning paper news of bloody rioting in Ceylon, led, with a high degree of inconsistency, by Buddhist monks. New nations in Africa such as Ghana threatens to suppress internal opposition by methods very reminiscent of the bad old days. Even after paying, during an American visit, homage to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, Dr. Sukarno of Indonesia, returns home via Moscow much more impressed by the relevance of Soviet experience than of American. Newly enfranchised nations such as Egypt gladly dicker for arms with the Soviet Union. An Indian state elects a Communist government, and each area, liberated from imperial slavery, seems to develop odd ways of attaining those unalienable rights proclaimed in 1776. Indeed, some of them seem very easily alienable under the pressures of "freedom."

Nothing can be done to make the world easily and automatically safe for democracy (as Chesterton pointed out in 1918, "The world will never be made safe for democracy, it is a dangerous trade"). The good American will have to get used to seeing his principles parroted and parodied. But he will suffer less and be less tempted to angry and foolish reactions if he can bring himself to

think that maybe the decline of empires, at the speed at which it has taken place, is not an unmitigated benefit, and if he also can bring himself to accept the fact that a nation which gets its freedom—that is, is freed from foreign rule—gains that and nothing more. What it gains may have little or no relevance to its real economic or social problems, except to make them worse, and even if it is evident that the gains are well worth the price, the price may yet be very high. And if the price includes poverty, disorder, and division, the United States in its own interest may be forced to pick up the tab.

The United States may have to step in to fill the gap in common defense made by the withdrawal of the imperial power. It may have to spend men, money and patience (patience will be the hardest to come by) to prop up a new, free, but rickety governmental structure. It may even, as a last aggravation of its sad state, have to receive, with what self-control it can, charges of exploitation and imperialism made by peoples in complete control, as far as the American goes, of their own destiny. Bewildered and bothered, the American in the street—or in the White House—will be less bewildered, if no less annoyed, if he accepts the fact that the end of empires is the end of an epoch that suited the United States pretty well, and that the wicked, grasping imperial powers were doing a job (possibly from the worst of motives) that somebody had to do—a job that now must be done mainly by the United States, the reluctant legatee of the old firms now in liquidation.

For the decline of empire means the passing of a crude form of solution to a real problem. "All nations are equal, but some are more equal than others." Since this cynical view happens to be true, it means that nations have very different resources, degrees of competence, are at very different stages in historical development (but want to be at the same stage) and, in defiance of all objective assessments, are ready to assert that this stage of real equality has been reached—that Liberia is a republic in the sense that the United States is; that Ceylon is a state in the sense that Holland is. The old, condemned imperial order denied this. It asserted that nations were unequal, that they were at different stages of development and that the advanced nations had the right, the opportunity and the duty to bring the backward areas, forcibly if need be, up to scratch—a laborious and expensive process for which it was only reasonable to charge a fee.

I am well aware that this appears to contradict the formal doctrines of the Declaration of Independence and that such doctrines would be shocking if developed inside the United States. California and Mississippi are equal and are at the same stage of progress; the peoples of the two States are equal, if not identical, and law and custom make no difference between one group of inhabitants and another. Such is the theory; I beg to be excused from comment on the fact. But outside the United States, until very modern times, this was neither theory nor fact. No one thought that Egypt (legally then a Turkish possession) should be allowed a free hand in controlling the way from Europe to Asia simply because it "owned" the Isthmus of Suez. (The United States, nonimperialist as she was, took much the same line about Colombia's claim to own Panama.)

There was a practical justification for this high and mighty attitude. All the new techniques that transformed the world in the last 150 years originated in Europe or North America. The owners of the new machines and the new weapons faced a world that lay lapped in immemorial slumber. Briskly, like the proprietor of a health farm, the white world insisted on wakening the sleepers, by ruling them directly, as in In-

dia; by insisting on a highly privileged position, as in China; or by frightening the more alert into imitating the white man before he took over, as in Japan. Conquest, empire was as old as human society. What was new was the expanding technical superiority of the conquerors that ate into the "cake of custom," and prodded the sleepers wide awake and bred, in reaction, the force that has undone the empires—nationalism.

It is desirable at this point to proclaim that I am too much disposed to accept the unavoidable to protest against this state of affairs. As the wise Bishop Butler put it, "Things and actions are what they are, and the consequences of them will be what they will be; why then should we seek to be deceived?" Why indeed? But it is a part of deception not to notice what follows from "things and actions being what they are," and there is some danger of such error being committed.

The first error in which it is tempting to fall is to assume that the end of imperialism, the arrival on the stage of nationalism, is necessarily accompanied by material or even by moral progress. For it is too often forgotten that the basic article of the nationalist creed is that progress, good government, liberty, and civilization have no meaning except in nationalist terms. It is true that nationalist propaganda usually promises lots of goodies as well as national "freedom," but they are not of the essence of the contract, and the promise is often not kept. For example, material progress may be accelerated, usually is accelerated when the economic area of a state is large. The size of the United States is one reason for its wealth. But nationalism usually breaks up existing economic units (usually, not always), for, to the nationalist, progress in material well-being is empty if it does not mean progress in national well-being. A man can be emotionally well off only in a nation state to which he belongs, even if he could be materially better off in his mere material command of goods in a vaster nonnational or antinational area.

Thus, although not a perfect economic unit, the old Austro-Hungarian empire was a more satisfactory one than that created by the "succession" states. Yet it is now—and was in 1918—useless to point out this fact to the emergent nationalities. What they wanted was not well-being, but national well-being. It was a choice that the peoples of the old empire were free to make as a result of the Allied victory in the First World War. They made it, and no wisdom from above the battle, from Woodrow Wilson or Herbert Hoover, could have altered that fact.

After all, no such decision is as irrational as the decision to wage and endure war, and we are all conditioned to make that decision. "Give me liberty or give me death" is not only Patrick Henry's slogan. The same uneconomic choice can be seen nearer to the United States. What rational justification is there for the frontiers of Central America? The little republics round the waist of the Americas are obviously designed to be united or even to be united under Mexico. But suggest to the them. I am quite prepared to believe that even Panama, invented for the convenience of the United States, has bred in the past fifty years a genuine national feeling that will last—and may become a real nuisance to the United States, at any rate from a propaganda point of view. Why should Panama not imitate Egypt? And, from the nationalist point of view, there is no easy answer to that one.

The greatest single gift of British rule to India, perhaps the only one, was the creation of India. For it did not exist before the East India Company and then the British Indian Government by war, by road, by railway, by law made a united government

and a united economy for a subcontinent never before united in history under an effective central Indian Government. But the first result of freedom for the India thus created was suicide. We now have India and Pakistan, the latter state a nation that did not exist, even as a name, 50 years ago. The one great good thing imperialism did was undone. The unity the French imposed on Indochina has not survived their defeat, and it is not certain that the unity of Indonesia (another artificial, imported name) will survive Dutch rule for long. All of these breakdowns in unity may have been worth while; they were certainly nearly, if not quite, inevitable, but they had a high price.

Nor is that all. The division of the imperial units suggests something about nationalism that is novel and ominous. Nationalism often, too often, breeds nationalism. Peoples who have got along more or less with each other under foreign rule suddenly develop violent antagonism when foreign rule is withdrawn or is threatened with collapse. For under the foreign tyrant some kind of neutrality could be imposed from above. If neither group ruled itself, it had not to worry about being ruled by its neighbors. But if those neighbors were on the way to becoming the ruling class, then the prospect of local foreign rule became intolerable. So the Indian Moslems revolted against the prospect of Hindu rule; Turkish turned on Greek Cypriots; and in once peaceful Ceylon, Sinhalese turned on Tamils as self-government, freedom, got more complete. Nationalism, that is to say, is often the result of a reaction. If a government claims to embody a national tradition, a way of life, a language, a religion, or all of them, people have got to ask themselves is it really their way of life, language, religion? Often the answer given in blood and rapine is "No, a thousand times no." Freedom in these situations—and they are common enough—brings not peace, but a sword.

And this leads to the invention of nationalities, to be the creation of new human groups cut off from the mass of mankind by new feuds, new and carefully fostered differences. It is, of course, too easy to be critical and cynical about the history manufactured for new nations or old nations making new claims. Popular history in all countries is full of comforting legend. It is largely because they have their nationalist growing pains far behind them that western European and North American nations can afford to be scholarly, critical; can debunk national heroes and legends, remember that Washington swore, and doubt the cherry tree. Some Americans in the South may even doubt whether Lee made the right choice in going with his State in 1861 instead of sticking with the United States, and some Germans may believe that Bismarck's temporary triumph was a longrun catastrophe for Germany and for Europe.

We cannot expect this kind of critical history from the new nations. We should be more struck with admiration than we are when we get an approach to it as we do in India in the educated classes, or when we think of Thomas Masaryk exposing the Dvur and Hora forgeries of the country's literary past, despite the fact that they flattered Czech national vanity. But we must be prepared today for a high degree of fiction in all or almost all nationalist propaganda, and the American people, full of kindness and credulity, must not be shocked when they discover that some interesting spokesmen for some interesting countries are prone to the use of what Huck Finn called stretchers.

What is more important is the not infrequent case where historical fiction conceals from a long-suppressed and now renaissance nation that its misfortunes are also largely its own fault. Except where the preponderance of power is overwhelm-

ingly on the imperial side, and possibly not always then, the fact of subjection is a fact about the oppressed nation. It suggests weaknesses that mere freedom will not necessarily cure. Freedom may be (I think today it almost always is) the necessary preliminary to curing the weakness, but the weakness of resources, traditions, social habits, is there to be cured. Waving a new flag makes you feel good, but that is about all.

It is difficult for Americans to realize that for a great part of the world, the views of poets and philosophers, of orators and of legend makers are more important than the views of businessmen or scientists or economists. The Arabs are dazzled by their own past, seen in a golden haze. For two generations they have been asking the question why they, who once ruled the Mediterranean and brought civilization to the Christian barbarians, have been kicked around and subjected to foreign rule in their homelands. And the answer they expect must be encouraging. It must exaggerate the unity of the Arabs and suggest that only Western tyranny or local corruption prevents the creation of a great Arab nation stretching from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf. It must ignore permanent and desperate problems of inadequate resources (as in Egypt and Algeria); of undoubtedly Arab but totally anachronistic social structures (as in Yemen and Saudi Arabia). It must find in hatred of Israel a substitute for difficult problems of social and religious readjustment. It must be uncritical of the social results of Islam. And it must give a great place to treason. For all suppressed Nations have a deep conviction of betrayal.

"Let Erin remember the days of old
Ere her faithless sons betrayed her,
When Malachi wore the collar of gold
That he won from the proud invader."

What the Irish sang the new nationalities still sing, and so every national leader has to look over his shoulder to keep an eye on his countrymen, who may see in the possibly inevitable failures and limited successes of "freedom" not a result of the nature of things, but treachery. So Nuri-as-Said is butchered, so Gandhi is assassinated.

And the leaders who have to be watchful often become leaders by negation rather than by affirmation; they are against something (foreign rule) rather than for something, for basic changes in the internal structure of the Nation, eradication of the very weaknesses that helped to produce foreign rule in the beginning. Of course, this is not always so. Nationalist leaders are sometimes preachers, as was Gandhi, of self-reform as well as of the expulsion of the foreigner. The Gaelic League, the chief begetter of modern Ireland, had as one of its slogans: "And as we are shall Banba (Ireland) be." But it is easier to damn the imperialists than to go in for fundamental self-criticism, and when the imperialist has been heaved out or has left under his own steam, the basic problems remain.

So the world is faced with the new states with inadequate economic resources, with erratic frontiers, with dissident minorities, with delusions of grandeur and, what is worse, of goodness. And all this is in a world where the new nations are almost all arising in poor regions where, even with the best and most rational government, the headaches would be frightful, where the problem of keeping abreast of the birth rate and of not actually going backward in well-being is serious enough to daunt the bravest. It is not being offensive or aggressive to assert that half the nations whose delegates give parties in New York round the United Nations building are too poor and too backward to give their peoples in the next generation even as good a government and as

adequate a standard of life as the most backward European nation (let us say Portugal) or the most backward American State (let us say Mississippi) possesses.

Freedom from imperial yoke may even be a luxury some of them (which could be named) can hardly afford. There are areas in the dwindling British and French Empires that are a dead loss to the imperial power; regions that cannot afford freedom, although only the most prudent of their leaders know this. For there is nothing in the law of nature and of nature's God that provides that an area with the linguistic and cultural unity that demand nationhood and will not be denied will have any of the other resources for even frugal well-being.

The great problem of the concentration of most of the world's wealth and technical competence in a small area of the globe has many nonpolitical aspects. It is to be noted that there is no first-class industrial power outside the temperate zones. But the political problem of the replacement of the empires by the nations is one of the governing conditions of any attempt to redress the imbalance that is so deeply and dangerously dividing the world. And it is the beginning of wisdom for Americans, conditioned as they are by their own largely irrelevant history of nation making, to recognize the national freedom may be an obstacle to a quick redressing of the balance, both by creating doubtfully viable national units and by transferring authority to leaders whose competence has lain in the exploiting (all right, the heroic undoing) of a national grievance.

But if this is the beginning, it is not the end of wisdom. For it is not only a fact, if not a totally welcome fact, that the days of empire are over; it is a fact that the nation state offers possibilities of improvement that the empires either never did (which I doubt) or have ceased to do (which I admit). There is another fact. If one political truth is established today, it is that once the nationalist bug bites a group of human beings they cannot be cured except by national freedom, with all the possible social and economic disadvantages it may bring. Once an Algerian, for instance, decides that he is not a Frenchman and doesn't want to be one, rational economic argument is wasted. Bernard Shaw usually talked nonsense on political questions, but he occasionally talked sense, and his Irish origin illuminated much of this question for him. So, he wrote sense in his preface to "John Bull's Other Island," the only play he ever devoted to his native land. "A conquered nation is like a man with a cancer: he can think of nothing else, and is forced to place himself, to the exclusion of all better company, in the hands of quacks who profess to treat or cure cancer." This is true, and the first great gain of freedom is that thought and effort can be devoted to something more immediately relevant than freedom.

It does not follow, of course, that it will be. There are few greater emotional losses than a grievance that explains why things have gone wrong in terms of another's fault. Any father of a family can testify to that (and his children can testify, too, in another sense). To get freedom is to lose a grievance, and some nations have firmly refused to give up their darling excuse. Thus, if the people of the Argentine Republic devoted a tenth as much rational thought to the causes of their serious, but quite curable troubles that they have wasted on irrelevant and unjust spleen about "Yanqui" imperialism, they would be a great deal better off. If a patriotic Cuban put to himself the question, "Would we not have been materially better off if we had had more Yanqui imperialism?" and then admitted that some, if not all, of the troubles of Cuba are home-made, freedom would be an unmitigated good. Can any candid observer, looking at

Haiti and the Dominican Republic, pretend that freedom is always an unmitigated good?

The beneficial effects of freedom can be seen in two such different former jewels of the English crown as Ireland and India. For more than a generation of freedom has taught most of the inhabitants of the Irish Republic that their troubles are no longer of England's making, that "the border" is neither here nor there in the bookkeeping of a declining nation, that the Gaelic League was right: "And as we are shall Banba be." Even an act which, seen from the outside, seems one of the most foolish ever perpetrated by a rational community—the exit from the commonwealth in 1948—may have been worth the price in making plain to the Irish people that a republic left them where they were, with the basic problem of why the Irish won't, if they can help it, live in Ireland.

The problems of India are so gigantic that courage fails the spectator (but not the Indians). But one great gain is the creation of a government that does not hesitate to face Indian abuses such as the caste system. The government of Nehru makes many mistakes, but it can, through the mouth of the Prime Minister, preach to the Indians the lesson that it is now up to them. No British government could do that. It can risk appearing "antireligious" as no British government dared risk appearing. It has not succeeded in abolishing untouchability or in winning over all the primitive tribes of India. It has not undone many centuries of limitations on the role of women. It has not succeeded in giving India what India needs badly, a competent and enlightened business class. But it has made beginnings in all these fields. It has kept India from becoming a mere "Hindustan." And it has made it possible for Indians to borrow from the West with no feeling of humiliation.

There is nothing that the new Indian government did that enlightened British officials didn't see as desirable. But, in this century, the British government in India had lost the power to innovate. An imperial power that begins to doubt its mission is rightly doomed. The old, confident, authoritarian British rulers stamped out the burning of widows, the religious murders of the Thugs, abolished backward kingdoms like Oudh and introduced in a fine phillistine fashion the English language as the lingua franca of all India. These things, with the Indian army (obedient to civilian authority) and civil service (uniquely honest and competent in Asia), were great British legacies, but it was time for the British to go. Talk to an Indian who is now liberated from the need to think, all the time, in terms of national freedom, and you see the gain. He may even think that Macaulay, imposing English, had something to be said for him as he contemplates the bloody riots over languages that freedom has brought and the danger that an "Indian" national language such as Hindi may be a source of disunion and breed a new Pakistan in the south.

If this is the first, it is not the only gain. Indian nationalism may be simply the fruit of anti-British feeling, but it is a fact and gives India a new unity most necessary in a land divided by language, race, caste. It gives the Indian a new feeling of not being looked down on, and so a new freedom in his attitude to the outer world into which India has been dragged. True, the kind of dignity that nationalism breeds may be touchy, offensive, unrealistic, but there is no substitute for it. As the American Negro is no longer content to be grateful for concessions made from above, all over the world hundreds of millions of men are finding a new meaning in life, a new loyalty to something bigger than the village, the caste, the tribe.

It is not in solving immediate technical problems of well-being that the nations score over the empires. They often handle them, for quite a long time, worse than the imperial rulers did. It is in creating a new type of human being, who may not, it is true, adjust himself adequately to the New World, but at least is not doomed to fall in that adjustment as the empires finally became doomed to fall.

If the American abandons the fallacious parallel with the facts of the American Revolution (as apart from the spirit of '76) and contemplates the New World that is coming into being, he will be forced to avoid snap and easily systematic judgments (especially the judgment that assesses the worth and prospects of a new nation by its willingness to be noisily anti-Communist). He will see many nations running before they can walk—and so falling; demanding steel mills when what they need is more wells and better seed; aspiring after the heights of atomic cannon when they need to learn how to maintain a truck; above all, pouring out endless floods of what it may be too unkind to call mendacity, but can justly be called nonobjective information.

He will find few nations willing—or able—to imitate all or most of the American way of life, social, political, economic. If he wishes to help the world (as many do), he will have to learn to help it in un-American ways, to learn un-American qualities such as patience and the willingness to wait a long time for results. If what he wants is allies against communism, he will find in nationalism the most, perhaps the only effective force against international communism, even when that nationalism is unwilling to stand up and be counted. For the great battles will probably be fought in the hearts of men, not on material beaches where marines can land, but in a world now effectually united for the first time in history by material means and divided by passion and envy. One may regret the old imperial days, but the awkward and often unprogressive nationalist world is that in which we all must now live.

Anatole Litvak Receives Radio Liberation Award—Ceremonies To Be Broadcast to Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ANATOLE LITVAK RECEIVES RADIO LIBERATION AWARD—CEREMONIES TO BE BROADCAST TO SOVIET UNION

NEW YORK.—Radio Liberation has presented to a scroll to producer Anatole Litvak, attesting to his achievements in the field of motion pictures.

The presentation was made by Howland H. Sargeant, president of the American Committee for Liberation which supports Radio Liberation's around-the-clock broadcasts to the Soviet Union. Mr. Sargeant, a former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, said it was the first such honor ever presented by Radio Liberation.

The ceremony, in which Mr. Litvak spoke in Russian, was taped for later broadcast to the Soviet Union by Radio Liberation, which

has powerful transmitting facilities in West Germany and the Far East.

The Radio Liberation scroll said:

"For his outstanding achievements as producer-director of motion pictures and for his contributions to the art of cinematography, Radio Liberation—the Voice of Former Soviet Citizens—is pleased to present this statement of commendation to Anatole Litvak.

"Born in Kiev, Anatole Litvak underwent the rigorous and thorough training offered by the Dramatic School of Petrograd. He left his homeland in 1924 and since then has distinguished himself in Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States as a producer and director of films, each bearing the imprint of his creative mastery.

"He served as an officer in the U.S. Army and was decorated by the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the United States of which he had become a citizen.

"May this statement of commendation testify not only to the towering stature of a creative artist—but also to the spiritual integrity of one no less devoted to the cause of freedom."

False Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have traveled abroad are aware of the excellent U.S. Customs Service and its efficient and friendly personnel.

It has always been amazing to me that so few could handle so much so well.

Seldom do we realize, when we return from a pleasant journey abroad, that returning with us may be criminals carrying important quantities of illegal drugs. Many of them are intercepted by the Customs Service, but unfortunately some get through simply because there are not enough customs men to go around.

I submit a most timely editorial entitled "One Economy That Costs Us High" from the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., of February 19, 1959, which focuses attention on this often-ignored problem:

ONE ECONOMY THAT COSTS US HIGH

Heroin, the big H of the drug traffic, is no longer of much use medically. It is inferior to morphine which it resembles, but it used to be administered instead of morphine under the mistaken impression it was less habit-forming. Its narcotic effect is almost instantaneous. Manufacture and importation of it are forbidden in the United States. It is the drug used by an estimated 95 percent of addicts.

Last weekend Federal and New York City narcotics agents in a carefully planned series of raids confiscated 32 pounds of the junk, and arrested 27 persons who were described as importers, wholesalers, and distributors. "These are not small fry," said George Gaffney, regional head of the Federal Narcotics Bureau. And he added, perhaps significantly, that none of them uses drugs. Generally the big wheels of the racket are too smart. The ones who use drugs do not stay big wheels long.

The raids were carefully planned, as they had to be. The illegal drug traffic is a rabbit

warren of informers, prostitutes, pervers, all willing to sell anything, information included, for a fix. Two years went into the planning, and it was worth the trouble if big sources of supply have been stopped.

Arresting the users or even the small-fry pushers of narcotics is a necessary but rather futile aspect of halting the drug traffic. Not only must the pushers' suppliers be arrested, but the suppliers of the suppliers must be identified and rendered harmless. Most illegal narcotics are imported. The Customs Service is too badly undermanned to cope with it on all its many fronts at once. Once the stuff gets into the United States, it is distributed fast, and the job of tracking it and its distributors becomes more complicated. Fighting the drug traffic is a continuing war with no truce asked or given. Are we giving law enforcement sufficient manpower to make it anything like an equal battle?

Fiscal Problems of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the texts of several articles which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News. I think these articles present a true picture of the damage done to our State of Michigan by a Governor who listens to the dictates of one segment of our population rather than making an effort to answer the needs of all our citizens:

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Dec. 9, 1958]

THE AMERICAN WAY

History is replete with the stories of men who destroyed themselves but took down with them, or first destroyed, the nations which nurtured them. And history does repeat itself, thanks to the indifference of mankind to the lessons of the past as well as complacency in the face of the future.

Out of the third generation of a family dedicated to the cause of socialism, born and bred in an atmosphere of mistaken thought sincere hatred for what they deemed the evils of capitalism, and with an almost sublime disregard for essential economic truths, came Walter Reuther.

European conditions and limitations, not those of America, seeded the thinking of the Reuther family, beginning with old Jacob Reuther (grandfather of Walter) who left Germany with his 11-year-old son Valentine in 1892, to make a new home in America and escape military conscription for his son.

Valentine Reuther and later his children, including Walter, were apparently raised as Lutherans. It is said that Jacob modified his religion to meet his own conceptions, based largely on his belief that the churches did too much for God and not enough for man. In a belief so simple, and sincere, could grow easily the worship of man rather than the worship of God, and lead even to the atheism which many believe is that of Walter Reuther.

It is tremendously significant that Valentine Reuther trained his children in socialism. He seems to have held regular sessions on Sundays, with his four sons (Ted, Walter, Roy, and Victor) discussing and debating all manner of subjects relating to working men and women.

These meetings took place in an era when the country was discovering and fighting off some of the evils men concoct under freedom and lack of understanding. And there were evils and injustices which needed correcting, although they were not inherent in the fact of freedom of enterprise under rules of fair play with government or law as umpire.

Walter Reuther grew up actively in socialist organization, later even with violence in organization of workers. Fired from his job as a young man, he went to Europe with his brother Victor and studied communism first hand in Russia. He came home vibrating with deep fervor for the Russian system of economic control.

The point is that this man is self-consecrated to the principles of socialism and government control of economic life. His fanaticism, cold in its utter dedication, is incapable of understanding the economic truths which will eventually destroy him. The tragedy is he could easily destroy our country with a socialist dominated and guided government. Walter Reuther already controls the State of Michigan, which, alone among the Midwestern States, has gone backward in prosperity since he took over.

ALFRED P. HAAKE.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Nov. 21, 1958]

THE AMERICAN WAY

Hundreds of letters from individual union members to the McClellan committee of the Senate, expressed fear of reprisals if they dared sign their names to their protests against tyrannical and corrupt practices of union labor bosses.

What a travesty on our vaunted freedom when men dare not tell the truth and express their discontent with the actions of their union masters, lest they lose their jobs—or even worse.

But that is the fact. And the reason for it lies largely in the pernicious agreements between management and unions which force workers to join the union if they want to keep their jobs. It is called by several soft-soaping names, but the correct description is the "closed shop."

Under that label many a factory should hang out a sign for applicants for work: "Americans who believe in freedom are not hired here."

There is an answer to that violation of our constitutional rights. It is the "right to work" laws, already passed in 18 States, which forbid employers and union bosses to enter into closed-shop agreements.

These right-to-work laws, barring compulsory unionization, were upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court in 1949, and sustained in principle in 1954 in the decision on segregation in public schools.

But where are the liberals who believe in freedom and constitutional rights? They weep crocodile tears over restrictions in "freedom of choice" for all citizens regardless of race, and accept without a murmur a system of private slavery under which a man cannot get or keep a job unless he joins a union, pays tribute to and takes orders from a labor boss or his goons.

They are afraid.

The power, political as well as industrial, of the UAW-CIO boss has gone far beyond a single industry and its affiliates. He makes no bones about his aim to get political control of the United States and to win his socialist objectives through legislation. He already controls nearly a majority in both Senate and House, and may even name the next President of the United States.

And the pattern of control with closed union members serving in precincts, through which he already controls Michigan and its Governor, is being built elsewhere with alarming rapidity and thoroughness. He has

more money to spend for elections than both major parties together.

Think about that, you businessmen, professional men, workers, housewives, and students getting ready to work—all of you who believe in freedom. And while you are thinking about it, let me remind you that what happens to a State, such as once industrially proud Michigan, when it falls under the domination of a little labor clique and a subservient Governor, falling backward in employment and industrial development, while its neighboring States forge ahead. Read these figures and weep:

Industrial construction, 1956-57

Ohio.....	\$921,678,000
Indiana.....	889,123,000
Michigan.....	199,176,000

We are on the threshold of a greater prosperity than we have yet known. We can realize that prosperity and even make it endure, if we will shake off the shackles of compulsory union tyranny, and give men the right to work without fear.

ALFRED P. HAAKE.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Feb. 14, 1959]

FAVORABLE TAX CLIMATE AND NICE WEATHER NEEDED TO ATTRACT NEW BUSINESS

It is most unfortunate that dieting—tightening the belt—has never become fashionable among governments.

Most governmental units would look atrocious if they were capable of assuming form and appearing on the beach in bathing suits. They would present the sad sight of bulging waistlines, sagging jowls, flabby muscles, and drooping bags under the eyes.

A good diet certainly would improve their figures.

In particular, we are all in favor of Florida governments going on a biennial diet. We believe it would do a great deal toward improving the State's appearance and health.

This is the way we view it.

Across the Nation, the legislatures of 46 States are in session or will convene this year. In all but a very few instances, the paramount issues up for consideration center around new or increased taxes.

There is a plague of financial ills virtually everywhere.

One of the most seriously stricken units is the noble welfare State of Michigan, where the 10-year reign of Gov. G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams has brought the commonwealth to the brink of financial disaster.

But at the same time nearly 40 States are giving serious consideration to new or higher levies in a wide range of tax fields.

Taxpayers in nine States face personal income tax problems. Tobacco taxes are eyed in nine States. Gasoline levies are due for action in eight States. Seven States are weighing sales taxes and a like number are toying with liquor imposts.

Corporation taxes, motor vehicle fees, inheritance, natural resources, gambling, soft drinks, business franchises, restaurant meals, hotels and motels, property and head taxes are other fields where States plan attacks on the taxpayers' pocketbooks.

At the moment, Florida is among the few exceptions.

Gov. LeRoy Collins has enunciated the policy of holding the line in the 1959-61 biennium. He believes no new taxes will be necessary.

National publications, in looking over the appalling situation of State taxes, are noting Florida's position with some admiration.

And there we have a factor that can be of inestimable value to Florida.

The State has been boasting for years of its favorable tax climate. This has been used as a lure to bring individuals and businesses here.

Now, this asset becomes more important than ever.

Businesses and industries can be expected to take a close look at Florida's tax climate in drafting plans for expansion or relocation.

In the next 2 years, this may well be a vital consideration inducing concerns to locate in the State and provide the much-needed support for Florida's economy.

Cursory studies in Michigan indicate business is finding it increasingly difficult to operate there. The U.S. News & World Report for February 13 cites cases of manufacturers moving from Michigan to other States to ease the tax burden while other concerns are passing up new plants in the State for similar reasons.

The fact Governor Williams had to appeal recently to 23 of the State's largest employers for tax payments in advance to keep the government functioning has pointed up the problems graphically. Businessmen, accordingly, will have this uppermost in their minds when it comes to making future plans.

Under the circumstances, it would not be surprising to find concerns following the example of the Chris Craft Corp., which forsook Algonac, Mich., for Pompano Beach.

In the next 2 years a favorable Florida tax climate can help the State move toward its goal of a more rounded economy, one better suited to withstand a siege of poor weather in the winter season, the inevitable periods of business slowdown, and the other variations of life.

For that reason, it is important that Florida, both the State and the localities, do some governmental dieting. It is important that the people temper their demands for new and expanded services in the interests of a sounder development, in the interests of business expansion which will mean more and better jobs.

The challenge is there. The question is whether Florida can fatten its economy through a dieting government?

HARVEY CALL.

Need for a Third Federal Judge in the Western District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the story of a court's success or failure is in its statistics, for they set a standard of attainment which the court must not fall short of in each succeeding year.

The court, as a part of our governmental machinery, must be given freedom to function so that it may react consciously to the practical needs of the times and the community it serves.

It has become increasingly evident from the statistics cited in a recent article in the Buffalo Courier-Express that efficient performances cannot be expected where conditions necessary to efficiency are impossible.

An additional judgeship would make for a more democratic court and procedure answerable to the best existing public opinion.

This court has the direct and unequivocal duty of disposing of all of the business coming to it from year to year.

The safety of personal liberty, of the rights of the public and of property, depend upon the efficient, impartial enforcement of the laws of the land, which is entrusted to this court.

Long delays are expensive to the taxpayers, as well as exceedingly damaging in failing to bring about prompt satisfaction to society when a crime has been committed, and to the individual when he is falsely charged. Delay discourages the witnesses, the prosecuting attorney, and the general public in the effort to enforce the law.

I shall make a determined, sincere, constant effort to correct this evil condition of literally choking this court of the western district of New York with accumulated cases by seeking appointment of an additional judgeship for this area.

To focus attention on a national basis to a local problem, I am including an article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 11, 1959, giving the statistical justification for this judgeship:

ADDED CASES POINT UP NEED FOR THIRD JUDGE
(By George Wyatt)

The need for a third Federal judge in the western district of New York is being brought into sharp focus by a substantial increase in the backlog of Federal court cases here. At the close of business yesterday there were 307 civil cases and 65 criminal cases pending.

Despite an almost doubled caseload, the western district has had only two judges at one time since 1927.

The situation has become even more critical since last summer when Judge Justin C. Morgan was incapacitated by illness. Since August 1, his last day in court, virtually the entire burden has been borne by Judge Harold P. Burke of Rochester.

The district got its second judge in 1927 when Federal authorities appointed Judge Simon L. Adler to help Judge John R. Hazel.

Now—32 years later—the number of judges remains unchanged. But those who urge appointment of a third judge point to these changes:

1. Caseload: In 1927 there were 226 civil cases filed, compared with double the number, 450, last year. There were 208 criminal cases filed in 1958, compared to 600 in 1927. However, the huge majority of the 1927 criminal cases were minor prohibition violations which were handled routinely. The modern criminal caseload involves many full jury trials.

2. Wider jurisdiction: Since 1927, literally thousands of Federal statutes have been added to the jurisdiction of the court. In the fields of labor and business alone, the judges are concerned with entire new areas of jurisdiction. Federal jurisdiction in criminal coverage in the areas of tax matters, espionage and subversion, labor racketeering, narcotics, immigration, and others has been broadened.

3. Population: The 17 counties of the district in 1930 totaled 2,208,447. The 1950 population was 2,341,042. Experts estimate it is now above 3 million.

4. Economic growth: Business analysts estimate the gross commerce of the district has nearly trebled since 1927, not counting the difference in dollar value since then. With growing commercial complexity comes matching complexity of litigation.

Lumping the 1958 criminal and civil cases, the district's two judges each had a total case load of 329. The national median caseload for Federal judges about 250.

During Judge Morgan's illness, Judge Burke has had to travel here for court sessions on an average of at least once a week. When he comes the work load is staggering.

On an average day he will handle upward of two dozen cases, including arraignments, sentencings and civil motions.

The trial calendar in both Buffalo and Rochester has been slowed. There have been no nonjury civil cases in Buffalo, for example, since last July.

The operation of Federal grand juries here also has been hampered. Although not necessary, it is customary to have a judge present when a grand jury is in session.

Repeated delays occur when the grand jury is awaiting Judge Burke's return here for rulings. This has become a serious element in the Federal grand jury's lengthy probe of the city paving scandals and of the Appalachian-linked western New Yorkers.

Legislative Oversight, Spectrum, Study, and Investigation—H.R. 4800

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I had the special honor and privilege of speaking to the Federal Communications Bar Association, composed of distinguished members of the legal profession. I was very glad to have had an invitation to speak to this particular group at this particular time. It gave me an opportunity to discuss with them some most important problems in which I knew they had a great interest, as does the American public.

In that my remarks were directed to the work of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and with particular reference to the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, our plans for this Congress, some exposures of false claims in a recent book, and a discussion of the bill introduced as a result of our committee last year, I thought perhaps the Members might be interested, and therefore include it in the RECORD with these remarks:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE OREN HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS BAR ASSOCIATION, HOTEL WILLARD, FEBRUARY 26, 1959

Mr. President, members of the Federal Communications Bar Association, honored guests, I welcome this opportunity of appearing before you today. I feel you could hardly have chosen a better time for this discussion because there are several important developments that I would like to talk to you about, and I doubt whether I could find a more interested audience since the things I want to discuss with you are of great importance to you, your clients, and the FCC.

In the first place, there has been a lot of speculation and wide interest in the future program of our committee. I am speaking of our plans for further study and investigation pursuant to the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. From the experience we had in the last

Congress, I can readily understand this interest.

In our committee report filed January 3 this year, we made recommendations on a variety of questions that needed further study and investigation. I have no other intention than to carry out these recommendations.

In view of the fact that so many of these questions are highly sensitive, I felt it advisable to ask for a budget separate from the other work of our committee in order that the Congress and the public would know just what we had in mind.

You are familiar with the announcement of a few days ago with respect to the reestablishment of the Legislative Oversight Committee.

On Monday of this week, I introduced a resolution requesting \$350,000 for the committee to make the special study and investigation. I went before the House Administration Committee and explained our purpose. The committee approved the funds for this work and yesterday reported to the House. It being a privileged matter, the chairman of the committee called it up for consideration. With little discussion and a few pertinent questions, the House approved the request and made the full amount of \$350,000 available to the committee.

In the budget that I submitted to the House Administration Committee, \$200,000 was for the purpose of continuing the work of the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight. Obviously, we have not had time as yet to get together a staff, since the funds were obtained only yesterday.

I want to make it perfectly clear, however, that the committee will use the greatest precaution in obtaining the kind of a staff that is needed and which will carry out the plans and policies of the committee for a forthright, fearless, fair and objective study and investigation.

We have not had an opportunity to formulate specific plans and a program, but the pattern is fairly well established in our recommendations contained in the report filed January 3.

In the second place, we asked and obtained \$150,000 to make a study of what I believe to be one of the most important problems we have today which is of tremendous concern and interest to the American public, that is a study of the proper utilization of the radio spectrum.

Many of the situations which we dealt with in the Oversight Subcommittee are a direct result of the scarcity of desirable spectrum space available for broadcasting purposes.

It is my intention to have our regular Subcommittee on Communications and Power study the present and prospective utilization of the radio spectrum and have it also study the proper governmental machinery and procedures to bring about an efficient utilization of the spectrum.

As you well know, at present there is divided responsibility between the President and the FCC for the allocation of frequencies for governmental and nongovernmental purposes. The demand for spectrum space has grown to such an extent and is expected to grow still further at such speed that it is dubious whether the divided responsibility can bring about an efficient utilization of the spectrum. The spectrum situation may be analogous to the situation which did exist with respect to the use of the airspace by military, commercial, and private planes, and which led during the last Congress to the creation of the unified Federal Aviation Agency.

I consider this study one of the most important ones which our committee can undertake in the field of communications. We shall seek to retain an expert staff to make

this study, and the outcome of this study may affect you, your clients, and the American people most importantly.

Thirdly, most of you know that a week ago I introduced a bill, H.R. 4800, to carry out the legislative recommendations made by the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight in its report to the Congress at the end of the last session. The hearings on which this report was based commenced in January 1958 and continued through November 1958. The hearing record of more than 11,000 pages, exclusive of exhibits, is probably not much shorter than the sum total of news stories that have been written about these hearings, and the individuals involved in these hearings as well as the Members of Congress who conducted them.

One aspect of the hearings, which particularly seems to have intrigued the press, is the proven or alleged misconduct of certain members of the commissions which were under investigation, of parties involved in proceedings before these commissions, and of other persons in public or private life interested in some of these proceedings.

Now, I don't want to deny for a moment that improper or unethical conduct by members of the regulatory commissions and commission employees, by parties and practitioners before these agencies, by persons in the executive branch or in the Congress, constitutes a most serious and difficult problem which ought to be given proper attention and that such conduct ought to be prevented in the future. However, I want to emphasize that even if all the commissions and all of the persons in public and private life who are concerned with proceedings before these agencies were angels, there still would be other crucial problems in connection with the operation of these agencies which the Congress must come to grips with and on which the American people must be well informed.

Many of you probably have read recent newspaper stories about a book written by a former counsel of the Special Oversight Subcommittee. A few of you even may have read the book. Now, I could spend all of the time which you have allowed me here today in pointing out misstatements of fact and erroneous assumptions and conclusions made by the author. However, I doubt that you would want me to take the time, and I am reasonably sure that it would not be time well spent.

I have thus far refrained from making any comment publicly. However, there are two or three things I would like to say now which I think would be appropriate.

In the first place, even though our committee, in my opinion, accomplished a lot and did a good job in the last Congress, I would be one of the first to admit that some mistakes were made in connection with such a difficult and sensitive task.

In fact, about the first and perhaps the most serious mistake the committee made was that it employed Dr. Schwartz as its chief counsel.

When he was interviewed by the committee and presented with the policy statement previously adopted by the committee, he complimented the statement and thought it constituted a very fine and objective approach. After he became employed, he apparently forgot or else arbitrarily failed to proceed in accordance with the committee policy.

I would never question anyone's right to his ideas on a matter of principle. I do seriously take issue, however, with the methods, tactics, and procedures employed by Dr. Schwartz. I could not agree with them from the first public utterances he made before the Federal Bar Association. This was the major reason for what later developed.

He was determined either to rule or ruin. In my opinion, and as illustrated in his

book, he proposes to change completely our fundamental principle of regulatory commissions. (Ch. 2 of the book.)

In other words, the book itself is the most outstanding proof of why the committee should never have employed him. He admits to defiance of the committee and he asserts that it was his purpose and responsibility to make the policies and conduct the investigation according to his own views and procedure.

Having been completely unsuccessful with his tactics, he proceeded to write a book. As for the sharp criticism and personal reflections on me, I care little. I did observe the one compliment, which must have been an oversight, when he referred to me as a "most urbane denizen."

Just let me mention two or three of the false and inaccurate claims:

There is reference to the Albany television case in which Mr. Hagerty was involved.

There was nothing at any time called to the attention of the committee about any problem relating to the Albany TV comparative television case. Neither I nor any other member of the committee received any information from the staff or anyone else until after the expiration of the committee in January, and you have recently seen the publicity.

Dr. Schwartz undertakes to claim credit for the Adams-Goldfine fiasco. There was nothing in the files referring to this matter in any way, with the exception of one memorandum from the Federal Trade Commission which in no way referred to Mr. Adams. Dr. Schwartz gave no information to the committee in public hearings or in executive session, and there was nothing at that time developed on it.

Two staff investigators had obtained the information regarding Commissioner Mack and the channel 10 question. However, this information had not been put together and developed for presentation at the time the committee terminated the services of Dr. Schwartz.

In other words, not only are the claims false, but it again emphasizes his attitude in withholding information from the committee itself.

The book reconfirms my earlier conviction that the author has not as yet grasped the scope of the task assigned to the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, and that he preferred to follow his own notions of what the subcommittee should investigate instead of carrying out the detailed policies which had been laid down by the subcommittee for the scope and conduct of this investigation. In other words, while he was counsel of the subcommittee and still at the present time, he is almost exclusively concerned with the problem of improper conduct and what to do about it, as if that problem, serious though it is, was the only or even the foremost problem that confronts us in dealing with the independent regulatory agencies and their operation in the public interest.

Under these circumstances, the most important task of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, namely a thorough study of the functioning or malfunctioning of the independent regulatory agencies, beyond improper conduct, and of the causes of and the possible remedies for such malfunctioning still lies ahead of us.

That does not mean that the job which the subcommittee has done to date is insignificant. Quite the contrary. I feel that the accomplishments of the subcommittee to date are very substantial, and it is my hope that the bill which I have just introduced and which carries out the legislative recommendations of the Oversight Subcommittee will be enacted into law.

The process by which a bill becomes law is fortunately a slow one. This process offers ample opportunity to all interested parties of making their views known to the Con-

gress. I trust I am correct in believing that you are interested parties, and I appeal to you that you give the provisions of this bill your careful attention both in your own interest and in the interest of your clients and most of all in the interest of the American people.

I appreciate, of course, that the Federal Communications Bar Association cannot take any position with respect to substantive matters. You represent different classes of clients who have divergent interests and it would be too much to expect that you or your clients would agree as to the substantive provisions of the Communications Act. However, H.R. 4800 deals primarily with organizational and procedural problems, and these problems, I feel, are a proper subject for discussion by the Federal Communications Bar Association. It is my hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have the benefit of detailed and specific recommendations of your association with respect to this legislation. Your constructive criticism and your suggestions for amendments as well as your support for the principles on which this bill is based will be most welcome.

Let us take a brief look at some of the provisions of H.R. 4800. Title I of the bill relates to the FCC exclusively. The other titles of the bill deal with the remaining five of the six big independent regulatory commissions. The provisions for all of the agencies are substantially identical.

Section 101 sets forth the policy. The bill is intended to strengthen the independence and effectiveness of the independent regulatory agencies and to increase the public confidence in their efficient, fair, and independent operation. These objectives are to be reached by taking the following actions: (1) Guarding against improper influence upon and improper conduct of agency members and employees; (2) observing ethical standards by members, employees, parties and practitioners; (3) preventing off-the-record communications; (4) selecting chairman by agencies themselves; (5) assuming of individual responsibility by commissioners for preparation of agency opinions; and (6) making uniform the President's power to dismiss commissioners for cause.

Section 102 which contains definitions is a most important section because it defines the term "proceeding" and thereby outlines the boundaries of the key provisions of the bill. I want to call to your attention particularly subsection (b) of section 102 which has the effect of making applicable to certain rule-making proceedings the prohibition against off-the-record communications and the requirement that all communications made concerning such rule-making proceeding be placed in the public files of such proceeding. The rule-making proceedings to which this prohibition and this requirement apply, however, are only those in which the Commission actually undertakes an "on-the-record-only proceeding" and where a notice of proposed rule-making to this effect has been issued.

It seems to us that in those cases of rule-making, the Commission holds out to the participants and to the public generally that only on-the-record communications will be taken into consideration by the Commission, and therefore there is no room for any other communications. I realize, this may be an innovation and may go beyond the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. However, I believe it is desirable to make this change.

Section 103 outlines in general terms criteria of improper influence by parties and others upon the Commission and of improper conduct by Commission members and employees. The Commission is directed to prescribe regulations implementing and supplementing these provisions. While the

criminal provisions of the bill do not apply to this section, I want to call to your attention certain provisions of subsection (d) of section 103. In order to bring about compliance with this section, the Commission is directed to establish procedures for considering and acting on complaints, and the Commission is authorized to issue reprimands and take other disciplinary action, including suspension or disqualification of persons appearing in a representative capacity before the Commission, or take other action which may be warranted in particular instances, including action against the parties to the proceeding. This is a most important power which the Commission would be given, and, in my opinion, this power is necessary if the provisions against improper influence and improper conduct are to be enforced effectively.

Sections 104 and 105 dealing with off-the-record communications and the requirement as to placing certain communications in the public files of proceedings, may perhaps be considered the heart of the bill. We appreciate that exceptions may have to be made with regard to these provisions in order to promote the expeditious and efficient discharge by the Commission of its duties, and in order to secure the cooperation of other agencies of Government. Nobody knows better than the Commission and the attorneys who regularly appear before the Commission how broad these exceptions should be. Under the bill, the Commission would have three months from the date of enactment of this legislation to prescribe the regulations setting forth the exceptions from the prohibition against off-the-record communications. I trust, the Commission can count on your assistance and scrutiny in prescribing proper exceptions, and proper exceptions only.

Please note carefully that the criminal penalties of section 107 apply to sections 104 and 105 as well as section 106(a) which provides for the filing of a notice of appearance by any person who appears for himself or in a representative capacity in any proceeding or matter before the Commission. The hearings before the Oversight Subcommittee developed several situations in which parties had two teams to represent them—an on-the-record team and another one whose existence was not even known to the attorneys who did their best to represent their clients in accordance with the regular procedures of the Commission. This kind of influence peddling has to stop, and section 106 is designed to help stop it.

Section 111 provides that the Commission shall choose its own Chairman and Vice Chairman. The term of the Chairman is not to exceed 3 years. The Chairman, after serving a full term, may not again serve as Chairman until a full term has elapsed.

The purpose of this provision is undoubtedly clear to all of you, as is the purpose of section 112 which provides for the assumption of individual responsibility by Commissioners for the preparation of agency opinions. Such opinion is to be signed by the member of the Commission who was responsible for its preparation. Specialization in opinion preparation according to types of cases is prohibited.

Several of the big six independent regulatory agencies are already following this practice and the results, according to the testimony before our subcommittee, have been very salutary.

I believe all of you will welcome section 113 which provides that failure of the Commission to act on motions for procedural or interlocutory relief within 60 days shall be treated as a denial of such motion.

Section 114 repeals the honorarium provision now contained in the Federal Communications Act, and section 115 repeals the provision establishing the "Review

Staff" and the provision prohibiting certain off-the-record communications. These provisions were added by the McFarland act. The reasons for their repeal are apparent: the provisions of H.R. 4800 are either in conflict with or go beyond the provisions which are to be repealed.

This concludes my very brief review of some of the key provisions of H.R. 4800 which are applicable to the FCC. I appeal again to you to study with care the provisions of this bill, to come forward with your constructive criticism and suggestions because we are most anxious to make this the best possible legislation, and you appreciate that we shall be legislating in a most critical and sensitive area.

It has been a pleasure to be with you today, and I hope that this day will mark the beginning of renewed efforts for fruitful cooperation between your association and our committee. Thank you.

Pennypinching That Aids Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica, Calif., Evening Outlook of January 12, 1959:

PENNYPINCHING THAT AIDS CRIME

The Port of Los Angeles is the favorite west coast port of entry for dope smugglers trying to bring their illicit and highly profitable wares into the United States. For reasons of geography as well as population, it is especially favored by smugglers getting their supplies from Red China, the world's principal source of heroin, and also from Mexico. With huge profits and also dire penalties at stake, dope smugglers find many ways to hide their small packets of contraband and to disguise their occupation. It takes officials of long experience and expert training in this field to catch them.

It might therefore be expected that the U.S. customs service would keep at least a minimum staff of such experts on duty at the Port of Los Angeles, adequate to the big and exacting job of watching out for dope smugglers on incoming ships. Yet when a wave of economy hit the U.S. customs in 1958, orders went out from Washington that have the effect of reducing all personnel, including those of ship inspectors at the Port of Los Angeles.

This arbitrary order, preventing replacement of any customs employee who is shifted elsewhere, or who dies or is retired, has resulted in the skeletonizing of a Port of Los Angeles force of inspectors that was already understaffed. During the week of Christmas, three large ships entered this port which should have been thoroughly searched for dope smugglers. But only two inspectors were available. They could not do the job in the brief time allowed them.

The austerity program, as it is called by Washington, recognizes that practically every office is faced with an increase in business and many are in urgent need of additional personnel. Yet it includes numerous pennypinching measures. Cause of the austerity is failure of Congress to provide \$300,000 additional funds to compensate for mandatory wage and salary increases to Bureau personnel.

We are all for economy in Government when it eliminates unnecessary services, waste, duplication, or costly monuments to bureaucracy. But the economy practiced by the Customs Bureau at the Port of Los Angeles and other major U.S. ports has pared a few hundred thousand dollars off the Government's payroll at the cost of weakening the public's protection against the most nefarious and costly traffic in the world today. And not only the public's protection against the drug traffic, but against a large proportion of our major crimes which are traceable to drugs.

"For want of a nail, the shoe was lost—for want of a shoe, etc." The number of drug addicts in California has been growing at an appalling rate, and such leading authorities as J. Edgar Hoover emphasizes that we must stamp out the drug traffic before we can reduce the incidence of crime. The pennypinching imposed on the U.S. Customs Service is a move in the reverse direction, opening our ports to the dope smugglers.

Tax Incentive To Invest Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 20, 1959:

WALL STREET, U.S.A.

(By Donald I. Rogers)

TAX INCENTIVE TO INVEST ABROAD

One of the more constructive campaigns being conducted in Washington these days is being managed by Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, who holds promise of a boon to U.S. taxpayers and both individual and corporate investors who seek to expand their foreign investment activities.

Representative Boggs has introduced a bill (H.R. 5) "to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance." No one can quarrel with the aims and intentions of this bill.

Representative Boggs' bill clearly recognizes that valid tax incentives are most essential to the advancement of private foreign investment by American citizens. In his speeches he has made another equally valid point—that tax reductions to encourage increased private investment abroad should be regarded as part of our national security program, particularly in view of the mounting economic offensive of the Soviet Union.

There's a weight of solid evidence to prove that tax incentives can stimulate portfolio investment abroad, as well as direct investment by U.S. corporations. One need only look across the northern boundary to find an outstanding example in the record of the publicly held Canadian investment companies established since 1954.

Since 1954 eight publicly held Canadian investment companies have been formed in response to the hospitable treatment afforded under Canadian laws. To qualify their shares for sale in the United States, they registered under the United States investment company act of 1940 and the securities act of 1933.

In little more than 4 years more than 129,000 United States investors, large and small, have put about \$393 million to work principally in Canada, through these professionally managed companies, according to the Committee of Canadian Investment Companies. The average individual holding in the securities of these companies was in excess of \$3,000 an investor at the close of 1958.

Why the success of these companies? How have they managed to attract so much long-term individual investment for the securities of companies contributing to the long-range growth of Canada and other free world nations?

There are three basic answers:

1. They have offered United States investors an opportunity to get diversification and informed investment management supervision of foreign securities.

2. They have offered United States investors an opportunity to avail themselves of certain tax incentives offered by Canadian laws to attract needed capital—incentives unimpaired under United States tax laws.

3. They have offered United States investors an opportunity to make long-term foreign investments without being subject to the many inconveniences that ordinarily arise in connection with foreign investments.

By policy, Canadian investment companies retain and reinvest both their net income and capital gains that may be realized. They thus compound the possible long-term capital gains benefits for their shareholders at low tax cost and keep their resources continuously at work, principally in the economy of Canada. Since Canada does not tax capital gains the publicly held Canadian portfolio companies are not subject to such a tax. And, as Canadian corporations, they may retain and plow back their current income without penalty. Thus, under consistent and long-standing United States tax policy, they have given the United States portfolio investors the type of incentives and opportunities to participate in foreign investment that have long been available to the direct United States corporate investor.

The response of United States investors to these opportunities clearly illustrates that a new and effective pattern has been created for stimulating private investment abroad.

This pattern can be extended, with similarly desirable and long-term benefits, to other receptive developing nations.

Maintaining these incentives and improving them, as the Boggs bill would do, cannot help but motivate both direct and portfolio investment abroad.

Statement of Peter Volid, of Barrington, Ill., Chairman of the Board of King Korn Stamp Co., of Chicago, Upon Receiving the Horatio Alger Award Presented by the American Schools and Colleges Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am appending a statement by Peter Volid, chairman of the board of King Korn Stamp Co. of Chicago, upon receiving the Horatio Alger Award presented by the American Schools and Col-

leges Association. His friends report that Mr. Volid is proud indeed to be numbered among such men as have been chosen to symbolize America's "rags to riches dream come true."

The rise of Peter Volid is a tribute not only to his own genius but equally to the American free enterprise system which has made this country great.

Mr. Volid, owner and manager of King Korn Stamp Co., succeeded in increasing the annual gross of that company within a period of less than 4 years from nothing to an estimated \$10 million. His business life, from its inception, contained meteoric force. Following 2 years' attendance at Sheldon High School in Chicago, he started out, in 1922, as a door-to-door peddler of ham, bacon, hosiery, and notions. He later became Wisconsin representative for Brillo steel wool and then worked for a Chicago macaroni company in the early 1930's. When he had saved up \$2,000, Peter Volid set himself up in business as a food broker. With perspicuity, realizing that few companies specialized in marshmallows, he set himself up as a marshmallow maker and seller by borrowing \$3,000 from 29 persons. He himself sold his own products—and sold them so successfully that in 1951, at 54 years of age, he retired. In 1952, however, he was asked by Thriftway Stores to make a management survey of their chain—and later to organize and run the premium stamp business of that company, which they had decided to start. Before the end of 1 year, Mr. Volid bought out the founders of the company. He had increased the number of stores using the stamps to 1,000. The revenues therefrom rose consistently until in 1956 they amounted to \$7 million. Small wonder that in describing Mr. Volid's miraculous rise, a national magazine titled its article, "Something for Nothing."

In appending the following statement of Mr. Volid, whom I am proud to claim as a constituent of the 13th District of Illinois, I would personally recommend his words as a renewed challenge and answer to those whose faith in America and its free system will never die:

Opportunities for the young people of today who are entering their chosen fields in the business world are greater now than at any other time in our Nation's history.

However, these young people must, it seems to me, set a plan for the future and follow it. They must first of all decide what their objectives and goals are; then they should make a realistic study of what it will take in the way of sacrifice, energy, and hard work to realize those goals. Finally, they must be willing to pursue their goals with unswerving persistence.

If a youth can apply this simple formula, there is no limit as to what he or she can achieve. America today is in the throes of an industrial, business and commercial, and scientific revolution that has known no equal in days gone by. And to the ambitious youth, who is not afraid of the time tested techniques of hard work and persistent application of effort, there is no direction to go but up—up to greater heights than were heretofore possible by ourselves and our predecessors.

The youth of today must not be influenced by those who say that the economy is a saturated one—that one today cannot forge ahead and receive just recognition without

influence or powerful connections—or that the saga of Horatio Alger is a dead one in the country. Just as these Horatio Alger award winners on this stage today overcame every conceivable obstacle to rise to great achievement and heights in their fields, so today, there are thousands of youngsters all over America who have begun their climb up the ladder, and who will be the success stories of tomorrow.

You must remember that these men, 30, 40, 50 years ago heard the same basic discouragements that you will hear today. Yet they managed to rise above their meager beginnings. And so can you by applying and living the same techniques that they did.

Persistence and hard work applied over a long period of time can turn the mediocre into a giant. One need not be blessed with great mental or physical strengths; but merely a determination and a will to work hard.

In most cases the rest, brilliance, wisdom, knowledge, commonsense, will all come as the determination and hard work is applied. One must also not be afraid of failure. For it is only through failure that one can learn and profit by his mistakes. If you refuse to stretch yourself and hence run the risk of failure, you can never grow. The only fact that must be remembered is that after failure, you must recognize your mistakes and try again, the next time avoiding the pitfalls of the last experience.

A Long Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to insert the following richly deserved tribute to the Honorable William A. Wachenfeld that appeared in the Newark Evening News of February 24, 1959.

Judge Wachenfeld's career exemplifies the truth of the statement that the "expression and perfection of the law" come only from men endowed with a rich spirit, full learning and humility of soul. His integrity, intellectual capacity, and devotion to duty have won Judge Wachenfeld the respect and esteem of his fellow citizens. As the editorial states, Judge Wachenfeld's "retirement brings to a close a public career of unusual length and commendable performance." He takes with him into retirement the gratitude of the people of New Jersey and their best wishes that the years ahead will return to him in good measure the health and happiness he has earned.

A LONG CAREER

It's hard to realize that the seemingly ageless William A. Wachenfeld is 70, but he is. And today, in obedience to the constitution, he must step down from the supreme court seat he has occupied 12 years.

Before that he served 13 years as prosecutor of Essex County. Next year will bring the 50th anniversary of his graduation from law school. A busy lawyer, he found time for politics and public affairs. He might have been governor had he not twice refused to be a candidate.

William Wachenfeld was not everyone's idea of a supreme court justice when Gov-

ernor Edge appointed him in 1946. Vigorous and combative and brusque of speech, he seemed better fitted for administrative office.

It was out of character for him to sit patiently through the endless, often tenuous, argument which judges must endure, and he himself doubted that he had the temperamental requisites for the bench. Nevertheless, he made the adjustment successfully, becoming one of the court's most useful members.

As might have been expected, he became a notable dissenter. Some of his disagreements with his colleagues were scholarly explorations; others, especially those dealing with criminal law, consisted of a single scathing paragraph or page.

His retirement brings to a close a public career of unusual length and commendable performance.

A Worthy Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial, which appeared in the February 19 issue of the *Jesup Sentinel*, paying tribute to Miss Gussie Sutton.

Miss Sutton, well known and recognized throughout Jesup and Wayne County as one of its most outstanding citizens, was presented the first Kiwanis award of the year on February 13 at the annual Kiwanis ladies' night program. Miss Sutton is city clerk of the city of Jesup.

The editorial follows:

A WORTHY TRIBUTE

Rev. Albert Hall, pastor of the First Methodist Church in Jesup, presented most effectively the feelings, respect, and admiration of the people of Jesup and Wayne County, last Friday night, when he presented, on behalf of the Jesup Kiwanis Club, the club's first Kiwanis Award of the Year to Miss Gussie Sutton.

Miss Gussie, as she is affectionately known, has through the years gained the respect and admiration of every person with whom she has come in contact and has been one of the main supports of the present city manager form of city government. Miss Gussie served as city clerk of Jesup prior to the establishment of the present system of city government. She succeeded the late Don Surrency as clerk of the city of Jesup and has served under two city managers.

In honoring Miss Gussie, and presenting the first Kiwanis Award of the Year before more than a hundred Kiwanians and guests, who gave a standing ovation of approval to the praise spoken and the presentation of the award to the city's beloved Miss Gussie, Rev. Albert Hall took the opportunity to condemn those people who look toward the destination of the city rather than for its good.

He pointed out the dangers and results of people starting or assisting in the spread of vicious and unfounded rumors and that such people can destroy more good than a complete community can build in many years.

We join with Reverend Hall, officials and members of the Jesup Kiwanis Club and the people of Wayne County, in paying long-

overdue praise to one of Jesup's most capable, unselfish, and beloved citizens. Miss Gussie has demonstrated to all those with whom she has come in contact her unselfish devotion to duty, and her willingness to serve her fellowman at every opportunity. Such an award could not have been deserved more, nor been awarded to a more deserving person.

We also commend Rev. Albert Hall for the outstanding presentation, and for bringing to the attention of the people of Jesup and Wayne County one of its growing evils, an evil that appears to have gained such a firm hold upon the community that it is rapidly taking its place as the greatest problem of the city, that of the spreading of vicious rumors.

An unfounded rumor started as an innocent little falsehood, often becomes a vicious evil that can destroy the very life of any community. Not only is the person who started the rumor at fault, but those people who, often without thinking, assist in the spread of its evil fangs, are contributing as much or more toward the destruction of their community and their people as any other person.

An unfounded truth, a little falsehood, or a vicious deliberate rumor, started for the purpose of destroying a person, and caused to grow, through the support and assistance of people, who, "heard that so and so was reported to be such and such," can not only destroy the person to whom it was directed but the very community in which it was started.

Jesup and Wayne County has grown and prospered through the past 10 years, gaining for itself the reputation as one of the State's faster growing cities, and one to which its citizens could point with pride. Within recent weeks these characteristics which have contributed so much to its growth, and its reputation is fast fading into the background, and taking their place as the growing reputation of a city of vicious rumors, or unfounded truths, and a divided people, neither satisfied with its progress and its accomplishments, but striving in its evil way to uproot the good that has been done and the progress made.

Unthinkingly many of the better people of the city have joined hands with this effort to destroy the very lifeblood of the community, in joining with the rumor-makers, and helping in passing them on to others in the city.

We join with Reverend Hall and others of the city in urging that we stop and take stock of our individual lives, see if we are assets to our community, see if this community is a better place for our children to live, for our having lived and worked here, or have we joined hands with those who would destroy what others have worked so hard to accomplish.

The Jesup way of life is a good way of life, all of us should join hands in an effort to stamp out every false rumor, every effort to destroy those things that have made us a great little city.

Shining On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *Record*, I include the following article from the *Hollywood, Calif., Legionnaire* for February 1959:

SHINING ON

(By P. A. "Dick" Horton)

One of our national heroes who seemed to best represent the common man of America, was Abraham Lincoln. His birth in a hand-hewn log house; his modest and frugal childhood; his guidance from a kind and understanding mother and his own determination to educate himself were character moulding factors that have always appealed to the American people. His life, more than any other American has given hope and inspiration to the youth of our land. That, regardless of social or economic station in life Americans all have equal opportunities to reach the highest position of trust in our land.

During Lincoln's day our people held a deep respect, loyalty and gratitude for Washington and the knowledge that he was more responsible than any other person for the winning of our freedom, for the adoption of our Constitution and for the building of the first Nation on earth dedicated to the religious and political freedom of mankind.

Lincoln's reverence and respect for Washington are revealed in his statement: "To add brightness to the sun, or glory to the name of Washington, are alike impossible. Let none attempt it, and in its ageless, deathless splendor leave it, shining on."

The Nation was at that time less than a century old. Many were still alive whose fathers had been companions of Washington. Our people were proud, very proud of the accomplishment of both of these two noble Americans. Loyalty, integrity, patriotism, and faith were the guiding words, spirit, and conduct of Americans. The most odious word in the English language was treason.

OUR CHANGING WORLD

Following World War I, the world was aflame with the hatred built up by centuries of turmoil, strife, plottings, trickery, and ambitions of European politicians. New tyrants had risen in Italy, Germany, and Russia. Each of these tyrants were determined to conquer the world or destroy it. Propaganda or brainwashing became an advanced art.

The old Grecian method of appealing the masses was used under the banner of socialism and false promises of equality, position and goods. Hitler called his socialism "nazism"; Mussolini called his socialism "fascism"; Stalin called his socialism "communism." While the approach differed slightly, the objective was the same in every instance, to enforce conformity under the iron rule of dictatorship under the penalty of death or even worse.

Serene in our belief it could not happen here, our people were aroused by diligent members of patriotic societies and particularly the American Legion. One piece of evidence after another was furnished by patriots who found plottings, schemings, and propaganda of the agents of these foreign groups. Most of this material was received with a shrug. Veterans, patriots, Americans were crucified for daring to suggest that there were those among us that worked for our downfall. Treason is an ugly word.

Patriotic members of the American Legion and other groups realized that unless we could soon obtain an official government body with its cloak of authority to investigate and expose these traitors in our midst, it would soon be too late to save our beloved America.

The National Americanism Commissioner, Homer Challaieux, and the united efforts of the members of the Legion in every State in the Union, and including the writer in the State of California, pleaded with our Congress, individually and collectively, until we had at last obtained the appointment of a committee in Congress known as the

Un-American Activities Committee. Enemies of this committee have attempted to destroy it ever since its organization. But year after year patriots have risen to its defense.

History will write of the noble work it has done and how it has exposed the traitors in our midst. How it exposed the machinations of the Remingtons, the Harry Dexter Whites, the Alger Hisses, and those thousands of men and women of foreign ideals who have come to our shores determined to destroy all that those two noble men, Washington and Lincoln, had worked so diligently to obtain.

The need for this committee is greater now than at any other time in our Nation's history. It is stated that the Civil Liberties Union and other organizations whose loyalty to our country has long been submerged by their sympathy for Communist causes intend to file a petition of 2 million names demanding a discontinuance of the Un-American Activities Committee.

We must all ask ourselves, Are we less loyal than our fathers; is conformity and slavery a good substitute for liberty? Do we lack the energy to defend our country or protect it from the fanatics who would destroy it? Our Congress is now in session. How deeply are you interested in your country's future? Write to your Congressmen. Write to your Senators and express your views on this matter.

When the shades of night have fallen and you are nestled in the bosom of your family secure in the rights guaranteed you under our Constitution, take time to pray to God that we may continue the America of Washington and Lincoln, and that the light of liberty be kept shining on.

Repeal Excise Taxes on Telephone Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my belief that the Federal excise taxes on local and long distance telephone services, which, with other excise taxes, were imposed on the citizens of our Nation as war-time measures, should be repealed. I was, therefore, pleased when the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia recently passed a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact during the current session of Congress, legislation repealing said excise taxes on local and long distance telephone services and other communication services. So that other Members of the House may be advised of the action taken by the Georgia House of Representatives, I am, under leave to extend my remarks, inserting house resolution No. 212, introduced by Mr. Downing Musgrove, of Clinch County in the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia, as follows:

H.R. 212

Whereas the Congress of the United States during World War II, as an emergency measure, levied the Federal excise tax upon the charges for local telephone service and increased the tax rates on long distance telephone service and other communication services for the purposes of raising needed

funds for the war effort and of discouraging the unnecessary use of services and materials needed to carry on the war; and

Whereas the emergency ended many years ago, and the principal purposes for enacting the Federal excise taxes on local and long distance telephone services no longer exist; and

Whereas historically, a Federal excise tax on telephone services has never been imposed on the American public except in times of emergency; and

Whereas telephone service has become an essential household and business service and is an everyday necessity for nearly everyone; and

Whereas, telephone service is the only household utility service that is subject to a Federal excise tax; and

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on telephone services are discriminatory, unfair, have outlived their justification and should no longer be continued in effect; and

Whereas measures which would effect the repeal of these taxes on communication services are now pending in the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, That we do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact during the current session of Congress legislation repealing said excise taxes on local and long distance telephone services and other communication services; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate, and to each member of the Georgia delegation in Congress.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Pittsburgh chapter of the Lithuanian American Council, on February 15, 1959, commemorating the 41st anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania:

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., sponsored by the Lithuanian American Council of Pittsburgh, and held February 15, 1959, at the Lithuanian Citizens Hall, Pittsburgh, to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the declaration of Independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas in 1940 the Soviet Union in conspiracy with the Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all treaties and obligations, signed by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and against the will of the people, annexed her to the Communist empire; and

"Whereas since that time the freedom of Lithuanian people is suppressed by cruel means of the Communist dictatorship which strives to dominate all the world; and

"Whereas the fate of Lithuania as well as of other subjugated eastern European nations will depend on the success of the foreign policy of the United States; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism and do all in its power to liberate the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain; be it further

"Resolved, That this meeting urges the Government of United States to continue its opposition to the United Nations' Draft Code of Offenses which prohibits lending assistance to and liberation of captive nations; and be it finally

"Resolved, That the Government of United States refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to Lithuania and the other enslaved European nations."

STANLEY F. BAKANAS,
Secretary.

As Others See Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the February 11, 1959, Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News that was reprinted in the Charlevoix Courier of Charlevoix, Mich., on February 19, 1959.

The editor of the Charlevoix Courier had wisely commented in part as follows:

Now and then it might be to our advantage to see ourselves as others see us.

How true. And we may well ask the question "Just what is the chief executive of Michigan, the political head of one of the great industrial States in our Nation doing to continue the State's preeminence and to encourage the entry into the State of new industries?" We might also inquire, "What is the Governor doing to create a fiscal environment in our State that is conducive to expanding job opportunities so that our highly skilled labor can have jobs that are better jobs through private enterprise rather than poorer jobs through Government enterprise?"

The editorial reprint I referred to at the outset of my remarks follows:

AS OTHERS SEE US

(We who live in Michigan may be more or less complacent about the situation in our State government. Now and then it might be to our advantage to see ourselves as others see us. With that in mind we offer the following editorial, "Michigan Shows What Happens," which appeared February 11, 1959 in the Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News.—Editor's Comment.)

The State of Michigan might be called a guinea pig by which we are able to test the effects of too free spending.

Its experience is significant because it has been for several years under the control of influences that have moved into the Federal field. Gov. G. Mennen Williams, a presidential hopeful, has been in the State House for five terms. He has been so closely associated with Walter Reuther, UAW head, that some have called Reuther the power behind the throne.

Under this regime Michigan has spent herself virtually bankrupt.

The condition of the treasury is such that, in order to meet payrolls, Governor Williams has had to appeal to his old enemies, the big corporations, to pay their taxes early. The State is running a deficit this year estimated at \$89 million. Even the juggling of funds was not enough to put the State on a basis to pay its help.

The story of how Governor Williams has brought the State to this critical financial condition is too long to tell here. But the important fact is that it is the same welfare program that the Williams-Reuther cult is now trying to wish on the Federal Government, that has drained the State's treasury.

Walter Reuther is at the head of one of the groups that is demanding greatly expanded and expensive projects for Washington to finance.

Listing what has happened in Michigan, U.S. News & World Report says, "All these problems have combined to add to the State's financial worries. New business enterprises are slow to come to Michigan. . . . Thus, the people of Michigan, one of the wealthiest States in the United States, now finds their government broke."

Our representatives in Washington who would head the Government there in the same direction Michigan has been traveling, might well study where that path has led one of our richest States.

Utilization of Military Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proper utilization of our military manpower is one of the most important issues facing America today.

One key phase of this problem has been raised in a letter to the Secretary of the Air Force by Lodge No. 1092, American Federation of Government Employees. The specific problem involved is the use of military personnel in civilian and administrative type duties.

I intend to bring this letter to the attention of the Special Subcommittee on Manpower, which has been established by the Armed Services Committee, but I feel that the questions it raises are so important that I should bring them to the attention of the entire House at this time.

I quote the key points of a letter to the Secretary of the Air Force by Mr. John Mann, president of Lodge No. 1092, American Federation of Government Employees:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

LODGE NO. 1092.

February 25, 1959.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Staffing of civilian-type support positions with military personnel has approached a point which, we feel, actually jeopardizes economic completion of the Air Force combat mission. Recent military and civilian pay raises have a direct bearing upon this problem. The assignment of military personnel to civilian or administrative-type duties has become prohibitively expensive. Pay fringe benefits have in-

creased costs to where today's enlisted man can earn over \$10,000 per year. In the officer category, the career cost amortization of one full colonel may involve as much as \$33,000 per year. This includes base pay, quarters allowance, longevity pay, flying pay, responsibility pay, PCS costs, dislocation allowances, training costs, retirement, Medicare, and other fringe benefits not inherent in civilian manpower costs.

In terms of overall manpower implications, the problem involves much more than simple comparisons of take-home pay between military and civilian personnel. An Air Force major and a GS-12 civilian, for example, may have similar take-home pay in terms of dollars. However, in terms of true cost to the taxpayer, a military man involves many costs, benefits, and investments (education, training, facilities, housing, retirement, etc.) not accorded a GS-12, or other comparable career civilian.

In many areas in Headquarters USAF, commissioned officers spend their entire tour of duty in nonmilitary, nondefense, noncombat, functional assignments. This is unnecessarily expensive. More importantly, it is creating a misleading manpower picture in terms of defense readiness and combat capability. Manpower totals are padded with thousands of uniformed personnel who are not engaged in, or even prepared for, defense or military-type duties. We feel that this is neither the spirit nor intent of Congress in putting a man in uniform. The assignment of military personnel to administrative and support type activities may well constitute the most expensive form of bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Compounding this situation is the fact that the military man often does not have the motivation, aptitude, background, or training for support type duties. He knows he will probably be rotated in 3 years into an entirely different career category. He also realizes that interim civilian type assignments tend to jeopardize his long-range military advancement potential. In the support areas, particularly, this has created officer and civilian morale problems, poor management leadership, lost continuity, and inadequate technical specialization. In many cases, important projects or programs are canceled prematurely, or reorganizations undertaken, at considerable loss in Air Force funds and resources, simply to coincide with an individual officer's rotation. In others, costly or ill-considered decisions are made as a result of disinterest, lack of training, or personnel instability. We feel that this type of transient management is costing the American taxpayer millions of dollars in excess defense costs. During recent Senate appropriations hearings, considerable discussion was centered upon the high cost of personnel instability within Headquarters USAF.

The problem, as we see it, involves much more than simple mismanagement, or labor relations, as such. The entire concept of civilian-military relationships, roles, and teamwork must be reexamined within Headquarters USAF. . . . For some reason, Headquarters USAF continues to pursue a costly and illogical manpower policy concerning the utilization of civilians. The impact of this policy upon defense capability and costs should be obvious.

We also feel that the proposed 2-percent reduction in DOD civilian manpower will actually increase overall defense payroll costs. Reductions in civilian manpower, in many instances, simply mean that military personnel will be assigned to perform civilian duties. Direct and indirect payroll costs will actually be increased in many areas. This process will then be compounded by a secondary manpower cycle wherein Headquarters USAF will demonstrate a need for additional military manpower. In contrast to this, it is accepted knowledge that advancing weapon systems, technology, and air-

power concepts (missiles and spacecraft) will require progressively greater concentration of stabilized civilian manpower in the direct and indirect support areas.

We could cite many more arguments and examples of why greater utilization should be made of civilian manpower in support-type activities in Headquarters USAF. However, numerous studies by outside consultants and citizen groups (Hoover Commission, Sarnoff Commission, Ford Foundation, and Rockefeller Report) have indicated similar conclusions. We feel that corrective action is long overdue.

As a point of departure, the following proposals are submitted:

Review of Headquarters USAF civilian-manning ratios in all direct and indirect support functions; and progressive civilizational of appropriate broad functional areas and activities throughout Headquarters USAF, as outlined in DOD 1100.9.

JOHN MANN,

President, AFGE Lodge 1092, AFL-CIO,
Headquarters, USAF.

Curing Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Lawrence A. Collins, Sr., recently had some sound advice to give regarding the problem of curing unemployment. It appeared in the Long Beach Independent newspaper on February 22, in the following column:

CURING UNEMPLOYMENT

(By L. A. C.)

The 4.7 million unemployment figure for January is disturbing news. It has brought demands from the AFL-CIO for shorter hours and a much greater spending program by Government to produce more jobs. Walter Reuther advocates an unemployment march on Washington to dramatize the demands.

It would be unrealistic to ignore the dangers of widespread unemployment. But it is equally unrealistic to expect that full employment can be achieved by unsound measures. Actually we have had an average of about 3 million classified as unemployed for most of the past 10 years. These are largely people who are in process of changing jobs—there is a normal turnover of jobs which brought this 3 million unemployed to be viewed as normal during our most prosperous years. It was about 4 to 5 percent of the available working force.

We are just coming out of a recession. Our labor force increases at the rate of about 1.5 million a year. New jobs must be created for this new working population. We have met this increase in the past. The big question is how we are to do it for the future. This raises the question of shorter hours—or creation of new jobs by private enterprise or Government spending.

There is a grave question that shortening the workweek would provide the needed new jobs. Such action would mean a reduction in the weekly pay of workers and thereby less purchasing power. Or, if present 40-hour pay were maintained for 35 hours' work, it would add to the cost of everything produced by the workers. This would reduce the amount of purchasing power of workers.

When it comes to providing jobs by Government spending, we should look back to the

1934-39 period, when billions of dollars were expended by many alphabetical agencies. There was never a year during this period that unemployment fell below 7 million workers—with a working force 10 million less than we have at present. It was only when war broke out in Europe and we became the arsenal for France and Britain that we pulled out of that depression.

After World War II, we were busy making up the shortages created by 4 years of war and austerity. Then private enterprise poured billions of dollars into new products, plants, and machinery. Prices increased 100 percent over the 1930's—but income of workers increased 150 percent. The result has been higher living standards, more people employed, and general prosperity. We have had three minor recessions during the last 10 years. But we pulled out of two without a serious economic disorder. We are very close to being out of the recession which started some 18 months ago.

Some of the added 1.7 million unemployment above the 3 million normal is caused by workers producing more, the extension of working hours of those employed, and the wage and fringe benefit increases given unions the past year. Production is at high levels, prices are stabilized, and with winter over there is good reason to expect jobs to be more plentiful.

There is every reason for concern over our ability to provide the new jobs needed for our expanding working force. It is probable there will be shorter hours in the future. But such changes should not be allowed to increase costs of production and thereby create a destructive inflation spiral. Unless unions and their supporters in Congress accept this view, they will be creating greater unemployment and destroy the value of dollars now held or hoped for by all the people.

Spending Higher at White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in his budget message this year, President Eisenhower has indicated the various cuts he proposes in the number of tax dollars to be spent on each program for the fiscal year beginning on July 1. And while he proposes cuts in some of our most vital programs, he fails to practice at home in the White House the economy he preaches in his budget.

Drew Pearson's column in the February 23, 1959, Washington Post and Times Herald edition, points up some of the items which have increased the budget for the White House. The column follows:

SPENDING HIGHER AT WHITE HOUSE

(By Drew Pearson)

Stung by President Eisenhower's evangelistic outbursts against the spenders, Democratic leaders are taking a sharp look at how Ike practices the economy he preaches. Their findings reveal he has been the most extravagant President in American history.

He spends twice as much to run the White House as former President Truman ever did. During Truman's last year, his operating expenses came to \$2,467,000. This is petty cash compared with the \$5,013,750 bill Ike turned in for the fiscal year ending June 30.

He also left the White House out of his fervent campaign to balance next year's budget. While he ordered everyone else to slash expenses, he boosted his own budget by a generous \$332,250.

Truman was able to get along with an office staff of 245. Ike has added another 153 employees to the payroll. He has also increased the White House work crew from 62 to 71. Among their new duties are hunting lost golf balls and keeping the squirrels off Ike's putting green.

The cost of operating the whole Executive Office has soared even more spectacularly under Eisenhower. This includes all the octopus arms of the White House, such as the National Security Council, Budget Bureau, Office of Defense Mobilization, and Council of Economic Advisers.

LUXURIES DISGUISED

Truman spent \$6,703,000 on the whole works his last year in office. Ike's total budget for the Executive Office this year is \$52,736,250. Next year he is asking for \$91,880,000. Of course, 89 percent of the increase will go to the newly created Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. But a full 5 percent will go to the same Budget Bureau which is supposed to enforce his economy edict.

Many of Ike's little luxuries are charged to other Government departments, so they don't show up in the White House budget. The two helicopters which whisk him and his staff to Gettysburg on weekends are charged to the Marine Corps. Sometimes he makes the hop in a light, twin-engined plane, kept at his disposal by the Air Force.

Ike didn't wait long after moving into the White House to get rid of Truman's hand-me-down plane and order a de luxe new model for himself. The Air Force paid \$3.8 million for the *Columbine*, which was decorated to suit Mamie's tastes. Last year, the President decided the plane needed another rest room and running water. However, the story leaked out before the new plumbing was installed, causing such unfavorable publicity that he withdrew the order.

The Presidential launches, the *Barbara Ann* and *Suste E.*, are maintained and operated by the Navy. One was dispatched all the way to Newport, R.I., last year to ferry the President between the golf course and his vacation headquarters.

Incidentally, he has taken more vacations at the taxpayers' expense than any other President in history. His biggest year was 1957 when he took 22 vacations, counting long weekends at Camp David and his Gettysburg farm. Last year, he was away from the White House 16 times. Already this year, he has slipped away for four brief vacations.

UNCLE SAM PAYS

The Eisenhowers also use White House servants on their farm. Their personal belongings are frequently hauled by Army truck. Once Ike brought in GI's to dig a ditch around his farm when he couldn't find civilians who would work in the rain.

Besides his extravagance with the taxpayers' money, Ike has accepted expensive personal gifts. Certainly the deep freeze which caused Truman such painful publicity was a five-and-dime item compared to what Eisenhower has received. Gifts he can't use are usually kept in the family. Mamie's sister, Mrs. Gordon Moore, is the chief beneficiary.

White House intimates say the President's fervor over economy is inspired by the tight little circle of millionaires who have become his closest friends. They include:

Former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, now head of National Steel; William Robinson, Coca-Cola's board chairman; W. Alton Jones, Cities Service chairman; Clifford Roberts of Reynolds & Co.; Barry Leitch, president of Cluett, Peabody

& Co., and George Allen, a director of many big companies.

This is Ike's golfing-bridge cabinet. Democrats point out that these are men whose own living standards are the highest in the world, but who believe in economy for small business, schools, farmers, veterans, widows, and the aged.

NOTE.—This column called the White House for details of Ike's finances, but Jim Hagerly was in Mexico. No one else was permitted to discuss the subject.

California Fiscal Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, many interesting fiscal statistics regarding the Nation's second largest State were compiled recently by columnist Bill Broom. California sets a particularly fast pace in attention to educational facilities. I feel that colleagues from other States will be interested in comparing the figures furnished by Mr. Broom, on California, to those of their own States.

Mr. Broom's column follows:

CENSUS SHOWS THIS STATE BIG SPENDER AND LIBERAL TAXER
(By Bill Broom)

WASHINGTON.—The Californian taxes himself higher and spends more for his local schools than the average citizen of any other State in the Nation.

He is able to do this because his annual income is \$2,523 for every man, woman, and child in his State. He ranks fourth in the Nation in this respect.

These are some of the statistics turned up by the Department of Commerce in its annual business census of State and local government finances. The figures cover 1957.

The Californian is a free spender and a liberal taxer. He ranks in the top 10 on a per capita basis for most every classification covered by the census.

His annual State and local tax bill is \$237.87 per person, and that's highest in the Nation.

The U.S. average is \$169.147; the lowest being Arkansas with \$100.40.

The biggest chunk of his governmental budget goes for education. Californians spend \$98.22 per capita every year on local schools, highest average in the Nation. He slips on his budget for colleges and universities, however, with a per capita expenditure of \$19.16, well above the average of \$11.50 for the Nation, but 12th in per capita ranking. The total for all education is \$119.39 per capita annually, second high in the Nation.

The Census Bureau provides its statistics in two ways. One set of statistics cover the total dollar amount spent in each State. The other divides that amount by the number of residents of the State, giving the per capita figure.

On total spending, the Californian leaves nearly everybody eating his dust. His State and local governments spend more for education, colleges and universities, local schools, highways, public welfare, and natural resources than any other State in the Union.

New York spends greater dollar amounts for health and hospitals, police and fire protection. The Californian is third in the total amount of \$80 million he pays out for interest on his debt.

On a per capita basis, the Californian pays \$321.20 annually for all government services (ranking fourth), \$46.48 for highways (ranking 29th), \$29.19 for public welfare (ranking 7th), and \$24.02 for health and hospitals (ranking 7th).

The national per capita average in those categories is \$237.35 for all services, \$83 for education, \$11.50 for colleges and universities, \$69.60 for local schools, \$45.79 for highways, \$19.94 for public welfare, and \$18.80 for health and hospitals.

With all that spending, the Californian hasn't gotten himself too far in debt. His per capita debt is \$327.02, 10th highest in the Nation, and a little more than the national average of \$299.75. New Yorkers are a lot worse off. Each of them owes \$568.62. In the District of Columbia, where Congress won't permit long-term indebtedness, the average is only \$45.61.

The dollar spending totals, in which the Californian ranks highest, are \$1,657,060,000 for all education, \$265 million for colleges and universities, \$1,363 billion for local schools, \$645 million for highways, \$405 million for public welfare, and \$210.5 million for natural resources.

California, which spends \$333.4 million for health and hospitals, \$171 million for police, and \$115 for fire protection, ranks second in those categories.

Where does the money come from and what is the Californian's ranking on a per capita basis?

His local and State governments have a total annual per capita revenue of \$314.06, third highest in the Nation. They receive \$33.50 per capita from the Federal Government (ranking 12th), \$112.01 per capita in property taxes (ranking 2d), \$125.86 in other nonproperty taxes (ranking 4th), and \$42.67 in charges and miscellaneous government revenue (ranking 9th).

Remaking the Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, delivered at the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association meeting in New Orleans, La.

The Mississippi is one of the great rivers of the world. Never have I heard a finer discussion of this river than was delivered by General Wilson. It is so full of valuable information that I wanted others to share it.

The address follows:

REMAKING THE MISSISSIPPI

To address the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association is a high point in the career of any member of the Army Corps of Engineers. I am privileged today to make my first appearance before you.

The task of bringing this river system to its present state of control and improvement has taken a long time. I am sure most of you recall what Mark Twain said about it. He considered the job of what he called remaking the Mississippi one that was exceeded only by the original job of creating it. That was probably the greatest understatement he ever made.

While we can all be proud of our progress on the Mississippi, we dare not be satisfied with it—or complacent about it. There is still a great deal that engineers do not know about the behavior of a river of the size and characteristics of the Mississippi. Although the present flood control works have successfully passed flows greater than any of previous record, we still cannot be sure that we have the protection we need or can afford.

So, now the Corps of Engineers, with your cooperation, is reevaluating the adequacy of the protection we now have and is reappraising the degree of flood risk that confronts us so as to ascertain wherein it may be justifiable to improve the present project.

General Carter will discuss with you the progress being made on the Mississippi River project. I want to talk about the future, looking far ahead to anticipate some of the problems we can expect to encounter. The answers to all of them, of course, are not apparent at this time, but I hope that some constructive benefit can be derived by pointing our thoughts in certain directions.

In considering future development of the Mississippi, we must keep two principal factors in mind. The first, as I have already indicated, is that we dare not become satisfied and complacent about the adequacy of the works we have built for controlling the tremendous force of our largest river system. Second is to appraise accurately the equally dominant force of economic and social growth that determines the requirements for control and use of the river and its waters. Although in past years the Corps of Engineers sometimes has been criticized for building too big and too far ahead, the fact is that in virtually every instance the economic growth of the country has outrun the adequacy of our projects long before the facilities were worn out. Let us examine that question a little further.

The burden of supporting America's post-war boom has fallen with especial weight upon water resources. Though in many ways these resources have become less available, demands upon them have skyrocketed. We are building navigation facilities faster than ever before, but the growth of traffic outstrips our building. Bigger vessels tend to make our harbor facilities obsolete. Irrigation and power needs also are rising. The surge of population and enterprise into river-valley flood plains increases the urgency of the flood control problem.

Not only have traditional needs become intensified, but new ones are appearing. We used to take water supply for granted. Now domestic and industrial consumption have multiplied. At the same time, pollution is degrading surface supplies, drawdowns are raising the cost of underground supplies, and encroachment on reservoir sites is undercutting the feasibility of many storage projects. Recreation has been transformed from an amenity into a social necessity. Serious questions of preserving our fish and wildlife resources have arisen.

In short, our water resources problems have mushroomed upward and outward since the war, and the trend is just commencing. I do not believe these problems are yet out of control, but every year that passes will make it harder to keep them under control. I feel that no doubt the post-war expansion which has made the problem urgent will continue and accelerate for years to come.

We are in a feverish age. Automation, synthetics and electronics are revolutionizing production processes. The atomic era, by opening new realms of power, may intensify the drain upon basic natural resources. Ideas, the most explosive force of all, can now be manipulated with techniques that reach into the subconscious and, thanks to modern communications, they can be disseminated throughout the world with the speed of light. Entire nations previously retarded in economic and social progress are

now asserting themselves as powers and are repolarizing the currents of trade and politics.

Populations, including our own, are erupting with a force comparable to that of the atom. When Magellan circumnavigated the globe 500 years ago the world had a population of half a billion. When Jules Verne sent Phineas Fobb on his imaginary 80-day circuit in the 1870's there were 1.4 billion people—a 900 million increase in 400 years. When Wendell Willkie made his 160-hour "One World" trip in 1942, there were 2.3 billion people—another 900 million increase, but accomplished in only 70 years. And last year, the Strategic Air Command circled in 45 hours a world of 2.8 billion people. The rate of population growth has increased more than fivefold within three centuries.

All of this means that our natural resources base, including our water resources, will have to support even greater efforts than before.

It follows that our water resources development programs will have to continue to be bold in scope and vigorous in prosecution and that we must rigidly adhere to the requirements of good planning and sound economics to the end that we can ultimately enjoy the fullest use of this limited resource.

Our task of remaking the Mississippi and its tributaries should be continued in light of these considerations, and with the same boldness, foresight, courage, and skill with which we must plan our military defenses. For in the international conflict in which we are now engaged, national defense requires both military and economic preparations.

In the resurvey of the Mississippi we are exercising the type of alertness that must be maintained generally, and for an indefinite period in the future. Here in the lower valley our flood-control project has opened large flood-plain areas to development by a generation that has never had its imagination prodded by an actual flood experience. As perhaps most of you know, we are trying to ascertain two basic facts in this survey. First, is it justifiable to provide protection against a flood of greater magnitude than the project is now being built to withstand? And second, what improvements or changes in the flood control system should be made to accommodate a flood of such magnitude?

While I cannot prejudge the final report, there are indications from the interim report made last year, that we may be warranted in increasing the magnitude of the project flood. We are studying the effects of the changes brought about in the regime of the river; whether we have made proper allowance of the reduction of peak flows by upstream, tributary storage; the adequacy of the levees, floodways and channels, and all other factors that would be necessary to assure a 3-foot freeboard against a project flood of the magnitude being considered.

Determination of the effects of up-stream storage is a particularly complex undertaking. We know that we must look to the reservoirs of the Ohio Valley for about 90 percent of the reduction of peaks for floods at Cairo that occur in January and February. For floods that occur in the late spring and early summer, we must look to the reservoirs on the Mississippi-Missouri above Cairo for up to 80 percent of the reductions in peak flows.

To accomplish this requires a well-balanced and comprehensive system of reservoirs in order that floods from the major tributaries may be regulated regardless of geographical origin.

But here in the Alluvial Valley we must keep in mind that the reservoirs on the tributaries are built primarily to serve more local needs. Thus, while tributary reservoirs hold back water to help reduce the flood peaks on the lower Mississippi, this

is not the principal purpose for which the majority are designed. It follows that there is a limit to which we can look to them for help in reducing your floods. We must take fully into account the benefits you will receive from them, but at the same time depend primarily upon the adequacy of the levees and other works for safely passing floods through the Alluvial Valley. At the present time, low flows in the main stem of the Mississippi present a problem primarily to navigation. It appears that a discharge of 100,000 cubic feet per second at Cairo and of 140,000 cubic feet per second at the mouth of the Arkansas are the minimums necessary to maintain an adequate navigation channel without unreasonable maintenance dredging, and provide sufficient water for industrial and domestic use and pollution abatement.

Flows of less than this minimum discharge have been encountered on numerous occasions in the past. During 5 of the past 25 years the flows at Cairo have been less than the minimum and during 9 of these years the flows below the mouth of the Arkansas have been less than the minimum.

We must anticipate that periods of extremely low flow will be encountered in the future. Flows of less than the minimum would present a serious threat to dependable navigation with the 12- by 300-foot channel authorized from Cairo to Baton Rouge. Moreover, there is the question of rising demands on the river for other water uses, including, of particular significance, future irrigation, industrial water and pollution abatement, which could conceivably place even larger demands upon the river. We must take into account the fact that increasing demands upon the river for all kinds of water uses will occur throughout the entire river system, which will further affect the availability of water during periods of drought. This includes not only water appropriated from the streams, but also continued excessive demands upon the underground water tables, which, in turn, affect the rivers.

The population experts anticipate increase of 60 million people in the United States in the next 17 years. This, in addition to the per capita increases in water uses, means that our national water requirements for all purposes will more than double. Crop surpluses as we now conceive them will diminish and there will be heavy demands for water for agricultural uses for enhancing production even in the more normal humid times, to say nothing of periods of drought.

Although the seemingly abundant waters of the Mississippi have been the envy of our parched friends in Texas and Oklahoma for a long time, I want to emphasize that the main stem of the Mississippi may not be an inexhaustible source of water for all uses over the years ahead.

Moreover, it does not appear likely that sufficient storage is practical on the upstream tributaries both to serve the ultimate needs there and to solve all of the low water problems of the Mississippi.

Virtually the entire country is affected by the problem of diminishing sites for the economical storage of water, a question that is growing more critical each year. For example, it is now doubtful that more than about 15 of the 48 remaining reservoirs authorized for the Ohio River system have any reasonable chance of ever being built. The reason? It is simply the exorbitant price we are paying for the sprawling, unregulated construction of highways, airfields, utility lines, urban communities, industries and other encroachments on the reservoir sites have made the cost of procuring the land prohibitive in many instances.

I think you people of the Alluvial Valley are becoming more aware of the importance

of upstream reservoirs and certainly you will become more acutely conscious of it in the future. Reservoirs on the Missouri contributed about one-third of the flow of the Mississippi at St. Louis during the 1953 drought. In September and November of that year, the upstream reservoirs provided about one-fourth of the discharge at Cairo, a figure that rose to 40 percent in October. At Baton Rouge about 25 percent of the flow was coming from the upstream reservoirs. A similar condition was repeated in 1954 and we had trouble again in 1955 and 1956. In January of the latter year, the Mississippi reached the lowest stage of record at Memphis, and extremely low stages were recorded all along the lower river, and very little assistance could be provided from the reservoirs on the Ohio and the Missouri.

The answers to the problem in your area appear to lie in several directions.

First is to encourage the construction of upstream conservation storage which will inevitably benefit the Lower Mississippi as well. You should support action to preserve the remaining reservoir sites from further encroachment, throughout the great Mississippi Valley.

Next is to make good use of the opportunities for storing the waters originating within your own States. You will ultimately need all you can get. There is none to be wasted.

Develop maximum treatment to return unpolluted water to the streams.

Then, as a last resort, you ultimately may have to limit the uses of waters diverted from the Mississippi in times of extremely low flow.

Please remember, I am looking far ahead, but one must be farsighted in considering where we go from here with respect to future water resources development. I did not come here to present you a discouraging picture concerning your water future. In fact, your future, waterwise, is one of the brightest in the country. I am confident that ways to overcome the problems of low flows can be found. I am probably much more optimistic about them than many of my forebears in the corps were when they first tackled the problems of curbing the floods of the lower Mississippi. I can think of nothing more spine chilling to an engineer than to see a vast expanse of rushing water, as far as the eye can reach, destroying entire communities and taking the lives of hundreds of people.

We have demonstrated that we can tame the floods, and certainly we are in much better position, for having done so, to tackle the problems of enough water. That should be our next big battle in meeting the seemingly endless challenge of the conquest of nature.

A Long Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to insert in the RECORD the following editorial tribute, which appeared in the Newark Evening News February 24, 1959, to my good friend and one of the most respected members of the bench and bar, the former associate justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, William A. Wachenfeld:

A LONG CAREER

It's hard to realize that the seemingly ageless William A. Wachenfeld is 70, but he

is. And today in obedience to the Constitution he must step down from the supreme court seat he has occupied 12 years.

Before that he served 13 years as prosecutor of Essex County. Next year will bring the 50th anniversary of his graduation from law school. A busy lawyer, he found time for politics and public affairs. He might have been Governor had he not twice refused to be a candidate.

William Wachenfeld was not everyone's idea of a supreme court justice when Governor Edge appointed him in 1946. Vigorous and combative and brusque of speech, he seemed better fitted for administrative office.

It was out of character for him to sit patiently through the endless, often tenuous argument which judges must endure, and he himself doubted that he had the temperamental requisites for the bench. Nevertheless, he made the adjustment successfully, becoming one of the court's most useful members.

As might have been expected, he became a notable dissenter. Some of his disagreements with his colleagues were scholarly explorations, others, especially those dealing with criminal law, consisted of single scathing paragraph or page.

His retirement brings to a close a public career of unusual length and commendable performance.

Bill Aims To Spur Investing Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, February 15, 1959:

BILL AIMS TO SPUR INVESTING ABROAD—TAX-CUT PLAN TERMED STEP TOWARD SHIFTING FOREIGN AID TO PRIVATE HANDS

(By Brendan M. Jones)

Any proposals for tax reductions these days would seem—with a bit of understatement—to be somewhat out of tune with the times.

But one such proposal has been gaining serious consideration and even slightly optimistic support among businesses engaged in trade and other foreign operations. It is a bill (H.R. 5) providing various Federal tax benefits as a stimulus to increased business investment abroad.

In view of its sponsor, Representative Hale Boggs, Democrat, of Louisiana, the bill ultimately could result in a saving on Government spending and possibly a tax revenue gain. His proposals, which he maintains are valid and moderate, would provide some rate reduction as well as more liberal tax treatment of foreign-investment income.

Potentially the proposed tax incentives could, by spurring expansion of foreign investments, produce more taxable income. But at the outset they would cause a loss of revenue. The maximum estimate of such loss, according to Mr. Boggs, is \$500 million a year. Such a figure, he feels, is relatively insignificant compared with multiple billions spent on defense and foreign aid.

A PRACTICAL STEP

Essentially, the main merit of the bill, Mr. Boggs asserts, is that it is a practical step toward getting private enterprise to take over the job of foreign economic aid. While this might not mean any direct saving to the

average taxpayer, it could conceivably ease increasing demands on Government revenues, which threaten to force tax increases.

The job of assisting economic development abroad has been given new urgency by Soviet Russia's increasing competition in trade and aid. The Communist drive is aimed primarily at the less developed countries. These are also the countries that private foreign investment has tended to shun. The reasons for this attitude are many and varied, but largely they come down to a matter of the risks exceeding the rewards.

The main fact of the Soviet challenge, however, is that it promises to increase the need for foreign economic assistance over an indefinite period. It has been recognized that, despite high appropriations, the efforts of Government foreign aid will become increasingly inadequate to meet the problem.

By contrast, private industry has a vast reserve of capital and technical skills that are regarded as more than sufficient to fill the prospective task. Taxation, however, while not the only impediment to increased foreign investment, represents a major obstacle to its rise along lines best suited to the long-term Soviet competition.

Such, briefly, is the background for the special significance of the Boggs bill. What then are its prospects for enactment, and what also are some of the basic reasons for special treatment of foreign investment generally?

Mr. Boggs gained an important measure of support for his bill last week from local business groups. It came as a result of a meeting organized by the International section of the New York Board of Trade. The meeting, attended by some 500 representatives of business, banking, and trade groups, brought general endorsement of the measure from key elements of the foreign-trade community here.

Opposition to the measure has been expressed by the American Tariff League, which last week described the bill as a move to encourage migration of American industry to foreign countries. The league, which has been a leading advocate of more protective tariffs, said the bill would be discriminatory in giving American corporations abroad a lower tax liability than those engaged in domestic production.

LACKS ACTIVE SUPPORT

Apart from the attitudes of business groups, however, the Boggs bill lacks active administration support. Actually it is in line with broad administration policies as set forth in a similar measure that suffered defeat in 1954. Treasury officials are reported opposed to the measure on general principle, but there has been evidence of some support for it from officials of the Departments of State and Commerce.

According to some calculations, the bill has a fair chance of bipartisan support. It may also have an appeal to those legislators who, while opposed to increased foreign economic aid, would like to find an alternative because of concern with the Russian challenge.

Basically the bill seeks to permit a certain flexibility for reinvestment of foreign-earned income. It does this through a number of deferral procedures under which such income would not become subject to tax until repatriated in the form of dividends.

Its tax reduction feature is based on the precedence of existing law granting a 14-point lower tax rate to companies organized under the Western Hemisphere Trading Corporation Act. This lower rate established in 1942, applies to companies qualifying under the statute as doing at least 95 percent of their business in Western Hemisphere countries other than the United States. The Boggs bill would simply extend this principle on a world-wide basis.

Another main part of the bill would establish a new kind of foreign business corporation. Such a corporation would be treated as a company operating abroad, although it would be based in this country. Thus, it would be legally obliged to report earnings to the Internal Revenue Service. This provision would counteract the trend of business to set up corporations in foreign tax havens where, apart for other advantages, they are under no legal obligation to report operations to United States tax officials.

Claims for more favorable tax treatment of foreign-earned income range from the principle that income should be taxed only where earned to consideration of extra hazards of investment abroad. That foreign-based corporations have to pay foreign as well as Federal taxes is often ignored.

In addition, it is contended that foreign investment besides entailing special risks makes a basic contribution to the domestic economy by assuring raw materials sources and increasing industrial exports. Now, however, the strongest argument for favorable treatment is based on the fact of foreign investments' relation to foreign policy and national security interests.

Finally, a recent Department of Commerce survey has shown that companies interested in foreign operations regard Federal taxation as the major single obstacle to increased foreign investment.

Problems Plaguing American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Daniel F. Rice & Co. commodity letter of February 18. All who are genuinely concerned with solving the problems plaguing American agriculture today will be interested in some of the proposals advanced in this letter:

COMMODITY LETTER

The time has come in matters of agricultural legislation to get on one horse and ride off in one direction. It has been clear to us for a long time that an agricultural support program cannot be all things to all people; that it cannot repeal the immutable laws of supply, demand, and price. If a price program is designed to support prices above levels that would otherwise exist it has to have enough teeth in it to command the supply so that the price can be put where it is wanted.

This simple principle has either not been clear to the administration and the Congress or they have chosen to ignore it. The Congress has tried to gallop off in two directions at once—toward higher prices that would prevail in the marketplace and unlimited production. The Department of Agriculture has thrashed about in all directions at once. They have advocated lower price supports but have never wanted to go the whole hog and eliminate supports, as the reasoning of their position would dictate. They have argued that lower supports would cut production and have sat for 6 years with the same argument while prices went down and production up. They have taken huge quantities of grain off the market through loans to support prices and at

the same time have sold huge quantities which have weighed very heavily on prices. The Department tried a soil bank scheme. It was never clear whether this was to cut production or to improve land so that we could get more production.

The result of all of this confusion has been lower prices, the accumulation of huge stocks, expenditure of vast sums of public funds, and reduced farm income. In early 1953 when this administration took office wheat was selling for \$2.45 per bushel, corn \$1.65, oats 92 cents, and soybeans \$3. Now wheat is \$2, corn \$1.20, oats 88 cents, and soybeans \$2.24. By way of contrast the Dow-Jones industrial stock price was 287 in January 1953 and now is 590. The agricultural situation is becoming critical. How long farmers can continue to take the kind of economic punishment that they have been submitted to in recent years is conjectural. There is no doubt that justice calls for an immediate reversal of the recent trend.

During this session of Congress the agricultural problem is getting more than the usual amount of attention. Three things appear to be behind this interest: (1) attempts to capture the farm vote, (2) concern over the high cost of farm programs, and (3) concern over the ineffectiveness of existing programs. The administration continues to beat the same old drum for lower supports. With regard to wheat they seem to think that some varieties and qualities would go as low as \$1.12. The Congress is kicking around two price proposals. One is for direct income deficiency payments on the amount of the commodity used domestically and the other is a scheme to use food as an instrument of peace. The second presumably means to increase our export dumping programs. One wonders if there are any more ways to dump than are already being used.

None of the suggestions get to the point of a fair price in the marketplace. There is no reason to think that a fair price to farmers cannot be determined and production and inventories adjusted and managed so that this fair price can be maintained. There is no reason why agriculture cannot be run as a business so that it produces when there is a profit and does not produce when there is a loss. There is no reason why farmers should be expected to subsidize consumers, both domestic and foreign, and why government should in turn be forced to heavily subsidize farmers.

To put agriculture in a profitable position a four-step program needs to be adopted:

1. Establish fair prices for the main agricultural products. A new system needs to be developed to take into account new technology and new methods.
2. Establish production goals that will result in the desired prices. These goals need to be established by a board of nonpartisan experts.

3. Enforce multiple cross compliance. No system of control will work if land is taken out of one crop and put into another, creating a problem somewhere else. Land taken out of one crop has got to go out of production.

4. Freeze existing surplus stocks. When production and use are brought into balance these stocks can be appraised and their disposition determined. We may want to keep them as a reserve against atomic attack. Stocks can be frozen. If one bushel of corn in Crossroads, Iowa, needs to be sold because it is going out of condition, CCG can buy a bushel at Crossroads to replace it.

This program cannot be compromised and made to work. Either we adopt this program or we return to a nongovernment situation. We cannot continue to ride two horses in opposite directions.

A "Dime Dollar" Can Result From Failure To Curb Inflation Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger, February 12, 1959. It refers to some views of our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER, who as we all know is one of the soundest and most dedicated Members of this body. The editorial follows:

A "DIME DOLLAR" CAN RESULT FROM FAILURE TO CURB INFLATION THREAT

Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, distinguished Member of Congress from Mississippi, warns that while communism cannot conquer this Nation, inflation easily can unless every effort is made to prevent it. He stresses that the preservation of a strong economy in any country requires vigilance on the part of the people against inflation.

In our time, says Representative COLMER, we have seen the ravages of this economic disease in many nations throughout the world. It has gained a foothold in the United States and unless checked, it could become the economic cancer that could disastrously soften us. Thus, America could become fair game for the Communists.

Lenin himself, father of communism, said the way to conquer us would be to make this country spend itself into bankruptcy. As Representative COLMER points out, our public debt now stands at \$282 billion. Interest on the public debt in 1958 was \$7,867 million. This staggering interest on the national debt is now twice as much as was required to operate the entire Federal Government three decades ago.

"One of the greatest causes of inflation," says Representative COLMER, "is unquestionably the continued deficit spending by our Federal Government. Carried on long enough, it is bound to destroy the economy of this country and when that happens, our whole way of life will disappear too. The question that we must face up to is: 'What are we going to do about it?' On the answer hangs the fate of our Nation."

Voicing similar concern over the perils of inflation, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William Martin has recently warned that a sound dollar is as essential to American strength and security as atomic bombs and missiles. The people's savings, their life insurance, their investments, their pensions, all depend on a stable currency.

The integrity of the American dollar, the Federal Reserve Board Chairman has emphasized, depends upon economy in government at Federal, State and local levels. There are but three ways to meet the unpaid bills of government—through taxation, inflation or repudiation. Chairman Martin offers this disturbing conclusion:

"A nation that piles debt upon debt, refuses to balance its budgets and continues to run in the red, inflates its currency, circulates phoney money, undermines its defense and destroys the security of its citizenship. We the people must live within our income or perish. Only a government that conserves can survive. We will save or sink."

On top of this warning comes another, from William A. Burkett who is superintendent of banks for the State of California, predicting that we will have a 25-cent dollar

in this country before too long if the Federal Government does not do something to check inflation. He is quoted as saying, in an advertisement in the American Banker published by the Hancock Bank at Bay St. Louis, Miss.

"If the history of the last 100 years teaches us anything, it is that inflation is more dangerous to the people than any other thing except war. We who have lived to see a 50-cent dollar could live to see a 25-cent dollar or a 10-cent dollar if the Government and the people continue to spend beyond their means and keep going deeper into debt."

Legislation Is Needed To Free Our People From the Foreign-Made Shackles of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for his intense and enthusiastic efforts to get through some type of legislation that will free our people from the foreign-made shackles of unemployment. He has done just about everything humanly possible to return to Congress the tariffmaking authority established in it by the Constitution. He deserves a large measure of credit for whatever help the statutory escape clause has been. Unfortunately, diplomatic considerations have superseded economic reality in the final determination of too many escape clause cases, and I think that the legislation proposed by my close friend from West Virginia here today is very sound, practical, and urgently needed. My remarks will be brief. Later I am going to insert some figures on imports that should alarm even the most fervent freetrader, and I want to include a quotation, from a respected naval officer, that belongs in a discussion of this kind.

First, I should like to mention that I am pleased with the reaction of the Westinghouse Co. to Tennessee Valley Authority's plans to purchase foreign generating equipment without so much as a by-your-leave to the American manufacturers and workmen who have been subsidizing TVA from its inception. Westinghouse has arranged for Governor Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, to come down to meet with our congressional delegation on this important issue Thursday evening. Because of Pennsylvania's wide unemployment, I think it necessary for everyone in the State and Federal Governments to coordinate all efforts in overcoming the economic obstacles that have so many of our families in actual poverty. The detrimental affect of an oversupply of alien commodities entering American markets is an obvious factor in Pennsylvania's economic problems. I hope that more and more of our State's delegation will walk with those of us who have been striving for whatever legis-

lation is required to remedy the present deplorable situation.

We may as well realize one thing, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to stop Government agencies from ordering supplies and equipment from foreign manufacturers if we permit these departments and agencies themselves to make the decisions. For 25 years Government departments have been subjected to such generous doses of international propaganda that free trade has become one of their obsessions. Any time that hearings or inquiries are held on the matter of foreign trade, an assortment of representatives of a miscellany of Government departments always appears with briefcases chockfull of data gathered from hosts of countries throughout the world. These Government officeholders who come out to cheer for further lowering of trade barriers have traveled—at Government expense—hither and yon among the nations of Europe, Asia, and South America, but they apparently are not interested in becoming clued on what is taking place back where the tax dollars are collected.

The average Government worker living in Washington and in Foreign Service is not exposed to the economic ups and downs experienced in the various parts of our own country. Week after week, and month after month, and year after year there are heavy pockets of unemployment throughout central and western Pennsylvania, just as there are in the State of the gentleman who has granted me this time. The U.S. News & World Report for February 20 contains an indication of why Government officials in the Nation's Capital are either uninformed or uninterested about what is going on back at the ranch. "How's Business Around the Country" is the title of a series of tables reporting on conditions in selected communities from coast to coast. Of the 33 eastern cities listed, 19 are marked as victims of substantial unemployment; 13 are classified in the moderate unemployment category; one city—Washington, D.C.—has slight unemployment. As a matter of fact, Washington is the only city of the 78 studied for the United States as a whole in which unemployment is not either moderate or substantial.

While the parties responsible for import-export policy are assured of their paychecks without interruption, the fellow back home who is getting the bill for these services finds his means of livelihood taken away by incredible foreign trade policies. He has only Congress to look to for help. I suggest we give it to him by demanding quick action on this bill to amend section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

I also ask that the House enact the bill which I have introduced to restrict imports of residual oil, the product of foreign refineries which has washed out thousands of jobs in our mine and rail communities. These are the figures which I wish to include in the Record:

From January 1 to February 13, 1959, the daily average for residual oil imported into the United States was 807,700 barrels. If this rate continues for the remainder of the year, the 1959 total

will come to 294,830,500 barrels—or more than 70 million tons of bituminous coal in energy equivalent. Keeping that figure in mind, please also note this statement by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke as reported in the Washington Star on February 15:

The possibility of a surprise attack by submarines is very great, and it is causing us a great deal of concern.

Admiral Burke's remark was made at a recent hearing before the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, at which time it was disclosed that of Russia's 500 submarines, about one-half are long-range craft.

Mr. Speaker, who among us would dare to depend upon foreign oil that must travel over the lonely seaways that even now may be infested with Red submarines carrying the most destructive missiles in the history of naval warfare? The daily imports of residual oil for the first 7 weeks of this year have been equal to 193,830 tons of bituminous coal. In an emergency this tonnage—plus enormously more coal to be used in the actual war effort—would be required. I suggest that, instead of forcing our unemployed coal miners to wander about the country seeking employment opportunities in other industries, we encourage them to remain in their mining communities. They are a vital component of our national defense. They will be ready for whatever demands are made upon them if our foreign trade policies will only give them a chance. The same principle applies to railroad workers. We are not going to have them when we need them if we permit their jobs to be taken away unnecessarily in the meantime.

We may equate the position of the coal miner and the railroad worker to that of the Westinghouse employee who will have no work if foreign generating equipment is allowed to come in and price American products out of the market. We can put the pottery worker, glassmaker, and all other victims of inequitable foreign trade competition in the same category. We owe it to them and to our security to keep them occupied now, for without them we would not have a chance against the common enemy in an emergency.

Taxes Take One-third of Average Family Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, lest we forget the burden of taxes to support governmental spending, Robert G. Shortal, of United Press International, recently outlined them as follows:

TAXES TAKE ONE-THIRD OF AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME

(By Robert G. Shortal)

NEW YORK.—Joe Smith is a typical American. He works full time for a company

which pays him \$4,500 a year and part time for the Government which takes \$1,393 from him.

The sad fact of the matter is that Joe Smith spends more of his working day earning his taxes than he does to pay for any major item in the family's budget.

The Tax Foundation estimates that the average worker toils 2 hours and 29 minutes each day to earn his taxes, compared with 1 hour and 39 minutes to earn his food money, 1 hour and 25 minutes to pay the mortgage or rent, 37 minutes for clothing, 42 minutes for transportation, 24 minutes for medical care, 20 minutes for recreation, and 24 minutes to pay for his other purchases.

It has been estimated that direct and hidden taxes siphon off one-third of the family's income.

Everybody is painfully aware of income taxes, which range up to 91 percent on individual incomes and 52 percent on corporate incomes. Most people also are aware of the excise taxes they pay when they buy cigarettes, liquor, or furs.

However, not many Americans are aware of the number of taxes hidden in the price of things they buy. The really hidden ones are the excise taxes which must be paid by manufacturers.

Manufacturers of refrigerators, for instance, must pay a 5-percent tax on each unit they sell to retailers. Although this tax doesn't appear on the price tag, it is included in the price the consumer pays.

The Tax Foundation estimates that there are 151 taxes on a loaf of bread, 116 on a man's suit, 100 on an egg, 150 on a woman's hat, and 600 on a house. Taxes, direct and indirect, account for 25 percent of the \$2,000 cost of a low-priced car.

The plain fact of the matter is that only people pay most of the hidden taxes. Business—from the giant corporation to the corner grocery store—collects them.

The foundation points out that companies, large and small, couldn't stay in business long if they had to pay all these taxes out of their own pocket. Taxes are a cost of doing business and are taken into account when setting prices.

The foundation said practically everything a consumer buys has a hunk of tax hidden in the price.

Lincoln's Monetary Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I think it would be appropriate on this anniversary month of the birth of Abraham Lincoln to call to the attention of the House the following text of his monetary policy. I believe this policy clearly shows the understanding Abraham Lincoln had of the powers of the Government in relation to money:

LINCOLN'S MONETARY POLICY

Money is the creature of law, and the creation of the original issue of money should be maintained as an exclusive monopoly of National Government.

Money possesses no value to the State other than given to it by circulation.

Capital has its proper place and is entitled to every protection. The wages of men should be recognized in the structure of and in the social order as more important than the wages of money.

No duty is more imperative on the Government than the duty it owes the people to furnish them with a sound and uniform currency, and of regulating the circulation of the medium of exchange so that labor will be protected from a vicious currency, and commerce will be facilitated by cheap and safe exchanges.

The available supply of gold and silver being wholly inadequate to permit the issuance of coins of intrinsic value or paper currency convertible into coin in the volume required to serve the needs of the people, some other basis for the issue of currency must be developed, and some means other than that of convertibility into coin must be developed to prevent undue fluctuations in the value of paper currency or any other substitute for money of intrinsic value that may come into use.

The monetary needs of increasing numbers of people advancing toward higher standards of living can and should be met by the Government. Such needs can be served by the issue of national currency and credit through the operation of a national banking system. The circulation of a medium of exchange issued and backed by the Government can be properly regulated and redundancy of issue avoided by the withdrawing from circulation such amounts as may be necessary by taxation, redeposit, and otherwise. Government has the power to regulate the currency and credit of the Nation.

Government should stand behind its currency and credit and the bank deposits of the Nation. No individual should suffer a loss of money through depreciated or inflated currency or bank bankruptcy.

Government possessing the power to create and issue currency and credit as money and enjoying the right to withdraw both currency and credit from circulation by taxation and otherwise, need not and should not borrow capital at interest as the means of financing governmental work and public enterprise. The Government should create, issue, and circulate all the currency and credit needed to satisfy the spending power of the Government and the buying power of consumers. The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of Government, but it is the Government's greatest creative opportunity.

By the adoption of these principles, the long-felt want for a uniform medium will be satisfied. The taxpayers will be saved immense sums in interest, discounts, and exchanges. The financing of all public enterprise, the maintenance of stable Government and ordered progress, and the conduct of the Treasury will become matters of practical administration. The people can and will be furnished with a currency as safe as their own Government. Money will cease to be master and become the servant of humanity. Democracy will rise superior to the money power.

A Report on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter I recently received from Mr. Harry E. Boyes, news editor of radio station WION, Ionia, Mich. Mr. Boyes makes a very interesting and informative report on his recent visit to Cuba and the conclusions he arrives at

as a result of his many personal contacts with the Cubans themselves:

FEBRUARY 9, 1959.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: I mentioned to you on the phone the other day I was sending you a report of my impressions of my recent trip to Cuba. Here it is. I hope what I have to say will be of interest and possibly a help to you.

If I was to draw any single conclusion from my short stay in Havana it would be this: Our foreign policy with regards to Latin America is presently facing a crossroad. This conclusion is reached from many observations.

The first is this: The Cubans above all desire friendly relations with the United States. This desire stems from many things, among them the hope that the United States will assist them in restoring their economy. They do not necessarily wish the United States to do this through financial channels, but in many instances would prefer technical assistance and other aids that would allow them to fully exploit their own potential. Cubans resent the American foreign policy that allows our big business interests a free rein in their country. This resentment against our large corporate structures stems from the stifling of Cuban business, of which our business interests can be and sometimes are, guilty. Such resentment of American business in particularly noticeable today because the Cubans feel the Republican administration favors and aids this type of operation. In spite of resentment Cuba has a tremendous feeling of affection toward this country. They look upon us as big brothers.

My second point would deal with the violent change of government. Either our State Department was completely out of touch with the feeling of the Cuban people in the months leading up to the overthrow of Batista, or such knowledge was kept hidden from the American public in general and Members of Congress, such as yourself, in particular. I refer to some of the statements voiced about the change of government by certain of our Congressmen—statements referring to "purge" and "blood baths." Granted these men are entitled to express their opinions, but when responsible men in Government "sound off" on any subject, their words are usually taken to be the official view of the United States Government which, as you and I know, may not always be the case; but to people who have endured years of oppression such words cut deeply. It was my firm belief upon leaving Cuba that the executions were fully justified. Without going into great detail let me simply say, those executed were sadists of the worst sort and the Cuban people lived in the shadow of terror and oppression created by these men. Had not the Castro regime embarked upon the course it did, Cuba would have experienced a state of anarchy similar to 1933 and many innocent people would have lost their lives. My point in this case is this, in dealing with the best of our friends let us in the future either know what is going on, or choose our words more wisely.

Thirdly, I had the opportunity of speaking with several South American newsmen and I definitely received the impression from them that we are not the most popular people in the world in eyes of the citizens of their countries. Some of these newsmen were openly hostile to those of us from the United States. Others merely voiced their knowledge of the feeling within their countries.

Fourthly, The swing in the Latin American is definitely toward democratic forms of government. These people sincerely desire to live in friendship with the United States, but we feel that their friendship is only

wanted in time of need. They would like the United States to regard them as partners. There is a new awareness of government "by the people" in this part of the world, and the Latins know that they need help to develop the economies in which those governments can exist. They despise having to make overtures to Russia in the hopes of forcing the United States to come across with what they need. A good example of what I refer to is the recent oil drilling equipment "deal" conducted in Argentina.

These are some of the reasons for feeling the way I do and for believing that the next move on our part will be extremely crucial for this country. However, I also believe that a solution exists to the "crossroads" situation that I mentioned earlier.

If the United States can embark on a policy that would aid Cuba in developing its industry and agriculture so that this country can achieve even a portion of its tremendous potential, then the rest of Latin America would begin to look upon us again with favor. To me, Cuba is the place to begin because of its consistently friendly feeling toward the United States and because the results that we need can be more quickly achieved in Cuba than elsewhere in Latin America. However, Cuba is only a beginning and in this ever changing world a strong Western Hemisphere is just as desirable—perhaps more so—than a friendly Europe.

Many things I saw in Cuba—poverty, great wealth, lack of facilities, and incomplete construction—are well known to all and need no explanation at this point, however, they also are factors which will contribute to the end results.

These are strictly my conclusions but I spent much time in Cuba talking with people, those working in shops, taxi drivers, hotel clerks, rebels, and with people of prominence, and the ideas that I have set forth are the composite I reached through these conversations.

I hope these thoughts will be of assistance to you.

Best regards,

HARRY E. BOYES.

City of Mayfield Heights, Ohio, Memorializes the Congress To Eliminate the 10-Percent Tax on Telephone Calls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, like so many other temporary taxes, the 10-percent excise tax on telephone service levied during World War II to reduce the load on overburdened telephone facilities and to raise funds for financing the war effort is still with us. While there is some justification for continuing such a tax on luxury items, the telephone certainly cannot be put in this category. In the home and in business today the telephone is a necessary public utility just as gas, electricity, etc.

On February 23, the council of the city of Mayfield Heights, Ohio, under the leadership of Mayor Edwin T. Frantz, approved a resolution memorializing the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate to eliminate the 10-percent tax on telephone calls. Under leave to

extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the resolution herewith:

RESOLUTION No. 1959-23

A resolution memorializing the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate to eliminate the 10-percent tax on telephone calls

Whereas the Council of the City of Mayfield Heights hereby respectfully petitions the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Members of the U.S. Senate to eliminate the 10-percent tax on telephone calls, for the following reasons:

1. That the emergency which existed at the time this tax was created no longer exists.

2. That said tax is burdensome upon telephone users: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Mayfield Heights, State of Ohio,

Section 1: That this council hereby respectfully memorializes the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Members of the U.S. Senate to eliminate the 10-percent tax on telephone calls.

Section 2: That the clerk of council be, and she hereby is, directed to send certified copies of this resolution to U.S. Senators LAUSCHE and YOUNG and Congressman BOLTON.

Section 3: That this resolution shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

M. A. LANESE,
President of Council.

Attest:
ALICE K. SUPPLE,
Clerk of Council.

Approved by the Mayor:
EDWIN T. FRANTZ,
Mayor.

U.S. Economic Supremacy Is Put to Test by Khrushchey's Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Mr. Carroll Kilpatrick which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 14, 1959:

U.S. ECONOMIC SUPREMACY IS PUT TO TEST
(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Premier Nikita S. Khrushchey's economic challenge to the United States is regarded by experts in government and private circles here as exaggerated in detail but nevertheless a serious long-range threat.

Some officials go so far as to say that this economic challenge has now become greater even than the military challenge, and that Russia and China combined eventually will outproduce the free industrial countries.

President Eisenhower, however, told his last press conference that he did not believe an expanded Federal program was necessary or desirable as an answer to the Soviet 7-year plan.

In Khrushchey's speech last month at the 21st Communist Party Congress, the Soviet leader extolled the complete superiority of socialism over capitalism and said that by 1970 Russia will attain the world's highest standard of living.

Khrushchey told the assembled party delegates that the Soviet's fundamental economic task is to overtake the most highly

developed capitalist countries in per capita production.

"If we calculate on a per capita basis," the Soviet Premier said in the course of his lengthy discourse, "we will probably need, after the fulfillment of the 7-year plan (in 1965), about 5 more years to catch up with and outstrip the United States in industrial output."

"Thus by that time (1970), or perhaps sooner, the Soviet Union will advance to world leadership both in absolute volume of production and in per capita production."

Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss, in a speech Wednesday in Chicago, dismissed Khrushchev's claims as boasting, and pointed out that in 1958 the gross national product in the United States was \$437 billion compared with about \$180 billion in Russia if you want to believe their statistics.

Nevertheless, Strauss warned that Russia's foreign trade offensive is a serious menace which the general public does not yet appreciate.

Russia is not in business for business, but for economic warfare, the Secretary said.

It is this new trade potential that both experts more than Khrushchev's grandiose claims of beating the United States in total and per capita production.

With its growing economic power, Moscow will be strong enough to use trade more and more as a weapon of the cold war, directing trade with one hand where it will do the most good from the Communist viewpoint and withholding trade with another hand if it decides to crack down on a country that is not toeing the line.

Even more disastrous for the West would be a demonstration of Soviet economic progress at a time of economic recession in the leading capitalist country.

If Moscow is able to conduct its economic offensive on the basis of greatly expanded production at home, and if the United States decides it cannot afford to promote certain economic programs either at home or abroad, the lesson would quickly be apparent to all the uncommitted countries as well as to America's friends.

Some experts argue that the statistical race between the United States and Russia is not too significant. They quote Paul-Henri Spaak, Secretary-General of NATO, who recently said, "I feel that a rich Communist is probably less to be feared than a poor Communist."

"What we must realize," Spaak said, "is that the Communist goal is not merely an economic or a social threat; it is much wider; the ambition of communism is to be the wellspring of a new civilization, in which the essential foundations of our spiritual, intellectual, moral and political life will be challenged."

One expert summarized the issue this way: "For us to say we cannot afford aid to India or cannot afford adequate schools, or cannot afford a proper defense, is to admit failure."

"We must maintain a satisfactory rate of growth—not to postpone the time the U.S.S.R. matches our productive capacity but to demonstrate for ourselves and the rest of the world that our system works."

The rate of progress could be more important, particularly in the eyes of the underdeveloped countries, than the absolute difference between the United States and Russia. Russia's rate is now between 6 and 8 percent a year and China's is reportedly as high as 10 percent. The United States rate, which dropped considerably last year, averaged 4 percent between 1947 and 1956.

It is conceded that Russia's rate of growth will continue to be about twice that of the United States, but even so, gross national product in the United States in 1970 will be almost twice Russia's. Not until the turn of the century according to American experts, will Russia equal America in total output.

As one indication of Russia's more formidable economic base is the substantial industrial progress that has been made in the Eastern European satellites. To the surprise of most observers, postwar development in the satellites has been impressive, and Poland, East Germany and Czechoslovakia are now in the vanguard of the Soviet bloc in seeking trade contracts with the Afro-Asian countries and Latin America.

Jan Wszelaki, prewar economic adviser to the Polish Government and specialist in Eastern European economics, shows in a new study for the National Planning Association that the satellites have obtained "impressive economic footholds" in a number of underdeveloped countries. The Eastern European countries and Russia need raw material imports which the underdeveloped countries are all too eager to sell.

In return, the satellites are increasingly able to "supply the kind of industrial goods the developing countries can use," Wszelaki says, adding that Moscow has assigned this trade "high political priority."

Instead of being a burden on the Soviet Union, the satellites have become of great value, particularly in the last year or two, he writes.

Wszelaki declares that "control over East-Central Europe continues to be more than marginally important to Soviet economic development and . . . is of at least equal value in the Soviet trade-and-aid offensive."

He further notes, as part of Communist economic development that Moscow soon will establish an international bank to finance economic projects in uncommitted countries.

Russia now is a poor second to the United States in total industrial production. In the reasonably near future it will be a strong second—a fact that will make a great impression on the rest of the world unless—all experts agree—the United States makes the best possible use of its machinery and resources to strengthen itself and its associates in the free world.

Our Surplus Crops Could Be Utilized in Industry if We Make a Real Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, for the last decade we have been hearing the claim that if get rid of our surplus farm commodities we will be a long way toward solving the farm problem. So far, nothing attempted by this administration or previous ones has done anything to get rid of these surpluses. Six years ago we had \$1,118 million worth of surplus commodities stored in Government warehouses and bins. Today, that figure has climbed to nearly \$5.5 billion.

There are any number of ways of eliminating such surpluses. One is to try the old depression program of destroying them. A much sounder method has been advocated in this House by a number of Members and in the other body by some of our most capable Senators. I refer to the program for industrial uses of these farm crops.

I am indeed proud that a fellow citizen of Nebraska, Mr. J. Leroy Welsh, has

done a great deal toward making this a real possibility rather than just wishful thinking. As head of the President's Commission on Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products he has supervised the writing of a very important report along these lines.

However, for some reason there is considerable opposition to a real development of industrial uses of farm commodities. The Secretary of Agriculture has been far from friendly to this program and has done his best to fill it with his halfhearted support. One bone of contention is that the Department under Mr. Benson has demanded sole right to control expenditure of any funds allocated to this important program. In this direction lies further stalling, further delay, and eventual death through bureaucratic strangulation of this potential benefit to the American people and the American farmers.

It is the contention of the able and sound thinking Mr. Welsh that a separate board would do the best job and that this board must have wide discretion to farm out research to industry and private research organizations rather than attempt to keep it within the Government.

Recently the Omaha World-Herald carried a lengthy and very thorough article by Bob Considine concerning the subject. For the benefit of my colleagues, particularly in the cities, I would like to bring this article to their attention. The story follows:

How To Get Rid of Farm Surpluses

(By Bob Considine)

OMAHA.—Telegraph poles made of corn? Automobile tires from wheat? Nylons from barley? Peppier gasoline from oats? Protein for the protein-starved world from soybeans?

Well, we'd better start thinking seriously about these and other ways of getting rid of our colossal grain surpluses or we'll be sorry, the country's leading authority on the crisis told us.

He is J. Leroy Welsh, Chairman of President Eisenhower's Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

PROGRESS WON'T STOP

Mr. Welsh gave us some hair-raising facts about a problem that seldom swims before the ken of city folks.

"By July 1 the Government will have in storage \$9 billion worth of surpluses," the Nebraska grain dealer said.

In 5 years, if this program is continued, and we find no adequate use for the produce, we'll have between \$20 and \$30 billion tied up.

"Warehouse rent on what we've got right now comes to more than \$1 million a day. Every day. Seven days a week."

"The Government just can't stop agricultural progress. It pays the farmer to take part of his land out of food production, but then the State or some other organization turns around and shows him how to raise more on his remaining land than he raised on the whole dam' acreage."

MOUNTAIN OF PROTEIN

"Take Nebraska. By 1960 we'll have enough irrigation wells pumping—about 22,000 of them—to produce a full crop without one drop of rainfall."

"Here, and elsewhere, the Government can't count on drought to slow things up."

Mr. Welsh, whose commission's recommendations have not been passed by the House of Representatives, said that much of

the world is ready and eager to buy the protein content of our grain reserves.

"They don't want the stuff as is," he put it. "Almost every country in the world has its own surplus of starch. But there's a lot of protein in there with the starch if we ever get industrious enough to recover it. It comes to 34 percent of the total bulk of grain.

"Seven years ago this residue, which grain men call 'bitter' and fed to animals, was made palatable for humans when blended with other foods.

"But as far as I know only one major American food producer has made use of this great discovery. He put it in a breakfast cereal.

"The rice-eating peoples of Asia hunger for protein we're letting go to pot.

"Matter of fact, people in most countries need more protein in their starchy diets. Italy, for instance. We need markets like that desperately if we're going to whittle down the size of our surpluses."

Mr. Welsh pointed out that 1 bushel of grain will yield 2½ gallons of alcohol, for hosts of purposes over and above the best known application of the stuff.

JUST 10 PERCENT

"If the petroleum people would substitute as little as 10 percent of their varied production with grain-produced material, we could eliminate our costly surpluses and stop paying farmers not to do what God intended them to do," Mr. Welsh asserted.

"If the Government had given grain to the tire companies to make synthetic rubber—given it free—we'd all be saving money today.

"If the first oil prospectors had found starch instead of oil, we'd be making today out of starch everything that is made from petroleum.

"After all, there's not much difference, molecularly, between a field of corn and an oil bed. The oil was once vegetation. It all comes out even in the laboratory."

BUT IF WE DON'T

"But the petroleum industry won't buy this huge source of raw materials, a source that renews itself all over the Nation with every crop.

"The plastics and synthetics trades have been slow to dip into our mountains of surpluses, too.

"Enough protein to add stature to countless millions of people, upgrade the health of whole areas of the earth, lies unexploited in our bins.

"Nothing is going to stop the American farmer from producing more than this country needs, what we can sell, and what we can give away abroad without hurting our foreign friend's markets.

"But if we don't soon put this bounty to work we'll go bust."

Republicans To Draft Credo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. Pelly. Mr. Speaker, the history of intra-party differences and conflicts over issues and policies, as between members of the same political party would fill a book and make interesting reading. Actually it is remarkable that under the stress of strong personal loyalties and the resulting cross-convictions of thought that our two great political parties have

not splintered into a multiparty system as is the situation today in modern Italy and France. All of which is very much to the good of the great Nation which is so beloved in common by members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Moreover, I might add that I doubt if any present Member of Congress will ever live to see a reconstituting or readjustment as between the parties with conservatives joining with conservatives and liberals joining with liberals or some such regrouping.

From time to time, however, in the process of establishing majority views and finding a common basis for agreement, contention manifests itself. Early in this session of Congress Republicans in the Senate in selecting a floor leader revived the modern versus conservative argument of their party. Then in mid-January, in Des Moines, Iowa, at the meeting of the Republican National Committee, partisan roles and policies were under attack and made headlines.

Now at the Senate end of the Capitol, the Democrats are in the limelight with dissident voices asking for more party caucuses to afford wider participation in formulating legislative programs and policies.

But to return to matters pertaining to my own party, which obviously I can discuss with more propriety, Republican Chairman Alcorn has just announced a 44-member committee to draft a long-range statement of Republican Party policy and objectives.

Naturally the question arises, Can any such study group of either party representing all segments of thinking, spell out successfully a set of principles covering a party stand on all vital issues?

Personally, Mr. Speaker, as a Republican I have said that if Republicans stuck to fundamentals and general objectives and principles we can stand firm and find unity. When it comes to regulations on labor, fiscal problems, foreign policy, or domestic programs we should be able to agree on a pattern and framework, but each individual, to have accord, would have to complete the picture for himself or herself as to shades, degree, and details. In other words, there would have to be flexibility and in the spirit of the republican form of government which protects minorities properly there must be mutual respect of viewpoint and compromise between individuals. Each party member cannot demand exactly what fits his or her own convictions down to the last dot. That would be impossible.

Actually, our two great political parties follow the tradition of establishing principles at the grassroots by precinct caucus. After local discussion and free debate, party opinion is implemented and finds substance and form by process of resolution and vote at conventions at various levels until a set of principles and statement of majority views and objectives are consummated in the formal adoption of a party platform. In turn, referring to national principles and objectives, the respective party Members of the House and Members of the Senate establish their respective programs ex-

cept that the party to which the Chief Executive has allegiance naturally has an influential and active partner in establishing the program deemed in conformity with party policy.

Speaking for myself, I am happy Mr. Alcorn has acted with the President's blessing to have a committee of 44 members of my party draft a statement of principles and long-range objectives. Such a committee should spell out the distinction between the two political parties and point out our Republican philosophy, especially where we insist on need as a requirement to recipients of Federal Government assistance.

To return, however, to my original thought and opening remarks, each political party has its internal differences and sources of conflict. Nothing can effect agreement on all issues. But it is certainly wholesome and constructive for an organization to take a fresh look at what it advocates and at what it seeks to accomplish and how. Self-analysis and self-criticism are healthy signs, and out of what I might call this agony of self-appraisal of the Republican Party I look for Republicans to rally to a rededicated and revitalized party under a strong creed under which our candidates can look for vigorous and united public support.

Of one thing I am sure; no party platform should remain static. For example, the establishment of the European Common Market and free trade areas excluding the United States which became effective in January will require a re-examination of our tariff policy. We stand to lose out to foreign manufacturers and our high-cost American-made products, coupled with worldwide dollar shortages and other barriers, already are cutting U.S. industries out of world competition. I fear American capital may be induced to establish more mass production outlets overseas and then they will ship back into our own domestic markets. Our labor will lose both in foreign markets and here at home.

Therefore we should reemphasize the long-standing Republican principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which imperil the living standards of the American workman. We will not, I hope, retreat from favoring world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition but domestic industry must be protected from serious injury and I feel we Republicans should review our historic position from time to time.

By the same token, on domestic matters such as a farm program, where Republicans have strongly differed within the ranks of party, I am certain unity can be restored if we reexamine and restate our policies. Certainly we believe in building a Nation in which each and every citizen may make the most of his skill, incentive, and enterprise. We believe in individual freedom and oppose a welfare state. We believe in incentives and rewards to workmen and industry for ability, knowledge, hard work, risk, and initiative. This principle should appeal to the laboring people of America.

By the same token Republicans are against big Government spending, big taxes, and Federal control. We would assist those citizens who need help; but in every case the local community and citizens should manage their own affairs and daily lives. We believe that individual opportunity and individual freedom go hand in hand.

The Republican task force to paint the true image of the Republican Party if it succeeds will create an issue which to me needs portrayal to all Republicans. Once we see ourselves and objectives in proper perspective, we can go to the people offering principles which assure the best hope of all citizens—not leaders in Wall Street; not leaders in labor—but all citizens in every walk of life a better and happier existence.

Intra-party issues, selfish interests, and human weakness will always exist as long as politics and politicians compete for popular favor. Yet men and women everywhere regardless of political faith will continue to cherish ideals and hold convictions dear.

It is therefore in our Nation's best interest that both our political parties re-study their policies from time to time and strengthen in every way the honest advancement of principles on which there is united agreement. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hail with hope and expectation the efforts of the 44 Republicans from all walks of life and from all over the country who will seek a common ground on which members of the Republican Party can find unity and offer leadership and service to the Nation.

Hon. Hale Boggs, of Louisiana, Suggests U.S. Base Companies To Defer Tax on Foreign Income Used Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the March 1959 issue of the *Journal of Taxation*:

BOGGS SUGGESTS "U.S. BASE COMPANIES" TO DEFER TAX ON FOREIGN INCOME USED ABROAD

"Why do we force our businessmen to seek out such countries as Liechtenstein, Monaco and Panama to achieve a business result?" asks Congressman Hale Boggs, Democrat of Louisiana. "I have come to the conclusion that no reason for forcing them to do so exists. It is within our power to provide the means of organizing base companies in the United States itself for the conduct of foreign business operations. We have the example of Canada's 4-K companies and Britain's overseas trade corporations. As a matter of fact, we have the example of practically every other trading country in the world before us to follow."

Because Mr. Boggs is a member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy, this arresting suggestion demands the

serious attention of tax practitioners and taxpayers alike.

"Enactment of a law permitting the creation of a unique class of domestic corporations organized for the conduct of business abroad would do much to provide incentives to foreign investment," said Mr. Boggs in his remarks at the recent meeting of the Foreign Trade Council. "Such companies would be in a position to utilize the earnings derived from their foreign operations for the expansion of their activities in the free countries of the world without the immediate payment of United States tax. These corporations would pay U.S. tax on their foreign source income only when it is severed from the foreign operation by a distribution to the shareholder. Such corporations—I refer to them as U.S. base companies for want of a better term—could and should be permitted to carry on all operations now conducted by foreign base companies. I wish to emphasize that I think that exporting activities be included within permissible activities."

"Provision for U.S. base companies would not in my opinion require any change in the existing law providing for Western Hemisphere Trade Corporations. Additionally, I see no reason for not permitting any company desiring to do so to continue to operate abroad through a branch."

"It is fair to state that the present fiscal condition of the United States should make deferral attractive to those in the executive department who are responsible for securing the revenues with which to meet the Government's bills. Deferral involves no loss of U.S. revenue since by hypothesis every dollar of foreign earnings would be subject to tax when repatriated to the United States and severed from the base operation by distribution to stockholders."

NEED FOR ACTION IS GREAT

"A most charitable appraisal of the code as it applies to foreign-source income would find it capricious in result, formalistic in impact, and difficult to administer," said Mr. Boggs. "I know of no one familiar with taxation who does not believe that a thorough legislative overhaul of foreign tax technique and policy is badly needed and long overdue. But it will be an uphill fight to get tax incentives for the encouragement of foreign investment and it behooves us at least to begin by considering recommendations which, though they may not go as far as we believe necessary, have a chance of adoption. I would think it wise for those who have competence in the field of taxation to direct their attention to proposals to defer U.S. tax on foreign source income until it is severed for domestic use."

ADVANTAGES OF THIRD-COUNTRY SUBSIDIARY

"Possibility for the deferral of U.S. taxes on foreign source income now exist under the current code, but the benefits of such deferrals by using foreign subsidiaries or foreign base companies are not available in many instances except at great price. The slow development of the statute and its rather fragmentary administrative and judicial interpretation have effectively denied these benefits to many companies. As an example of a business unfairly treated by the present law, consider company A which at great risk embarked upon the unknown of foreign investment in the 1920's. Legal advisers then had little experience with foreign investment and there were few interpretations of the law. The attitude of the U.S. Treasury Department was certainly far different from its present one. Accepting the best advice available, company A organized its foreign undertaking in the form of a subsidiary incorporated in Brazil. The risk proved worthwhile and the undertaking was successful in Brazil. Company A was also aware that similar markets for its products

existed in Argentina, Peru, South Africa, and elsewhere. One would think it a simple matter for company A to transfer a part of its hard-earned, foreign-source earnings to any one of the countries named and establish a similar successful venture for the ultimate benefit of the United States and the countries involved. We know it is not."

"Now look at company B which manufactured a product similar to company A's. For years company B watched the experience of company A and, convinced of the wisdom of foreign investment, decided to move into the foreign field in 1953, but, learning from company A's difficult tax position, it established a base company and, by utilizing this third-country arrangement, is developing the markets in Argentina, Peru and South Africa with profits from other countries untaxed by the United States. This financing ability should be available to company A as well. B's accumulated earnings and profits in any one country may be transferred without the imposition of U.S. tax to another subsidiary where they are needed. Additional benefits accrue to company B such as the averaging of foreign tax rates for the purpose of achieving the maximum benefit of the U.S. foreign tax credit. It may achieve many tax savings on branch or other agency operations because its base company is not subject to U.S. tax jurisdiction."

"Surely, if we were proceeding de novo, no one would support this inherently inequitable and discriminatory arrangement. Yet we today condone it by inaction and perpetuate the inequity by an overdeveloped concern for the bare possibility of tax avoidance."

"The chief reason why company A is unable to remove this tax handicap is section 367. Section 367 applies only to exchanges which involve gain and provides that, in determining the extent to which gain shall be recognized, a foreign corporation shall not be considered as a corporation for purposes of most of the important sections of subchapter C unless, before any exchange is undertaken, it has been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that the exchange is not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax. Section 367 began as section 112(k) of the Revenue Act of 1932 in a campaign against foreign personal holding companies which were then being utilized for the purpose of avoiding the U.S. capital-gains tax. Now, of course, with today's tax rates, it is not difficult for the Treasury Department and the IRS to find that a purpose of a contemplated exchange is the avoidance of Federal income taxes. Deferral is so deemed."

"However, company A has no desire to avoid the payment of U.S. tax. It simply wishes to compete with equality under U.S. law with company B for foreign investment opportunities. This it cannot do because section 367 has cemented, not only company A, but perhaps a majority of the primary companies in the field of foreign investment, into a fixed organization pattern."

"Even if we were to assume that rare thing, the Commissioner's approval of an exchange involving a foreign corporation, company A is by no means out of the woods. Subchapter C of the code was framed with domestic business problems in mind. It does not take into account the vagaries of foreign law and the policy of many foreign countries requiring a high percentage of local ownership in corporations. Thus even assuming that company A can overcome what is almost the irrefutable presumption of section 367, it may nevertheless find itself unable to invest where investment is needed because of a statute which should have as one of its

principal objectives neutrality of impact between similarly situated taxpayers."

H.R. 5, introduced by Representative Boggs on January 7, 1959, attempts to solve both of the problems he discussed. Section 2 provides for the creation of a new class of foreign business corporation. Section 3 modifies section 367 of the code to permit tax-free transfer by making that provision inapplicable to an exchange arising out of, or in connection with, a transfer of "foreign business property" (as defined) to a foreign corporation in exchange for its stock.

SUMMARY OF BOGGS BILL AND INITIAL INDUSTRY REACTION

The bill introduced by Representative Boggs to accomplish some of his objectives is seen by some representatives of the foreign trade industry to be facing grave difficulties in its progress through the legislature. The bill (H.R. 5) contains seven independent sections and it may be that, if the need for compromise develops, one or more sections may be dropped.

Section 1 is introductory.

Section 2 would create a new class of Foreign Business Corporations (FBC). These would be domestic corporations which would be permitted to defer U.S. tax so long as the earnings remained invested abroad, to some extent as third-country, foreign-base corporations now do.

Section 3 would permit the tax-free transfer by U.S. corporations of foreign business assets to controlled foreign corporations.

Section 4 would extend the 14-percentage-point tax reduction allowed to Western Hemisphere trade corporations on all foreign income. Only companies with 90 percent of their income from foreign business could qualify as International Trade Corporations (ITC). The WHTC would be abolished.

Section 5 would create an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit which may be elected in lieu of the per-country limitation.

Section 6 would specifically permit credit for foreign taxes forgiven by the foreign country as part of a tax incentive program.

Section 7 would permit nonrecognition of gain on property of foreign subsidiaries involuntarily converted.

Paul D. Seghers, New York City tax attorney and chairman of the International Section of the New York Board of Trade, expressed one reaction of foreign tax experts to the bill: it's complex and doesn't cover all the points that need correction. Mr. Seghers says that, "The need for encouragement of increased activity abroad through tax incentives is so abundantly clear that it is a disappointment that the one piece of legislation proposed along these lines should fall short of affording sufficient incentive. Nevertheless, it would seem reasonable first to consider whether the urgency for legislation to accomplish the announced purpose of the Boggs bill is so great that it would be better to enact H.R. 5 at the earliest possible moment, rather than to risk prolonged delay by seeking to incorporate changes in it, though they may be very desirable."

"However, H.R. 5, if denuded of its provisions for the extension to worldwide trade of the 14-percentage-point tax reduction and for credit for tax waived by foreign countries, would be inadequate to accomplish satisfactorily its intended effect—to encourage private investment abroad."

"Why? Deferral is now available through the use of foreign subsidiaries and, according to the most ardent supporters of deferral, is being quite widely availed of in this manner by their competitors. Why, then, can it be anticipated that another form of deferral, given almost the same tax treatment as a foreign subsidiary, will stimulate U.S. business to put money into foreign operations?"

"Hence, all who are concerned with the achievement of the announced objectives of H.R. 5 should unite in insisting that the substance of the 14-point reduction and the tax sparing be retained in it."

"The tax-deferral method adopted is based on a plan proposed by Ira Wonder and E. R. Barlow, both of Harvard. It would be better had the method of deferral proposed by Richard C. Munsche (at the December hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy) been incorporated in H.R. 5, rather than the Harvard plan. In other words, it would be better, as a method of deferral of the tax, to have the income taxed to the stockholder of the Foreign Business Corporation when distributed, rather than to tax the corporation on its income when distributed by it. Unfortunately, there are many obvious disadvantages in the method of deferral of tax provided in the Boggs bill."

"I note that it is apparently possible to qualify the same U.S. corporation for treatment in the same taxable year as both a foreign business corporation and an international trade corporation. This would afford the benefit of both the tax deferral and the 14-percentage-point tax reduction."

"The proposed allowance, in effect, of either the per country or the overall limitation on the amount of the foreign tax credit is to be commended as a badly needed correction of an injustice. It is to be noted, however, that this still leaves much to be desired to correct the injustices resulting from the Treasury's interpretation and application of the code provisions with respect to credit for foreign taxes levied in lieu of income taxes."

Other reactions run the familiar gamut of varied opinion. At the opposite pole to Mr. Seghers may perhaps be the point to fix the position of Prof. Stanley Surrey of the Harvard Law School. He feels that, at present, there is a drive to secure a distinct U.S. tax preference for U.S. corporations having foreign income; the main goal is a 38 percent U.S. tax rate on those earnings. From the start, as Professor Surrey sees it, basic congressional policy has been that a dollar received from foreign earnings should bear the same ultimate U.S. tax burden as a dollar from domestic earnings. Why then, he asks, should a dollar earned abroad be treated any differently? He feels that this question lies at the root of every tax policy issue relating to foreign income.

Somewhere in between are some practically and politically minded persons who believe that, at this point in our political picture, it will be necessary to settle for deferment alone.

Other minor voices may still be heard. Someone has suggested that, if deferment is to be enacted, foreign incorporated base companies should be required to meet the same standards of reporting to the IRS that will be required of foreign business corporations. Another has inquired why no corrective legislation has been proposed to eliminate the tax advantage which results from the arithmetic operation of the foreign tax credit formula (see 10 J. Tax 33).

CITIZENS WORKING ABROAD MUST NOW FILE RETURNS

U.S. citizens employed abroad will have to file Federal income tax returns for 1958 and later years, even though their income earned outside the United States may be exempt from tax, as a result of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958. Taxpayers claiming exemptions under Section 911(a) on their income from personal sources earned abroad will be required to submit with their tax return a new Form 2555, "Statement to Support Exclusion of Income Earned Abroad."

The 1954 Code has always required that a return be filed by a taxpayer who has annual

gross income of \$600 or more (\$1,200 if he is 65 years of age or over).

Formerly, many citizens employed in foreign countries did not have to file returns because their gross income, which did not include income exempt because earned abroad, was less than the minimum gross income for filing a return. Now the taxpayer abroad must include exempt earned income when determining whether he must file an income tax return.

All income received for personal services performed abroad by a citizen who is a bona fide resident of a foreign country for at least one full taxable year is exempt. There is also an exemption of the first \$20,000 of income received for personal services performed abroad by a citizen who is physically present in foreign countries for (approximately) 17 out of 18 consecutive months.

If the taxpayer qualifies under either of these two rules, income derived from personal services rendered abroad is exempt. This includes wages, salaries, fees, bonuses, commissions, tips and similar income.

However, income paid by the United States Government is not, under any circumstances, exempt for reasons of bona fide residence or presence in a foreign country. Accordingly, U.S. Government employees abroad are generally not affected by the new filing requirement because their government salary is taxable and they have always been required to file income tax returns.

Congressional Complaint Blocks Further Oil Price Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, some days ago, I had occasion to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the serious situation created in upstate New York by another increase in the price of fuel oil completely unjustified by the circumstances. I advised the Members of this House of the hardship that these increases were creating for the people of my district, and I advised them that I had also brought this matter to the attention of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and to the appropriate antimonopoly subcommittees of both Houses of the Congress.

I have been gratified by the tremendous favorable response which I have received from people throughout New York State to the action which I took, and I have been gratified, too, by the prompt action of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in referring this matter to Mr. Richard B. O'Donnell, Chief of their New York office for full investigation.

But, Mr. Speaker, no development has pleased me more than a report which appeared in one of the leading newspapers in my district the other day, the paper which had first brought this matter to my attention, to the effect that as a result of statements made in this House and action taken by a Member of this body, an additional projected price increase was forestalled. All too often

an individual Member of this House who rises to discuss a matter of public concern has doubts in his own mind as to how effective his comments may be in accomplishing the action he seeks. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that in this case we have indeed been effective in a concrete way, and, under unanimous consent, I include at this point an article from the Freeman's Journal, of Coopers-town, N.Y., dated February 18, 1959:

STRATTON PRESSES OIL PRICE INVESTIGATION—
ANOTHER 1/4-CENT INCREASE IS POSTPONED

Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York's 32d District, has announced that the Justice Department has advised him that the subject of recent fuel oil price increases in the upstate New York area has been referred to Richard B. O'Donnell, chief of the New York office of the Department's Antitrust Division, for consideration in connection with other similar complaints under study in that office.

Congressman STRATTON asked for the investigation by the Justice Department following an editorial in the Freeman's Journal's issue of January 21 which called the fuel oil price increase of a half-cent a gallon completely unjustified.

Last week, the Journal heard from a contact within the oil industry that another quarter-cent increase had been scheduled to go into effect on or about February 1, but it was postponed after Mr. STRATTON started his campaign for Justice Department and congressional investigations of the industry's pricing policies.

Congressman STRATTON said that a communication from Victor R. Hansen, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, advised him that the Department was following the recent fuel oil price increases very closely to determine whether they are the result of a conspiracy to fix prices in violation of the Federal antitrust laws. Assistant Attorney General Hansen, also added, in his communication to the Congressman, that "if we obtain evidence of price-fixing agreements I assure you that prompt action will be taken to enforce the antitrust laws."

The Department's letter also referred to a pending indictment in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in which some 29 major oil companies were charged with fixing prices on crude oil and automotive gasoline. The Department's letter pointed out that "the price of crude oil has a relation to the price of heating fuel oil about which you have complained."

Congressman STRATTON announced that he was highly gratified at the prompt and effective response which he had received from the Justice Department and said that he hoped that this action would help curb any further unwarranted or unjustified price increases of this type.

Congressman STRATTON also said that he was submitting the information with regard to the fuel oil price increases in upstate New York to the House Judiciary Committee with the request that the committee's Subcommittee on Antimonopoly Measures look into the matter further.

Giving World True U.S. Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Constantine Brown, one of America's

most reliable and conscientious reporters, wrote a most significant article which appears in the February 24 issue of the Washington Evening Star and other newspapers of the Nation.

Mr. Brown comments on the failure of the U.S. Information Agency to tell properly the American story and combat the propaganda of the Soviets and their satellites. He uses, as an example of this failure, the inability—or unwillingness—of the USIA to place in its proper perspective the situation in America created by the Supreme Court decree on school segregation. While the Information Service may have handled other subjects properly, the record of this situation does not commend the USIA.

It occurs to me that an agency of the U.S. Government should hew to the American policy of relating the facts and all of the facts. For, in not bringing out both sides of the issue in this instance, USIA does a disservice to the American people and to our relations with foreign nations. The action taken defeats the very purpose for which tax dollars have been most lavishly appropriated.

And, as parallel study, I recommend the reading of Senator ELLENDER's recent report to the U.S. Senate on his tour and his study of USIA activities in South and Central America. This report—together with Mr. Constantine Brown's article—will be helpful to a Congress presently concerned with budget requests for this agency.

Mr. Brown's article follows:

GIVING WORLD TRUE U.S. PICTURE—USIA
SEEN FAILING TO TELL OTHER PEOPLE OF
RESPECTABLE POSITION OF NEGROES

(By Constantine Brown)

With the assortment of crises, dilemmas, and issues which confront our Nation in almost monotonous regularity, the question is often heard, "What will our allies think of us?" or "This is grist for the Soviet propaganda mill."

American taxpayers have contributed millions of dollars to the U.S. Information Agency and its offspring, the Voice of America. Our USIA offices around the world and in every important capital are well staffed and, we hope, well supplied with all the information available to counteract Soviet propaganda and to explain some of the vital issues we must see in this country.

One of the most important issues in the last 3 years has been integration. When this reporter made his last trip around the world in the fall of 1958 he was asked in almost every country he visited about our racial problems. Far too often the questioner's tone of voice reflected a feeling that America was treating its colored citizens in a very shabby fashion.

In Karachi, Pakistan, for instance, the leading English language newspaper, Dawn, ran a lead editorial severely criticizing the United States on the subject.

In France I found people who actually believed that American Negroes were starving, given no voting rights, and lived in ghettos, much like the Jews in Hitler's Germany.

In Tokyo I heard that many people believed that Negroes were lynched every day.

Nowhere did I find any attempt of the USIA to explain how well off American Negroes are comparatively; how many of them live in well-built houses, how many of them drive the most expensive cars. Nor that the majority of American Negroes live in far greater luxury than many of the foreigners who are feeling so sorry for them.

Neither did I find any evidence that our USIA was presenting to our friends both sides of our segregation question. To the

people overseas it would seem that all of America's white citizens hate all American black citizens, and vice versa. It was never told to them, for instance, that there are a large number of Negroes who prefer segregation and who are working alongside and with the whites who also prefer it.

There is ample evidence which the USIA could present. A leading publisher of a string of weekly Negro newspapers, Davis Lee, has written several editorials on the subject. In one published in the Anderson, S.C., Herald on January 18, Mr. Lee said: "These (Negro) advocates of desegregation want to force white people to desegregate, but they haven't desegregated within our race. In some sections of South Carolina the yellow Negroes won't have anything to do with the dark Negroes. I know Negroes in Charleston who will not speak to other Negroes because they are of different stations in life."

"In some sections the yellow and mulatto Negroes have churches that dark Negroes cannot attend. The educated Negro shuns the uneducated of his race. The professional members of our race will rob and exploit the unfortunate members of our race. But they refuse to associate with them on an equal social basis. At the rate they are going, in a few years there will not be a Negro race. You can hardly conceive of sensible leaders advocating a movement that is going to do away with our race. But that is what they are doing."

If the USIA wanted to present proof to our friends overseas that the American Negroes are not a downtrodden and starving minority in our country, they need only to quote Mr. Lee further. He wrote: "Ted Lewis is one of Atlanta's leading Negro businessmen. Some time ago he was having financial difficulty. He went to some of the city's leading Negro businessmen, including the bankers, and tried to borrow \$2,500."

"They turned him down flat. He went to the small-loan department of the C&S Bank. One of the officials went over his plans with him, and then recommended that he borrow \$5,000 instead of \$2,500. The bank let him have the money without questions. As a result he is a success today, a credit to Georgia and his race."

There are many things our USIA could do to let the world know that the American Negroes are respected, intelligent and first-class American citizens. It is only a vocal few of both the black and white race who are giving our country a black eye on every continent of the world.

Miss Debra Glater, New York State Winner of the Voice of Democracy Broadcasting Contest, an Eloquent Voice for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Washington the 50 winners representing the 49 States of the Union and the District of Columbia who scored highest in their respective areas in the annual Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest, conducted jointly by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Electronic Industries Association, the State Association of Broadcasters, and the Veterans of Foreign

Wars, assembled in Washington for the presentation of the national awards. I had the high privilege of attending that luncheon in company with the number one winner in my New York State, Miss Debra Glater, 17 years old, of Schenectady, N.Y., a constituent of mine and a student at Mount Pleasant High School in Schenectady. I was deeply impressed with the outstanding qualities of all of the 50 young men and women who participated as finalists in this contest. But I was especially impressed with the moving and eloquent expression of the meaning of democracy contained in the script of Miss Glater, which took top award in the Empire State of our Nation.

This script shows a deep understanding of the meaning of democracy as it is practiced in our community and in our Nation, and it also is eloquent tribute to the outstanding educational training provided to the young men and women of Schenectady by the Schenectady public school system.

Because I believe that Miss Glater's script ought to be read by every American, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Debra Glater)

May I read you a letter which I received 2 weeks ago from Bonn, Germany?

"MY DEAR COUSIN DEBRA: Life is so wonderful in the West, but yet so strange. I say strange in the sense of newness. Although I am 17 years old, I must begin life again—like a newborn baby. So many new words I've learned in these few days. Yesterday, while walking in the market square, I overheard two people talking about coming to America. I heard them say that America is a land of fulfillment, a land rich in opportunity. And Debbie, one word I heard them repeat over and over—'democracy.' I've heard this word in school, but what does it really mean?"

Helena's letter goes on—but I must stop here, as it's this part of the letter that troubles me. How can I explain the word 'democracy'? How can I put into simple words this way of life which is my heritage—and which I take so much for granted? Will you listen to me and my answer? Do you think I have told her the truths about Democracy?

"DEAR HELENA: I rejoice with you in your new found freedom. I know there will be many new things you will be wanting to see and enjoy. I feel that an excellent place to begin is with your question, 'What is democracy?'"

"This question is not easily answered, for democracy is a composition of many ideals. To me, democracy means freedoms. In the United States, I can fulfill my religious ideals freely. As I walk down State Street in Schenectady, I can see S. John's Church, the First Methodist Church, and Beth Israel Synagogue. I can hear soft melodious voices of young choir boys singing Christmas carols. The ancient appeal of the Kol Nidre melody on the eve of the Jewish Day of Atonement emanates from the walls of the synagogue. You see, Helena, I need not be ashamed of my religion, that my beliefs are not like those of my neighbors. This privilege, this wonderful feeling of freedom of religion, everyone in a democracy possesses. This is a sharp note in the harmonious chord of democracy."

"The freedom of press, speech, and public opinion—to what do these liberties entitle me, as a citizen of America? I can write any article I may desire, without reprisal, but must consider the reputations of my neighbors."

I can print what I know and feel is the truth, and express my thoughts on anything from economics to a cartoon. In my democracy, I am free to think, to investigate, and to express myself. This is another forceful note in the chord of democracy."

"The freedom of enterprise grants to me the privilege of choosing my occupation. If I wish to further my education, I may do so. If I take pride in my work, I can be a success. This opportunity for success is very evident, for in America one can see the tables of the workman as well as the tables of the executive filled with food. In America one can see a picture of well-being. People are well clothed and possess the material comforts, which contribute to their security and happiness."

"And so, the third exuberant note is struck in the chord of democracy."

"But, Helena, democracy begins with education. It's a wonderful sight to see students in high school working in a physics laboratory, or studying math, history, and languages, for they mean America's future. I, as well as each individual, have the benefit of public schools and colleges which will teach me to become a better American citizen. Thus, the final thundering note in the chord of democracy is struck."

"What is democracy, Helena? It is the constant repetitious song of freedom-loving citizens, bound together by the basic melody in our Constitution. It is a way of life, the American way of life. I hope you understand my explanation, Helena, and that it will not be too long before both of us can speak for democracy."

Coal Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in order to clear up any misunderstanding on my proposal for the creation of a Coal Research Commission, I submit the following analysis and argument.

COAL PROBLEMS

The serious condition of the coal industry can be directly traced to the following sources:

First. Importation of fuel oil.

Second. The subsidization of other power sources.

Third. The favored position given to competitive domestic fuels taxwise by existing laws.

Fourth. The high cost of transportation of coal which, in some instances, is higher than the production costs.

Fifth. Our foreign trade and air policies which are responsible for a reduction of American production which in turn reduces the use and need of fuel.

The Canadian government has long ago realized this and has had in operation at least two major operations for the benefit of the coal industry.

First. They subsidize coal by paying a subvention on coal transportation to enable the producer to meet competition with other domestic fuels as well as American imports.

Second. They maintain a complete unit for research into the uses, pro-

duction and marketing of coal through a coal research commission.

Even this last operation has been denied our coal industry.

We have research and study commissions on many subjects and yet, we refuse as a body to pass the necessary enabling legislation to create a study commission for coal.

Why? Simply because other fuel sources oppose the coal industry. In passing, it might be interesting to note that more payroll dollars are paid out by the coal industry per B.t.u. of heat energy than any other source of fuel.

For years the membership of the House of Representatives coming from the coal mining areas have been attempting to pass legislation to create a Coal Research Commission.

It has always been defeated by arguments based upon economy. Nothing could be farther from the truth than the statement that "we can't afford a Study Commission for Coal."

In the face of the declining fuel market for coal, the subsidization by the Government of TVA atomic powerplants, and other fuel sources makes it imperative for coal to find new uses and new markets.

One such outlet is fast disappearing. That outlet was called the foreign shipments market.

Recently, the following stories appeared in the public press:

Bonn puts embargo on imports of coal.

Six nation trade agreement group to put limitations on coal imports. Study plan to subsidize this domestic coal to compete with American imports.

Recently, West Germany put a tariff on coal of \$4.79 a ton.

The above-captioned stories tell a very sad story. While we are opening our tariff doors wider and wider for foreign made goods, our so-called friends are clamping down on our products just as quickly as they become self-sufficient.

There is a growing suspicion too, that some of our own foreign aid money will be used to subsidize our competitors.

This, of course, would not be a new phase in our international policies. It has been going on for some time in other fields of American production.

The history of coal is the history of steel and the history of steel is the history of our phenomenal growth as a producing, successful nation.

There are still untapped reserves sufficient to provide fuel needs for many, many years.

However, in the face of present and future threats to this industry from other fuel sources, it becomes our duty to help this industry and the thousands of families and hundreds of communities that depend upon coal for their welfare and in some cases, their very existence.

There can be no valid argument to offset the arguments so far advanced. I expect to present a new bill which will make the Commission self-sustaining.

I would increase the coal depreciation allowance from 5 to 15 percent—oil and gas enjoy a 27 percent allowance—and take a certain per tonnage assessment against all coal mined to carry out the

work of the Study and Research Commission.

It is estimated that we have coal reserves beyond our needs for the foreseeable future.

Coal is one of the world's most versatile minerals. Its uses are limitless. The need now is for the proper study of its many byproducts with the goal in mind of preserving both the industry and the jobs of its employees.

The stubborn, and sometimes blind, opposition to the Commission fails to recognize that our neighbor Canada has such a commission and has for years been giving its coal industry Government subsidies in both Government-financed research and direct transportation subsidies.

King Coal is not dead, he just slumbering. He still has the power and the resources to keep alive the fires in the continuing and eternal struggle for the welfare of all the people.

To those of us whose roots are deep down in the bowels of Mother Earth nurtured by hard times, near starvation, strikes, coal and iron police and meager fare of the old company store, the depreciation of our coal economy strikes us as a real catastrophe.

The sickness of the coal industry is contagious. No one dare really measure the loss sustained by our whole economy when a coal mine shuts down. It is not money alone, it is all of the other values that somehow have become a part of our way of life.

This Congress cannot, in good conscience, refuse again to pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I again appeal to the good will and sound judgment of this House to support my bill for the creation of a coal research commission.

Increasing imports of crude and residual oils are having a greater impact on the bituminous coal industry than ever before. Please consider these facts.

The administration's voluntary import control program, even under the broader trade agreements statute enacted in 1958, is not effective in restricting the imports of crude oil and products. Imports of residual oil have not been included in the voluntary control plan.

Residual imports in 1958 were approximately at the 1957 level. Coal production in 1958 was 20 percent below the previous year. Residual imports for the week ending January 9, 1959, averaged 867,200 barrels daily—456,300 barrels daily above the comparable week in 1958. This is the highest level in history. Coal production for the same week was 645,000 tons below the comparable week in 1958.

Total residual imports to January 9 were 7,342,800 barrels, greater by more than 2 million barrels than for the same period in 1958. Total coal production to January 10 was 9,922,000 tons, less by 2,584,000 tons than for the same period last year.

Imported residual prices along the eastern seaboard, the area of greatest impact in coal's markets, have been reduced from \$2.57 in August 1958, to \$2.37 in January 1959. Thousands of tons of coal's markets have been absorbed as a

result of the increased residual imports and reductions in price. Economic conditions in coal-producing areas are deplorable. Unemployment is on the increase, and the number of public assistance recipients is increasing.

Significant facts regarding the proposal for the establishment of a coal research independent agency:

First. In practically all instances where Government-sponsored research programs are in operation, administration and control of such agencies are in the hands of independent agencies, for instance: National Science Foundation, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Atomic Energy Commission.

Recently the Department of Defense, within its own organization, has set up a separate and distinct agency for research operations rather than assign control of these activities to the various established Government divisions.

Second. An important research program, such as anticipated, to benefit the coal industry would require high-type administrative personnel. This is obtained in independent agencies, whereas the same option is not available under established agencies. For instance, the chain of command in an existing Government agency would be along the lines of the following: First, secretary of the department; second, under secretary of the department; third, assistant secretary in charge of the particular area; fourth, director of the bureau within which such operations might fall; fifth, assistant director of the bureau; sixth, chief of the division; and, seventh, head of a research program.

In other words, in the average governmental department a coal research program would necessarily fall to an individual in the seventh administrative level.

Third. Traditionally, in moving projects through Government agencies interdepartmental delays tend to hamper expeditious movement. Likewise, most Government agencies are inclined to protect their own "empires" from possible invasion by other Government departments.

Fourth. There has existed for quite some time a natural inhibition on the part of private industry to turn over to an established Government agency information that might result in impediments to such industry competitively. This is particularly true where several competitive industries find their direction under the head of the same department or bureau. In these cases, industries are reticent about giving information and details of activities for fear that it might find its way into the hands of competitors in its own field.

Fifth. The coal industry's desire for a coal research program is for one that would be all comprehensive, and all inclusive. It should not, therefore, be limited to the field of technical research in which most of the existing coal research done by Government has been confined. In addition to the technical aspects of research, the coal industry's suggested program would cover such other areas as market and distribution, transportation, utilization, etc. In Gov-

ernment, in order to find experience and the qualification to evaluate projects in such fields, it would be necessary to refer to several separate existing departments of the Government. This would require a very involved job of coordinating as well as directing.

Sixth. As evidenced by the experience of Government itself in placing research under individual agencies, the problem of administering a research program requires individual and special attention. It is not something that can be operated successfully as an adjunct administrative task involving other operations of a Government department.

Significant quotations pertaining to the coal industry's suggestion for a coal research project:

House Report 1263, August 27, 1957, "Findings and Recommendations of the Special Subcommittee on Coal Research," in the conclusions of that report on page 29, made the following comments concerning a coal research project:

A short-range, federally supported coal research and development program such as that referred to in the preceding paragraph, if it is to be conducted expeditiously and effectively and achieve the maximum end results, should utilize the research facilities and personnel of industry associations, universities, and other nonprofit organizations, of private consulting firms and of the Department of the Interior and other Federal agencies, to the extent it is practical to do so, and should be administered by an independent Federal agency which must not be shackled and inhibited by such traditional approaches and restrictive policies as control research activities in the Department of the Interior.

As between the work on coal research in existing Government agencies and the suggestion which has been made by the coal industry for an independent agency, this same report, on page 91, makes the following comment:

And the Bureau of Mines, as a matter of policy, does not concentrate its coal research activities on efforts to solve the short-range problems of the industry. Most of the Bureau's work on coal, which now amounts to about \$5 million annually, is in the area of long-range research and is of such nature that it appears unlikely the average coal producer will be benefited by it.

With reference to the unanimity of the recommendation for a coal research agency established as an independent agency of the Federal Government, the above quoted report has the following to say:

The Bureau of Mines does not look with favor upon an expanded coal research program along the general lines suggested by the National Coal Association and as suggested by practically every witness appearing before the subcommittee on behalf of the coal producers, mine workers, State organizations, community officials, civic groups, and coal-carrying railroads.

In addition to the congressional comments, the Western State Governors' Mineral Policies Conference on November 7, 1955, advocated an approach similar to that recommended by the coal industry in the following comment from their conference report:

1. Establish at Federal level, and at State level where desirable, permanent minerals research advisory boards. These boards

should consider and recommend initiation of research programs, which, in their opinion, are particularly needed.

Excerpt from statement of policy of National Coal Association, page 12:

RESEARCH

Scientific research has made an immeasurable contribution to the economic growth which has made the United States preeminent among the nations of the world. Research should be broadened and intensified to assure further expansion of the Nation's economy and the maintenance of the U.S. leadership. Private industry should continue to play a substantial role in research and make every feasible contribution to the Nation's continued progress. The ultimate in research is beyond the economic capability of some segments of the economy. In furtherance of the national interest and the public welfare, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to encourage and participate actively in appropriate research in the field of energy resources. An independent Federal agency composed of representatives of industry and Government should be established to aid in developing, coordinating, supervising, and financing an appropriate research program for the extraction, utilization, and consumption of bituminous coal. The program should rely upon existing research facilities to the greatest feasible extent, giving impetus and direction to present research efforts.

Hon. Daniel Alden Reed

SPEECH
OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, while driving to my district on Thursday morning last, I heard on my car radio the sad and distressing news of the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable DANIEL ALDEN REED. For several years in Washington, Uncle Dan and his good wife resided in an adjoining apartment and our pleasant association with them shall remain a treasured experience in our lives.

I have never met a more cheerful individual nor one more dedicated to his work and the betterment of his fellow man. His appreciative constituents of the 43d District of New York returned him to Congress time and again until he had attained something of a record in his 83d year and his 21st consecutive term in the House. From every walk of life, the people of his home district frequently expressed their regard with gifts ranging from small delicacies for his table to a fine automobile purchased through popular subscription.

He was a friend and an inspiration to all and we shall miss his presence sorely, as we have during his long hospital confinement.

To his charming, courageous wife, Georgia, and his fine son, William, we extend our sincerest sympathy in their great loss. I am sure we echo the sentiments of all his friends and constituents in these hallowed words, "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

Modesto, Calif., Naval Reserve Unit Is
Cited for High Rating in Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. MCFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call your attention to a recent article in the Modesto (Calif.) Bee concerning the high rating of the Naval Reserve Electronics Division 12-17.

In these days when we must build an adequate defense for this Nation and at the same time watch every dollar that is expended, it is good to know that the Reserves are being trained and qualified to take their place and do an effective job if we find ourselves in a position where we have to call on them to supplement our Regular Forces.

Following is a brief summary of the newspaper article. You will note the broad section of county life represented in the unit:

Scoring one of the highest personnel inspection marks in history, Naval Reserve Electronics Division 12-17, Modesto, earned the plaudits of Capt. E. J. MacGregor, U.S. Navy, 12th Naval District, Deputy Chief of Staff for Naval Reserve.

"The division, led by Lt. Comdr. Harvey B. Rhodes, Modesto city schools adult education chief, scored 3.91, a record cited by Captain MacGregor as the highest personnel inspection score known to him.

Commander Rhodes' division was followed closely by its sister outfit, NRED 12-16, whose enlisted personnel rated 3.86. Lieutenant Commander Richard Copland, Modesto accountant, heads this unit.

The two divisions, training 120 officers and men, comprise Naval Reserve Electronics Battalion 12-3, led by Commander Dwight H. Barnes, Modesto newspaperman. They are part of the 12th Naval District electronics program headed by Commander R. H. Konig, Treasure Island.

NRED 12-17, ranking 18th in national standing among more than 220 similar units, earned high grades in administration and training to become eligible for national trophy consideration.

Division executive officers, Lts. Gerald Underwood, NRED, 12-17, and Russell Lawson, NRED 12-16, an attorney and teacher, respectively, gave much personal inspection credit to enlisted squad leaders:

Radarmen Henry A. Mayers, Turlock paper company foreman, and Lauren Miller, Stanislaus County Road Department employee; Storekeeper Martin J. Sanchez, Turlock salesman, and Personnelman James K. Yoshino, Turlock farmer, all of NRED 12-17, and in NRED 12-16 Electronics Technicians Robert Dewey, Modesto laboratory technician; Ernest P. Scheuber, Modesto feed company employee, and Hideo Yamada, Oakdale farmer; Radioman James S. West, general merchandise firm official, and Storekeeper A. R. Lindsley, junior executive in a chain store.

Captain MacGregor, in presenting Commander Barnes' Battalion trophy to the top division, reminded naval reservists of their important service to the Defense Establishment and to the Nation's taxpayers.

They are the manpower, already trained, to bring the Navy up to fighting strength on a moment's notice in the event of mobilization or attack.

With a third of today's annual \$10,500,000,000 naval budget going to pay and allowances, Captain MacGregor explained were it not for the Naval Reserve, the Navy would have to be up to full war-time complement at all times and the costs would be much higher.

"I know of no group of men who do a more important job for their community and their Nation than the Naval Reserve," Captain MacGregor said.

The National Debt

SPEECH
OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], in leading this discussion today. I take pride that the gentleman conferred with me during the time he was formulating his proposal to begin a responsible and systematic program of paying off our national mortgage, and I am glad to be a cosponsor of this idea.

As some of the participants in this discussion today have suggested, our national debt is, strictly speaking, an unpaid bill from two world wars. On the budget front our two political parties have fought a rough draw since demobilization in 1946. President Truman had three overbalanced budgets with a surplus of nearly \$13 billion; and his four deficit budgets totaled over \$18 billion. President Eisenhower has made a \$3 billion debt payment in 2 surplus years; and his 4 deficit years have increased the debt nearly \$23 billion.

Most people have the idea that since the end of World War II our national debt has been mounting rapidly. However, in relative terms our Federal debt has been stable. In fact, considering that our economy has almost doubled since 1945, the national debt is actually smaller and more manageable today, and hence easier to pay off if the people will support a systematic annual debt-retirement plan.

Another fact that has been missed by many critics of Federal spending is that since 1945, while Federal debt has grown roughly 10 percent, the outstanding debt of all State and local governments increased more than 350 percent to a total of \$55 billion. In other words, the Federal Government has actually done a sounder job of debt management than State and local governments during the postwar period.

During the new fiscal year, out of every dollar paid in Federal taxes approximately 11 cents—\$8.1 billion—is earmarked to pay the interest charge on the debt. In other words, if the debt remains about the same and we follow current debt policies, by 1987 we will have paid out in interest the total amount of the debt—but we will still owe the debt.

What is the reason our Presidents—and Congresses—have never put forward a debt retirement program? Why have we given so little attention to this problem?

The answer, I believe, is imbedded in our political habits and the attitudes of our citizens which influence public men. For instance, some Congressmen—and citizens—argue that the only way to hold down expenditures is to cut taxes—a philosophy which in practice means a perpetually unbalanced budget. Then there are those—a majority perhaps—who believe that it is smart politics to cut taxes as soon as a budget surplus appears—preferably just before the next election. Then there is constituent pressure for an unbalanced budget by, for example, the type of citizens who write their Congressmen to warn them that the tax rate is confiscatory. Naturally, this pressure plays on the politician's fear of advocating higher taxes, and results in noisy applause for any officeholder who stands up for the taxpayer and demands lower taxes.

The formula is simple: Only overbalanced budgets pay off debt. It is plain, then, that debt reduction is keyed to courageous political leadership that is willing to call for austerity and higher taxes.

Perhaps this all adds up to the conclusion that, for the present at least, it is impossible from a political standpoint to sell the American people on a debt reduction program. In my opinion the trouble with this conclusion is that it misjudges the temper of the American people and assumes that they are soft and self-indulgent.

One final point should be made in connection with this debt reduction plan. The only anti-inflation weapon which has not really had a tryout is an overbalanced budget in times when the economy is strong.

It is my personal feeling that the people are far ahead of their elected representatives on this whole issue. Moreover, I believe they would respond if there were national leadership on this question. For one, I am not only an advocate of debt retirement, but would vote for higher taxes if such a step were necessary to carry out the plan embodied in the idea we have discussed today.

Dedication of Highway Trailer Co. Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of the dedication of a new plant, the Highway Trailer Co., at Hazleton, on February 19, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania, had some significant things to say on what the people of Pennsylvania and the Commonwealth are doing to improve the industrial situation in the Keystone State.

Governor Lawrence had high praise for CAN-DO, the industrial promotional organization of Hazleton, as well as the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, emphasizing that the people of the Greater Hazleton community had dug deep into their pockets to finance the handsome plants that now house Capitol Products, General Foam Corp., Lewis Steel Products, and Highway Trailer.

Stressing the self-help aspect of these industrial promotions, Governor Lawrence pointed out that these four plants, at full normal operation, will employ 810 people and create annual payrolls totaling nearly \$3 million.

The Governor used the new plants as an example of teamwork to get things done in Pennsylvania. He said:

These plants are costing nearly \$2½ million. Seventy percent of this comes from your subscriptions and bank loans and 30 percent, or roughly, \$736,000, in loans from the State's industrial development authority.

PIDA—as we have come to call the authority—is, in my opinion, the most essential use of public funds Pennsylvania can make. It is an absolute necessity if we are to achieve the economic redevelopment of our chronically distressed areas. PIDA—make no mistake—is not a giveaway. These are loans, not grants. They are to be repaid, with interest.

Mr. Speaker, this is an ideal example of the philosophy of the area redevelopment bill, the Flood-Douglas bill, which was passed last year, only to meet the fate of a veto, and which has been reintroduced this year and is now coming up for hearings. Pennsylvania shows the way government, industry and the community can cooperate to create jobs, increase production, produce payrolls, banish unemployment.

It is most encouraging to know that Governor Lawrence is all out and fully behind this job-development plan in Pennsylvania. In his campaign last fall, he made this issue one of the main planks in his platform, and true to his word, as he always has been, he is asking the Legislature of Pennsylvania for a new appropriation of \$10 million to carry on this forward-looking, result-getting, payroll-creating industrial promotion campaign. In addition to asking this amount, Governor Lawrence has just requested the general assembly for an additional \$1,850,000 appropriation to replenish the authority's loan funds until the new biennium begins on June 1.

Just how successfully the PIDA is working was reported by Governor Lawrence when he said that in Luzerne County my home district:

During the past 30 months PIDA loans went into industrial projects which created 3,300 new factory jobs in 17 new or expanding plants.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of this outstanding performance of community and State teamwork and joint financing, with bank participation, in spite of the excellent work being accomplished in this direction, the fact remains that today Luzerne County has 25,000, or 18 percent of its working force, unemployed. So you can see that this is a problem we must keep working at constantly, and one, too, in which we need the aid of the provisions of the Flood-Douglas bill.

I, too, want to congratulate Mr. David Charnay and his associates upon their new industrial home and say to them again that they are most welcome as members of the industrial community of Hazleton, in Luzerne County. And again, I want to offer my congratulations to the great Hazleton community team whose dedicated efforts resulted in the decision of Highway Trailer to locate at Valmont Park, the home of Hazleton's new industries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have Governor Lawrence's remarks at the formal dedication of the Highway Trailer Co. plant inserted in the Appendix of the Record:

REMARKS OF GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE AT THE DEDICATION OF THE HIGHWAY TRAILER CO. PLANT, HAZLETON, PA., FEBRUARY 19, 1959

This is the first time that I have participated in a plant dedication since I became Governor of Pennsylvania a few weeks ago.

I am glad that this particular experience can be in Hazleton here in the anthracite region, where new job opportunities are urgently needed—and where the Nation's most dramatic demonstration of community industrial development has come into being.

I am pleased to welcome Highway Trailer to Pennsylvania.

We are proud to have this fine company join the great industrial family of the Commonwealth.

Pennsylvania welcomes industry. Our need for industrial growth is obvious. Therefore, when we Pennsylvanians say "welcome" to industry, we believe that our welcome is a little warmer and more deeply meant than might be the case in States which have not known our problem.

To Mr. Charnay and his associates, and to the stockholders and employees of Highway Trailer, let me say also that Pennsylvania does not merely want to be with you at these joyous dedication ceremonies, our people want you to enjoy a long and profitable life among us, and we want your company to continue its expansion here.

I consider it our continuing duty to help you, insofar as we can, toward enhancing your stability and growth as a company. I have made it a matter of major policy to create and maintain the kind of business climate in which companies can succeed and grow.

And now, let me extend my congratulations to the people of Hazleton, to your banks, and to your civic leaders, who, with the strong support of the general public, have done so magnificent a job of industrial development through CAN-DO and the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce.

It wasn't easy to dig down into your pockets and raise the money that is financing these handsome plants here at Valmont Park—Capitol Products, General Foam Corp., Lewis Steel Products, and now Highway Trailer.

But you did it.

Certainly the statistics bear out what you have done here. You know them well, but on an occasion like this they bear repeating because they tell—better than anything else—the tremendous job you have done.

These four plants, at full normal operation, employ 810 people, and create yearly payrolls totaling nearly \$3 million.

That's a wonderful record of achievement, and it doesn't even take into account the jobs and payrolls created indirectly as a result of this new employment.

These plants are costing nearly \$2½ million. Seventy percent of this addition comes from your subscriptions and bank loans and 30 percent, or roughly \$736,000, in loans from the State's industrial development authority.

PIDA—as we have come to call the authority—is, in my opinion, the most essential use of public funds Pennsylvania can make. It is an absolute necessity if we are to achieve the economic redevelopment of our chronically distressed areas. PIDA—make no mistake—is not a giveaway. These are loans, not grants. They are to be repaid, with interest.

And you can take pride that PIDA is in a very real sense, a product and creation of this area. Up until its establishment, Hazleton and other anthracite communities financed plant construction through subscription funds and first mortgage loans from your banks. Many called this post-World War II effort "the Scranton Plan," but it did not operate only in Scranton. It was a plan that worked—although it could not work fast enough to absorb all the employment needs in the area.

PIDA came into being, not as a departure of the area plan, but as a part of it. Actually, some of the people right here today helped to formulate the program and write the needed legislation. Senators McMenamin, Flick, Murphy, Wagner, and Scott of the hard coal regions were among its sponsors. And when PIDA came into being, with men like your own Vic Diehm as members of its board, the burden of local fund-raising was cut in half. Before, you had to raise 40 percent of funds needed—under PIDA, you raise 20 percent. With the same effort by notable Hazletonians like Diehm and the untiring Dr. Dessen and your chamber of commerce, you can bring more plants, offering more employment.

Your own plan has been strengthened at the suggestion of your own leaders. And the result has been the speeding up of industrial growth in cities like Hazleton, and with firms like Highway Trailer. Here's what your plan developed into—what the result of your original thinking did in Pennsylvania.

PIDA has participated in the financing of 72 new plants and plant expansions in distressed area communities. Those plants and expansions are creating just under 12,000 new factory jobs.

I have requested the general assembly for an additional \$1,850,000 to replenish the authority's loan funds until the new biennium begins on June 1.

And for the next biennium—and I am pleased to announce it here for the first time—I am requesting an additional \$10 million from the general assembly for PIDA.

Pennsylvanians know this program is working. Here in Luzerne County during the past 30 months, PIDA loans went into industrial projects which created 3,300 new factory jobs in 17 new or expanding plants. I congratulate you for making such a record.

It is a record of cooperation and yet, as you know in the region, it is only the beginning.

These are the thoughts that occur to me as I welcome Highway Trailer to Hazleton and Pennsylvania. You could not have come to a greater State or a finer community.

This work, as I have said, is only in its starting stages. I am hopeful that our PIDA funds are going to be supplemented by a Federal program of financial assistance to distressed areas in the matter of industrial development. Our own Senator CLARK and Congressman DAN FLOOD, as well as others in our Pennsylvania congressional delegation, have given that legislation top billing in their programs.

In a few days, I am going to Washington to testify on this matter in the official hearings, and I shall do everything in my power to see such legislation enacted into law. With this kind of Federal help, our efforts to achieve economic stability in Pennsylvania will be greatly strengthened.

Again, I congratulate the Highway Trailer Co. for seeing here a great benefit for them-

selves; I congratulate your civic leaders for your can-do program. I feel a sense of pride in Pennsylvania's government for assisting what was done here, but more than anything else, I congratulate the people of Hazleton and the region for your faith in your community, for your perseverance in adversity, for the spirit which has emerged here which is an example to any community in the Nation.

Truly, Pennsylvania's greatest asset is its people, as you have proved right here in Hazleton. May God bless you in this venture and in all your work.

Tax Cuts on Profits From Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York World Telegram and Sun of February 6, 1959:

TRADE BOARD FOR TAX CUT PROFIT ABROAD—BACKS BOGGS BILL TO SPUR INVESTMENT

A drive to stimulate the foreign investment of about \$10 to \$15 billion of U.S. capital each year opened today under the sponsorship of the international section, New York Board of Trade, which urged passage of the Boggs bill providing for a 14 percent point cut in U.S. taxes on foreign-earned income of U.S.-owned firms.

Paul D. Seghers, chairman of the section, said that the reduction to 38 percent, instead of the present 52 percent, in corporate income taxes would not only increase U.S.-owned investment abroad by as much as \$15 billion a year, but would also create a friendlier climate for American business abroad.

He estimated last year's investment abroad at \$5 billion.

OTHERS SUPPORT IT

Clay R. Smith, treasurer, Pfizer International Inc., a subsidiary of Chas Pfizer & Co. Inc., also urged passage of the Boggs bill as a means of allowing the same 14 percent tax break for investment in Europe and elsewhere as is already available in the Western Hemisphere.

Richard C. Munsche, tax manager, Coca-Cola Export Corp., a subsidiary of the Coca-Cola Co., indicated that the cut would reduce U.S. revenues by only about \$150 million.

Francis Pay Miller, tax specialist, W. R. Grace & Co., said that both the United States and Commerce Department favored the bill but that the Treasury alone was blocking it.

MORE FLEXIBILITY

Albert D. Early, partner, Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, law firm, said the Boggs bill would give major corporations more flexibility in foreign investments.

Stefan J. Rundt, foreign trade consultant, noted that, although many U.S. corporations already have foreign subsidiaries, some of them secret, the bill would remove ethical roadblocks to the foreign investment of many other large firms. He indicated that provisions of the bill would help reverse the "flight from the dollar" throughout Europe.

The board of trade also announced plans for a conference, arranged by the international section, to be held February 10 at the Hotel Astor to unite more than 50 leading businessmen behind the Boggs bill.

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the fifth of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia is inserted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SPENDING SPREE PRODUCES REAL WOE

(By Morton Mintz)

(Fifth in a series)

In the spring of 1953, a 50-year-old woman went on a spending spree. She ran up bills totaling almost \$1,500.

She bought appliances, a television set, and clothing for herself and her seven children. About half of the total was spent in seven easy-credit stores.

Her husband had known for some years that his wife was mentally disturbed and put faith in soothsayers. He said, however, that he was unaware that she was making the purchases and that he was being made responsible for the debts.

The creditors presumably established that the husband was employed, so that his wages could be attached in event the debts were not satisfied. It is not known if the wife's condition was evident to any of the sales personnel.

FROM THE RECORDS

Here is the story that comes out of employer, hospital, and municipal court and bankruptcy court records and from conversations with the husband and others directly involved:

On June 18, 1953, the woman got into a taxicab. She did not make clear where she wished to go and she spoke incoherently. The cab driver took her to the sixth precinct; police sent her to District of Columbia General Hospital and on June 29, she was committed to St. Elizabeths Hospital. She was diagnosed as a psychotic.

The husband made a few trifling payments on the debts. Late in 1953, three easy-credit stores sued him; the others along with other creditors, apparently wrote off his debts as hopeless. He made no answer to the suits, so judgments were declared by default.

The way was open for attachment of his wages. On February 19, 1954, writs from all three stores landed almost at once. The employer noted on the last one, "Wages \$127.24 (for 2 weeks) all of which has been answered for on previous writs of attachments" from the other two stores.

On March 19, the husband filed a debtors' petition in U.S. Bankruptcy Court. It said his debts, all contracted in 1953, totaled \$1,425.79 and his assets \$462.71.

STATES HIS PREDICAMENT

The petition said the husband states upon his oath that his wife incurred heavy indebtedness during the past year; that his salary has been attached three times recently; that if another attachment is placed against his salary, he will lose his job according to the policy of the company, and will be without means to support his family.

On March 22, the husband was adjudged to be legally bankrupt. (He was discharged from bankruptcy on November 24, 1954.) On March 26, he asked the municipal court to quash the attachment of the store that arrived last, Marvins Credit, Inc., 734 Seventh Street NW., but this move failed. His motion said his creditors "are constantly at-

taching (my) salary * * * the entire family is without proper food."

In a statement of affairs filed in bankruptcy court on April 21, the husband said Marvin's, which had a balance due of \$160.56, "attached March 17, 1954, and there is now \$173.95 held by (the employer) on attachments, of which \$158.56 was condemned by Marvin's."

The second store, due \$71.26, cleared the books with a long-delayed attachment effected in October, 1955.

Records indicate that Hollywood Credit Clothing Co., Inc., 703 Seventh Street NW., obtained \$140.23 by attachments and \$78 by payments, leaving a balance of \$101.90. Just when this debt was lifted is not clearly indicated.

The employer's records, however, show that the husband's paychecks were attached a total of eight times between February 16, 1954, and June 1, 1956, leaving him without pay for 16 weeks' work in 15½ months.

Then, at least by normal credit standards, a strange thing happened. Here was a man who had been ruled bankrupt; who himself lacked the slightest understanding of how to handle money, and who presented extreme collection problems. Yet Hollywood sold him more on its "Credit That Is Different" and Marvin's on its "Magic Credit."

Hollywood filed suit on April 20, 1955, charging that he had become delinquent again. He confessed a debt of \$320.13, and the store attached his wages. With his payments, Hollywood netted about \$250 prior to the fourth attachment, served on August 29, 1956. The employer noted on the writ, "The defendant has left the service of the company."

PATIENCE EXHAUSTED

Employed there 17 years, he was fired by an employer whose patience was exhausted and who could see no end to the costs and trouble of handling the garnishments.

For about a year the husband had only off-and-on employment. Finally a firm hired him as a janitor, at \$34 a week. His old job, which benefited by union standards, paid \$80.

The new employer's turn came on February 19, 1958, when he was served a writ that said the husband still owed Hollywood \$30 (he had paid \$290.13) plus court costs of \$13 plus 6 percent interest. His \$34 wage was attached; the employer lent him the balance, and the debt was paid off.

Marvin's obtained a default judgment in 1957 on a balance of \$164. But it was unable to attach the husband's wages because in this instance he got an exemption. The garnishment law permits the income of a head of a household to be exempted from attachment if it does not exceed \$400 in the two months prior to issuance of the writ. His wages were, however, frozen for more than a week, until the Court could determine his eligibility.

JUST COULDN'T DO IT

The husband said in a recent interview that he had tried to pay off his debts "\$5, \$6 a week, but there were so many bills, try to pay the rent, \$40, try to eat * * * got so I couldn't take care of it."

Recalling his dismissal from his first job, he said, "One night I went to get my time card, didn't have no time card."

There was a 2-month period in which the Department of Public Welfare paid his rent. He is in easy credit debt even today for about \$130, some of it for clothing he bought the children now at home. He is paying it off at about \$2 a week.

Since February 1956, St. Elizabeth's has permitted his wife to come home several times a week. "When she comes out now," her husband said, "she says, 'Don't make any more bills.'"

IT DOES HAPPEN HERE

This is not a typical garnishment case, if there is such. It is, however, not unusual in

the trial of grief it left or in its individual aspects. Its importance lies in its disclosure of things that happen under the District's 58-year-old garnishment law:

The municipal court and employers become collectors, chiefly for a few easy credit operators.

Such firms as these thus have an inducement to sell to persons who buy much more than they can afford and who are unable to pay except when attachments deprive them of necessities.

The employee's entire pay check can be attached, and attachments on the same bills can keep coming.

Employees are fired after multiple attachment, often after only two.

Exemption of a person's wages from attachment, so as to leave something for food and rent, is not automatic. Even if an exemption is won, wages are tied up for 7 to 10 days.

The public is burdened with relief costs and the difference between the nominal and actual court costs.

Court costs, even if nominal, and interest inflate the defendant's original debt.

The debt can be charged to a person who does not know of the purchases or that he is being made responsible.

Why Statesmen and Reporters Turn

Gray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a brief examination surrounding the current visit of British Prime Minister Macmillan to Moscow will furnish the answers to the above caption to these remarks.

In two separate articles appearing in yesterday's Evening Star we see how wide of the mark a columnist sitting in his ivory tower here in Washington can come when his observations are stacked alongside those made by a correspondent closer to the scene.

In his column entitled "Britain Takes the West's Helm," William S. White has this to say:

Mr. Macmillan's mission to Moscow has quietly turned upside down the diplomacy of the allied world. Today at least, and possibly for a fairly lengthy tomorrow, it is British leadership that holds the initiative on the Western side.

And then in the same issue and on the same subject—Mr. Macmillan's overtures to Communist boss Khrushchev—Crosby S. Noyes, the Star's European correspondent, in a report subtitled "Berlin Outlook Dims," makes this comment:

In the face of the deliberate insults, the frustration of his hopes and the total intransigence which he has met, it may seem to Mr. Macmillan that his best course at this point would be to cut short his fruitless quest and come home.

All of which simply points up the fact that John Foster Dulles in always taking a firm stand with the Communists and President Eisenhower in refusing to meet with Khrushchev until he shows some evidence of sincerity have been pursuing the proper course all along.

The Right To Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I include here in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by the great columnist, George Sokolsky, entitled "The Right To Protest." This article, I believe, covers very clearly what was in the minds of a great many people during the time of Mr. Mikoyan's visit to the United States. Secondly, it also raises the question that is in the minds of many people and has never been answered, and that is: Who invited Mikoyan to the United States?

The article follows:

[From the Long Island Press, Jan. 23, 1959]

THE RIGHT TO PROTEST

(By George E. Sokolsky)

One sometimes gets more light on events in what is known as fan mail than anywhere else. Sometimes, I refer to such letters in this column. That which I received from Bert A. Doering of St. Louis is one of several on the same subject and in the same tone. I take two paragraphs from Doering's letter as particularly pertinent:

"You spoke about Mr. Mikoyan being confronted by a picket line in this country composed of alien refugees, including Hungarians, Bulgarians, Poles, Czechs, and other foreigners. You said these refugees marched in protest against Mikoyan, and were duly dispersed by the police, although picket lines are supposed to be respected. Your perverted views about respecting such picket lines are extremely obnoxious.

"These damned alien refugees who should be extremely grateful for being afforded asylum in this country now presume to exercise their will in this country by forming picket lines in protest against the visit to this country by a foreign dignitary who is here with the full approval of our Government. These uncouth alien refugees should be taught how to behave themselves in this country, or sent back from whence they came."

Those "damned aliens" are refugees who have been given asylum in this country because in their own they fought for those principles of life and conduct for which we stand in the United States. Because they believed in our way of life, many such persons in the satellite countries have been shipped to Siberia or were murdered. A very few fortunate ones found their way to the United States.

Here they are suddenly confronted with the butcher of Budapest, one of the men who participated in the genocide of Hungary. They find that preparations are made to wine and dine this man, that he is received by bankers and manufacturers as a friend, and no voice is raised protesting his presence in our midst. So they organize to protest and to tell their story—a story of murder, a story of genocide, a story of horrors.

Doering says further:

"It is quite possible that the rude and riotous demonstrations of these uncouth refugees was inspired by the vituperative language of Government spokesmen in their references to Government officials of Soviet Russia. These Government spokesmen are just as uncouth and ill-mannered as these alien refugees who want to take over the country after they get here. And you approve this conduct."

Yes, I do approve of the right to protest and only regret that at the moment I was

unable to go on the picket line against Mikoyan who came here to do this country only harm. The right to protest is fundamental in the America way of life. It emanates from the right to petition. This is not a police state in which the citizens must be silent while the officials act for them. Nor need we fear to speak our minds on political and social questions. Therein lies the strength of our Nation.

Undoubtedly some Americans helped to "cook up" this Hollywood farce of bringing Anastas Mikoyan to this country on a publicity man's Odyssey through our land. Harry Truman, with characteristic down-to-earth wisdom, speaks of them:

"I hope that the recent crop of diplomatic tourists does not get us into more complications at a time when the free world is trying to find how to deal with the Communist world."

Neither President Eisenhower nor Secretary of State John Foster Dulles gave Mikoyan an inch because apparently he would not budge an inch. He used television, radio, and every device of communications to influence public opinion against the stated views of the Government of the United States, to separate the people from their Government.

According to Doering that was all right because Mikoyan was a guest of the United States. Who invited him? Let a committee of Congress discover who invited him. Mikoyan, himself, said on "Meet the Press," in reply to a question, that he came here to visit the Russian Ambassador. The President has not admitted that he invited Mikoyan to this country and the President did not give him a formal reception. Guests of the Government of the United States usually stay at Blair House in Washington. Such a courtesy was not extended to Mikoyan. The Secretary of State does not admit to inviting him. Nobody does.

Kosciusko Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader-Evening News of February 12, 1959:

KOSCIUSKO ANNIVERSARY

To residents of Greater Wilkes-Barre, the name of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Polish patriot, who fought for American independence, and whose 213th birthday anniversary is observed today, has special significance, apart from our interest as grateful Americans.

This community, as a large center of Americans of Polish ancestry, has in recent years played a leading role in the Kosciuszko Foundation, with headquarters in New York. Dr. Joseph J. Kocyan, city, is chairman of the board of trustees, of which Joseph J. Lester, Kingston, and Dr. Eugene Farley, president of Wilkes College, are members. Among those who have been active on the national council are John S. Cresko, Mary Glowacki, Mary R. Koons, and John Mallonewski.

For more than three decades the Kosciuszko Foundation has been promoting cultural relations between the United States and Poland by providing scholarships and other grants through the dues and gifts of members, scores of whom are local residents.

It is fitting, indeed, to perpetuate the memory of General Kosciuszko in this fashion, for it not only serves to remind us of our debt to this gallant officer, but of the ties between the two countries, especially in trying times like these through which we are passing. The native land of this hero of the Revolution has been undergoing an ordeal for two decades, fighting an uphill battle to keep the fires of liberty burning.

The spirit of Thaddeus Kosciuszko lives on in the hearts of his countrymen who carry on with traditional courage in the face of such tremendous odds, thanks to his stirring example.

The Vaughn Bible Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, February 13, the Vaughn Bible Class of Calvary Baptist Church celebrated its 70th anniversary with an annual banquet which was attended by some 400 people. The speaker of the occasion was the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, who was introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. CLIFFORD MCINTIRE].

In connection with this important event one of the classmates, Dr. Nelson M. Blake, prepared a statement in the style of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, in that it was so appropriate and timely in connection with our 70th anniversary banquet. I ask that it be extended in the RECORD with these remarks:

Three score and ten years ago our founding fathers organized in Calvary Baptist Sunday School the Vaughn Bible Class, committed to the study of God's Word, and dedicated to a genuine concern for the other fellow. Now we are faced with a great challenge, testing whether this class, or any class so organized and so dedicated, can long continue. We are met together on a significant anniversary of this class. We have gathered here to enjoy Christian fellowship and to pay tribute to those loyal and faithful men who have labored so devotedly that this class might endure. It is both fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate this class. The noble men, living and dead, who have served here through the years have consecrated it far beyond our ability to add or detract. Members of Calvary Church and of the Vaughn Class will pay little attention to what we say here, but they can never forget what these men have done here. It is for us, the living, to be dedicated anew to the continuing program which those who have labored here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be dedicated here to the challenging tasks remaining before us—that from the lives and examples of our leaders we pledge renewed devotion to the high and worthy purposes for which they have labored so faithfully; that we here solemnly resolve that these leaders shall not have served in vain; that the Vaughn Bible Class, under God's guidance and direction shall experience a spiritual rebirth; and that sincere service for God, for country, and for the other fellow shall continue to inspire and challenge us as the years come and go.

Congressional Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have been witness to a crescendoing wave of critical opinion, public and private, with respect to the expendability of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or at least with respect to the urgency of reappraising its effectiveness in rooting out subversion and the need for clarifying its jurisdiction. It required no divining rod to perceive that this sudden intense and widespread interest in the activities of the Un-American Activities Committee was touched off by the decision of the Supreme Court in the Watkins case which castigated in no uncertain terms the efforts of congressional committees to expose persons through the investigative process merely for the sake of exposure.

I would like at this time to commend to your attention the following editorial, appropriately entitled "Congressional Abuse," which appeared in the February 21 issue of the Toledo Blade and which places dramatic emphasis on the continued excesses and abuses of the Un-American Activities Committee in publishing a so-called elite corps of 39 lawyers whom they have identified as Communists.

The editor suggests that the validity and reliability of the committee's list be properly evaluated against the background of a formal protest to the Congress by the California Bar Association in 1957, a protest against the improper and abusive conduct, amply documented, of the members of that committee in the course of its investigation.

I believe the following editorial is highly illuminating and its conclusions an unmistakable indictment of distinctly un-American methods employed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

CONGRESSIONAL ABUSE

In releasing a report on what it calls an "elite corps" of Communist lawyers, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has not only unfairly attacked a group of accused attorneys but has also jeopardized the constitutional right to counsel. The House group listed the names of 39 lawyers from a total of 100 who, it said, had been identified as Communists before the committee. It charged that their activities included abuse of the courts, misbehavior before congressional committees and circumvention of the law.

Of the attorneys named, 23 are from California. This being the case, the Congress and the country should now pay attention to what the California Bar Association said in 1957 with regard to the committee's treatment of members of the bar in that State. In a formal protest to Congress, the association branded the group's conduct toward lawyers in hearings there as "improper and lacking in dignity and impartiality" and as "grossly offensive."

To document its case, the association declared that:

"A lawyer accused by a witness as being a Communist was thereafter referred to by the committee counsel as 'Comrade.'"

"Lawyers who tried to object to such treatment were ejected from the hearings even though they were not 'disrespectful, unruly, or bolsterous.'"

In the light of such a protest as this from a respectable professional organization, Congress had better look to the misbehavior of its own committee. Members of the bar, while practicing their profession, should not be required to put up with abuse by representatives of Government. If they are to be accused, they should have full opportunity to defend themselves.

Continuation of the irresponsible and abusive methods of the Committee on Un-American Activities can hardly fail to discourage attorneys from taking the cases of Communists or other unpopular clients, thus impairing the guarantee of the assistance of counsel, which the Bill of Rights provides and which both the American Bar Association and the California Bar Association have sought to uphold.

The Soaring Spire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no one knows better than the housewife the gathering danger of inflation if the practice of borrowing and spending by our Federal Government continues unbridled. Their awareness of this risk is ably set forth in a resolution adopted by the Hinsdale Women's Republican Club of Hinsdale, Ill. Their observations should be well taken at this time. The resolution follows:

The following resolution was passed unanimously at the regular meeting of the Hinsdale Women's Republican Club on January 12, 1959:

"Whereas the tax burden in the United States has reached an all-time high, with increasing pressure on the 1959 sessions of State and national legislatures for increased appropriations; and

"Whereas Government spending programs in the various fields of foreign aid, welfare, and education require ever-increasing taxation, which is destroying initiative, incentive, and enterprise; and degrading the national character; and

"Whereas Government by continuous taxing and borrowing and spending is causing an inflation, which eventually will confiscate the savings and investments of every citizen; and

"Whereas the taxpayers are helpless in this matter, unless they make a combined and united effort to demand relief: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this club of Republican women—

"1. That our representatives on both State and National levels be advised that they may count upon our unified assistance in their fight to resist this trend of spending;

"2. That they be asked to make careful study of all requests for money, in order to ascertain what economy may be worked out;

"3. That all new taxing agencies and services be held in abeyance;

"4. That we call on taxpayers at precinct and grassroots level to join in this economy

effort, by writing to their representatives in Washington and Springfield;

"5. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Illinois Members of Congress, and to all members of the general assembly in Springfield."

MARY C. ALSBAUGH,
Chairman of Legislation.

William T. Wynn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the death of William T. Wynn, of Greenville, Miss., on Saturday, February 21, was a great loss to our country, but it was an especially great loss to the Mississippi Delta, the area which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. Mr. Wynn was an outstanding business leader, well known throughout the country.

He was one of the founders and most successful presidents of the National Cotton Council. His greatest love, however, was Greenville and the Mississippi Delta. His contributions to the progress of our area can never be measured. Billy Wynn was a southern gentleman in the highest tradition of that expression.

Under unanimous consent, I include editorials from the Delta Democrat-Times, of Greenville, Miss., and from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

[From the Delta Democrat-Times, Feb. 23, 1959]

WILLIAM T. WYNN

Taken all in all, William T. Wynn was Mississippi's foremost present-day citizen. As such, this many-faceted man will be remembered and mourned in our community, our State, our region and our Nation, each of which he served ably and patriotically and in a variety of ways. He was soldier and churchman, lawyer and lawmaker, a visionary agriculturalist who led in the fashioning of the National Cotton Council into a mighty weapon for the South; and a businessman and financier whose acumen had the tinge of genius. All these things he was and more.

But my own remembrance and mourning are not so much for such a man as for one who was my benefactor and advisor and friend. Billy Wynn was one of the handful of Deltans who sponsored my coming to Greenville nearly 23 years ago to establish a new daily newspaper. In that difficult, eventually successful struggle, he and our seven associates gave of their time and wisdom and resources to an extent that is in retrospect as unbelievable to me as it is to the literally thousands to whom I have told this story. I owe him much.

Nor am I unique as a beneficiary of Billy Wynn. No one knows and no one will ever know the range of his unobtrusive generosity. Some of us he put on the road to success. Some he rescued from poverty or disgrace or worse. Some were close to him and some were strangers or nearly so, to whom he offered his helping hand for no other reason than that they were fellow humans in need.

Yet this is not enough to say of him. The successful man can be dull and the open-

handed citizen dreary. Billy Wynn was neither dreary nor dull. He enjoyed life in all its aspects, in drawing room and duck-blind and at the racetrack and the football stadium; in the political powwow and at the directors' table; in civic undertaking and in the casual banter of the American main street. No matter where he was, his rare personal charm and his unfailing courtesy glowed warm and bright, drawing to their flame all manner of men and women. He was one of God's gentlemen. May God rest his soul.

HODDING CARTER.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal]

W. T. WYNN

W. T. Wynn, who died Saturday in Hot Springs, Ark., while on a vacation from his Greenville, Miss., home, was a man of many facets, varied careers and ambitions.

Billy Wynn, as he was known best by his friends and associates, was a lawyer, financier, banker, cotton planter and ginner, politician, and civic leader.

Successful in all the fields he entered, he will be remembered best for his devoted zeal in civic and community affairs.

He was one of the organizers of the Delta Council, which is the voice of the Mississippi alluvial empire in matters ranging from water conservation to farm legislation, from schools to forestry development. It was logical that he should serve a term as president of the group.

With the late Oscar Johnston he moved to form the National Cotton Council, which speaks for cotton both at home and abroad. He served the council as director, treasurer, president, or chairman of the board during all the years since it was formed.

Of all his activities cotton demanded and received the most attention. He guided the council through the hectic span that marked the efforts to develop legislative and pricing policies which would restore cotton to its place in the sun. After his tenure in office he remained a strong force in the determination of policy.

Many men have made successes in single fields. Few have had the varied successes that came to Billy Wynn.

Yet he gave of himself freely, without stint or hope of personal gain to further the welfare of his community and the cotton industry.

Gentle and gentlemanly, soft spoken but forceful, he was beloved for what he was as well as for what he did.

His reward has been the success of the organizations he fostered; his monument, their continued and growing influence.

Congratulations to Clarostat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared in Foster's Daily Democrat, Dover, N.H., on February 24, 1959, in observance of the 10th anniversary of the Clarostat Manufacturing Co. New Hampshire is proud to have Clarostat as one of its industries. The company has performed an outstanding service to the community and the economic life of the State:

CONGRATULATIONS TO CLAROSTAT

Clarostat, the popular name for the Clarostat Manufacturing Co., is tonight formally observing its 10th anniversary in Dover. On this occasion it will honor employees of 5 to 25 years with a banquet and presentation of awards.

A long story could be written about the 38-year-old concern that started on one floor of a Brooklyn, N.Y., factory building in 1921 as a small manufacturer of miscellaneous items. Not until 3 years later when it produced a special type of rheostat that clarified static in radios of those days, did the company begin to grow. This new product gave the present name—Clarostat—to the concern. It was forced to move to larger space in Brooklyn and the payroll increased to a few hundred.

About a dozen years ago continued growth of the business demanded that new quarters be located. Company executives searched all over the Northeast. Finally, when the late Charles Burnell, one of the top executives of Clarostat, made a trip up through the Connecticut Valley, he was referred to the New Hampshire Planning and Development Commission.

To this State agency and to the old Dover Mill Committee go much of the credit for having the Brooklyn corporation take over the Pacific No. 1 mill. Into this building the Government had poured several hundreds of thousands of dollars to modernize the plant during the war emergency. It was turned over to Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., to operate on a war project.

As a result, Clarostat purchased a modern plant for a relatively small sum, and it also inherited hundreds of men and women who had received Sylvania training on detailed assembly-line electronic work, an asset difficult to appraise in dollars and cents. In the list of 173 employees, of whom 125 are Dover residents, who have been with Clarostat for 10 years, we note many names of former Sylvania workers.

Since coming to Dover, Clarostat has a record of almost constant growth. Its research facilities have multiplied and it has developed many new television and radio components. From a few hundred workers at the end of the first year in Dover, the company now has over 1,300 on its payroll. Salaries and wages have gone up from \$1 million to nearly \$4 million annually.

Last year its payroll aggregated \$3,773,029. Probably over 80 percent of this is in the immediate Dover area. The official breakdown shows that 76 percent is specifically paid to residents in Strafford County and adjacent communities. Of the remaining 24 percent, all but a very small amount is paid to employees residing within 25 miles of this city.

Of the total 1958 payroll, \$1,710,000, or about 46 percent, is paid to Dover people.

To get off money matters, a noteworthy feature of the 10th anniversary of Clarostat in Dover is the pleasant relationship existing with its employees through local 242, IUE (AFL-CIO). We note that union officials are frequently called in by management to cooperate on numerous projects. Tonight's dinner is one such.

The Democrat feels that it is in a position to extend to the Clarostat Manufacturing Co., not only its own congratulations, but those of the local area business community and people, for the success that the company has enjoyed, and for what it has meant to the area economy as one of the largest employers.

President Eisenhower and the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, seven state-of-the-Union messages ago, President Eisenhower stated wisely that our school system demands some prompt, effective help. He said the whole situation calls for careful congressional study and action.

Since that time, his recommendations have ranged from study to first echelon action, then back to second echelon study after first echelon inaction.

In 1954, he put it this way:

In order to appraise the needs, I hope that this year a conference on education will be held in each State, culminating in a national conference. From these conferences on education, every level of government—from the Federal Government to each local school board—should gain the information with which to attack this serious problem.

In 1955, the year the conferences were to be completed, he once again became an action man. He put it this way:

However, such factors as population growth, additional responsibilities of schools, and increased and longer school attendance have produced an unprecedented classroom shortage. This shortage is of immediate concern to all our people. Affirmative action must be taken now.

Without impairing in any way the responsibilities of our States, our localities, communities, or families, the Federal Government should serve as an effective agent in dealing with this problem.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-five was the year, too, that the President sent us a special message.

In 1956, he reported the conclusion of the broadly representative White House Conference on Education, that—

The people of the United States must make a greater effort through their local, State, and Federal Governments to improve the education of our youth. This expression from the people—

He said—

must now be translated into action at all levels of government.

So far as the Federal share of responsibility is concerned, I urge that the Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of Federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit of school classrooms.

He promised, and delivered, to Congress that year his recommended program of Federal assistance for school construction.

He hit his peak in 1957, when he said:

High priority should be given the school construction bill. This will benefit children of all races throughout the country—and children of all races need schools now. A

program designed to meet emergency needs for more classrooms should be enacted without delay.

But he also hit bottom in the summer of 1957. In July 25, we all lost when the House, by a vote of 208 to 203, killed the bill authorizing general Federal aid to the States for school construction.

This was the bill President Eisenhower said he wanted—until its life hung on his expression of support on the day the bill was voted on. Then there was silence. A statement from the President prior to the vote, that he would be disappointed if school construction legislation were not passed, would have done a lot more good than his mention of disappointment after the bill was killed. For a shift of three votes would have saved the bill. Ninety-seven Democrats and one hundred and eleven Republicans voted against the bill. One hundred and twenty-six Democrats and seventy-seven Republicans voted for it.

In his 1958 state-of-the-Union message, President Eisenhower lumped education and research together, saying his recommended program "involves new activities by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare designed principally to encourage improved teaching quality and student opportunities in the interests of national security."

But that was the year, too, that he talked of spurring the maximum amount of local effort and called for "redoubled exertions on the part of all Americans if we are to rise to the demands of our times."

This—

He said—

means hard work on the part of State and local governments, private industry, schools and colleges, private organizations and foundations, teachers, parents, and—perhaps most important of all—the student himself, with his bag of books and his homework.

In his 1959 budget message, President Eisenhower proposed another study. He said he would set up a committee of selfless, able, and devoted individuals, outside of Government to make an appraisal of the potentials of our future. The result would be establishment of national goals. The committee also would be concerned "with methods to meet such goals and which levels of Government—local, State, or Federal—might or should be particularly concerned."

As one example, consider our schools, operated under the authority of local communities and States. In their capacity and in their quality they conform to no recognizable standards. In some places facilities are ample, in others meager. Pay of teachers ranges between wide limits, from the adequate to the shameful.

He said:

We need a national goal. Once established, I am certain that public opinion would compel steady progress toward its accomplishment.

So far, we have not heard anything further from the President. His Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did hold a press conference and released a letter to Speaker RAYBURN. So we are down to a second-echelon study.

The Late Meyer Berger, of the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Shirley Povich which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 12, 1959:

New York, February 11.—At the Riverside Memorial Chapel at Amsterdam and 76th, the cab driver pulled up and said there would be no fare for this one. "I'm not taking," he said, "I'm parking." Meyer Berger wrote a story about me and my hack in 1953. Today, like you, I'm a passenger. I got respects to pay."

They were at Mike Berger's funeral services today, the cab drivers, the destitute, the hardluck ones, his little people with whom he treated in his "About New York" column for the New York Times. Also the big people, the editors of the Times to whom he gave 30 years of super reporting and city officials and big-name folks who had admired Meyer Berger and were now grieving.

They came from other newspapers, too, and the magazines, in farewell salute to the gentle champion of their craft who had beaten his own East Side boyhood poverty to gain fame as the reportorial giant of newspaper city rooms.

They knew that Mike Berger did not merely write stories with his typewriter. He caressed them tenderly and brightly and sensitively amid the tumult of the city room, and the fact that two of them won him Pulitzer prizes was unimportant to admiring colleagues who knew there were hundreds from his typewriter that qualified.

One that didn't win him a Pulitzer prize was the lead he spun when the Times editors turned over to Mike the story of the killing of mobster Albert Anastasia. That master killer of the gangster troop who had plagued New York for years got his in 1957 from two gunmen who found Anastasia in a barber's chair at the Park Sheraton Hotel. Berger assessed the story and wrote, "Death Took the Executioner Yesterday."

The services for Berger today were in the faith of his fathers and he was committed to rest with the chant of the Hebrew "El mole rachmin, schochen bamromin." If it is presumptuous to introduce a Lincoln-esque note, at least the fellows of Mike Berger's craft could agree that he, too, is lost to the ages.

The reporter who, better than any other, captured the sights and sounds of New York and grew up to dominate the language of newspapers, made it after only 2 years of high school. But he had discovered the free libraries and learned, too, from his school-teacher wife, and as one of the 11 Berger children he was learning also the throbs that travel with good people of little goods. He wrote of them kindly.

The big story, too, was Berger's dish and his competitive colleagues on other newspapers would wait for the Berger lead in the New York Times with the kind of trepidation that actors reserve for the next morning's reviews. His way of handling the story was the simplicity of the fine artist as he appraised events and made tools of words.

Thus it was that when the first of World War II's soldier dead came home from Europe in 1947, Mike captured the depth of the story virtually in one lead sentence when he typed "They came in on the morning tide, in 6248 coffins, in the hold of the transport James V. Connolly."

Once a night city editor of the Times, impatient with the lack of slam-bang journalistic style by new young reporter Berger, told him, "You'll never make a newspaperman." Today in the Riverside Chapel, the Times' current city editor, Frank Adams, said "the tongue of an angel is needed to do justice to the craftsmanship and the quality of our departed comrade."

He graduated from police reporter to the toughest crucible of all newspaper-writing jobs, that of night re-write man who assembles facts against time and out of them confects the story that should be written, well. His facility with re-writes brought him the top reporting assignments, and then the Times gave him the thrice-weekly "About New York" column. New Yorkers recognized the byline and then recognized him as the tall, thin gentleman with spectacles and long, inquisitive nose, who listened patiently to them and wrote about them.

Times men said of him that he liked everybody, including some that didn't deserve to be liked. In the city room he was the biggest soft touch for "the bite." Famous enough to have a private office, he wouldn't. Too astigmatic to pass the eye test for the World War I Army, he memorized the good-vision chart and got in. He came back with a Purple Heart and a Silver Star.

He took another fling at war as a correspondent in 1944 and lasted only 2 months, got no farther than England. He developed ulcers that were kicking up. You can get ulcers if you listen too patiently and too kindly to other people's hard-luck tales. Oh, yes, the \$1,000 Pulitzer prize he won for writing the 13-person killing by Howard Unruh, the demented war veteran, in New Jersey in 1949, he didn't keep. Sent it along to the killer's mother. His feeling for people told him where it would be needed. It also helped him write so well.

Junior Colleges Put in Limelight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the widespread support for the public junior college movement was the general display of interest by many school leaders at the national convention of the American Association of School Administrators recently held at Atlantic City. In one of the most heavily attended sectional meetings at the convention, general agreement was expressed on behalf of the need for a system of community colleges throughout the Nation.

Recently the Christian Science Monitor contained an excellent article by the paper's education editor, Millicent Taylor, concerning the association's discussion of the community college movement. I think it will be of interest to all and ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JUNIOR COLLEGES PUT IN LIMELIGHT

(By Millicent Taylor)

ATLANTIC CITY.—Is extending the public school system upward to include the junior college the next step in American education?

School leaders meeting here for the national convention of the American Association of School Administrators, a department of the National Education Association, say it can't be stopped.

In a heavily attended section meeting, the need for systems of junior or community colleges all across the Nation was readily conceded. The point at issue was what the setup should be.

This discussion was only one of nearly two score section meetings dealing simultaneously with all kinds of school problems, ranging from identifying the gifted and stepping up foreign languages to teacher certification and the training of school custodians.

PATTERN OUTLINED

Presenting the California pattern of public junior colleges as a successful one, James H. Corson, superintendent of schools, Modesto, described such colleges as (1) voluntarily initiated by local communities, (2) tuition free, (3) public supported and distributing the cost between State and local levels, (4) serving an existing high school area or combined areas, and (5) administered by a locally elected or appointed board of lay citizens, with the State responsible for accredited standards, and a liaison between its programs and the university providing professional consultative service and the like.

Dr. Corson sees the public junior colleges as providing, beyond high school, education at less cost to the family and to the State. He also sees these colleges as offering real encouragement in an increasingly complex society to those who can benefit by going on with formal education. In addition, they relieve the strain on the senior colleges—large numbers entering senior colleges in the third year.

Able students that are enrolled in them are challenged, and go on to professional degrees and to positions of leadership.

STRONG GUIDANCE NOTED

At the same time guidance is stronger in the junior college than in the early years of the larger senior colleges and universities, and many a young person is enabled to find himself.

It is the experience in California, too, that the junior colleges iron out student problems and relieve the senior colleges of remedial work, although the junior college is not by any means "just a salvage shop."

Close cooperation with the community, Dr. Corson emphasized, enables the junior college to offer advanced technical, semiprofessional, terminal business, and trade training in direct response to community, area, State, and national needs.

The public junior college has also proved the best center for serving adults locally in special, refresher, and retraining programs. It brings into the community at low cost, he added, many cultural advantages and interests formerly restricted to the oasis of the college town.

"As the Nation faces the rising tide of college students during the next decade, heavy

reliance must be placed upon the junior college," Dr. Corson stressed.

"It is probable that they will continue and extend their important role in the democratization of higher education and will bring educational opportunity within commuting distance to scattered student populations throughout the State and Nation. We advocate the principle of local control. If local school districts feel shortage of funds, as they probably will, the State can increase its support with a much lower outlay than it could provide another brand of higher education."

And he added that to do nothing to meet the already urgent need is to place our heads in the sand.

Lawrence Bethel, president of the Fashion Institute of Technology, a higher education institution of New York public schools, declared himself in favor of public junior colleges. But he warned the school heads against merely adding two grades to the high school. The junior college must have administrative and educational freedom to develop as a separate institution of college character, he stressed.

Formation of a junior college in an area must be voluntary, meeting a felt need of the community with the full support of the community and with ready aid from the State.

This was an opinion expressed by many other school heads present.

FAST GROWTH RECORDED

Dr. Bethel also questioned the practicability of forming junior colleges in any but the more heavily populated districts. Where high school graduating classes are small and distances too great to combine high school areas, the junior college classes would be too small to provide courses diverse enough of quality high enough to meet the interests, needs, and abilities of all the students.

In the light of the present 50 percent drop-out or failures in some of the better colleges, too, he suggested that we are not reaching the interests and abilities of half our present registration. He therefore urged that before the schools add a network of public junior colleges and encourage more students to go beyond high school, that they improve their present programs.

"The junior college is now the most rapidly developing phase of education in the United States," he summarized. "It is estimated that by the end of the next decade it will register more than 50 percent of the freshmen of all collegiate institutions. This proportion already has been exceeded in California. It is becoming the undergraduate collegiate institution of our modern educational structure."

"Let us not impede its progress by trying to make it an appendage of a totally different phase of the structure. Rather, let us assist it to grow and develop in its own right."

Who'll Be the Next President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, today more than 15 months before the parties select their candidates for President, speculation is rampant as to who the next President will be. In the 18th Congressional District, I have tried to obtain information in order to translate that speculation into an informed prediction.

At the early part of this year, I forwarded to all the registered voters in my congressional area a questionnaire. Included in this questionnaire were the following questions: "Whom do you prefer as President of the United States?" and "Whom do you prefer as Vice President of the United States?"

Many replies were returned to me and about 60 percent of those that answered indicated that it was too soon to determine their choice. The remaining answers indicated various choices for President and Vice President. One can draw many conclusions from the answers and I shall draw several.

In order to better understand the results, a description of my congressional district and the economic position of the residents would be helpful. My district consists of residents who are paying extremely high rents and extremely low rents. The rentals range from \$100 per room per month to \$5 per room per month. Included among them are the residents of a great number of low income public housing projects. They are workers, businessmen, executives, teachers, and many public employees.

My area is populated probably by the most heterogeneous group in the United States. There are Italians, Puerto Ricans, Negroes, Cubans, Germans, Hungarians, Irish, Czechs, and other nationality groups. This area is known as East Harlem and Yorkville. This area is strictly urban with no private residences or one-family homes.

The names of the Presidential hopefuls were not listed on the questionnaire and the constituency wrote in the names according to their choice. Twenty-one and one-half percent selected Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY for either President or Vice President. Thirteen percent selected Adlai Stevenson. Four and one-half percent selected Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. Four percent selected Gov. Robert B. Meyner. Two and one-half percent selected Senator STUART SYMINGTON. Two percent selected Mayor Robert F. Wagner. One percent selected Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. Twelve and one-half percent selected Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, and 9½ percent selected Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

The choice for Presidency was the closest with JOHN KENNEDY eking out a 1-percent margin over Adlai Stevenson. Mr. NIXON for President had a slight edge of 2 percent over Rockefeller.

This questionnaire was forwarded to the constituency before Governor Rockefeller advocated his high tax program and reduced exemptions. The attitudes of the residents of the State of New York, and particularly in this section, undoubtedly have changed regarding Governor Rockefeller.

It is noteworthy that during the last presidential election, President Dwight Eisenhower defeated Adlai Stevenson in this area by a margin of 18,000. The district is considered a Democratic district, except in a presidential election.

The strength which Senator KENNEDY showed in the polls was surprising. He was clearly either a choice for President or Vice President, and would, in my opinion, prove to be a strong candidate in

this congressional district. The strength of Adlai Stevenson was only for President with a small percentage of the people selecting him as their choice for Vice President. Apparently the voters feel that Mr. Stevenson should be presidential and not a vice presidential choice.

The contest between RICHARD NIXON and Nelson Rockefeller was extremely close. During the last New York gubernatorial election, Nelson Rockefeller on an overall basis won in this congressional area, losing in the north end and winning in the south end of the district. The strength that Nixon showed, in my opinion, was surprisingly strong. While more people favored JOHN KENNEDY, sentiment was strong for Nixon.

Other surveys, such as U.S. News & World Report, are based upon preferences of particular leaders with votes in the convention. My survey indicates the choice by the people who cast their votes. In view of the large number of people who abstained from indicating a choice so far in advance, one can readily conclude that the great majority of the voting population is undecided at the present time.

In my opinion, this is the home stretch and those presidential hopefuls who demonstrate aggressive leadership and who are shown by press and television to possess understanding of our domestic and foreign problems, will be the choice of the uncommitted electorate. At this point, the people of my area who have expressed themselves clearly want JACK KENNEDY for one of the two highest positions in our country.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., 6 Wesley Circle
N. Mex.
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*.....3840 Lorcom Lane,
Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *University Club*
R. I.
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*.....
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr.,
Mo.
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., 5511 Cedar Park-
way, Chevy Chase,
Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H.,
Minn.
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*.....3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*.....4929 Hillbrook
Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okl.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La.*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*.....2030 Chesapeake
St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*.....
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., The Shoreham
Wash.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S., *Mike,*
Okl.
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*.....122 Schotts
Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
Neuberger, Richard L.,
Oreg.
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., Sheraton-Park
Wyo.

Pastore, John O., *R. I.*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*.....
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoepfel, Andrew F.,
Kans.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase
(Mrs.), *Maine*.....
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr.,
N. J.
Williams, John J., *Del.*.....
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman),
Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington,
Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon,
Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin,
and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of
South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Hum-
phrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jor-
dan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of
North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams
of Delaware, and Schoepfel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell,
Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson,
Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of
Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible,
Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges,
Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt,
Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel,
Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Vir-
ginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington,
Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett,
Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith,
Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and
Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright,
Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire,
Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey,
Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, and
Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear,
Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and
Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr,
Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas,
Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams
of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton,
and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green,
Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse,
Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley,
Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and
Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson,
Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt,
Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson,
Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Car-

roll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak,
Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore,
Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche,
Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee,
Schoepfel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey,
Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver,
Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, Mc-
Clellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd,
Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and
Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy,
McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Ran-
dolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater,
Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits,
and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chair-
man), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough,
Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNa-
mara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy,
Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of
South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and
Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden,
Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis,
Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel
Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts,
3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852
Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut
Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037
Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whitaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van
Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey
Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823
Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St.
Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lipsett, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice
Warren. *District of Columbia.*
First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frank-
furter. *Maine, Massachusetts, New Hamp-
shire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.*
Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan.
Connecticut, New York, Vermont.
Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan.
*Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia
Islands.*
Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice
Warren. *Maryland, North Carolina, South
Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.*
Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black.
*Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia,
Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.*
Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart.
Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.
Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark.
Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.
Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whit-
taker. *Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri,
Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.*
Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas.
*Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana,
Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.*
Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whit-
taker. *Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Okla-
homa, Utah, Wyoming.*